Health needs assessment: knowing the psychological risks of frontline rescue workers for COVID-19 by simplified risk probability scale (SRPS)

Yan Bo[12], Fei Zhao[12*]

[1]Department of Medicine, Northwest Minzu University, Lanzhou 73000, Gansu Province, China

[2]Northwest Minzu University Key Laboratory of Environmental Ecology and Population Health in Northwest Minority Areas, Lanzhou 73000, Gansu Province, China

*** Correspondence:**
Fei Zhao
runfor710@163.com

Keywords: COVID-19; Anti-epidemic social relief teams; Anxiety; Depression; Simplified Risk Probability Scale; Experience.

Abstract

BACKGROUND: Frontline rescue workers during the COVID-19 pandemic faced elevated psychological risks, yet existing tools (e.g., PHQ-9, GAD-7) lack specificity for crisis contexts.

AIM: To develop a Simplified Risk Probability Scale (SRPS) tailored for rapid self-assessment of depression and anxiety in frontline rescue teams, integrating socio-economic and occupational predictors unique to pandemic rescue operations.

METHODS: The present SRPS study employed a cross-sectional observational research design, utilising the statistical principle of snowball sampling to complete data collection via questionnaires. Lanzhou, China was designated as the questionnaire delivery city for snowball sampling. The questionnaire included a COVID-19 self-made survey scale, as well as the self-assessed anxiety scale (SAS) and the self-assessed depression scale (SDS) questionnaires to assess depression and anxiety symptoms. The statistical analysis process primarily employed univariate and multivariate analyses to identify the key variables necessary for establishing the SRPS. Ultimately, the binary logistic regression models and nomogram were utilised to establish the SRPS. The accuracy and sensitivity of the SRPS were assessed by receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves.

RESULTS: During the study period from 1 October to 1 November 2022, the 273 valid participants, the depression detection rate was 93/273 and the anxiety detection rate was 98/273. Univariate analyses showed that monthly income affected depression, with the lowest number of detections among participants with a monthly income of 3000-4000 CNY and the highest number of detections among those with a monthly income of more than 7000 CNY; age, marital status, and risk level of the area in which they lived affected anxiety, with the highest number of detections among those who lived in a high-risk area, were married, and were no older than 30 years of age. Attitude toward the rescue rotation system was a common significant single factor for depression and anxiety, with the highest number of detections of depression among participants who were able to accept the rotation system; diagnosis of COVID-19 infection in participants or their friends, and attitude toward work stress also affected anxiety, with the lowest number of detections of anxiety among participants who

could not tolerate work stress. While univariate analysis indicated higher depression rates in the >7000 CNY group (32/77), multifactorial models revealed middle-income (3000-4000 CNY) as a significant risk factor [OR = 3.666 (1.085 - 12.385) , p=0.036], possibly mediated by job insecurity, and not being able to tolerate work stress during COVID-19 was a risk factor for anxiety [OR = 14.258 (4.213 - 58.983)]. A prediction model was constructed with a 70% sample size and plotted on a column chart, and it was found that age and monthly income were predictors of depression status, and attitude towards work stress during the epidemic was a predictor of anxiety status; the model was validated with a 30% sample size, and the areas under the ROC curves for depression and anxiety status were 0.572 and 0.662, respectively.

CONCLUSION: We successfully constructed the SRPS based on the perspective of social rescue. The SRPS provides a rapid screening tool for rescue teams, with potential integration into mobile health platforms (e.g., via QR code scanning). Future training programs should prioritize interventions targeting middle-income workers and stress tolerance strategies.

1 Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic has profoundly disrupted global daily life since its emergence in December 2019. Characterized by rapid progression to pulmonary fibrosis and hypoxia-related mortality (1), the virus's high mutation rate has rendered conventional antiviral therapies largely ineffective, necessitating stringent public health measures such as restricted outdoor activities for self-protection (1). While China initially pursued herd immunity strategies to mitigate pandemic spread (2), the Hong Kong government implemented a containment approach involving non-medical frontline personnel, including security personnel and volunteers, to curb viral transmission (3).

Frontline rescue workers constitute a high-risk population for psychological distress due to prolonged exposure to occupational stressors, including heavy workloads, infection risks, and social isolation from family members (4,5). Studies indicate anxiety and depression prevalence rates of 19.8% and 27.7%, respectively, among Hong Kong's anti-epidemic teams (6). Key risk factors encompass COVID-19 infection, emotional isolation, familial separation, logistical constraints, and age-related vulnerabilities (4,7–9). However, existing assessment tools like PHQ-9 and GAD-7 exhibit critical limitations in crisis contexts: their generic design lacks specificity for rescue operations, and their administration time (10–15 minutes) proves impractical during high-pressure missions (10).

This gap underscores the urgent need for context-specific psychological risk assessment tools. A validated predictive model incorporating pandemic-specific variables—such as income instability, rotational work systems, and occupational stressors—could enable rapid self-assessment through simplified scoring protocols (10). Such innovation requires interdisciplinary collaboration between mental health professionals and rescue organizations to ensure ecological validity and operational feasibility.

The present study aims to address these challenges by developing a Simplified Risk Probability Scale (SRPS) tailored for frontline anti-epidemic personnel. Distinct from conventional instruments, the SRPS prioritizes brevity (10 items) and contextual relevance, integrating socio-economic and occupational predictors unique to pandemic rescue operations. By enabling real-time mental health screening, this tool holds potential for integration into mobile health platforms, thereby enhancing early intervention capabilities during public health emergencies.

2 Methods

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

2.1 Study design

This cross-sectional observational study employed snowball sampling to recruit participants from COVID-19 frontline rescue teams in Lanzhou, China, between October 1 and November 1, 2022 (5). The study adhered to STROBE guidelines for observational research reporting (11).

2.2 Participants

Eligible participants met the following criteria:

1. Aged ≥18 years
2. Active involvement in COVID-19 rescue operations
3. Absence of pre-existing psychiatric disorders (e.g., schizophrenia, bipolar disorder)

Exclusion criteria included:

1. Refusal to provide informed consent
2. Incomplete questionnaire responses (>20% missing data)

Sample size determination followed Riley's predictive modeling framework (12), requiring 150 participants based on a 10:1 event-per-variable ratio for 15 candidate predictors.

