Post-viral mental health sequelae: Systematic review and meta-analysis of prevalence proportions

Simeon Joel Zürcher [1,2], Céline Banzer [3], Christine Adamus [1,2], Anja I. Lehmann [4], Dirk Richter [1,2,5], Philipp Kerksieck [4]

[1] Center for Psychiatric Rehabilitation, Universitäre Psychiatrische Dienste Bern (UPD), Bern, Switzerland

[2] University Hospital of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

[3] Department of Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

[4] Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute, Public and Organizational Health, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

[5] Department of Health Professions, Bern University of Applied Sciences, Bern, Switzerland

***Correspondence:**

Simeon J. Zürcher,

Center for Psychiatric Rehabilitation, Universitäre Psychiatrische Dienste Bern (UPD)

Murtenstrasse 46, 3008 Bern, Switzerland

Email: simeon.zuercher@upd.unibe.ch

Abstract

Background: Mental health problems (MHP) in COVID-19 patients and survivors were anticipated already during early stages of this pandemic. We aimed to synthesize the prevalence of anxiety, depression, post-traumatic and general distress of major virus epidemics since 2002.

Methods: In this systematic review and meta-analysis, we searched PubMed, PsycINFO, and Embase from 2002 until April 14, 2021 for peer-reviewed studies reporting prevalence of MHP in adults with laboratory-confirmed or suspected SARS-CoV-1, H1N1, MERS-CoV, H7N9, Ebolavirus, or SARS-CoV-2 infection. We included studies that assessed MHP with well-validated and frequently used scales. A three-level random-effects meta-analysis for dependent sizes was conducted to account for multiple outcome reporting. We pooled MHP jointly and separately for mild or moderate-to-severe severity by acute (one month), ongoing (one to three month), and post-illness phase (longer than three months). A meta-regression was conducted to test for moderating effects. PROSPERO registration: CRD42020194535.

Findings: We identified 59 studies providing a total of 187 effect sizes. Range for sample size (n=14-n=1002), females (22-79%), and mean age (32-72 years). MHP prevalence was higher for mild (35·5-46·3%) compared to moderate-to-severe MPH (17·3-22·3). MHP, in general, decreased from acute to post-illness from 46·3% to 38·8% and for mild and moderate-to-severe from 22·3% to 18·8%, respectively. We found no evidence of moderating effects except for non-random sampling and H1N1 showing higher proportions.

Interpretation: MHP decreased over time but were still on a substantial level at post-illness. This highlights a need for rapid access to mental health care and rehabilitation planning in affected individuals.

Introduction

A large body of evidence from COVID-19 and earlier epidemics such as SARS-CoV-1 and Ebola raised concerns regarding long-lasting neurological and psychological problems in infected individuals.[1-4] Yet, the pathological processes in which COVID-19 leads to detrimental psychoneurological effects are still largely unknown and are subject to extensive ongoing research. Pathophysiological mechanisms including immune response, vascular damage, detrimental effects of critical illness and side effects from treatments may play an important role.[5] Psychological problems (thereinafter mental health problems[MHP]), are at least partly attributable to sociodemographic and environmental factors. Infected individuals may suffer from life-threatening complications with uncertain survival or recovery, social isolation, and reduced access to social support, all of which can lead to loneliness and MHP.[6,7] Affected individuals may face compromised access to care due to escalating case numbers and overwhelmed health services. Post-illness, survivors may face ongoing symptoms such as reduced physical functioning, fatigue, social and economic issues such as stigmatization with a refusal of services, and reduced working abilities.[1,3,8,9] Mental health problems may also be aggravated by a history of pre-existing mental health problems.[10]

As treatment possibilities improve, there is a shift towards physical and psychological long-term effects in affected individuals. Estimating the magnitude of long-lasting mental and physical problems, including mechanisms and risk factors, is critical to estimate individual, societal and economic costs and to facilitate treatment and rehabilitation planning.[11] Results from original studies and reviews estimating MHP prevalence values can be limited in estimating the burden of disease due to a large heterogeneity in study quality, like assessment methods used.[1,12]

We are not aware of a systematic evidence synthesis including patients and survivors of major infections disease epidemics in the last two decades that include severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 1 (SARS-CoV-1), swine flu (H1N1), Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV), avian influenza (H7N9), Ebolavirus, and severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). In the present meta-analysis, we aimed to estimate the overall MHP prevalence and the prevalence proportion of anxiety, depression, post-traumatic stress, and general distress with validated and widely used scales in suspected and laboratory-confirmed patients and survivors. We used a meta-regression to investigate potential moderating effects on the overall MHP proportions.

Methods

Search strategy and selection criteria

The study was registered with PROSPERO (CRD42020194535) and is reported in adherence to PRISMA guidelines.[13] As compared to the registered protocol, we focused on infected individuals/survivors and excluded original studies on the general population and health-care workers due to the excessive number of systematic reviews already available for these populations.

We searched PubMed, PsycINFO, Embase and Google Scholar for peer-reviewed studies in the range from January 1, 2002 to April 14, 2021. Reference lists of all eligible studies and topic relevant reviews were screened to identify studies that were potentially missed. We used a broad set of keywords (**appendix p 2**) related to epidemics of interest and frequently used and established assessment instruments found by our last review,[12] as defined in the inclusion section. Inclusion criteria were: (**a**) peer-reviewed articles using a quantitative methodology; (**b**) published in the languages Dutch, English, French, German or Spanish; (**c**) providing MHP prevalence values assessed by any versions of the impact of event scale (IES), the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D), the Patient Health Questionnaire/Generalized Anxiety Disorder scale (PHQ/GAD), the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS), and the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ); (**d**) adult patients/survivors (≥ 18 years) with suspected or confirmed SARS-CoV-1, H1N1, MERS-CoV, H7N9, Ebolavirus or SARS-CoV-2 infection. Exclusion criteria were: (**a**) subgroups of patients/survivors including psychiatric patients, marginalized individuals, people with chronic physical conditions; (**b**) articles not providing prevalence **(appendix p 3).**

After removing duplicates electronically and manually, two authors (SJZ, PK) identified studies meeting the inclusion criteria based on title and abstracts independently and blinded to each other's decisions. Any study that met the inclusion criteria was inspected independently and blinded in full-text by two authors (SJZ, CA, CB, PK) for closer inspection. Agreement on the eligibility of full-text was 90.3% (Cohens Kappa: 0·79 [95% CI 0·69-0·90]). Discrepancies were resolved through discussion.

