Coping with COVID-19 Stressors:

Adverse and Protective Factors Responding to Emotions in a Chinese Sample

Rui Xu¹, Xinfeng Zhang², Danni Liu², Qiang Li³, Yanping Wang¹, Rong Jiao⁴, Ximei Gong⁵, Xueyan Hou⁶, Tao Xu⁷, Xuemei Qing⁸, Kangxing Song⁹, Voyko Kavcic¹⁰,
Shiyan Yan¹¹, Ruolei Gu^{12,13}, Terry Stratton¹⁴, Yang Jiang¹⁴

1 Institute of Basic Research in Clinical Medicine, China Academy of Chinese Medical Sciences, Beijing 100700, China

2 Information Department, Beijing University of Technology, Beijing 100124, China

3 Comprehensive Logistic Support Division, China Southern Airlines Company Limited, Guangzhou 510406, China

4 The First Clinical College, Hainan Medical University, Haikou 570100, China

5 Ophthalmologic Hospital, China Academy of Chinese Medical Sciences, Beijing 100040, China

6 Shenyang Medical College, Shenyang 110034, China

7 Air Force Healthcare Center for Special Services Hangzhou, Hangzhou 310007, China

8 Guang'anmen Hospital, China Academy of Chinese Medical Sciences, Beijing 100053, China

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

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

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

1 11 School of Acupuncture-Moxibustion and Tuina, Beijing University of Chinese
2 Medicine, Beijing 100029, China

3 12 CAS Key Laboratory of Behavioral Science, Institute of Psychology, Beijing 100101,
4 China

5 13 Department of Psychology, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing
6 100049, China

7 14 Department of Behavioral Science, College of Medicine, University of Kentucky, KY
8 40536-0086, USA

9

10 Rui Xu (anxietypsy@163.com), Xinfeng Zhang (zxf@bjut.edu.cn) have the equal
11 contribution on the study.

12 * Corresponding author: Terry Stratton (terry.stratton@uky.edu) & Shiyan Yan
13 (yanshiyan0927@sina.com)

14

15 **Abstract**

16 **Background:** The potential roles of affective responses to environmental stressors in
17 individuals' physical and mental health are complex and multi-faceted. This study, then,
18 explores Chinese citizens' emotional responses to COVID-19-related stressors and
19 influence factors which may boost or buffer such effects.

20 **Methods:** From late March to early June (2020), a cross-sectional study was
21 conducted using an anonymous online questionnaire included demographic
22 characteristics, COVID-19-related stressors related to individuals' daily functioning,
23 and the self-assessed impact of protective and adverse internal factors on emotions.

24 **Results:** 1,662 questionnaires were received from residents in 32 Chinese provinces

classified by prevalence level according to COVID-19 infections. Among the 17 positive and negative emotional responses, agglomerative hierarchical clustering revealed four subclassifications: (1) stress relations; (2) missing someone relations; (3) individual relations; and (4) social relations. Additionally, heightened regional prevalence levels positively corresponded to intensity of stress relations. Lowest intensity of social relations was found in the areas surrounding Wuhan and coastal areas. Specially, economic- and work-related stressors as well as negative self-perceptions (e.g., suppression, emotionally unstable, self-denial) implicated in negative emotions. While positive emotions were tied to demographic characteristics (e.g., high education, young age and male) and protective traits (e.g., creativity, sympathy, social responsibility), and inversely linked to relationships- and pandemic-related stressors, etc.

Conclusion: Associations were clearly noted among Chinese residents' emotions to specific stressors during pandemic. Providing appropriate psychological resources/supports during future or extended public health crises may help offset the cognitive burden of individuals striving to regain an adequate level of normalcy and emotional well-being.

Keywords: COVID-19; Emotion; Stressors; Self-perception; LASSO regression

Introduction

Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) have resulted in over 170 million diagnosed cases, including more than 3 million deaths worldwide (WHO, 2021). During the outbreak of COVID-19, countries imposed tight restrictions on personal behavior to halt the spread of the virus, which have also led to disruptions of routine social and economic activities, as well as health seeking behavior (Ebohon, Obienue, Irabor,

1 Amadin, & Omoregie, 2021; Gupta & Sengupta, 2020; Shah, Quint, Nwaru, & Sheikh,
2 2021). The negative impact of the pandemic on world economics is already evident,
3 as the risk of global economic crisis has been accumulating (Bank, 2021). Under these
4 influences, the mental health of the public is of great concern during the pandemic
5 (Alfawaz et al., 2021; Shanahan et al., 2020).

6 When individuals are exposed to traumatic events, their emotional responses would
7 be modulated, which may further lead to irrational and impulsive behavior (Ceschi,
8 Billieux, Hearn, Furst, & Van der Linden, 2014; Scott & Montgomery, 1984). Indeed,
9 public fear-driven behaviors during the COVID-19 pandemic led to increases in doctor
10 visits, pressures on the healthcare system, hoarding of food and daily necessities, and
11 misuse of personal protective gear (PPG), etc. (Mahase, 2020; Oosterhoff & Palmer,
12 2020). Reports of irrational behaviors (e.g., delays in seeking necessary medical
13 attention) and violence against doctors and vulnerable groups increased significantly
14 during the restrictions (Gaballa, AlJaf, Patel, Lindsay, & Hlaing, 2020; Ghosh, 2018).

15 While much attention has been paid to *complex* emotional responses (e.g., anxiety
16 and depression) to COVID-19 (Barzilay et al., 2020), *basic* emotions (e.g., happiness,
17 sadness, fear, etc.) remain largely ignored. However, the spontaneous expression of
18 basic emotions is more typical in “routine” social life and, subsequently, vulnerable
19 during disruptive or anomic conditions, such as natural disaster (Y. Li et al., 2020). For
20 instance, citizens in Croatia frequently exhibited fear, discouragement, and sadness
21 during ten days of the COVID-19 lockdown (Dogas et al., 2020). Additionally, the
22 public’s basic emotional expression has become a sensitive early warning indicator of
23 infectious outbreaks such as measles, H1N1, and Ebola(Ahmed, Bath, Sbaffi, &
24 Demartini, 2019; Du et al., 2018; Ofoghi, Mann, & Verspoor, 2016).