2.3 Data Collection

Instruments

The survey comprised five sections.

Demographics: Age, sex, income, marital status, occupational role

COVID-19 Exposure: Rescue duration, task types, infection history

Stressors: Rescue rotation system acceptability, work pressure tolerance

Depression: Zung Self-Rating Depression Scale (SDS) (13)

Anxiety: Zung Self-Rating Anxiety Scale (SAS) (14)

A 10-item COVID-19-specific module was developed through expert consultation (Cronbach's α=0.82).

Procedure

Researchers administered questionnaires on-site immediately post-shift to minimize recall bias. Participants received standardized instructions emphasizing voluntary participation and data anonymity.

2.4 Statistical Analysis

Data analysis followed a seven-stage protocol:

1. **Descriptive Statistics**: Frequencies for demographic/clinical characteristics (5)
2. **Univariate Analysis**: χ^2 tests for categorical variables, t-tests for continuous variables (5)
3. **Multivariate Modeling**: Binary logistic regression with forward/backward selection (α=0.05)
4. **Predictive Modeling**: 70% training set for model development (17)
5. **Validation**: 30% validation set with ROC curve analysis (17)
6. **Visualization**: Nomograms for risk probability estimation (17)
7. **Sensitivity Analysis**: 10-fold cross-validation (12)

Statistical significance was defined as two-tailed $p<0.05$. Analyses were performed using SPSS 26.0 and R 4.2.1 with "rms" and "pROC" packages.

3 Results

3.1 Participant characteristics

During the questionnaire survey from 1st October to 1st November 2022, a total of 293 participants were surveyed in the SRSP study, of which 20 participants gave up partially answering the questionnaires, with a return rate of 100% (**Figure 1**). The study enrolled 273 frontline rescue workers (64.8% female; mean age 32.4±8.7 years) with complete questionnaire responses. Depression and anxiety symptom prevalence rates were 34.1% (93/273) and 35.9% (98/273), respectively. Key demographic characteristics are summarized in **Table 1**.

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article



Figure 1 Flow diagram. This flow chart describes the details of participants from inclusion to final exclusion during the questionnaire. Finally, only the completed questionnaires will be included in the report, and those incomplete questionnaires will be excluded.

Table 1 Demographics, n (%)

Variables	Category	n(%)/$\bar{X}$±S
Sex		
	Male	96 (35.16%)
	Female	177 (64.84%)
Age		

	<30 years old	148 (54.21%)
	31-40 years old	81 (29.67%)
	>41 years old	44 (16.12%)
Eduacation		
	Below undergraduate level	169 (61.9%)
	Bachelor degree or above	104 (38.1%)
Marital status		
	Unmarried	110 (40.29%)
	Married	163 (59.71%)
Living area		
	Urban area	191 (69.96%)
	Rural area	82 (30.04%)
Identity		
	Doctor	88 (32.23%)
	Nurse	72 (26.37%)
	Public security	18 (6.59%)
	Government department	29 (10.62%)
	Other	66 (24.18%)
Organization		
	Hospital	68 (24.91%)

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

	Center for disease control and prevention	42 (15.38%)
	Township health center	42 (15.38%)
	Public security organ	13 (4.76%)
	Government units at all levels	34 (12.45%)
	Volunteers	14 (5.13%)
	Other	60 (21.98%)
Professional titles		
	Deputy senior level	9 (3.3%)
	Intermediate level	35 (12.82%)
	Primary level	102 (37.36%)
	Unassessed	127 (46.52%)
Monthly income		
	<3000 CNY	69 (25.27%)
	3000～4000 CNY	45 (16.48%)
	4000-5000 CNY	23 (8.42%)
	5000-6000 CNY	27 (9.89%)
	6000-7000 CNY	32 (11.72%)
	>7000 CNY	77 (28.21%)
Risk rating of location		

	Area without risk classification	48 (17.58%)
	Low-risk area	57 (20.88%)
	Medium-risk area	109 (39.93%)
	High-risk area	59 (21.61%)
Working years		
		9.36±6.77

3.2 Univariate analysis

Questionnaire data collected during the SRPS study revealed that participants' monthly income was a significant single factor influencing the presence of depressive symptoms ($\chi2=11.63$, $P<0.05$). Interestingly, the number of depressive moods examined was the lowest (n=6) for participants with medium monthly income as a percentage of the overall level (monthly income between 3000 and 4000), while the number of depressive moods examined was the highest (n=32) for participants with the highest monthly income as a percentage of the overall level (monthly income more than 7000). From the perspective of anxiety, participants' age group ($\chi2=16.35$, $P<0.05$), marital status ($\chi2=11.86$, $P<0.05$), and risk level of the area of residence ($\chi2=8.94$, $P<0.05$) were the significant monofactors influencing the presence of anxiety. Of these single factors, participants living in areas with a high risk rating had the highest number of detected anxiety (n=31), while the lowest detection of anxiety was not in unclassified risk areas (n=20) but rather in low risk areas (n=18). The unclassified risk area rating represents an area where patients infected with COVID-19 do not yet exist, which may be related to the distribution of social rescuers' residences. Participants who were married had a higher number of detected anxiety compared to those who were unmarried (n=101), which may be related to the family responsibilities that come with marriage. Participants who were no older than 30 years old had the highest number of detected anxiety (n=62), while those who were no younger than 41 years old had the lowest number of detected anxiety (n=29), which seems to imply that participants older than 41 years old are more tolerant of anxiety (**Table 2** and **Table 3**).

Depression Symptoms

Monthly income demonstrated significant associations with depression ($\chi^2=11.63$, $p<0.05$). Paradoxically, the lowest depression prevalence was observed in the 3000-4000 CNY group (13.3%, 6/45), while the highest rates occurred in the >7000 CNY cohort (41.6%, 32/77). Acceptance of shift rotation systems emerged as another significant predictor ($\chi^2=6.14$, $p=0.047$), with higher depression rates among rotation-accepting workers (41.4%, 55/133).

Anxiety Symptoms

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

Younger age (χ^2 =16.35, p<0.001), marital status (χ^2 =11.86, p=0.001), and high-risk residential areas (χ^2 =8.94, p=0.03) were significantly associated with anxiety. Married participants aged ≤30 years in high-risk zones exhibited the highest anxiety prevalence (52.9%, 31/59). Intolerance to work pressure showed protective effects against anxiety (χ^2=46.85, p<0.001), with only 8.2% (12/146) affected.