Data extraction and coding

A standardized form was used to extract study data and quality **(appendix p 4)**. Data was extracted and checked by two authors for each included study (SJZ, CA, CB, PK). Variables extracted for descriptive and/or moderator analyses were first authors, year of publication, country, world-region (China, Asia excl. China, Europe, Africa, America), study design (cross-sectional, longitudinal, intervention), sampling method (random/complete sampling, non-random/unknown sampling strategy), response rate, epidemic, sex ratio, mean/median age, proportion with a history of a mental health conditions, proportion in need of intensive care unit, proportion of health care workers, proportion with higher education, treatment received (inpatient, outpatient, or miscellaneous), and months follow-up defined as the time elapsed since treatment or discharge coded as acute (≤ 1 month), ongoing (1-3 months), or post-illness (> 3 months) based on a recently proposed recording system.[14] Outcomes were prevalence proportions defined as the number of positive classified cases by assessment instrument divided by sample size. We calculated the overall MHP prevalence excluding the GHQ as a too generic measure of distress and MHP by domains including anxiety (GAD and HADS scale), depression (PHQ, CES-D, HADS-D scale), post-traumatic stress (IES-Scale), general distress (GHQ scale), and somatization

(PHQ-15 Scale). Prevalence values were further stratified by follow-up timepoint and severity defined as at least mild symptoms or at least moderate-to-severe symptoms cut-off by assessment instruments **(appendix p 5).**

Appraisal of the evidence

Quality was appraised independently by SJZ, CA, CB, and PK using eight items of the nine criteria version of the Joanna Briggs Institute Critical Appraisal Checklist for Studies Reporting Prevalence Data.[15] Each item was rated with yes, no, or unclear and covered sampling frame, sampling/recruitment, sample size, subjects and setting description, coverage, standardized procedures, transparent statistical analyses, and response rate. We excluded the item on valid assessment methods as we only included studies using well-established assessment scales (e.g., PHQ). To the best of our knowledge, there is no published recommendation of weighting and scoring.[15] We therefore binarized each quality item into yes/no (no or unclear) and calculated the quality achieved in percent (possible range from zero to eight out of a maximum of eight). We classified at least seven points (>87%) as good to excellent, five to six (63-75%) as moderate, less than four (≤50%) as poor. Discrepancies were resolved through discussion. Average inter-rater agreement across all items ranged from 80·0 to 96·7% (Cohens Kappa; 0·75 [95% CI 0·58-0·92] to 0·93 [95% CI 0·83-1·0]).

Data Analysis

We conducted a random-effects meta-analysis and meta-regression for dependent and non-dependent effect sizes for point prevalence values and moderators of overall MHP and by MHP domains separately including anxiety, depression, post-traumatic stress, general distress, and other MHP such as somatization. All estimates were separated by severity (mild or moderate-to-severe) (**appendix p 5)** and by follow-up time. In the case of dependent effect sizes for studies reporting multiple outcomes in the same participants, a three-level mixed-effects model was fitted (taking withing study variation into account).[16] To pool prevalence with 95% CIs, each study's proportion estimate was transformed by the Freeman-Tukey double-arcsine transformation for meta-analysis and back-transformed after model fitting.[17] We used I^2 to determine heterogeneity for analysis in non-dependent effect sizes. In dependent effect sizes, the distribution of total variance (%) attributed to between and within-study variance was estimated.[18] Meta-regression was conducted on arcsine transformed proportions due to better statistical properties as compared to untransformed proportions. Restricted maximum likelihood was used for parameter estimation. The threshold for significance was set to $p<0{\cdot}05$. Statistical analyses were conducted in R (version 4.0.3) using the metafor package.[19] Sensitivity analyses were performed by the investigation of influential effect-sizes using DFBETAS and Cook's distance.[19]

To analyze the data, we conducted the following a-priori defined steps. First, we estimated the overall pooled prevalence, including all effect sizes (excluding general distress as a generic measure of general distress) and by MHP domains separately. All estimations were stratified by mild or moderate-to-severe severity and acute, ongoing and post-illness follow-up timepoint. Second, a meta-regression on the overall mild and moderate-to-severe MHP values was conducted including follow-up timepoint, sex, age, education, history of a mental health condition, health-care workers, duration of hospitalization, intensive care treatment, type of treatment, response rate, sampling method, world region, and epidemic type as moderators. All moderators were tested individually while adjusting for follow-up timepoint in months. A complete model to test all moderators jointly was not possible due to the substantial missingness patterns.

Results

Study Characteristics

The systematic search yielded 3304 records, of which 59 (61 samples) were included in the analyses (**Figure 1**). The number of individuals ranged from 14 to 1´002, with a proportion of females ranging from 22% to 79% and mean/median age from 32-72 years. A total of 187 effect sizes for mild and moderate-to-severe MHP prevalence values were reported, with one study that assessed samples in different countries[20] and two that had overlapping samples.[21,22] Studies covered China (*n*=20), Asia excluding China (*n*=14), Europe (*n*=17), Africa (*n*=6), and America (*n*=3). 42 (71%) studies investigated SARS-CoV-2, eight (14%) SARS-CoV-1, four (7%) MERS-CoV, four (7%) Ebolavirus, and one (2%) H1N1, while no study covered H7N9 (**Table 1**). Time elapsed since treatment/data collection ranged from 0 to about 40 months, with 116 effect sizes providing data for acute, 35 for ongoing, and 36 post-illness stages, respectively. Studies rarely reported complete data on all descriptive or moderator variables leading to a substantial amount of missing data. While female/male ratio was provided regularly (>98%), other variables such as (history of a psychiatric condition, percent health care workers) were not regularly provided.

Overall, 18 studies showed an excellent, 15 studies a moderate and 26 a poor quality on the appraisal scale (**Table 1 and appendix pp 6-7**).

Pooled prevalence of mild or moderate-to-severe MHP including all domains jointly and separately by all timepoint of follow-up are shown in **Figure 2** and **Table 2**. Studies contributing to summary effects are shown in the supplementary material (**appendix pp 8-13**). Mild problems occurred at a substantially higher rate as moderate-to-severe MHP. We found a general downwards trend from the acute to ongoing/post-illness stage. This trend was also seen in the meta-regression including follow-up time as a moderator. The overall MHP significantly decreased from acute to the post-illness stage for mild (Coeff.$_{arcsine}$ -0·18 [95% CI -0·31 to -0·06], *p*=0·0038) as well as for moderate-to-severe (Coeff.$_{arcsine}$ -0·15 [95% CI -0·25 to -0·04], *p*=0·0080) severity. However, this trend was not significant for the ongoing vs. acute stage (**appendix p 14)**. Meta regression including mild or moderate-to-severe domains of anxiety, depression, and post-traumatic stress as outcomes, separately (data not shown), yielded a significant decrease in moderate anxiety from acute to post-illness only (Coeff.$_{arcsine}$ -0·14 [95% CI -0·26 to -0·02], *p*=0.0228).