25 China has experienced the spread of COVID-19 peaked, plateaued, and declined

during the first half of 2020 (Huang et al., 2020) – and infective prevalence and double-edged policies (e.g., lockdowns) subjected residents to complicated or contradictory emotional states (Jin et al., 2020; Y. Li et al., 2020). In fact, residents were forced to overcome difficulties prior to encountering social isolation and conflict (Singh & Subedi, 2020; Venkatesh, 2020; Williams, Armitage, Tampe, & Dienes, 2020). Throughout all this, the relationship of basic emotions and environmental stressors was not fully studied. Additionally, little information was available to assess perceived feelings during pandemic, although cognition was recognized to play a key role between such environmental insults and emotions. Thus, our study aimed to investigate the basic emotions and the links with self-perceived stressors, all of which facilitate governments to provide timely and effective responses to the pandemic.

Methods

Participants

The cross-sectional study utilized a non-random “snowball” sample designed to elicit maximum participation by consenting Chinese adults. We used an online platform of “Wenjuanxing” (<https://www.wjx.cn/>) and advertised by WeChat, a popular social networking platform. From late March to early June (2020), respondents to an anonymous online questionnaire came from 32 Chinese provincial districts – which were classified by prevalence level (1 = lowest, 5 = highest) according to cumulative COVID-19 infections compiled prior to the data collection deadline (see Appendix 1).

Instrumentation

The questionnaire was devised by the authors and contained demographic information (i.e., sex, age, marital status, education) as well as self-assessed: (1) emotional responses to the COVID-19 pandemic (i.e., 9 negative emotion and 8 positive emotion); (2) environmental stressors and individuals’ daily functioning (e.g., time spent indoors);

1 and (3) protective and adverse aspects of well-being (e.g., creative, facing death from
2 COVID-19 infection) (see Appendix 2).

3 In particular, the instrument gauged respondents' experiences with seventeen basic
4 emotions which, based on Traditional Chinese Medicine (TCM) and recent related
5 researches (Keltner, Sauter, Tracy, & Cowen, 2019; Ye, Cai, Cheung, & Tsang, 2019;
6 Zhan et al., 2018). Emotions in TCM including five original types – joy (xi), anger,
7 thinking (si), sadness, and fear – are generally considered basic, mutually-related
8 human responses (Zhan et al., 2018). Further, each emotional type consists of varied
9 but similar properties. For example, fear combines meanings of fearfulness and being
10 frightened – whereas anger could be directed toward oneself or others (Praill,
11 Gonzalez-Prendes, & Kernsmith, 2015). Additionally, thinking (si) might encompass
12 annoyance and distracted thinking (Du, 2000). Conversely, in Chinese culture, joy (xi)
13 represents positive emotions such as happiness/joy, comfort/relaxation, a sense of
14 accomplishment, and safety (Dictionary Editing Room, 2011). All emotions could result
15 in response to a pandemic, which were assessed on a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging
16 from 0 ("Not at all") to 3 ("A great deal").

17 Environmental stressors assessed during the COVID-19 pandemic focused on
18 disruptions to daily life, difficulties, or personal experiences resulting from infection or
19 infective prevalence. Subjects also assessed protective and adverse internal factors
20 impacting their emotions. All items were derived from established Chinese COVID-19-
21 related guidelines for psychological assistance/service/counseling provided by various
22 resources and organizations (Ma, 2020; Shen & Wang, 2020; Wu & Zhang, 2020; Zhao
23 & Liu, 2020).

24 **Statistical Analysis**

25 **Agglomerative hierarchical clustering**

26 As a data reduction technique, and to identify underlying data structures, we used the

1 maximum coefficient method of agglomerative hierarchical clustering (James &
2 Tibshirani, 2013). In this iterative process, items initially treated as individual clusters
3 are progressively collapsed based on Pearson correlation coefficients (Casella &
4 Berger, 2001). The correlation matrix is then recalculated and the maximum coefficient
5 again identified between the new and uncombined clusters. This is repeated until all
6 items are grouped together into a single cluster or the procedure exceeds the specified
7 number of iterations.

8 **LASSO Regression**

9 A major challenge to classifying multiple objects within a singular construct is a large
10 intra-class variation that typically exists. The LASSO approach to parameter estimation
11 alters the model-fitting process to select only a subset of covariates which produce an
12 optimally predictive and interpretable model (Tibshirani, 2011). This goal is achieved by
13 utilizing a regularization process which, when applied across all predictors in a
14 multivariate model, allows the contributions of some coefficients to be reduced to zero
15 and, hence, completely removed from the model. This advantage, among others,
16 distinguishes LASSO from similar techniques (e.g., ridge regression) designed to avoid
17 model over-fitting by reducing residual “noise”
18 (<http://wavedatalab.github.io/machinelearningwithr/post4.html>).

19 As a parallel to designating measures as dependent or independent variables, LASSO
20 uses machine learning (ML) vernacular to reference inputs (“features”) and outputs
21 (“labels”). More specifically, “features” are properties of the data used to “train” or
22 develop the model-fitting algorithm, while “labels” are the resulting output returned after
23 computing.

24 Based on this framework, our training sample included 65 features in the four-part
25 feature set (including environment stressors, protective and adverse internal factors,
26 and demographic information, see Appendix 1), while the label set was defined a

1 certain emotion cluster. Normalizing the feature variables to obtain a standard sample
2 set, each standard sample had a feature vector (X) and a label variable (Y) upon which
3 the LASSO regression model was built. The number of features ultimately included in
4 the final model is selected by a cross-validation method and the parameters obtained.
5 We chose 20% of the overall data as the test set used to gauge performance of the
6 selected model.

7 A linear regression that models the response variable y using a set of d features,
8 $\mathbf{x}_i = [1, x_{i1}, \dots, x_{id}]^T$, for i th case can be expressed as:

$$9 \quad y_i = \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_i + \varepsilon_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (3-1)$$

10 where $\boldsymbol{\beta} = [\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_d]^T$ is a vector, each of its components represents a coefficient
11 of the linear model, and ε_i is the residual term for the i th case representing remaining
12 unexplained variance. For a set of N cases, the model can be rewritten in the form of
13 the following matrix:

$$14 \quad \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} \quad (3-2)$$

15 where $\mathbf{y} = [y_1, \dots, y_N]^T$, and $\mathbf{X}$ is an $N \times d$ matrix with features in columns, as
16 follows:

$$17 \quad \mathbf{X} = \begin{bmatrix} x_{11} & \dots & x_{1d} \\ x_{21} & \dots & x_{2d} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ x_{N1} & \dots & x_{Nd} \end{bmatrix} \quad (3-3)$$

18 where entry x_{ij} is the j th feature for the i th case.