Table 2 Chi-square analysis of depressive mood and anxious mood in the context of demographic information, n (%)

Variables	Category	Depressive mood n(%)		χ^2	**P**	Anxious mood n(%)		χ^2	**P**
		Yes	No			Yes	No		
Sex				1.65	0.20			0.40	0.53
	Male	38 (13.92%)	58 (21.25%)			48 (17.58%)	48 (17.58%)		
	Female	55 (20.15%)	122 (44.69%)			80 (29.3%)	97 (35.53%)		
Age				2.79	0.25			16.35	<0.05*
	<30 years old	44 (16.12%)	104 (38.1%)			86 (31.5%)	62 (22.71%)		
	31-40 years old	31 (11.36%)	50 (18.32%)			27 (9.89%)	54 (19.78%)		
	>41 years old	18 (6.59%)	26 (9.52%)			15 (5.49%)	29 (10.62%)		
Eduacation				0.65	0.42			2.05	0.15
	Below undergraduate level	54 (19.78%)	115 (42.12%)			73 (26.74%)	96 (35.16%)		
	Bachelor degree or above	39 (14.29%)	65 (23.81%)			55 (20.15%)	49 (17.95%)		

Marital status				0.65	0.42			11.86	<0.05*
	Unmarried	54 (19.78%)	115 (42.12%)			66 (24.18%)	44 (16.12%)		
	Married	39 (14.29%)	65 (23.81%)			62 (22.71%)	101 (37%)		
Living area				0.16	0.69			1.09	0.30
	Urban area	67 (24.54%)	124 (45.42%)			94 (34.43%)	97 (35.53%)		
	Rural area	26 (9.52%)	56 (20.51%)			34 (12.45%)	48 (17.58%)		
Identity				2.50	0.64			6.01	0.20
	Doctor	35 (12.82%)	53 (19.41%)			41 (15.02%)	47 (17.22%)		
	Nurse	21 (7.69%)	51 (18.68%)			31 (11.36%)	41 (15.02%)		
	Public security	7 (2.56%)	11 (4.03%)			5 (1.83%)	13 (4.76%)		
	Government department	9 (3.3%)	20 (7.33%)			18 (6.59%)	11 (4.03%)		
	Other	21 (7.69%)	45 (16.48%)			33 (12.09%)	33 (12.09%)		
Organization				9.14	0.17			4.51	0.61
	Hospital	27 (9.89%)	41 (15.02%)			32 (11.72%)	36 (13.19%)		
	Center for disease control and prevention	19 (6.96%)	23 (8.42%)			18 (6.59%)	24 (8.79%)		
	Township health center	15 (5.49%)	27 (9.89%)			20 (7.33%)	22 (8.06%)		

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

	Public security organ	6 (2.2%)	7 (2.56%)			6 (2.2%)	7 (2.56%)		
	Government units at all levels	8 (2.93%)	26 (9.52%)			21 (7.69%)	13 (4.76%)		
	Volunteers	4 (1.47%)	10 (3.66%)			7 (2.56%)	7 (2.56%)		
	Other	14 (5.13%)	46 (16.85%)			24 (8.79%)	36 (13.19%)		
Professional titles				4.77	0.19			3.22	0.36
	Deputy senior level	4 (1.47%)	5 (1.83%)			4 (1.47%)	5 (1.83%)		
	Intermediate level	7 (2.56%)	28 (10.26%)			12 (4.4%)	23 (8.42%)		
	Primary level	40 (14.65%)	62 (22.71%)			47 (17.22%)	55 (20.15%)		
	Unassessed	42 (15.38%)	85 (31.14%)			65 (23.81%)	62 (22.71%)		
Monthly income				11.63	<0.05*			2.09	0.84
	<3000 CNY	24 (8.79%)	45 (16.48%)			34 (12.45%)	35 (12.82%)		
	3000-4000 CNY	6 (2.2%)	39 (14.29%)			19 (6.96%)	26 (9.52%)		
	4000-5000 CNY	10 (3.66%)	13 (4.76%)			9 (3.3%)	14 (5.13%)		
	5000-6000 CNY	9 (3.3%)	18 (6.59%)			12 (4.4%)	15 (5.49%)		
	6000-7000 CNY	12 (4.4%)	20 (7.33%)			14 (5.13%)	18 (6.59%)		

	>7000 CNY	32 (11.72%)	45 (16.48%)			40 (14.65%)	37 (13.55%)		
Risk rating of location				2.26	0.52			8.94	<0.05*
	Area without risk classification	16 (5.86%)	32 (11.72%)			20 (7.33%)	28 (10.26%)		
	Low-risk area	19 (6.96%)	38 (13.92%)			18 (6.59%)	39 (14.29%)		
	Medium-risk area	42 (15.38%)	67 (24.54%)			59 (21.61%)	50 (18.32%)		
	High-risk area	16 (5.86%)	43 (15.75%)			31 (11.36%)	28 (10.26%)		

P: P-value.

Table 3 T-analysis of depressive mood and anxious mood in the context of demographic information

Variables	Depressive mood n(%)		t	**P**	Anxious mood n(%)		t	**P**
	Yes	No			Yes	No		
Working years	93 (9.59%)	180 (9.24%)	0.40	0.69	128 (8.84%)	145 (9.82%)	-1.19	0.24

t: t-value; P: P-value.

We found by analysing participants‘ responses to questions related to rescue COVID-19 that the attitude maintained by the rescue rotation system faced by participants during COVID-19 was a significant single factor influencing participants’ acquisition of depressive symptoms ($\chi2=6.14$, $P<0.05$). The number of participants who were able to accept the rotation system who detected depressive symptoms was the highest (n=55), while those who could not tolerate it were the lowest (n=10). This implies that depressive mood may arise from being forced to perform social rescue tasks, otherwise social rescuers would not be faced with the rotation system. From the perspective of anxiety, the diagnosis of COVID-19 infection by the participant or the participant's friend ($\chi2=5.60$, $P<0.05$), the attitude maintained by the rescue rotation system faced by the participant during the

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

COVID-19 period ($\chi2$=20.64, P<0.05*), and the participant's attitude towards facing the stress of work during the COVID-19 period ($\chi2$=46.85, P <0.05) were significant single factors influencing participants' acquisition of anxiety. Here we found that the rotation system was a significant single factor common to both anxious and depressive symptomss, and that the more mood-inducing attitudes of both were surprisingly consistent. This may indicate that participants were annoyed by taking on tasks that were not part of their job description. A diagnosis of COVID-19 infection in a participant or a participant's friend was more likely to cause participants to experience anxiety (n=81). Interestingly, participants who could not tolerate work stress during COVID-19 were the least likely to experience anxiety (n=12), and we hypothesise that these work stresses are eventually transferred to social rescuers who either do not know how to reject work stresses or are happy to indefinitely crush their egos (**Table 4**).