Aside from a decreasing time trend, prevalence values were still substantial over all domains at post-illness phase for mild 38·8% [95% CI 33·6−44·1] and moderate severity 18·8% [95% CI 13·4−25·0]. Likewise, prevalence proportions for mild severity by domain at post-illness ranged from 33·5% [95% CI 24·8−42·7] to 43·5% [95% CI 34·1−53·1] for anxiety and post-traumatic stress, respectively. Moderate-to-severe MHP ranged from 12·1% [95% CI 5·3−21·1] to 39·1% [25·7−53·2] for anxiety and post-traumatic stress, respectively. Data for pooling general distress was available only in the ongoing stage. Pooling for somatization, and general distress (acute, post-illness), was not possible since only single effect-sizes were available (**appendix. p 13**).

Generally, there were many more effect sizes available for the acute phase, especially for depression and anxiety and less for the ongoing or post-illness phases (**Table 2**). To emphasize, the estimates for mild or moderate post-traumatic stress were based on very little data (two effect sizes), while the majority of estimators showed substantial heterogeneity with a significant part of variance that could be attributed to between and/or within-study heterogeneity (dependent effect sizes). Sensitivity analyses did not change the interpretation.

A meta-regression was conducted to test for moderating effects on mild or moderate MHP severity including all domains jointly. All moderatos were tested separately and adjusted for follow-up time in months (**appendix p 14)**. We found no evidence of moderating effects for sex, age, education, history of a psychologic condition, health care workers, duration of hospitalization, treatment in ICU, type of treatment, response rate, and world-region. In contrast, we found some evidence for lower mild MHP proportions in random vs. non-random sampling methods (Coeff.$_{arcsine}$ -0·16 [95% CI -0·28 to -0·04], *p*= 0·0083) and higher proportions of moderate-to-severe MHP in H1N1 vs. SARS-CoV-2 (Coeff.$_{arcsine}$ 0·39 [95% CI 0·003 to 0·78], *p*=0·0483). However, the contrast between H1N1 and SARS-CoV-2 should be interpreted cautiously since it is based on very little data.

Figure 1: PRISMA Flow chart of included studies reporting on mental health problems in virus disease patients and survivors



Table 1: Characteristics of included studies reporting mental health problems in virus disease patients and survivors (*n*=59)

Author (year)	Country	Virus type	Design	Sampling method[1]	Female (%)	Age[2]	Sample size	Outcomes	Quality[3]
Akinci and Basar (2021)[23]	Turkey	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	non-random	41·3	46·3	189	HADS anxiety; HADS depression	2/8 (25%)
Bah et al. (2020)[24]	Sierra Leone	Ebolavirus	cross-sectional	non-random	50·3		197	HADS anxiety; HADS depression	3/8 (37·5%)
Bellan et al. (2021)[25]	Italy	SARS-CoV-2	longitudinal	random	40·3	61	238	IES-R	8/8 (100%)
Bonazza et al. (2020)[26]	Italy	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	random	31·8	59	184 to 261	HADS anxiety; HADS depression; IES-R	6/8 (75%)
Chen et al. (2021)[27]	China	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	non-random	57·5	39·4	898	GAD-7; PHQ-9	4/8 (50%)
Chen et al. (2020)[28]	China	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	random	61·3	50	31	GAD-7; PHQ-9	2/8 (25%)
Cheng et al. (2004)[29]	China	SARS-CoV-1	cross-sectional	non-random	66	37·1	100	GHQ-28	4/8 (50%)
Chieffo et al. (2020)[30]	Italy	SARS-CoV-2	longitudinal	non-random	44·1	54	14 to 33	IES-R	3/8 (37·5%)
D´Cruz et al. (2021)[31]	UK	SARS-CoV-2	longitudinal	random	37·8	58·7	111 to 113	GAD-7; PHQ-9	7/8 (87·5%)
Etard et al. (2017)[32]	Guinea	Ebolavirus	longitudinal	random	54·2		472	CES-D	8/8 (100%)
Guo et al. (2020)[33]	China	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	non-random	42·7	42·5	103	GAD-7; PHQ-9	3/8 (37·5%)
He et al. (2021)[34]	China	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	non-random	50·6	56	65	GAD-7; PHQ-9	4/8 (50%)
Heyns et al. (2021)[35]	Belgium	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	random	50·4	72	47	HADS anxiety; HADS depression	7/8 (87·5%)
Horn et al. (2020)[36]	France	SARS-CoV-2	longitudinal	random	43·9	53	179	IES-6	7/8 (87·5%)
Hu et al. (2020)[37]	China	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	non-random	49·4	48·8	85	GAD-7; PHQ-9	3/8 (37·5%)
Islam et al. (2021)[38]	Bangladesh	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	non-random	42·1	34·7	1002	PHQ-9	4/8 (50%)
Jeong et al. (2016)[10]	South Korea	MERS-CoV	cross-sectional	non-random	50	52·3	36	GAD-7	4/8 (50%)

Table 1: Continued (n=59)

Author (year)	Country	Virus type	Design	Sampling method[1]	Female (%)	Age[2]	Sample size	Outcomes	Quality[3]
Jeong et al. (2020)[39]	South Korea	SARS-CoV-2	longitudinal	non-random	60·3	37·8	126	HADS anxiety; HADS depression	4/8 (50%)
Ju et al. (2021)[40]	China	SARS-CoV-2	longitudinal	random	46·3	39	95	GAD-7; PHQ-9	5/8 (62·5%)
Kandeger et al. (2020)[41]	Turkey	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	random	44	36·7	84	HADS anxiety; HADS depression	5/8 (62·5%)
Kang et al. (2021)[42]	South Korea	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	random	52·3		107	GAD-7; PHQ-9	6/8 (75%)
Keita et al. (2017)[43]	Guinea	Ebolavirus	longitudinal	random	53·9	31·6	256	CES-D	7/8 (87·5%)
Kim et al. (2018)[44]	South Korea	MERS-CoV	cross-sectional	random	63	41·1	27	PHQ-9	7/8 (87·5%)
Kim et al. (2020)[45]	South Korea	SARS-CoV-2	intervention	random		45	33	HADS anxiety; HADS depression	5/8 (62·5%)
Kong et al. (2020)[46]	China	SARS-CoV-2	intervention	random	51·4	50	144	HADS anxiety; HADS depression	4/8 (50%)
Kwek et al. (2006)[47]	Singapore	SARS-CoV-1	cross-sectional	random	79·4	34·8	63	HADS anxiety; HADS depression; IES	4/8 (50%)
Lam et al. (2009)[48]	China	SARS-CoV-1	cross-sectional	random	70·4	43·3	170	HADS totalscale	4/8 (50%)
Lee et al. (2007)[49]	China	SARS-CoV-1	cross-sectional	non-random	63·5		96	GHQ-12	3/8 (37·5%)
Lee et al. (2019)[50]	South Korea	MERS-CoV	longitudinal	random	38·5	49·7	52	IES-R; PHQ-9	7/8 (87·5%)
Li et al. (2020)[51]	China	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	non-random	45·5	51·4	99	HADS anxiety; HADS depression	2/8 (25%)
Luyt et al. (2012)[52]	France	H1N1	longitudinal	random	51·4	39·9	37	HADS anxiety; HADS depression; IES	7/8 (87·5%)
Ma et al. (2020)[6]	China	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	non-random	51·9	50·4	770	PHQ-9	5/8 (62·5%)
Mak et al. (2009)[53]	China	SARS-CoV-1	longitudinal	random	62·2	41·1	90	HADS anxiety; HADS depression	8/8 (100%)