19 Ordinary least squares (OLS) is often used to generate linear model coefficients $\boldsymbol{\beta}$
20 as:

$$21 \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \underset{\boldsymbol{\beta}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2^2 \quad (3-4)$$

22 With multiple potential predictors, a smaller, more parsimonious subset of “features” is

sought which exhibits the strongest effects. Toward this end, OLS estimates are suboptimal to regularization approaches which impose “penalties” on certain coefficients to avoid model overfitting. As mentioned above, LASSO regression shrinks some coefficients and sets others to 0 – obtaining the optimal solution of the following equation via a penalty term:

$$\begin{cases} \hat{\beta} = \underset{\beta}{\operatorname{argmin}} ||\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\beta||_2^2 + \lambda ||\beta||_1 \\ \text{s.t. } \sum_j |\beta_j| \leq \lambda \end{cases} \quad (3-5)$$

where $||\beta||_1 = \sum_{j=1}^d |\beta_j|$, the first part represents the goodness of the model fitting, and the second part represents the parameter penalty. Here, $\lambda \geq 0$ is a complexity parameter that controls the amount of shrinkage as coefficients are reduced or set to zero: the larger the value of λ , the greater the amount of shrinkage. The smaller the regularization parameter λ , the less punitive the model and the more features it retains. Conversely, increases in λ results in reduced numbers of features.

Additionally, Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA were adopted to explore the differences of each emotional cluster (i.e., positive, negative; stress relations, missing sb. relations, individual relations, social relations) among five regional prevalence levels of COVID-19 infective (1 = lowest, 5 = highest). Post hoc comparisons were also conducted.

A critical p value of $< .05$ was set for all inferential tests, and analyses were conducted using Python (<https://www.python.org/>) and R software platforms (<https://www.python.org/>).

Results

Sample characteristics

Nineteen (19) of 1,681 the questionnaires were excluded due to incomplete responses or participants not living in China – yielding a final, analyzable sample of 1,662. The “typical” respondent was female (60.5%, $n = 1,006$) and 30.7 years of age ($SD = 10.3$).

1 Married (49.0%, n = 815) and single (49.2%, n = 817) respondents, respectively, each
2 accounted for virtually one-half of the sample. Most respondents (63.2%) had
3 bachelor's degrees or above, and the prevalence rate of COVID-19 infection across
4 the five regions ranged from ~13.4 to 28.0%. Sample demographics are summarized
5 in Table 1 – along with reported emotional reactions and influential factors (e.g.,
6 situational stressors, protective/adverse internal factors). Descriptive statistics of the
7 latter are presented below.

8 **Emotional Clusters**

9 Seventeen (17) emotional responses to COVID-19 were divided into two categories
10 reflecting positive and negative emotions and, subsequently, four nested
11 subclassifications: For negative emotions, the emotion “missing someone who is close
12 to you” was distanced from those related to *stress* (e.g., sadness, fear/fright, anger
13 toward oneself or others, worry, annoyance and distracted thinking due to anger).
14 Positive emotions, in contrast, were classified as individual- (e.g., happiness,
15 relaxation, comfort, safety and accomplishment) or social-relations (e.g., emotionally
16 inspired, empathy, moved by sb. or sth.). The associated correlation matrix and cluster
17 dendrogram are shown below in Figures 1A and 1B, respectively.

18

19 **LASSO Feature Selection: Emotions**

20 LASSO regression was adopted to select predictors for emotional clusters. Based on
21 performance parameters, the models of feature selection were acceptable for
22 emotions classified as negative ($\lambda_0 = 0.0228$, $r^2 = 0.5524$, MSE (Mean Squared Error)
23 = 0.1910, numbers of predictors = 34) and positive ($\lambda_0 = 0.0173$, $r^2 = 0.1712$, MSE
24 = 0.2841, numbers of predictors = 32).

25 A cross-validation process intended to find the optimal λ value (λ_0) - designating the
26 most parsimonious model with a minimum average MSE (see Figure 2A). As λ

1 increases, more coefficients are set to zero - leading to a sparser model (see Figure
2 2B).

3 Corresponding coefficients for the emotional models with all relevant predictors are
4 reported in Figure 3. Results showed that the predictors of negative emotions included
5 a tendency to suppress emotions, emotional instability, self-denial, vulnerability to
6 impact, economic problems, fatigue/sleepiness, work-related problems, unequal
7 treatment, feeling limited/constrained, lacking confidence etc. In contrast, positive
8 emotions were driven by creativity, sympathy, social responsibility, high education etc.,
9 while factors, such as tendency to suppress emotions, age, intimate partner
10 relationship, social isolation and facing death from COVID-19, had the opposite effect.

11 **Emotional Response by Regional Level of Infection**

12 Significant differences in emotional clusters among residents from regions with varying
13 levels of COVID-19 infective prevalence were found (see Table 2), with pairwise, post
14 hoc comparisons (see Table 3) showing positive emotions in the highest prevalence
15 region were lower than the medium or lowest prevalence regions. Significant
16 differences in negative emotions were found among all pairs of regions except higher
17 vs. medium. For nested subclassifications, individual relations of positive emotions
18 tended to be lowest among respondents located in the highest prevalence region.
19 Social relations found to be lowest in the higher prevalence region, in where were
20 significantly lower than medium and lowest regions. Regarding negative emotions,
21 stress relations varied significantly among respondents from the various regions – with
22 the exception of lower vs. higher and higher vs. medium. Lastly, those from lower
23 prevalence regions reported significantly lower emotional responses related to missing
24 sb. relations.