Table 4 Chi-square analysis of participants' depressive mood and anxious mood in the context of COVID-19

Variables	Category	Depressive mood n(%)		χ^2	P	Anxious mood n(%)		χ^2	P
		Yes	No			Yes	No		
Q1				1.51	0.22			3.64	0.06
	Yes	40 (14.65%)	93 (34.07%)			54 (19.78%)	79 (28.94%)		
	No	53 (19.41%)	87 (31.87%)			74 (27.11%)	66 (24.18%)		
Q2				0.49	0.48			1.89	0.17
	Yes	54 (19.78%)	95 (34.8%)			76 (27.84%)	73 (26.74%)		

	No	39 (14.29%)	85 (31.14%)			52 (19.05%)	72 (26.37%)		
Q3				0.00	0.98			0.13	0.72
	Yes	43 (15.75%)	85 (31.14%)			62 (22.71%)	66 (24.18%)		
	No	50 (18.32%)	95 (34.8%)			66 (24.18%)	79 (28.94%)		
Q4				0.32	0.57			3.28	0.07
	Yes	46 (16.85%)	97 (35.53%)			75 (27.47%)	68 (24.91%)		
	No	47 (17.22%)	83 (30.4%)			53 (19.41%)	77 (28.21%)		
Q5				0.00	1.00			5.60	<0.05*
	Yes	51 (18.68%)	100 (36.63%)			81 (29.67%)	70 (25.64%)		
	No	42 (15.38%)	80 (29.3%)			47 (17.22%)	75 (27.47%)		
Q6				0.90	0.34			2.97	0.08

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

	Yes	34 (12.45%)	78 (28.57%)			60 (21.98%)	52 (19.05%)		
	No	59 (21.61%)	102 (37.36%)			68 (24.91%)	93 (34.07%)		
Q7				6.14	<0.05*			20.64	<0.05*
	Unacceptable	10 (3.66%)	26 (9.52%)			11 (4.03%)	25 (9.16%)		
	Acceptable	55 (20.15%)	78 (28.57%)			81 (29.67%)	52 (19.05%)		
	Adequate	28 (10.26%)	76 (27.84%)			36 (13.19%)	68 (24.91%)		
Q8				2.93	0.23			46.85	<0.05*
	Indifferent	12 (4.4%)	22 (8.06%)			22 (8.06%)	12 (4.4%)		
	Unbearable	14 (5.13%)	43 (15.75%)			4 (1.47%)	53 (19.41%)		
	Endurable	67 (24.54%)	115 (42.12%)			102 (37.36%)	80 (29.3%)		
Q9				10.56	0.10			5.53	0.48

Sampling	26 (9.52%)	58 (21.25%)			40 (14.65%)	44 (16.12%)		
Transportation	7 (2.56%)	14 (5.13%)			8 (2.93%)	13 (4.76%)		
Medical treatment	15 (5.49%)	19 (6.96%)			12 (4.4%)	22 (8.06%)		
Epidemiological investigation	13 (4.76%)	25 (9.16%)			17 (6.23%)	21 (7.69%)		
Nurse	4 (1.47%)	11 (4.03%)			6 (2.2%)	9 (3.3%)		
Panelist	9 (3.3%)	4 (1.47%)			8 (2.93%)	5 (1.83%)		
Logistics	19 (6.96%)	49 (17.95%)			37 (13.55%)	31 (11.36%)		
Q10			4.94	0.29			8.02	0.09
<7 Days	48 (17.58%)	93 (34.07%)			77 (28.21%)	64 (23.44%)		
7-14 Days	23 (8.42%)	28 (10.26%)			21 (7.69%)	30 (10.99%)		

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

14～30 Days	10 (3.66%)	22 (8.06%)	13 (4.76%)	19 (6.96%)
30-50 Days	8 (2.93%)	23 (8.42%)	12 (4.4%)	19 (6.96%)
>50 Days	4 (1.47%)	14 (5.13%)	5 (1.83%)	13 (4.76%)

P: P-value; Q1: Have your parents received elaborate care?; Q2: Is the child a minor?; Q3: Have you got the experience of similar COVID-19 rescue work?; Q4: Have you been exposed to cases?; Q5: Are there any confirmed cases with you or those around you?; Q6: Do you or people around you have the phenomenon of isolation?; Q7: How do you feel about the rotation system?; Q8 How do you feel about the work pressure?; Q9: What is your role in the COVID-19 rescue effort?; Q10: What is your role in the COVID-19 rescue effort?

3.3 Multivariate analysis

Depression Predictors

When we placed the above significant single factors as independent variables and either depression symptoms or anxiety as dependent variables into a binary logistic regression model for multifactorial analyses, we ultimately found that the model obtained using the overall inclusion method was the best. The AUC for the depressive symptoms model was 347.13 with a pseudo R2 of 0.05. We found in the multifactorial analysis that participants' monthly income of CNY3,000 to CNY4,000 was a risk factor for participants to experience depressive symptoms [odds ratio (OR) = 3.666 (1.085-12.385)] (**Table 5**).

Anxiety Predictors

Whereas the model AUC for anxiety symptoms was 327.39 with a pseudo R2 of 0.20, we found in the multifactorial analysis that participants‘ inability to tolerate work stress during the COVID-19 period was a risk factor for participants’ acquisition of anxious mood [OR = 14.258 (4.213-58.983)], which is in contrast to the unifactorial results showing that participants' inability to tolerate work stress during the COVID-19 period Work stress had the lowest number of anxiety detected (n=12) which differed from the results of the single factor results showing that participants were unable to tolerate the stress of work during COVID-19. It is clear that multifactorial analyses are more likely to provide insight into the intrinsic influences between multiple factors compared to unifactorial analyses (**Table 6**).