Table 1: Continued (n=59)

Author (year)	Country	Virus type	Design	Sampling method[1]	Female (%)	Age[2]	Sample size	Outcomes	Quality[3]
Martillo et al. (2021)[54]	USA	SARS-CoV-2	longitudinal	random	22·2	53·9	42	PHQ-9	6/8 (75%)
Mazza et al. (2020)[55]	Italy	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	non-random	34·3	57·8	102 to 300	IES-R	4/8 (50%)
Mina et al. (2021)[56]	Bangladesh	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	non-random	28	39·4	145	GAD-7; PHQ-9	2/8 (25%)
Morin et al. (2021)[57]	France	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	random	38·4	56·9	169	HADS anxiety	8/8 (100%)
Mowla et al. (2021)[58]	Iran	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	random	35	67·4	69	GHQ-28	6/8 (75%)
Olanipekun et al. (2021)[59]	USA	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	random	35·6	52·5	73	PHQ-9	7/8 (87·5%)
Park et al. (2020)[60]	South Korea	MERS-CoV	longitudinal	random	38·1	49·2	63	GAD-7; IES-R; PHQ-9	6/8 (75%)
Parker et al. (2021)[61]	USA	SARS-CoV-2	longitudinal	random	36	59	58	HADS anxiety; HADS depression	6/8 (75%)
Paz et al. (2020)[62]	Ecuador	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	non-random	51·9	37	759	GAD-7; PHQ-9	4/8 (50%)
Poyraz et al. (2021)[63]	Turkey	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	random	49·8	39·7	284	HADS anxiety; HADS depression; IES-R	5/8 (62·5%)
Raman et al. (2021)[64]	UK	SARS-CoV-2	longitudinal	random	41·4	55·4	57	GAD-7; PHQ-9	7/8 (87·5%)
Rass et al. (2021)[65]	Austria	SARS-CoV-2	longitudinal	random	39	56	98	HADS anxiety; HADS depression	7/8 (87·5%)
Sahan et al. (2021)[66]	Turkey	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	random	49·1	55	281	HADS anxiety; HADS depression	8/8 (100%)
Samrah et al. (2020)[67]	Jordan	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	random	59·1	35·8	66	PHQ-9	8/8 (100%)
Secor et al. (2020)[20]	Guinea, Liberia, Sierra Leone	Ebolavirus	cross-sectional	random	57·8		198 to 751	GAD-7; PHQ-9	5/8 (62·5%)
Sheng et al. (2005)[68]	China	SARS-CoV-1	cross-sectional	non-random	65·7	37·6	102	GHQ-28	3/8 (37·5%)

Table 1: Continued (n=59)

Author (year)	Country	Virus type	Design	Sampling method[1]	Female (%)	Age[2]	Sample size	Outcomes	Quality[3]
Speth et al. (2020)[69]	Switzerland	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	random	54·4	44·6	114	GAD-2; PHQ-2	5/8 (62·5%)
van den Borst et al. (2020)[70]	Netherlands	SARS-CoV-2	longitudinal	random	40·3	59	124	HADS anxiety; HADS depression; IES-R	7/8 (87·5%)
Wang et al. (2021)[71]	China	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	random	64·6		460	GAD-7; PHQ-15; PHQ-9	6/8 (75%)
Wu et al. (2005a)[22]	China	SARS-CoV-1	cross-sectional	random	56·9	41·5	195	HADS anxiety; HADS depression; IES-R	7/8 (87·5%)
Wu et al. (2005b)[21]	China	SARS-CoV-1	cross-sectional	non-random	56	41·8	131	HADS anxiety; HADS depression; IES-R	4/8 (50%)
Xu et al. (2021)[72]	China	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	non-random	43	41·7	121	CES-D	4/8 (50%)
Yadav et al. (2021)[73]	India	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	non-random	27	42·9	100	GAD-7; PHQ-9	2/8 (25%)
Zarghami et al. (2020)[74]	Iran	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	random	61	40·3	30 to 52	GAD-7; PHQ-9	5/8 (62·5%)
Zhang et al. (2020a)[75]	China	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	non-random	50	42·5	30	GAD-7; PHQ-9	4/8 (50%)
Zhang et al. (2020b)[76]	China	SARS-CoV-2	cross-sectional	non-random	41·6		296	HADS anxiety; HADS depression	4/8 (50%)

[1] Random sampling (random or complete sampling strategies where all eligible participants were attempted to be included), non-random sampling (i.e., convenience, snow-ball, or unknown sampling strategy).[2] Refers to mean or median age as provided by original studies. [3] No. of quality items that were answered with yes and percent of full quality complied

CES-D=Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale. GAD-2=Generalized Anxiety Disorder Scale - short form. GAD-7=Generalized Anxiety Disorder Scale. GHQ-12=General Health Questionnaire - short form. GHQ-28=General Health Questionnaire. HADS anxiety=Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale - anxiety subscale. HADS depression=Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale - depression subscale. HADS totalscale=Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale - total-scale. IES-6=Impact of Event Scale - short form. IES-R=Impact of Event Scale-Revised. IES=Impact of Event Scale. PHQ-15=Patient Health Questionnaire somatisation module. PHQ-2=Patient Health Questionnaire Depression module – short form. PHQ-9=Patient Health Questionnaire Depression module.

Figure 2: Pooled prevalence proportions of mild or moderate-to-severe mental health problems including all domains jointly and separately at acute, ongoing, and post-illness stage



MHP=mental health problems, Mod.-sev.=moderate-to-severe. Meta-analysis was conducted only where at least two effect sizes were available. The analysis was conducted with a random effects meta-analysis in the case of independent effect sizes or a three-level random effects model in the case of dependent effect sizes. We used double arcsine transformation for variance stabilization. Displayed are the back-transformed estimates in percent.