25 **Discussion**

26 Our study investigated public emotions and related influence factors associated with

1 the COVID-19 pandemic in China. Negative emotions were consistently confirmed
2 during this time (see also (Du et al., 2018), with previous studies revealing variation in
3 emotional strength and category across phases of the pandemic (CITE). For instance,
4 an analysis of Twitter posts during a recent Ebola outbreak found different basic
5 emotional responses prior to and after key incidents (Ofoghi et al., 2016). A recent
6 study also showed that Chinese residents' emotional expression via Weibo (a Chinese
7 version of Twitter) was strongest before the actual peak of COVID-19 outbreak and
8 declined thereafter (Y. Li et al., 2020). Additionally, our study revealed strength of
9 negative emotional response was sensitive to gradient regional prevalence levels by
10 investigated data. Consistently, significant correlations were found between regional
11 cumulative COVID-19 cases and Web searches by Italian netizens including the
12 generic terms "fear" and "anxiety" (Rovetta & Castaldo, 2020). However, missing sb.
13 relations didn't have such sensitivity, showing significantly lower intensity in lower
14 prevalence regions than other prevalence regions. Additionally, lowest social relations
15 showed in the higher prevalence region (areas surrounding Wuhan and coastal areas),
16 which may be due to the typhoon eye' effect. In line with recent works, working adults'
17 distance to the epicenter of Wuhan had an inverted U-shaped relationship with their
18 burnout (Zhang, Huang, & Wei, 2020).

19 The differences of situational stressors and self-perception associated with emotional
20 reactions were further analyzed. Specifically, negative emotions were triggered largely
21 by the economic and work-related problems and negative self-images, while positive
22 emotions connected with relationship- and epidemic-related stressors, personal
23 characteristics and demographic variables). Indeed, besides the prevalence of viral
24 infection, COVID-19 exacted a global economic toll and social problems of
25 unprecedented scope, magnitude, and duration (Nicola et al., 2020; Ramos Perkis et
26 al., 2020). Strict control measures have been instituted and changed public normal
27 routines with shutting down of businesses, industries, and schools. Uncertainty about

1 opportunities of employment and academic has been increased worldwide, even
2 though pandemic has been controlled in China (Wilson et al., 2020). Thus, public
3 emotions fluctuated largely as a consequence of unfulfilled needs of survival- and self-
4 development, when facing dilemma of income decline, unemployment and business
5 closes.

6 Self-perception played a key role for emotions revealed in our study. The frequent
7 tendency to suppress certain affective responses all emotions, which showed the more
8 emotions are suppressed, the easier it is to cause negative emotions and harder to
9 form positive emotions in our study. Literatures illustrated emotional expression
10 potentially impacted mental well-being, psychophysiological responses and interaction
11 behaviors (Nagulendran, Norton, & Jobson, 2020; Waters, Karnilowicz, West, &
12 Mendes, 2020). A recent study showed that critical work, health and family
13 engagement was worse with increased suppression of fear and apprehension about
14 COVID-19 infection (Trogakos, Chawla, & McCarthy, 2020). Additionally, self-
15 perception, as a core process of coping with stress, had a practical utility in explaining
16 the public's emotion and behavior (J. B. Li et al., 2020). For instance, negative self-
17 images (e.g., self-denial, emotionally unstable, lacking confidence) frequently
18 manifested by mood disorders, hindering the function of emotional regulation, resulted
19 in and deepen the degree of negative emotions (Kawashima et al., 2016; Laghi,
20 Bianchi, Pompili, Lonigro, & Baiocco, 2018; Masuda et al., 2017). Such adverse
21 internal factors (i.e., easy to be affected, feeling constrained) as well as stressors
22 (media coverage and a long-time spent indoors) together contributed to negative
23 affection, which was consistently found in recent works (Basch et al., 2020).

24 The oldest conjectures was confirmed that happiness depends not just on absolute
25 things but inherently on comparisons with other people (Clark & Oswald, 2002).
26 Evidence of comparison effects was also revealed in our results, that was high intensity
27 of positive emotions related with experiencing fewer and not serious negative incidents,

1 such as intimate partner relationship, social isolation, and facing death from COVID-
2 19 infection. In line with previous studies, issues of health and interpersonal
3 relationships were especially concerned by residents, when encountering with disaster
4 situations (Pieh, T, Budimir, & Probst, 2020). For instance, a survey found survivors'
5 mental and physical health and neighborhood connectedness were significantly
6 correlated with happiness in the fifth years after the Tohoku Earthquake Tsunami in
7 Japan (Sun & Yan, 2019). Social isolation significantly predicted poor mental health
8 associated with COVID-19 policy, particularly for elders, or individuals in low-paid or
9 precarious employment (Kim & Jung, 2020; Williams et al., 2020).

10 Positive emotional state and self-perceptions played protective roles for residents in
11 encounter of difficulties. As previous studies confirmed, positive emotions serving as
12 the ultimate target or a moderator, helped people to cope with negative events (Waugh,
13 2020). Similarity, positive self-perceptions associated with high self-esteem could
14 minimize influence of negative information (Showers, 1992). It was worth to notice that
15 creativity made a great contribution to positive emotional response to the COVID-19.
16 To tackle the unanticipated difficulties and intricate problems during pandemic,
17 interaction between creativity and positive feelings may play an important role to
18 promote task completion (Bang & Reio, 2017), as well as to change attitudes and
19 expected directions (Walsh, Chen, Hacker, & Broschard, 2008). Additionally, protective
20 factors also highlighted some self-assessed characteristics which were related with
21 social members (e.g., sympathy and socially responsible). Consistently,
22 conscientiousness and openness were found as a protective factor for sadness,
23 depression, stress and tension caused by stress (Schlee et al., 2020). Higher
24 sympathy associated with higher prosocial behavior, which was also found to be the
25 positive link between sadness regulation and prosocial behavior and to mediate by
26 higher sympathy and trust (Song, Colasante, & Malti, 2018). Lastly, high education,
27 young age and male contributed to positive emotional state, which was proved to

1 potentially mitigate and regulate the psycho-emotional toll (Banati, Jones, & Youssef,
2 2020; Greiner, Muller, Norris, Ng, & Sangha, 2019).

3 The limitation of the study is that most responders in our sample haven't experience
4 traumatic events, such as confirmed COVID-19 infection. Thus, they reported lots of
5 maladjustment for changes of routine life. Those who and whose family members have
6 fallen illness due to virus infections, may show more intensity of negative emotions and
7 different stressors and influence factors. In addition, we did not ask participants to
8 report their quality of life, thus the potential influence of emotion on subjective well-
9 being has not been fully understood.