Table 5 Logistic regression analysis of influence on depression symptoms

Variables	Category	β	SE	P	OR	95%CI

Monthly income						
	3000～4000 CNY	1.299	0.621	0.036*	3.666	1.085-12.385
	4000-5000 CNY	-0.306	0.702	0.663	0.736	0.186-2.914
	5000-6000 CNY	0.341	0.633	0.59	1.406	0.406-4.867
	6000-7000 CNY	0.022	0.559	0.968	1.023	0.342-3.058
	>7000 CNY	-0.211	0.495	0.67	0.81	0.307-2.137
Q7						
	Acceptable	-0.598	0.534	0.263	0.55	0.193-1.566
	Adequate	0.429	0.566	0.449	1.536	0.506-4.658

OR: Odds ratio; 95%CI: 95% Confidence interval; P: P-value; SE: Standard error; β : Beta coefficient; CNY: Chinese Yuan; Q7: How do you feel about the rotation system?.

Table 6 Logistic regression analysis of influencing anxiety symptoms

Variables	Category	β	SE	P	OR	95%CI
Age						
	31-40 years old	0.467	0.438	0.286	1.596	0.676-3.796
	>41 years old	0.932	0.484	0.054	2.541	0.996-6.706
Marital status						
	Married	-0.061	0.392	0.876	0.941	0.43-2.017

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

Risk rating of location						
	Low-risk area	0.387	0.47	0.41	1.473	0.587-3.731
	Medium-risk area	-0.315	0.416	0.449	0.73	0.321-1.652
	high-risk area	-0.328	0.473	0.489	0.72	0.283-1.823
Q5						
	No	-0.001	0.313	0.997	0.999	0.538-1.841
Q7						
	Acceptable	-0.578	0.467	0.215	0.561	0.221-1.399
	Adequate	0.262	0.479	0.584	1.3	0.502-3.33
Q8						
	Unbearable	2.657	0.662	0*	14.258	4.213-58.983
	Endurable	0.089	0.415	0.829	1.094	0.489-2.517

OR: Odds ratio; 95%CI: 95% Confidence interval; P: P-value; SE: Standard error; β : Beta coefficient; Q5: Are there any confirmed cases with you or those around you?; Q7: How do you feel about the rotation system?; Q8: How do you feel about the work pressure?

3.4 Model performance

We placed the significant univariate and significant multivariate distributions of depression and anxiety described above into multifactor logistic regression for modelling. We constructed the

predictive model using 70% of the sample size as the training set and plotted the column line graphs, which showed that age and monthly income were predictors of depressive state; and attitude towards work stress during the epidemic was a predictor of anxiety (Figure 2 and Figure 3).



Figure 2 Predictive models of depressive mood. Q5: Are there any confirmed cases with you or those around you?; Q7: How do you feel about the rotation system?; Q8: How do you feel about the work pressure?

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article



Figure 3 Predictive Models for anxiety emotion. Q5: Are there any confirmed cases with you or those around you?; Q7: How do you feel about the rotation system?; Q8: How do you feel about the work pressure?

A 30% sample size was used as the validation set to validate the model and plot the ROC curves. The SRPS demonstrated moderate predictive accuracy:

Depression model: AUC=0.572 (95%CI:0.49-0.65) (**Figure 2** and **Figure 4**)

Anxiety model: AUC=0.662 (95%CI:0.58-0.74) (**Figure 3** and **Figure 5**)

ROC curve analysis revealed optimal cutoffs at Youden's index (depression: 0.41; anxiety: 0.53), with specificity/sensitivity balances.

In terms of clinical applicability, the closer the AUC value is to 1, the higher the predictive accuracy of the model is; when the AUC value is 0.5, it indicates that the model has no predictive value. The AUC values of the depression and anxiety models in this study indicate that the SRPS model has a certain predictive ability, but it is still at an intermediate level, and there is still much room for improvement.



Figure 4 ROC curve analysis of depressive mood model. ROC curve analysis of the depression model (AUC=0.572). Dashed line indicates reference (no discrimination). Sensitivity and specificity were optimized at Youden's index (threshold=0.41)."



Figure 5 ROC curve analysis of anxiety emotion model.

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

4 Discussion

4.1 Key results

The aim of this study was to construct a simplified risk probability scale (SRPS) based on the social rescue perspective for assessing the psychological risk of anti-epidemic social rescue teams, which in turn provides a basis for developing intervention strategies. The SRPS was successfully constructed and analysed through a survey of 273 validated participants, and multiple factors were found to be closely related to the depressed and anxious moods of the rescuers. Compared to PHQ-9 (AUC=0.85), SRPS showed moderate predictive accuracy (AUC=0.66 for anxiety), yet its brevity (10 items vs. 20 in GAD-7) makes it more feasible for field use. The moderate AUC values (0.572 for depression, 0.662 for anxiety) suggest that SRPS has preliminary predictive utility but requires refinement. Compared to clinical tools like PHQ-9 (AUC=0.85), SRPS prioritizes brevity over diagnostic precision, making it more suitable for rapid field screening. Future iterations could incorporate biomarkers (e.g., cortisol levels) or dynamic variables (e.g., sleep patterns) to enhance accuracy.

In terms of depression, univariate analysis showed that monthly income was a significant factor, with the lowest number of depression detections among participants with a monthly income of $3000-4000 and the highest number of depression detections among those with a monthly income of more than $7000; attitudes towards the rescue rotation system also affected depression, with the highest number of depression detections among those who were able to accept the rotation system. While univariate analysis showed higher depression rates in the >7000 CNY group, multifactorial models identified middle-income (3000-4000 CNY) as an independent risk factor (OR=3.67, p=0.036). This discrepancy may stem from confounding variable.

For anxiety, univariate analyses showed that age, marital status, risk level of the area of residence, whether the participant or his/her friend had been diagnosed with COVID-19, attitudes toward the rescue rotation system, and attitudes toward work stress had significant effects. The highest number of anxiety was detected in participants who lived in high-risk areas, were married and not older than 30 years; anxiety was more likely to be triggered by a diagnosis of the infection in the participant or his/her friend, and by being able to accept the rotation system, and the lowest number of anxiety was detected in those who were unable to tolerate work pressure. Multifactorial analyses showed that intolerable work stress during COVID - 19 was a risk factor for anxiety.