Table 2: Pooled prevalence proportions of mild or moderate-to-severe mental health problems including all domains jointly and separately at acute, ongoing, and post-illness stage

Severity and Domain Timepoint of assessment*	**Nr. effect sizes**	**Pooled prevalence (95% CI)**	**p-value (Q) 2**	**% variance between study (heterogeneity)**	**% variance within 3**
Mild mental health problems (all domains)					
acute	55	46·3 (39·0-53·8)	<0·0001	84·1	12·2
ongoing	11	35·5 (18·7-54·3)	<0·0001	85·6	9·8
post-illness	18	38·8 (33·6-44·1)	<0·0001	0·0	88·4
Moderate-to-severe mental health problems (all domains)					
acute	60	22·3 (17·3-27·8)	<0·0001	83·1	13·0
ongoing	22	17·3 (10·7-25·1)	<0·0001	53·9	38·8
post-illness	17	18·8 (13·4-25·0)	<0·0001	33·2	57·6
Mild anxiety					
acute	22	44·7 (34·0-55·6)	<0·0001	96·3	0·0
ongoing	4	28·3 (20·0-37·5)	0·0188	73·6 (I2)	NA
post-illness	7	33·5 (24·8-42·7)	<0·0001	0·0	89·3
Moderate-to-severe anxiety					
acute	26	19·2 (13·5-25·7)	<0·0001	95·2	0·0
ongoing	8	14·1 (11·1-17·5)	0·0365	55·0 (I2)	NA
post-illness	6	12·1 (5·3-21·1)	<0·0001	41·0	45·8
Mild depression					
acute	30	45·3 (38·0-52·7)	<0·0001	91·3	4·5
ongoing	5	30·8 (11·7-54·1)	<0·0001	96·4 (I2)	NA
post-illness	6	43·5 (34·1-53·1)	<0·0001	0·0	86·6
Moderate-to-severe depression					
acute	26	21·9 (15·8-28·6)	<0·0001	96·1	0·0
ongoing	9	16·0 (8·6-25·2)	<0·0001	93·3 (I2)	NA
post-illness	9	18·2 (13·8-23·0)	<0·0001	0·0	80·3
Mild post-traumatic stress					
acute	2	62·4 (23·6-93·8)	<0·0001	94·8 (I2)	NA
ongoing	2	43·2 (38·0-48·5)	0·7398	0·0 (I2)	NA
post-illness	4	38·6 (24·0-54·3)	0·2022	0·0	36·6
Moderate-to-severe post-traumatic stress					
acute	7	25·3 (7·5-48·9)	<0·0001	94·2	2·7
ongoing	5	20·9 (9·2-35·7)	<0·0001	95·1 (I2)	NA
post-illness	2	39·1 (25·7-53·2)	0·3641	0·0 (I2)	NA
Moderate-to-severe general distress					
acute (NA)					
ongoing	2	66·3 (59·6-72·7)	0·6235	0·0 (I2)	NA
post-illness (NA)					

[1] Shown are pooled effect sizes where at least two studies by domain and timepoint were available. Otherwise indicated with NA. [2] p-value from test of heterogeneity (Q-test). [3] Within study variance displays the amount of within study variances attributed to dependent effect sizes within studies where a three-level meta-analysis was calculated

Discussion

We conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis that explored the prevalence proportions of acute, ongoing and post-acute mental health sequelae after infection with SARS-1, MERS, Ebola, H1N1 or SARS-Cov-2 viruses. We included 59 studies providing a total 187 effect sizes in the analysis. In general, we found that mild psychological problems had higher prevalence proportions than moderate to severe conditions. We also found that acute infections were associated with higher prevalence proportions of mental health problems than post-illness. This, however, was not found uniformly across all time-points and mental health problem severity groups.

The overall picture suggests that any mild and moderate-to-severe psychological conditions will be experienced by 39% and 19% of infection survivors for longer than 12 weeks. Likewise, anxiety, depression, and post-traumatic stress, and general distress were substantial beyond the acute phase. Combined, these results show that a considerable proportion of infection survivors will suffer from mental health problems severely for a longer time.

Our results support meta-studies on earlier epidemic outbreaks. A meta-analysis with Chinese publications on SARS-1 found a decrease of mental health problems over time but reported at 12 months post-hospital discharge a level of average distress above population norms.[77] A systematic review on post-Ebola virus disease studies gathered publications that found considerable depression prevalence and other psychological sequelae in Ebola survivors .[78]

Our results provide more precision than earlier meta-analytical results from COVID-19 meta-analyses. A not yet peer-reviewed study on various long-term sequelae of COVID-19 reported prevalence of 12% for anxiety and 13% for depression.[9] It is, however, unclear at what time this was assessed. A meta-analysis on early neurological and neuropsychiatric studies (published until July 2020) reported point prevalence values for anxiety of 15.9% and of 23.0% for depression.[1] Our results similarly fall in that range. However, milder mental health conditions are somewhat more prevalent and can have detrimental effects as well.

The moderator analysis has shown that post-illness COVID-19 mental health sequelae are not fundamentally different compared to consequences of earlier virus epidemics. While the information on the post-viral health detriments was available from earlier infection outbreaks, it is somewhat astonishing that the risks of longer-term conditions were overlooked in the early days of the pandemic and that it took quite some time to receive the science and media attention it now has.[79]

The moderator analysis has also shown effects for the time point and for the sampling method in particular. This suggests that methodological details and study quality are very important for assessing the contribution of single studies. In general, and as reported from earlier epidemiological studies on mental health effects of epidemics,[80] the study quality has to be evaluated as mixed. While about 56% reached a moderate to high study quality about 44 per cent showed a poor quality. Studies frequently suffered from non-transparency regarding sampling frame, recruitment, sample size and provided only a poor description of the study sample and setting and showed low response rates. Furthermore, at least one third showed an unclear or insufficient coverage of the identified sample. In contrast, studies predominantly assessed MHP in a standardized way and clearly described how prevalence was calculated.

Our findings highlight the importance of mental health interventions generally, but at an acute stage of infection specifically. First, clear information about the disease (e.g., infection rates, quarantine, vaccination) is not only important to address uncertainty and fear but also to improve mental health literacy within the population.[81] Therefore, public communication should also integrate virus- and pandemic-related mental health issues. Furthermore, multidisciplinary mental health support (that includes psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, mental health nurses and other professions) should be delivered at an early stage.[82] Access to mental health interventions could be supplemented by digital health online and smartphone technologies if face-to-face treatment is limited.[81,83,84] A clinical screening for psychiatric symptoms would ideally be an integrative element already within the acute stage. Therefore, mental health awareness appears to be an important aspect within primary care and emergency departments in particular. Moreover, social support for impaired individuals should be strengthened. This could be supported by prevention strategies that include community-based collaboration among education and employment services, families and housing, and voluntary work.[81]

Strengths and Limitations

The main strength of this research is that it is a large systematic review and meta-analysis that encompasses the major virus outbreaks within the last 20 years. Moreover, this research differentiates between diagnoses, time-points and moderators that allows a comprehensive view regarding the prevalence values of MHP.