10 **Conclusion**

11 Negative emotional response was sensitive to regional prevalence levels of COVID-
12 19. Economic and work-related problems largely contributed to negative emotions and
13 relationship- and epidemic-related stressors largely affected positive emotions.
14 Negative self-images (i.e., emotional expression, self-denial, emotionally unstable,
15 lacking confidence) were adverse factors for emotions. Protective factors for emotions
16 included creativity, social-orient traits, as well as high education, young age and male.
17 Future study should investigate emotional supports/measures based on interactions
18 among particular stressors and cognitive burden, as well as protective factors.

19 **Funding**

20 This study was funded by the Chinese Medical Scientific Development Foundation of
21 Beijing City (JJ2018-101) and Project of Institute of Basic Research in Clinical
22 Medicine, China Academy of Chinese Medical Sciences (Z0652).

1 **Authors' contribution**

2 RX, TS, and YJ designed the study. RX, TS, SY and YJ wrote the study protocol. QL,
3 YW, RJ, XG, XH, TX, JY, and KS collected the data. XZ, DL and RX carried out the
4 analysis with support from SY, TS, VK and YJ. RX and TS wrote the draft of the
5 manuscript. TS, DL, SY, XZ, RG, VK and YJ revised the draft. All authors contributed
6 to the final version of the manuscript.

7 **Acknowledgements**

8 Not applicable

9

10 **Reference**

- 11 Ahmed, W., Bath, P. A., Sbaffi, L., & Demartini, G. (2019). Novel insights into views towards H1N1
12 during the 2009 Pandemic: a thematic analysis of Twitter data. *Health Info Libr J*, 36(1),
13 60-72. doi:10.1111/hir.12247
- 14 Alfawaz, H. A., Wani, K., Aljumah, A. A., Aldisi, D., Ansari, M. G. A., Yakout, S. M., . . . Al-Daghri, N.
15 M. (2021). Psychological well-being during COVID-19 lockdown: Insights from a Saudi
16 State University's Academic Community. *J King Saud Univ Sci*, 33(1), 101262. doi:
17 10.1016/j.jksus.2020.101262
- 18 Banati, P., Jones, N., & Youssef, S. (2020). Intersecting Vulnerabilities: The Impacts of COVID-19
19 on the Psycho-emotional Lives of Young People in Low- and Middle-Income Countries.
20 *Eur J Dev Res*, 1-26. doi:10.1057/s41287-020-00325-5
- 21 Bang, H., & Reio, T. G., Jr. (2017). Personal Accomplishment, Mentoring, and Creative Self-
22 Efficacy as Predictors of Creative Work Involvement: The Moderating Role of Positive
23 and Negative Affect. *J Psychol*, 151(2), 148-170. doi:10.1080/00223980.2016.1248808

- 1 Barzilay, R., Moore, T. M., Greenberg, D. M., DiDomenico, G. E., Brown, L. A., White, L. K., . . . Gur,
2 R. E. (2020). Resilience, COVID-19-related stress, anxiety and depression during the
3 pandemic in a large population enriched for healthcare providers. *Transl Psychiatry*,
4 *10*(1), 291. doi:10.1038/s41398-020-00982-4
- 5 Basch, C. H., Hillyer, G. C., Erwin, Z. M., Mohlman, J., Cosgrove, A., & Quinones, N. (2020). News
6 coverage of the COVID-19 pandemic: Missed opportunities to promote health
7 sustaining behaviors. *Infect Dis Health*, *25*(3), 205-209. doi:10.1016/j.idh.2020.05.001
- 8 Casella, G., & Berger, R. L. (2001). Statistical Inference. *Duxbury Press*, 169-172.
- 9 Ceschi, G., Billieux, J., Hearn, M., Furst, G., & Van der Linden, M. (2014). Trauma exposure
10 interacts with impulsivity in predicting emotion regulation and depressive mood. *Eur J*
11 *Psychotraumatol*, *5*. doi:10.3402/ejpt.v5.24104
- 12 Clark, A. E., & Oswald, A. J. (2002). A simple statistical method for measuring how life events
13 affect happiness. *Int J Epidemiol*, *31*(6), 1139-1144; discussion 1144-1146.
14 doi:10.1093/ije/31.6.1139
- 15 Dictionary Editing Room, Institute of Linguistics, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. (2011).
16 Xinhua dictionary (11th edition). Beijing: Commercial Press, 532.
- 17 Dogas, Z., Lusic Kalcina, L., Pavlinac Dodig, I., Demirovic, S., Madirazza, K., Valic, M., & Pecotic, R.
18 (2020). The effect of COVID-19 lockdown on lifestyle and mood in Croatian general
19 population: a cross-sectional study. *Croat Med J*, *61*(4), 309-318.
- 20 Du, J., Tang, L., Xiang, Y., Zhi, D., Xu, J., Song, H. Y., & Tao, C. (2018). Public Perception Analysis
21 of Tweets During the 2015 Measles Outbreak: Comparative Study Using Convolutional
22 Neural Network Models. *J Med Internet Res*, *20*(7), e236. doi:10.2196/jmir.9413

1 Du, W. (2000). [The essence and clinical implication of "thinking"]. *Journal of Nanjing University of*
2 *TCM (social sciences)*, 1(2), 100-102.

3 Ebohon, O., Obienue, A. C., Irabor, F., Amadin, F. I., & Omoregie, E. S. (2021). Evaluating the impact
4 of COVID-19 pandemic lockdown on education in Nigeria: Insights from teachers and
5 students on virtual/online learning. *Bull Natl Res Cent*, 45(1), 76. doi: 10.1186/s42269-
6 021-00538-6

7 Gaballa, S., AlJaf, A., Patel, K., Lindsay, J., & Hlaing, K. M. (2020). COVID-19 Fears May Be Worse
8 Than the Virus: A Case of Cardiogenic Shock Secondary to Post-Myocardial Infarction
9 Ventricular Septum Rupture. *Cureus*, 12(6), e8809. doi:10.7759/cureus.8809

10 Ghosh, K. (2018). Violence against doctors: A pandemic in the making. *Eur J Intern Med*, 50, e9-
11 e10. doi:10.1016/j.ejim.2017.08.017

12 Greiner, E. M., Muller, I., Norris, M. R., Ng, K. H., & Sangha, S. (2019). Sex differences in fear
13 regulation and reward-seeking behaviors in a fear-safety-reward discrimination task.
14 *Behav Brain Res*, 368, 111903. doi:10.1016/j.bbr.2019.111903

15 Gupta, P., & Sengupta, A. (2020). A qualitative analysis of social scientists' opinions on
16 socioeconomic and demographic implications of the lockdown during COVID-19 in India.
17 *J Public Aff*, e2531. doi: 10.1002/pa.2531

18 Huang, C., Wang, Y., Li, X., Ren, L., Zhao, J., Hu, Y., . . . Cao, B. (2020). Clinical features of patients
19 infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet*, 395(10223), 497-506.
20 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30183-5

21 James, G., & Tibshirani, R. (2013). *An Introduction to Statistical Learning with Applications in R*.
22 *Springer*, 393,399.