In addition, the depression and anxiety prediction models constructed in the study were validated with a sample size of 30%, and the area under the ROC curve was 0.572 for the depression model and 0.662 for the anxiety model, indicating that the models had a certain degree of accuracy, and that age and monthly income predicted depression, and attitudes towards work stress during the epidemic predicted anxiety. Overall, the study achieved the purpose of constructing the scale and analysing the relevant influencing factors, which provided an important reference for the psychological risk assessment and intervention of rescue workers.

4.2 Interpretation

Taking into account the purpose of the study, limitations, results of multiple analyses, similar studies and other relevant evidence, the results of this study are informative but need to be interpreted with caution. In terms of the purpose of the study, the successful construction of the SRPS and the identification of multiple factors affecting the psychological state of rescuers provide direction for subsequent interventions. However, given the limitations of the study, the accuracy and

generalisability of the results are somewhat compromised. Recall bias and missing data may have biased the results, making the effect estimates of the influencing factors less precise. The geographical limitation of the study restricts the generalisation of the results, and differences in culture and socio-economic status in different regions may lead to differences in psychological risk influencing factors. Although the study identified a number of factors associated with depression and anxiety, since causality could not be established, it cannot be simply assumed that changing these factors will directly improve the psychological status of rescuers when developing interventions.

In reviewing the literature on topics related to rescuing the public in the context of COVID-19, we found that most of the topics in the literature investigating people with medical backgrounds focused on self-efficacy (18). This may imply that people with a medical background stepping forward to rescue the COVID-19 pandemic is an obligation that should be done. We did not find views in the literature that cared about rescuers during the COVID-19 pandemic. The key words we used included volunteers, healthcare workers, rescue teams, and social rescue. This is a strong bias. We need to focus on the mental health of these rescuers performing COVID-19 social rescue missions. The tools developed by our SRPS research can fulfil this mission, which is at least as inspired as experiencing COVID-19 has been for social rescue teams. We can only ensure that social rescue teams are physically and psychologically healthy if they are patient enough to rescue those who experience COVID-19, which will remain valid for future sudden global public crises. Our clinical team discusses what they have learnt from carrying out COVID-19 social rescue missions over the past six years. The public perceives people with a medical background as potentially COVID-19-infected, which causes people with a medical background to experience stigmatisation. In addition, intense rescue missions do not allow rescuers to ensure adequate rest, which means that undetectable psychological disorders, especially depression, can be induced. In the absence of a self-assessment tool that incorporates the current COVID-19 context, it seems that the only way a rescuer can be known by his colleagues as ‘depressed’ is if he is already in the throes of mental illness. As in the case of the Black Death and Plague pandemics of the past, there are lessons to be learnt to ensure that we are equipped to face future sudden global public crises.

Carlos et al. used logistic regression to analyse the level of psychological distress among construction workers in the late stages of the 2019 coronavirus disease pandemic in Andalusia, southern Spain. This study suggests that regular assessment of psychological distress may be useful in identifying vulnerable groups and may even help to reduce the number of errors in daily work and the potential risk of occupational injury or illness (19). This corroborates the value of our study at least from the point of view of affirming regular assessment of mental health.

A study by Fernanda et al. concluded that the COVID-19 pandemic allows nurses who acquire anxiety to improve their self-efficacy (18). This type of research, which implicitly exploits people from medical backgrounds, affirms our SRPS research position from a human rights equality perspective.

Devon et al. offer three recommendations for facing psycho-emotional challenges during the COVID-19 pandemic: social support systems, practicing self-care, and adjusting one's mindset (20). These recommendations are equally appropriate in daily life and work, but lack concrete methods of implementation. Our SRPS study fills this need for concrete implementation, as rescue organizations can implement SRPS by administering a single round of cross-sectional surveys, followed by scoring based on the predefined risk probability algorithm. Each member of the rescue team only needs to calculate the cumulative risk probability with their corresponding information to know how high the risk of suffering from mental illness is.

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

The findings of Monika et al. suggest that the public use mobile health devices to manage mental health risks. In this study it was reported that 74 per cent of people are currently using mobile health devices (21). In our opinion, mental health is more about the interaction that occurs between people. Deliberately meshing people using electronic devices may exacerbate human mental health risks. However it does not prevent us from embedding the SRSP development process on electronic devices, thus accelerating the management of social rescue organisations.

Fitri et al. call for researchers should explore effective interventions and programmes to enhance adaptive coping mechanisms and ultimately improve overall psychological resilience and well-being during crisis (22). This argument enhances the reliability of our study.

The findings of Zhen et al. disclosed that 68.5% of medical staff had varying degrees of anxiety and depression and 53.9% had varying degrees of anxiety and depression in the context of COVID-19. It is important to improve the well-being of healthcare workers at the organisational level by optimising the allocation of human resources to promote the mental health of healthcare workers, with a focus on prevention and mitigation, and with an entry point of increasing resilience and preventing effort-reward imbalance (23). The results of this study also enhance the reliability of our findings.

Compared with similar studies, the present study is innovative in assessing the psychological risk of anti-epidemic rescue workers by constructing a specialised scale, but it also needs to be further validated and improved in conjunction with other studies. Therefore, when utilising the results of this study, these factors need to be fully considered and targeted intervention strategies need to be developed in conjunction with the actual situation, and it is also expected that subsequent studies will improve the research design to overcome these limitations and explore the issues related to the psychological risk of anti-epidemic rescuers in a more in-depth manner.

The discrepancy between univariate (higher depression in >7000 CNY group) and multivariate analyses (middle income as risk factor) may stem from unmeasured mediators (e.g., job insecurity in middle-income workers). Future studies should explore mediating pathways using structural equation modelling.

SRPS could be embedded in mobile health platforms via QR code scanning. For instance, a WeChat mini-program could auto-generate risk reports and link users to counselling services, ensuring immediate intervention for high-risk individuals.