This research also has some limitations. Firstly, most studies within this systematic review and meta-analysis lack representativeness. Often, patients with unstable conditions or those within ICU units, or those not hospitalized were not included. This selection bias potentially led to an underestimation/overestimation of the prevalence values. Further, many original studies were generally of poor or moderate quality with incomplete data or a lack of random or complete sampling. This might be due to the urgent need for conducting such studies in a pandemic situation. Secondly, this meta-analysis methodology was limited by the fact that further well-validated instruments (e.g., State-Trait Anxiety Inventory) were not included in this research. The meta-regression should be interpreted cautiously since many studies did not provide data on all moderators. Furthermore, it was not possible to include all hypothetical moderators. Specifically, the physical disease severity and the burden of late physical effects were not covered as this was often not reported within studies.

Conclusion

This systematic review and meta-analysis explored the prevalence proportions of acute, ongoing, and post-acute mental health problems after a major virus outbreak within the last 20 years. Generally, mild mental health problems had higher prevalence proportions than moderate to severe conditions. Moreover, most mental health problems had a higher prevalence proportion at an acute infection stage compared to a post-acute stage. Our findings further underline the importance of the study quality that is not often given within the original studies. Therefore, guidelines aiming to advice assessment and reporting acute and post-illness MHP in a standardized way are urgently needed. Overall, this research highlights the fragility of mental health after infection from a pandemic virus. Additionally, it emphasizes the need for the early provision of mental health interventions that follow long-lasting post-viral mental health sequelae.

Conflict of interest

We declare no competing interests.

Author Contributions

SJZ and DR conceived and designed the study. SJZ, CB, CA, and PK conducted the literature search and selection, data extraction, and appraisal of study quality. SJZ conducted the statistical analyses. SJZ, PK, DR and AIL wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors contributed to data interpretation, manuscript revisions and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Funding

No funding.

Acknowledgements

No acknowledgements

References

1. Rogers JP, Chesney E, Oliver D, et al. Psychiatric and neuropsychiatric presentations associated with severe coronavirus infections: a systematic review and meta-analysis with comparison to the COVID-19 pandemic. *The Lancet Psychiatry* 2020; **7**(7): 611-27.

2. Liu D, Baumeister RF, Zhou Y. Mental health outcomes of coronavirus infection survivors: A rapid meta-analysis. *Journal of Psychiatric Research* 2020.

3. Lötsch F, Schnyder J, Goorhuis A, Grobusch MP. Neuropsychological long-term sequelae of Ebola virus disease survivors – A systematic review. *Travel Medicine and Infectious Disease* 2017; **18**: 18-23.

4. Taquet M, Luciano S, Geddes JR, Harrison PJ. Bidirectional associations between COVID-19 and psychiatric disorder: retrospective cohort studies of 62 354 COVID-19 cases in the USA. *The Lancet Psychiatry* 2021; **8**(2): 130-40.

5. Ren AL, Digby RJ, Needham EJ. Neurological update: COVID-19. *Journal of Neurology* 2021.

6. Ma Y-F, Li W, Deng H-B, et al. Prevalence of depression and its association with quality of life in clinically stable patients with COVID-19. *J Affect Disord* 2020; **275**: 145-8.

7. Brooks SK, Webster RK, Smith LE, et al. The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. *The Lancet* 2020; **395**(10227): 912-20.

8. Gardner PJ, Moallef P. Psychological impact on SARS survivors: Critical review of the English language literature. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne* 2015; **56**(1): 123-35.

9. Lopez-Leon S, Wegman-Ostrosky T, Perelman C, et al. More than 50 Long-term effects of COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *medRxiv : the preprint server for health sciences* 2021.

10. Jeong H, Yim HW, Song YJ, et al. Mental health status of people isolated due to Middle East Respiratory Syndrome. *Epidemiology and health* 2016; **38**: e2016048.

11. Migliavaca CB, Stein C, Colpani V, Munn Z, Falavigna M. Quality assessment of prevalence studies: a systematic review. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 2020; **127**: 59-68.

12. Zürcher SJ, Kerksieck P, Adamus C, et al. Prevalence of Mental Health Problems During Virus Epidemics in the General Public, Health Care Workers and Survivors: A Rapid Review of the Evidence. *Frontiers in public health* 2020; **8**: 560389.

13. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021; **372**: n71.

14. Mayor N, Tsang R, Joy M, Hobbs FDR, de Lusignan S. Long covid: coding is caring. *BMJ* 2021; **373**: n1262.

15. Munn Z, Moola S, Lisy K, Riitano D, Tufanaru C. Methodological guidance for systematic reviews of observational epidemiological studies reporting prevalence and cumulative incidence data. *International journal of evidence-based healthcare* 2015; **13**(3): 147-53.

16. Cheung MWL. A Guide to Conducting a Meta-Analysis with Non-Independent Effect Sizes. *Neuropsychology Review* 2019; **29**(4): 387-96.

17. Freeman MF, Tukey JW. Transformations Related to the Angular and the Square Root. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 1950; **21**(4): 607-11.

18. Assink M, Wibbelink CJM. Fitting three-level meta-analytic models in R: A step-by-step tutorial. *TQMP* 2016; **12**(3): 154-74.

19. Viechtbauer W. Conducting Meta-Analyses in R with the metafor Package. *2010* 2010; **36**(3): 48.

20. Secor A, Macauley R, Stan L, et al. Mental health among Ebola survivors in Liberia, Sierra Leone and Guinea: results from a cross-sectional study. *BMJ open* 2020; **10**(5): e035217.

21. Wu KK, Chan SK, Ma TM. Posttraumatic stress after SARS. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2005; **11**(8): 1297-300.

22. Wu KK, Chan SK, Ma TM. Posttraumatic stress, anxiety, and depression in survivors of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS). *Journal of traumatic stress* 2005; **18**(1): 39-42.

23. Akinci T, Melek Basar H. Relationship between sleep quality and the psychological status of patients hospitalised with COVID-19. *Sleep Medicine* 2021; **80**: 167-70.

24. Bah AJ, James PB, Bah N, Sesay AB, Sevalie S, Kanu JS. Prevalence of anxiety, depression and post-traumatic stress disorder among Ebola survivors in northern Sierra Leone: a cross-sectional study. *BMC public health* 2020; **20**(1): 1391.