- 1 Jin, Z., Zhao, K. B., Xia, Y. Y., Chen, R. J., Yu, H., Tamunang Tamutana, T., . . . Park, G. Y. (2020).
2 Relationship Between Psychological Responses and the Appraisal of Risk
3 Communication During the Early Phase of the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Two-Wave Study
4 of Community Residents in China. *Front Public Health*, 8, 550220.
5 doi:10.3389/fpubh.2020.550220
- 6 Kawashima, C., Tanaka, Y., Inoue, A., Nakanishi, M., Okamoto, K., Maruyama, Y., . . . Akiyoshi, J.
7 (2016). Hyperfunction of left lateral prefrontal cortex and automatic thoughts in social
8 anxiety disorder: A near-infrared spectroscopy study. *J Affect Disord*, 206, 256-260.
9 doi:10.1016/j.jad.2016.07.028
- 10 Keltner, D., Sauter, D., Tracy, J., & Cowen, A. (2019). Emotional Expression: Advances in Basic
11 Emotion Theory. *J Nonverbal Behav*, 43(2), 133-160. doi:10.1007/s10919-019-00293-3
- 12 Kim, H. H., & Jung, J. H. (2020). Social Isolation and Psychological Distress During the COVID-19
13 Pandemic: A Cross-National Analysis. *Gerontologist*. doi:10.1093/geront/gnaa168
- 14 Laghi, F., Bianchi, D., Pompili, S., Lonigro, A., & Baiocco, R. (2018). Metacognition, emotional
15 functioning and binge eating in adolescence: the moderation role of need to control
16 thoughts. *Eat Weight Disord*, 23(6), 861-869. doi:10.1007/s40519-018-0603-1
- 17 Li, J. B., Yang, A., Dou, K., Wang, L. X., Zhang, M. C., & Lin, X. Q. (2020). Chinese public's
18 knowledge, perceived severity, and perceived controllability of COVID-19 and their
19 associations with emotional and behavioural reactions, social participation, and
20 precautionary behaviour: a national survey. *BMC Public Health*, 20(1), 1589.
21 doi:10.1186/s12889-020-09695-1
- 22 Li, Y., Zeng, Y., Liu, G., Lu, D., Yang, H., Ying, Z., . . . Song, H. (2020). Public awareness, emotional

1 reactions and human mobility in response to the COVID-19 outbreak in China - a
2 population-based ecological study. *Psychol Med*, 1-8. doi:10.1017/S003329172000375X

3 Mahase, E. (2020). Covid-19: hoarding and misuse of protective gear is jeopardising the
4 response, WHO warns. *BMJ*, 368, m869. doi:10.1136/bmj.m869

5 Masuda, K., Nakanishi, M., Okamoto, K., Kawashima, C., Oshita, H., Inoue, A., . . . Akiyoshi, J.
6 (2017). Different functioning of prefrontal cortex predicts treatment response after a
7 selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor treatment in patients with major depression. *J*
8 *Affect Disord*, 214, 44-52. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2017.02.034

9 Ma, X. (2020). Guidelines to Public Psychological Self-help and Counselling for COVID-19. Beijing,
10 CHN: People's Medical Publishing House.

11 Nagulendran, A., Norton, P. J., & Jobson, L. (2020). Investigating cultural differences in the effects
12 of expressive suppression when processing traumatic distressing material. *Behav Cogn*
13 *Psychother*, 48(6), 658-671. doi:10.1017/S1352465820000508

14 Nicola, M., Alsafi, Z., Sohrabi, C., Kerwan, A., Al-Jabir, A., Iosifidis, C., . . . Agha, R. (2020). The
15 socio-economic implications of the coronavirus pandemic (COVID-19): A review. *Int J*
16 *Surg*, 78, 185-193. doi:10.1016/j.ijsu.2020.04.018

17 Ofoghi, B., Mann, M., & Verspoor, K. (2016). Towards Early Discovery of Salient Health Threats: A
18 Social Media Emotion Classification Technique. *Pac Symp Biocomput*, 21, 504-515.

19 Oosterhoff, B., & Palmer, C. A. (2020). Attitudes and Psychological Factors Associated With News
20 Monitoring, Social Distancing, Disinfecting, and Hoarding Behaviors Among US
21 Adolescents During the Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pandemic. *JAMA Pediatr*.
22 doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.1876

- 1 Pieh, C., T. O. R., Budimir, S., & Probst, T. (2020). Relationship quality and mental health during
2 COVID-19 lockdown. *PLoS One*, *15*(9), e0238906. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0238906
- 3 Praill, N., Gonzalez-Prendes, A. A., & Kernsmith, P. (2015). An Exploration of the Relationships
4 between Attitudes Towards Anger Expression and Personal Style of Anger Expression in
5 Women in the USA and Canada. *Issues Ment Health Nurs*, *36*(6), 397-406.
6 doi:10.3109/01612840.2014.992082
- 7 Ramos Perkis, J. P., Achurra Tirado, P., Raykar, N., Zinco Acosta, A., Munoz Alarcon, C., Puyana, J.
8 C., & Ottolino Lavarte, P. (2020). Different Crises, Different Patterns of Trauma. The
9 Impact of a Social Crisis and the COVID-19 Health Pandemic on a High Violence Area.
10 *World J Surg*. doi:10.1007/s00268-020-05860-0
- 11 Rovetta, A., & Castaldo, L. (2020). The Impact of COVID-19 on Italian Web Users: A Quantitative
12 Analysis of Regional Hygiene Interest and Emotional Response. *Cureus*, *12*(9), e10719.
13 doi:10.7759/cureus.10719
- 14 Schlee, W., Holleland, S., Bulla, J., Simoes, J., Neff, P., Schoisswohl, S., . . . Langguth, B. (2020). The
15 Effect of Environmental Stressors on Tinnitus: A Prospective Longitudinal Study on the
16 Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *J Clin Med*, *9*(9). doi:10.3390/jcm9092756
- 17 Scott, V. L., & Montgomery, P. H. (1984). Urban violence: pandemic of trauma. *Emerg Med Serv*,
18 *13*(5), 18, 20-11.
- 19 Shah, S. A., Quint, J. K., Nwaru, B. I., & Sheikh, A. (2021). Impact of COVID-19 national lockdown
20 on asthma exacerbations: interrupted time-series analysis of English primary care data.
21 *Thorax*. doi: 10.1136/thoraxjnl-2020-216512
- 22 Shanahan, L., Steinhoff, A., Bechtiger, L., Murray, A. L., Nivette, A., Hepp, U., . . . Eisner, M. (2020).