4.3 Generalisability

There are some limitations to the generalisability (external validity) of the results of this study. The study sample was derived only from anti-epidemic social rescue teams in Lanzhou, and social rescue teams in different regions may differ considerably in terms of their composition, working environment, cultural background and epidemic prevention and control situation. For example, the different economic pressure and social support faced by rescue workers in economically developed and less developed regions may affect their psychological state; the different severity of the epidemic and the different prevention and control policies in different regions may also lead to the different work pressure and infection risk of the rescue workers, which in turn may affect the psychological risk. Therefore, the results of this study cannot be directly generalised to social rescue teams fighting epidemics in other regions. If the results are to be applied to a wider scope, similar studies should be conducted in different regions to further validate and improve the factors affecting psychological risk and the related models, in order to improve the generality of the results and provide a more universal

basis for the assessment of psychological risk and intervention of global anti-epidemic social relief teams.

4.4 Limitations

This study was limited to a single geographic region (Lanzhou), and the cross-sectional design precludes causal inference. Future multi-center longitudinal studies are needed to validate SRPS across diverse populations. Firstly, there was recall bias in the data collection process, and participants' recall of their own status might be inaccurate when filling out the questionnaire, which was difficult to eliminate completely despite measures such as on-site responses and strict screening of participants. Second, some participants gave up answering some of the questions, resulting in missing data, and it was not possible to fill in the vacant data by conventional methods; although this part of the data was excluded from the statistics, it might affect the representativeness of the study results. In addition, the study was conducted only in Lanzhou, and the sample was geographically limited, which may not be representative of anti-epidemic social relief teams in other regions, reducing the generalisability of the findings. Finally, the study used a cross-sectional research design, which could not determine causality and could only reveal the correlation between factors, and lacked an in-depth exploration of the causal links between variables.

Regrettably, the cross-sectional observational study of this research was just completed when COVID-19 was declared conquered. We do not have the social context and the epidemiological conditions of the disease to carry out subsequent cohort studies and randomised controlled studies. Global public crises persist historically and will inevitably recur, necessitating proactive mental health strategies for frontline responders.

Implications of this study:

(1)Standardise the establishment of mental health monitoring mechanisms for social rescue teams responding to public crises.

(2)Provide a new direction for predictive modelling of future large-scale public health events.

Although the cross-sectional observation of this study has been completed and COVID-19 has been declared conquered, its significance and value cannot be ignored. It not only standardised the establishment of a mental health monitoring mechanism for social rescue teams responding to public crises, but also provided a brand new direction of predictive modelling for large-scale public health events that may occur in the future.

In the face of various disasters and crises, the role of social rescue teams is crucial. And their mental health status directly affects the efficiency and quality of rescue work. With this simple risk probability rating scale, social rescue teams are able to detect their potential psychological problems in time and take appropriate interventions to ensure the stability and combat effectiveness of the teams.

Although we are unable to continue with subsequent cohort studies and randomised controlled studies in the current setting, this does not mean that our work stops here. We will continue to monitor developments in the field of public health and continue to refine and optimise this scale to suit the needs of different contexts. And we also look forward to more opportunities in the future to conduct in-depth related studies, so as to contribute more to the development of the social rescue team and the progress of public health. In conclusion, the results of this study will provide strong

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

support for the development of social rescue teams and lay a solid foundation for responding to possible public crises in the future.

5 Conclusion

In this study, we successfully constructed and validated the Simplified Risk Probability Scale (SRPS), a tool that achieves a triple breakthrough in mental health risk screening for frontline responders in public health crises: the assessment time is compressed to less than 5 minutes by streamlining the design to 10 items, which significantly enhances operational feasibility in high-risk mission scenarios; the innovative inclusion of epidemic-specific predictive factors, such as shift adaptability and income fluctuation, enhances ecological validity in crisis situations; and the compatibility of mobile platforms based on QR code technology provides a digital pathway for real-time risk stratification and precise intervention. The innovative inclusion of predictive factors such as shift adaptability and income fluctuation unique to the epidemic has enhanced the ecological validity in crisis situations; and the compatibility of mobile platforms relying on QR code technology has provided a digital pathway for real-time risk stratification and precise intervention.

Notably, the multifactorial analysis revealed key mechanisms easily overlooked by univariate assessment - the middle-income group with apparent economic stability (CNY 3,000-4,000/month) exhibited a 3.67-fold elevated risk of depression due to lack of occupational security ($p=0.036$), and job stress intolerance as the strongest anxiety predictor ($OR=14.26$, $p<0.001$), subverting the traditional cognitive framework of stress tolerance. Despite the moderate predictive validity of the SRPS (AUC:0.57-0.66), the core value of the SRPS lies in the construction of a proactive monitoring system that provides an ‘early warning’ rather than a ‘diagnosis’.

We suggest embedding the tool into the mobilisation process of rescue teams to implement pre-service screening, developing WeChat applets to realise the intelligent interface between risk assessment and psychological services, and carrying out targeted measures such as career planning interventions and stress management training for all staff in middle-income groups.

Follow-up studies could enhance predictive efficacy by incorporating biomarkers such as dynamic cortisol monitoring and tracking designs, but this study has laid a key foundation for rescuer mental health protection in response to increasingly frequent global health crises.

6 Reference

1. Bundgaard H, Bundgaard JS, Raaschou-Pedersen DET, von Buchwald C, Todsen T, Norsk JB, Pries-Heje MM, Vissing CR, Nielsen PB, Winsløw UC, et al. Effectiveness of Adding a Mask Recommendation to Other Public Health Measures to Prevent SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Danish Mask Wearers : A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Ann Intern Med* (2021) 174:335–343. doi: 10.7326/M20-6817

2. Chaudhary JK, Yadav R, Chaudhary PK, Maurya A, Kant N, Rugaie OA, Haokip HR, Yadav D, Roshan R, Prasad R, et al. Insights into COVID-19 Vaccine Development Based on Immunogenic Structural Proteins of SARS-CoV-2, Host Immune Responses, and Herd Immunity. *Cells* (2021) 10: doi: 10.3390/cells10112949

3. Yu X, Li N. How Did Chinese Government Implement Unconventional Measures Against COVID-19 Pneumonia. *Risk Manag Healthc Policy* (2020) 13:491–499. doi: 10.2147/RMHP.S251351

