

1 **Full title: The experience of distress during the COVID-19 outbreak: a cross-**
2 **country examination on the fear of COVID-19 and the sense of loneliness**

3
4 **Short title: Fear of COVID-19 and loneliness**

5
6 Gianluca Lo Coco^{1*}, Ambra Gentile¹, Ksenija Bosnar², Ivana Milovanovic³, Antonino Bianco¹,
7 Patrik Drid³, Saša Pišot⁴

8
9 ¹ Department of Psychology, Educational Science, and Human Movement, University of Palermo,
10 Palermo, Italy

11 ² Faculty of Kinesiology, University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia

12 ³ Faculty of Sport and Physical Education, University of Novi Sad, Novi Sad, Serbia

13 ⁴ Institute for Kinesiology Research Scientific Research Center Koper, Koper, Slovenia

14

15

16

17

18 **Corresponding Author:* Gianluca Lo Coco, Ph.D, University of Palermo, Department of Psychology,
19 Educational Science and Human Movement, Viale delle Scienze, Edificio 15, 90128, Palermo (Italy). Phone:
20 +39 09123897725. Email: gianluca.lococo@unipa.it

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

Abstract

Objectives To examine gender, age and cross-country differences in fear of COVID-19 and sense of loneliness during the lockdown, by comparing people from countries with a high rate of infections and deaths (i.e. Spain and Italy) and from countries with a mild spread of infection (i.e. Croatia, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina).

Methods A total of 3876 participants (63% female) completed an online survey on “Everyday life practices in COVID-19 time” in April 2020, including measures of fear of COVID-19 and loneliness.

Results Males and females of all age groups in countries suffering from a strong impact of the COVID-19 pandemic reported higher fear of COVID-19 and sense of loneliness. In less endangered countries females and elder stated more symptoms than males and younger; in Spanish and Italian sample the pattern of differences is considerably more complex.

Conclusion Future research should thoroughly examine different age and gender groups. The analysis of emotional well-being in groups at risk of mental health issues can help to lessen the long term social and economic costs due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

Keywords COVID-19, fear of COVID-19, loneliness, cross-country, psychosocial distress.

59 **Introduction**

60 By the mid of January, the Chinese government quarantined the city of Wuhan (11 million
61 inhabitants) and subsequently extended the measure to Hubei province (60 million inhabitants) to
62 contain the Coronavirus Infectious Disease 2019 (COVID-19) epidemic. Since that time, there has
63 been a progressive spread of the virus throughout the world, infecting millions of people and
64 causing hundreds of thousands of deaths. On March 11, 2020, the World Health Organization
65 (WHO) declared a state of pandemic. Quarantine (i.e. the segregation of one or more healthy people
66 inside their own homes, to prevent infection and the virus spreading) was considered one of the
67 most helpful measures in containing the infection. Most countries issued varying degrees of
68 “shelter-in-place” orders [1] and almost one-third of the global population faced some form of
69 quarantine due to the COVID-19 outbreak in the last few months. However, there is evidence that
70 facing a quarantine can have detrimental effects on people’s psychological health [2], with anxiety,
71 anger, insomnia, somatic symptoms, mainly due to the loss of freedom, the separation from loved
72 ones, uncertainty over the disease, shortage of living supplies.

73 To date, there is some initial evidence showing the negative impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on
74 psychological well-being [3-5]. One of the first surveys, which was conducted in China during the
75 lockdown showed that more than 50% of participants rated the psychological impact of COVID-19-
76 related restrictions as moderate or severe [6], with greater difficulties associated with the effects of
77 COVID-19 pandemic on daily life and social and work activities [7-9]. Of course, this negative
78 impact is even stronger for healthcare professionals facing this global crisis [10], with a
79 considerable proportion of workers reporting symptoms of depression, anxiety and stress [11]. The
80 negative psychological effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on the individual’s mental health states
81 were further confirmed in studies from several Western countries [12-14].