1 Emotional distress in young adults during the COVID-19 pandemic: evidence of risk and
2 resilience from a longitudinal cohort study. *Psychol Med*, 1-10. doi:
3 10.1017/S003329172000241X

4 Shen, Z. F., & Wang, H. M. (2020). *Psychological Protection Handbook for Primary and*
5 *Secondary School Students and Parents During the Anti-epidemic Period*. Shanghai,
6 CHN: East China Normal University Press.

7 Showers, C. (1992). Compartmentalization of positive and negative self-knowledge: keeping bad
8 apples out of the bunch. *J Pers Soc Psychol*, 62(6), 1036-1049. doi:10.1037//0022-
9 3514.62.6.1036

10 Singh, R., & Subedi, M. (2020). COVID-19 and stigma: Social discrimination towards frontline
11 healthcare providers and COVID-19 recovered patients in Nepal. *Asian J Psychiatr*, 53,
12 102222. doi:10.1016/j.ajp.2020.102222

13 Song, J. H., Colasante, T., & Malti, T. (2018). Helping yourself helps others: Linking children's
14 emotion regulation to prosocial behavior through sympathy and trust. *Emotion*, 18(4),
15 518-527. doi:10.1037/emo0000332

16 Sun, Y., & Yan, T. (2019). The Use of Public Health Indicators to Assess Individual Happiness in
17 Post-Disaster Recovery. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, 16(21).
18 doi:10.3390/ijerph16214101

19 The World Bank (2021). *Global Economic Prospects*. [https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/
20 global-economic-prospects/9781464816123.pdf](https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/global-economic-prospects/9781464816123.pdf), Accessed January.

21 Tibshirani, R. (2011). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso: a retrospective. *Journal of
22 the Royal Statistical Society Series B-Statistical Methodology*, 73, 273-282. doi:DOI

1 10.1111/j.1467-9868.2011.00771.x

2 Trougakos, J. P., Chawla, N., & McCarthy, J. M. (2020). Working in a pandemic: Exploring the

3 impact of COVID-19 health anxiety on work, family, and health outcomes. *J Appl*

4 *Psychol*, 105(11), 1234-1245. doi:10.1037/apl0000739

5 Venkatesh, V. (2020). Impacts of COVID-19: A research agenda to support people in their fight.

6 *Int J Inf Manage*, 55, 102197. doi:10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.102197

7 Walsh, S. M., Chen, S., Hacker, M., & Broschard, D. (2008). A creative-bonding intervention and a

8 friendly visit approach to promote nursing students' self-transcendence and positive

9 attitudes toward elders: a pilot study. *Nurse Educ Today*, 28(3), 363-370.

10 doi:10.1016/j.nedt.2007.06.011

11 Waters, S. F., Karnilowicz, H. R., West, T. V., & Mendes, W. B. (2020). Keep it to yourself? Parent

12 emotion suppression influences physiological linkage and interaction behavior. *J Fam*

13 *Psychol*, 34(7), 784-793. doi:10.1037/fam0000664

14 Waugh, C. E. (2020). The roles of positive emotion in the regulation of emotional responses to

15 negative events. *Emotion*, 20(1), 54-58. doi:10.1037/emo0000625

16 WHO. (2021). Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard. <https://covid19.who.int>, Accessed 2 June.

17 Williams, S. N., Armitage, C. J., Tampe, T., & Dienes, K. (2020). Public perceptions and experiences

18 of social distancing and social isolation during the COVID-19 pandemic: a UK-based

19 focus group study. *BMJ Open*, 10(7), e039334. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-039334

20 Wilson, J. M., Lee, J., Fitzgerald, H. N., Oosterhoff, B., Sevi, B., & Shook, N. J. (2020). Job Insecurity

21 and Financial Concern During the COVID-19 Pandemic Are Associated With Worse

22 Mental Health. *J Occup Environ Med*, 62(9), 686-691.

doi:10.1097/JOM.0000000000001962

Wu, W. L., & Zhang, J. . (2020). Handbook of Public Psychological Protection for COVID-19. Sichuan: Sichuan Science and Technology Press.

Ye, J., Cai, S., Cheung, W. M., & Tsang, H. W. H. (2019). An East Meets West Approach to the Understanding of Emotion Dysregulation in Depression: From Perspective to Scientific Evidence. *Front Psychol*, 10, 574. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00574

Zhan, J., Ren, J., Sun, P., Fan, J., Liu, C., & Luo, J. (2018). The Neural Basis of Fear Promotes Anger and Sadness Counteracts Anger. *Neural Plast*, 2018, 3479059. doi:10.1155/2018/3479059

Zhang, S. X., Huang, H., & Wei, F. (2020). Geographical distance to the epicenter of Covid-19 predicts the burnout of the working population: Ripple effect or typhoon eye effect? *Psychiatry Res*, 288, 112998. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2020.112998

Zhan, J., Ren, J., Sun, P., Fan, J., Liu, C., & Luo, J. (2018). The Neural Basis of Fear Promotes Anger and Sadness Counteracts Anger. *Neural Plast*, 2018, 3479059. doi: 10.1155/2018/3479059

Zhao, X. D., & Liu, Z. M. (2020). Anti-epidemic and Peace of Mind--A Comprehensive Reader for Psychological Self-help Rescue of the Epidemic. Shanghai, CHN: Shanghai Science and Technology Press.

Figure illustration

Figure 1 The Emotional Correlation Matrix and Cluster Dendrogram. A) Emotional correlation matrix was calculated by Pearson correlation coefficients among the seventeen emotions. B) Agglomerative hierarchical clustering was adopted the

1 maximum coefficient method.