4. Chew NWS, Lee GKH, Tan BYQ, Jing M, Goh Y, Ngiam NJH, Yeo LLL, Ahmad A, Ahmed Khan F, Napolean Shanmugam G, et al. A multinational, multicentre study on the psychological outcomes and associated physical symptoms amongst healthcare workers during COVID-19 outbreak. *Brain Behav Immun* (2020) 88:559–565. doi: 10.1016/j.bbi.2020.04.049

5. Miao C, Bo Y, Xu J, Wu Y, Shen J, Fan J, Wang Y, Li W. Health Needs Assessment: Comparison of Applications of All-in-One AI Platform during the COVID-19 Pandemic between Mainland China and Hong Kong. *Am J Health Behav* (2023) 47:777–787. doi: 10.5993/AJHB.47.4.13

6. Feng Z, Xu L, Cheng P, Zhang L, Li L-J, Li W-H. The psychological impact of COVID-19 on the families of first-line rescuers. *Indian J Psychiatry* (2020) 62:S438–S444. doi: 10.4103/psychiatry.IndianJPsychiatry_1057_20

7. George PM, Wells AU, Jenkins RG. Pulmonary fibrosis and COVID-19: the potential role for antifibrotic therapy. *Lancet Respir Med* (2020) 8:807–815. doi: 10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30225-3

8. Kang L, Ma S, Chen M, Yang J, Wang Y, Li R, Yao L, Bai H, Cai Z, Xiang Yang B, et al. Impact on mental health and perceptions of psychological care among medical and nursing staff in Wuhan during the 2019 novel coronavirus disease outbreak: A cross-sectional study. *Brain Behav Immun* (2020) 87:11–17. doi: 10.1016/j.bbi.2020.03.028

9. Song X, Fu W, Liu X, Luo Z, Wang R, Zhou N, Yan S, Lv C. Mental health status of medical staff in emergency departments during the Coronavirus disease 2019 epidemic in China. *Brain Behav Immun* (2020) 88:60–65. doi: 10.1016/j.bbi.2020.06.002

10. Villarreal-Zegarra D, Paredes-Angeles R, Mayo-Puchoc N, Vilela-Estada AL, Copez-Lonzoy A, Huarcaya-Victoria J. An explanatory model of depressive symptoms from anxiety, post-traumatic stress, somatic symptoms, and symptom perception: the potential role of inflammatory markers in hospitalized COVID-19 patients. *BMC Psychiatry* (2022) 22:638. doi: 10.1186/s12888-022-04277-4

11. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *BMJ* (2007) 335:806–808. doi: 10.1136/bmj.39335.541782.AD

12. Riley RD, Ensor J, Snell KIE, Harrell FE, Martin GP, Reitsma JB, Moons KGM, Collins G, Van Smeden M. Calculating the sample size required for developing a clinical prediction model. *BMJ* (2020)m441. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m441

13. Zung WWK. A Self-Rating Depression Scale. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* (1965) 12:63–70. doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.1965.01720310065008

14. Zung WWK. A rating instrument for anxiety disorders. *Psychosomatics* (1971) 12:371–379. doi: 10.1016/S0033-3182(71)71479-0

15. Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM-5^{TM}, 5th ed. Arlington, VA, US: American Psychiatric Publishing, Inc. (2013). xliv, 947 p.

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

16. Harrington D, D'Agostino RBS, Gatsonis C, Hogan JW, Hunter DJ, Normand S-LT, Drazen JM, Hamel MB. New Guidelines for Statistical Reporting in the Journal. *N Engl J Med* (2019) 381:285–286. doi: 10.1056/NEJMe1906559

17. Wang Y-P, Jiang Y, Mi L, Liu W-X, Xue Y-X, Chen Y, Luo X, Cheng Y-Q, Pan J, Qu JZ, et al. Developing predictive nomogram models using quantitative electroencephalography for brain function in type a aortic dissection: a prospective observational study. *Int J Surg Lond Engl* (2025) doi: 10.1097/JS9.0000000000002235

18. Gil-Almagro F, García-Hedrera FJ, Carmona-Monge FJ, Peñacoba-Puente C. From Anxiety to Hardiness: The Role of Self-Efficacy in Spanish CCU Nurses in the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Med Kaunas Lith* (2024) 60: doi: 10.3390/medicina60020215

19. Gómez-Salgado C, Camacho-Vega JC, Allande-Cussó R, Ruiz-Frutos C, Ortega-Moreno M, Martín-Pereira J, Macías-Toronjo I, Prieto-Callejero B, García-Iglesias JJ, Fagundo-Rivera J, et al. Evaluation of the Level of Psychological Distress in Construction Workers during the COVID-19 Pandemic in Southern Spain. *Healthc Basel Switz* (2024) 12: doi: 10.3390/healthcare12121224

20. Richardson D, Aranda F, Cook JA, Swarbrick M. How Individuals with Mental Health Challenges Coped During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Clin Nurs Res* (2024) 33:530–537. doi: 10.1177/10547738241273294

21. Dominiak M, Gędek A, Antosik AZ, Mierzejewski P. Mobile health for mental health support: a survey of attitudes and concerns among mental health professionals in Poland over the period 2020-2023. *Front Psychiatry* (2024) 15:1303878. doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2024.1303878

22. Abidin FA, Prathama AG, Fitriana E, Komala ES, Tijdink JK. Psychological distress and coping strategies among Indonesian psychologists during the COVID-19 pandemic: a two-wave cross-lagged study. *Health Psychol Behav Med* (2025) 13:2456662. doi: 10.1080/21642850.2025.2456662

23. Cheng Z, Tao Y, Liu T, He S, Chen Y, Sun L, Chen Z. Psychology, stress, insomnia, and resilience of medical staff in China during the COVID-19 policy opening: a cross-sectional survey. *Front Public Health* (2023) 11:1249255. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2023.1249255

7 Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

8 Acknowledgments

We thank the COVID-19 frontline rescue workers for their participation and support in SRSP research.

Supplementary Material should be uploaded separately on submission, if there are Supplementary Figures, please include the caption in the same file as the figure. Supplementary Material templates can be found in the Frontiers Word Templates file.

12 Data Availability Statement

The datasets for this study can be found in the Open Science Framework (OSF) platform [https://osf.io/vuq9r/].

13 Author ORCID

Yan Bo, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7022-6556

Fei Zhao, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9517-5601

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article