25. Bellan M, Soddu D, Balbo PE, et al. Respiratory and Psychophysical Sequelae Among Patients With COVID-19 Four Months After Hospital Discharge. *JAMA network open* 2021; **4**(1): e2036142.

26. Bonazza F, Borghi L, di San Marco EC, et al. Psychological outcomes after hospitalization for COVID-19: data from a multidisciplinary follow-up screening program for recovered patients. *Research in psychotherapy (Milano)* 2020; **23**(3): 491.

27. Chen Y, Huang X, Zhang C, et al. Prevalence and predictors of posttraumatic stress disorder, depression and anxiety among hospitalized patients with coronavirus disease 2019 in China. *BMC psychiatry* 2021; **21**(1): 80.

28. Chen F, Wang XD, Zhu KK, Hu JB. Investigation of the psychological status of suspected patients during the Coronavirus disease 2019 epidemic. *Medicine* 2020; **99**(38): e22260.

29. Cheng SKW, Sheng B, Lau KK, et al. Adjustment outcomes in Chinese patients following one-month recovery from severe acute respiratory syndrome in Hong Kong. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease* 2004; **192**(12): 868-71.

30. Chieffo DPR, Delle Donne V, Massaroni V, et al. Psychopathological profile in COVID-19 patients including healthcare workers: the implications. *European review for medical and pharmacological sciences* 2020; **24**(22): 11964-70.

31. D'Cruz RF, Waller MD, Perrin F, et al. Chest radiography is a poor predictor of respiratory symptoms and functional impairment in survivors of severe COVID-19 pneumonia. *ERJ open research* 2021; **7**(1).

32. Etard JF, Sow MS, Leroy S, et al. Multidisciplinary assessment of post-Ebola sequelae in Guinea (Postebogui): an observational cohort study. *The Lancet Infectious diseases* 2017; **17**(5): 545-52.

33. Guo Q, Zheng Y, Shi J, et al. Immediate psychological distress in quarantined patients with COVID-19 and its association with peripheral inflammation: A mixed-method study. *Brain, behavior, and immunity* 2020.

34. He X, Zhang D, Zhang L, et al. Neurological and psychiatric presentations associated with COVID-19. *European archives of psychiatry and clinical neuroscience* 2021: 1-12.

35. Heyns A, Dupont J, Gielen E, et al. Impact of COVID-19: urging a need for multi-domain assessment of COVID-19 inpatients. *European geriatric medicine* 2021: 1-8.

36. Horn M, Wathelet M, Fovet T, et al. Is COVID-19 Associated With Posttraumatic Stress Disorder? *The Journal of clinical psychiatry* 2020; **82**(1).

37. Hu Y, Chen Y, Zheng Y, et al. Factors related to mental health of inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China. *Brain, behavior, and immunity* 2020.

38. Islam MS, Ferdous MZ, Islam US, Mosaddek ASM, Potenza MN, Pardhan S. Treatment, Persistent Symptoms, and Depression in People Infected with COVID-19 in Bangladesh. *International journal of environmental research and public health* 2021; **18**(4).

39. Jeong SJ, Chung WS, Sohn Y, et al. Clinical characteristics and online mental health care of asymptomatic or mildly symptomatic patients with coronavirus disease 2019. *PloS one* 2020; **15**(11): e0242130.

40. Ju Y, Chen W, Liu J, et al. Effects of centralized isolation vs. home isolation on psychological distress in patients with COVID-19. *J Psychosom Res* 2021; **143**: 110365.

41. Kandeger A, Aydin M, Altinbas K, et al. Evaluation of the relationship between perceived social support, coping strategies, anxiety, and depression symptoms among hospitalized COVID-19 patients. *International Journal of Psychiatry in Medicine* 2020.

42. Kang E, Lee SY, Kim MS, et al. The Psychological Burden of COVID-19 Stigma: Evaluation of the Mental Health of Isolated Mild Condition COVID-19 Patients. *Journal of Korean medical science* 2021; **36**(3): e33.

43. Keita MM, Taverne B, Sy Savane S, et al. Depressive symptoms among survivors of Ebola virus disease in Conakry (Guinea): preliminary results of the PostEboGui cohort. *BMC psychiatry* 2017; **17**(1): 127.

44. Kim HC, Yoo SY, Lee BH, Lee SH, Shin HS. Psychiatric Findings in Suspected and Confirmed Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Patients Quarantined in Hospital: A Retrospective Chart Analysis. *Psychiatry investigation* 2018; **15**(4): 355-60.

45. Kim JW, Stewart R, Kang SJ, Jung SI, Kim SW, Kim JM. Telephone based Interventions for Psychological Problems in Hospital Isolated Patients with COVID-19. *Clinical psychopharmacology and neuroscience : the official scientific journal of the Korean College of Neuropsychopharmacology* 2020; **18**(4): 616-20.

46. Kong X, Kong F, Zheng K, et al. Effect of Psychological-Behavioral Intervention on the Depression and Anxiety of COVID-19 Patients. *Frontiers in psychiatry* 2020; **11**: 586355.

47. Kwek SK, Chew WM, Ong KC, et al. Quality of life and psychological status in survivors of severe acute respiratory syndrome at 3 months postdischarge. *J Psychosom Res* 2006; **60**(5): 513-9.

48. Lam MH, Wing YK, Yu MW, et al. Mental morbidities and chronic fatigue in severe acute respiratory syndrome survivors: long-term follow-up. *Archives of internal medicine* 2009; **169**(22): 2142-7.

49. Lee AM, Wong JG, McAlonan GM, et al. Stress and psychological distress among SARS survivors 1 year after the outbreak. *Canadian journal of psychiatry Revue canadienne de psychiatrie* 2007; **52**(4): 233-40.

50. Lee SH, Shin HS, Park HY, et al. Depression as a Mediator of Chronic Fatigue and Post-Traumatic Stress Symptoms in Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Survivors. *Psychiatry investigation* 2019; **16**(1): 59-64.

51. Li X, Tian J, Xu Q. The Associated Factors of Anxiety and Depressive Symptoms in COVID-19 Patients Hospitalized in Wuhan, China. *The Psychiatric quarterly* 2020: 1-9.

52. Luyt CE, Combes A, Becquemin MH, et al. Long-term outcomes of pandemic 2009 influenza A(H1N1)-associated severe ARDS. *Chest* 2012; **142**(3): 583-92.

53. Mak IWC, Chu CM, Pan PC, Yiu MGC, Chan VL. Long-term psychiatric morbidities among SARS survivors. *General Hospital Psychiatry* 2009; **31**(4): 318-26.