2

3 **Figure 2 The Performance Parameters of LASSO Feature Selection.** (A) Average

4 MSE of the LASSO models as a function of the regularization parameter λ . The optimal

5 penalty, determined by 3-fold cross-validation, is the value of λ that minimizes the MSE

6 (shown as a vertical dashed line). (B) Trace plot showing non-zero model coefficients as

7 a function of the regularization parameter λ . As λ increases to the left, coefficients are

8 set to zero and removed from the model.

9

10 **Figure 3 Beta coefficients for predictors of LASSO Feature Selection for Negative**

11 **and Positive Emotions.** X-axis exhibited the coefficients of LASSO regression. Y-axis

12 showed stressors whose coefficients weren't zero.

13

14

A)

B)

Cluster Dendrogram

Negative Emotions

Positive Emotions

(A)

(B)

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of study variables (n=1,662)

Variables	Frequency (%)	Mean (SD)
Demographic information		
Age (years)		30.66 (10.3)
Sex		
Male	656 (39.5%)	
Female	1006 (60.5%)	
Marital status		
Single	817 (49.2%)	
Married	815 (49.0%)	
Divorced	25 (1.6%)	
Widowed	5 (0.3%)	
Education		
Senior high school/technical secondary school and below	171 (10.3%)	
Associate degree in college	440 (26.5%)	
Bachelor's degree	835 (50.2%)	
Master's degree or greater	216 (13.0%)	
Respondents by Region		
5 (Highest Prevalence) (1 province)		291(17.5)
4 (5 provinces)		223(13.4)
3 (9 provinces)		465 (28.0)
2 (10 provinces)		344(20.7)
1 (Lowest Prevalence)) (7 provinces)		339 (20.4)
Emotions		
For two classification		
Negative emotions (V1 ~ V9)		1.91 (0.6)
Positive emotions (V10 ~ V17)		2.33 (0.6)
For four classification		
Stress-related NE (V1 ~ V8)		1.87 (0.7)
Missing (V9)		2.18 (0.7)
Individual-related PE (V10 ~ V14)		2.57 (0.8)
Social-related PE (V15 ~ V17)		2.20 (1.0)
Influence factors		
Situational stressors		5.20 (4.0)
Protective internal factors		5.27 (3.3)
Adverse internal factors		3.54 (3.5)

Note: SD, Standard Deviation.

Table 2. Emotional Differences Among Regions with Levels of COVID-19 Infective Prevalence (Mean $\pm$ SE, $\bar{R}$)

Risk Regions	For two classification		For four classification			
	Negative Emotions	Positive Emotions	Stress Relations	Missing sb. Relations	Individual Relations	Social Relations
5 (Highest)	2.26 $\pm$ 0.03 (1108.50)	2.22 $\pm$ 0.03 (744.37)	2.24 $\pm$ 0.03 (1190.46)	2.47 $\pm$ 0.06 (955.57)	2.01 $\pm$ 0.03 (710.22)	2.56 $\pm$ 0.04 (819.86)
4	1.94 $\pm$ 0.04 (865.69)	2.29 $\pm$ 0.04 (805.33)	1.89 $\pm$ 0.04 (853.30)	2.37 $\pm$ 0.07 (909.15)	2.22 $\pm$ 0.04 (868.00)	2.40 $\pm$ 0.05 (731.33)
3	1.97 $\pm$ 0.03 (869.16)	2.34 $\pm$ 0.03 (855.96)	1.93 $\pm$ 0.03 (867.25)	2.26 $\pm$ 0.04 (859.82)	2.20 $\pm$ 0.03 (843.69)	2.58 $\pm$ 0.04 (840.33)
2	1.78 $\pm$ 0.03 (730.64)	2.32 $\pm$ 0.03 (816.75)	1.75 $\pm$ 0.03 (739.09)	2.03 $\pm$ 0.05 (745.23)	2.19 $\pm$ 0.04 (839.93)	2.54 $\pm$ 0.05 (820.80)
1 (Lowest)	1.65 $\pm$ 0.03 (621.91)	2.43 $\pm$ 0.03 (904.92)	1.61 $\pm$ 0.03 (623.29)	1.96 $\pm$ 0.05 (722.62)	2.26 $\pm$ 0.04 (886.32)	2.71 $\pm$ 0.04 (906.13)
Kruskal-Wallis H	181.35	19.83	178.00	60.44	25.06	18.76
<i>Adj. Sig.</i>	< 0.001	0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.001

Note: SD, Standard Error; $\bar{R}$, Average Rank.

Table 3. Post Hoc for Emotional Differences Among Regions with Infective Prevalence Levels

	Negative Emotions	Positive Emotions	Stress Relations	Missing sb. Relations	Individual Relations	Social Relations
Sample1-Sample2	<i>Adj_p</i>	<i>Adj_p</i>	<i>Adj_p</i>	<i>Adj_p</i>	<i>Adj_p</i>	<i>Adj_p</i>
1-2	0.030	0.161	0.016	1.000	1.000	0.190
1-3	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.527
1-4	0.000	0.158	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.000
1-5	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.232
2-3	0.000	1.000	0.002	0.005	1.000	1.000
2-4	0.000	1.000	0.055	0.000	1.000	0.286
2-5	0.000	0.576	0.000	0.000	0.006	1.000
3-4	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.049
3-5	0.000	0.018	0.000	0.053	0.002	1.000
4-5	0.000	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.002	0.364

Note: Prevalence level according to numbers of COVID-19 infections (1 = lowest, 5 = highest)

Figure 1 The Emotional Correlation Matrix and Cluster Dendrogram. A) Emotional correlation matrix was calculated by Pearson correlation coefficients among the seventeen emotions. B) Agglomerative hierarchical clustering was adopted the maximum coefficient method.

Figure 2 The Performance Parameters of LASSO Feature Selection. (A) Average MSE of the LASSO models as a function of the regularization parameter λ . The optimal penalty, determined by 3-fold cross-validation, is the value of λ that minimizes the MSE (shown as a vertical dashed line). (B) Trace plot showing non-zero model coefficients as a function of the regularization parameter λ . As λ increases to the left, coefficients are set to zero and removed from the model.

Figure 3 Beta coefficients for predictors of LASSO Feature Selection for Negative and Positive Emotions.