54. Martillo M, Dangayach N, Tabacof L, et al. Postintensive Care Syndrome in Survivors of Critical Illness Related to Coronavirus Disease 2019: Cohort Study From a New York City Critical Care Recovery Clinic. *Critical care medicine* 2021.

55. Mazza MG, De Lorenzo R, Conte C, et al. Anxiety and depression in COVID-19 survivors: Role of inflammatory and clinical predictors. *Brain, behavior, and immunity* 2020; **89**: 594-600.

56. Mina FB, Billah M, Karmakar S, et al. An online observational study assessing clinical characteristics and impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on mental health: a perspective study from Bangladesh. *Zeitschrift fur Gesundheitswissenschaften = Journal of public health* 2021: 1-9.

57. Morin L, Savale L, Pham T, et al. Four-Month Clinical Status of a Cohort of Patients After Hospitalization for COVID-19. *Jama* 2021.

58. Mowla A, Ghaedsharaf M, Pani A. Psychopathology in Elderly COVID-19 Survivors and Controls. *Journal of geriatric psychiatry and neurology* 2021: 8919887211002664.

59. Olanipekun T, Abe T, Effoe V, Westney G, Snyder R. Incidence and Severity of Depression Among Recovered African Americans with COVID-19-Associated Respiratory Failure. *Journal of racial and ethnic health disparities* 2021: 1-6.

60. Park HY, Park WB, Lee SH, et al. Posttraumatic stress disorder and depression of survivors 12 months after the outbreak of Middle East respiratory syndrome in South Korea. *BMC public health* 2020; **20**(1): 605.

61. Parker C, Shalev D, Hsu I, et al. Depression, Anxiety, and Acute Stress Disorder Among Patients Hospitalized With COVID-19: A Prospective Cohort Study. *J Acad Consult Liaison Psychiatry* 2021; **62**(2): 211-9.

62. Paz C, Mascialino G, Adana-Díaz L, et al. Behavioral and sociodemographic predictors of anxiety and depression in patients under epidemiological surveillance for COVID-19 in Ecuador. *PloS one* 2020; **15**(9): e0240008.

63. Poyraz B, Poyraz CA, Olgun Y, et al. Psychiatric morbidity and protracted symptoms after COVID-19. *Psychiatry research* 2021; **295**: 113604.

64. Raman B, Cassar MP, Tunnicliffe EM, et al. Medium-term effects of SARS-CoV-2 infection on multiple vital organs, exercise capacity, cognition, quality of life and mental health, post-hospital discharge. *EClinicalMedicine* 2021; **31**: 100683-.

65. Rass V, Beer R, Josef Schiefecker A, et al. Neurological outcome and quality of life three months after COVID-19: a prospective observational cohort study. *European journal of neurology* 2021.

66. Şahan E, Ünal SM, Kırpınar İ. Can we predict who will be more anxious and depressed in the COVID-19 ward? *J Psychosom Res* 2021; **140**: 110302.

67. Samrah SM, Al-Mistarehi AH, Aleshawi AJ, et al. Depression and Coping Among COVID-19-Infected Individuals After 10 Days of Mandatory in-Hospital Quarantine, Irbid, Jordan. *Psychology research and behavior management* 2020; **13**: 823-30.

68. Sheng B, Cheng SKW, Lau KK, Li HL, Chan ELY. The effects of disease severity, use of corticosteroids and social factors on neuropsychiatric complaints in severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) patients at acute and convalescent phases. *European Psychiatry* 2005; **20**(3): 236-42.

69. Speth MM, Singer-Cornelius T, Oberle M, Gengler I, Brockmeier SJ, Sedaghat AR. Mood, anxiety and olfactory dysfunction in COVID-19: evidence of central nervous system involvement? *The Laryngoscope* 2020.

70. van den Borst B, Peters JB, Brink M, et al. Comprehensive health assessment three months after recovery from acute COVID-19. *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America* 2020.

71. Wang M, Hu C, Zhao Q, et al. Acute psychological impact on COVID-19 patients in Hubei: a multicenter observational study. *Translational psychiatry* 2021; **11**(1): 133.

72. Xu F, Wang X, Yang Y, et al. Depression and insomnia in COVID-19 survivors: a cross-sectional survey from Chinese rehabilitation centers in Anhui province. *Sleep Med* 2021.

73. Yadav R, Yadav P, Kumar SS, Kumar R. Assessment of Depression, Anxiety, and Sleep Disturbance in COVID-19 Patients at Tertiary Care Centre of North India. *Journal of Neurosciences in Rural Practice* 2021.

74. Zarghami A, Farjam M, Fakhraei B, Hashemzadeh K, Yazdanpanah MH. A Report of the Telepsychiatric Evaluation of SARS-CoV-2 Patients. *Telemedicine journal and e-health : the official journal of the American Telemedicine Association* 2020.

75. Zhang H, Qin S, Zhang L, Feng Z, Fan C. A psychological investigation of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) patients in mobile cabin hospitals in Wuhan. *Annals of translational medicine* 2020; **8**(15): 941.

76. Zhang J, Yang Z, Wang X, et al. The relationship between resilience, anxiety and depression among patients with mild symptoms of COVID-19 in China: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of clinical nursing* 2020; **29**(21-22): 4020-9.

77. Liu D, Baumeister RF, Zhou Y. Mental health outcomes of coronavirus infection survivors: A rapid meta-analysis. *J Psychiatr Res* 2021; **137**: 542-53.

78. James PB, Wardle J, Steel A, Adams J. Post-Ebola psychosocial experiences and coping mechanisms among Ebola survivors: a systematic review. *Tropical medicine & international health : TM & IH* 2019; **24**(6): 671-91.

79. Marshall M. The four most urgent questions about long COVID. *Nature* 2021; **594**(7862): 168-70.

80. Richter D, Riedel-Heller S, Zürcher SJ. Mental health problems in the general population during and after the first lockdown phase due to the SARS-Cov-2 pandemic: rapid review of multi-wave studies. *Epidemiology and psychiatric sciences* 2021; **30**: e27.

81. Moreno C, Wykes T, Galderisi S, et al. How mental health care should change as a consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic. *The lancet Psychiatry* 2020; **7**(9): 813-24.

82. Xiang YT, Yang Y, Li W, et al. Timely mental health care for the 2019 novel coronavirus outbreak is urgently needed. *The lancet Psychiatry* 2020; **7**(3): 228-9.

83. Ho CS, Chee CY, Ho RC. Mental Health Strategies to Combat the Psychological Impact of COVID-19 Beyond Paranoia and Panic. *Ann Acad Med Singap* 2020; **49**(3): 155-60.

84. Liu S, Yang L, Zhang C, et al. Online mental health services in China during the COVID-19 outbreak. *The lancet Psychiatry* 2020; **7**(4): e17-e8.