82 As COVID-19 continues to spread, so does the research on people’s experience of fear during the
83 pandemic. Fear of personal infection or infection of loved ones is common among people exposed
84 to any infectious disease outbreak [2, 9], and a specific examination of the characteristics of the fear

85 of COVID-19 is worthwhile. Globally, more than 26 million people contracted the virus infection,
86 and 870,000 have died. Thus, it is likely that the high mortality rates due to COVID-19 have
87 negatively impacted on the individual's feelings of fear of contagion and anxiety across countries
88 all over the world. In the current study, we will focus on a cross-country examination of the
89 COVID-19 outbreak on the fear of COVID-19, by differentiating European countries which
90 reported a severe impact of the infection (i.e. Italy and Spain) and those which showed a mild
91 impact of the infection among populations (i.e. Croatia, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Bosnia and
92 Herzegovina).

93 Although fear is an adaptive response in the presence of danger, it was suggested that the construct
94 of fear of COVID-19 should be examined within an integrated complex model [15]. For example,
95 fear of infection can trigger healthy behaviors or, on the contrary, foster health anxiety. Fear of
96 COVID-19 can improve safety behaviors towards the elderly, but can also result in inappropriate
97 worries about loved ones. Concerns and fears about one's own health and the well-being of one's
98 own beloved ones (particularly elderly or people suffering from any physical illness) can exacerbate
99 feelings of anxiety. If these concerns are prolonged in time, they may increase the risk of serious
100 mental health conditions, including anxiety disorders, stress and trauma-related disorders [16].

101 Moreover, feelings of uncertainty about the future and the lack of an effective vaccine may have led
102 people to heighten their fear of COVID-19 during the quarantine. To date, some new tools for the
103 assessment of the Fear of COVID-19 have been developed [17-19] to provide healthcare
104 professionals with a valid measure for monitoring fear and anxiety of individuals during the
105 COVID-19 crisis [17, 20]. Previous research showed a significant association between the fear of
106 COVID-19 and the most recommended strategies to control the spread of COVID-19, such as
107 spatial distancing and handwashing [21, 22]. People with an excessive fear of the infectious
108 outbreak are more likely to report greater psychosocial distress, whereas people showing under-
109 response beliefs and little anxiety are more likely to disregard the physical distancing [19]. There is

110 also evidence that intolerance of uncertainty, risk for loved ones, health anxiety was associated with
111 the fear of COVID-19 [23].

112 An important step towards understanding the critical characteristics of this construct is to examine
113 the cross-country similarities and differences in fear of COVID-19. Although there is some
114 evidence to suggest that fear of COVID-19 can be concentrated in regions with the highest reported
115 COVID-19 cases [24], limited research efforts examined whether fear may differ in European
116 populations facing a high or limited impact of the infection and severity of restriction policies.
117 Moreover, the association between fear of COVID-19 and social isolation during the lockdown
118 needs to be further investigated in cross-cultural research. To date, the link between people's
119 experience of fear of COVID-19 and feelings of loneliness received little research attention.

120 Although physical distancing measures have been critical to contain the rate of infection, there is
121 concern that limits on social activities and restrictions on in-person social contacts may increase
122 feelings of loneliness [25, 26]. Prior research on the experience of loneliness in response to the
123 social restrictions due to the COVID-19-related quarantine reported mixed findings. For example, it
124 was shown that being under a stay-at-home order was associated with greater loneliness and health
125 anxiety. However, the higher perceived impact of COVID-19 on participants' daily life was
126 significantly associated with higher perceived social support and lower loneliness [13]. Moreover, a
127 recent longitudinal study [26] showed no significant changes in loneliness across the three
128 assessment points, between February and the end of April, in USA. Interestingly, despite people
129 perceived an increased absence of social connections during the initial stage of the COVID-19
130 outbreak, they did not feel more isolated in response of the implementation of social distancing
131 measures. To our knowledge, no previous research examined the link between fear of COVID-19
132 and feelings of loneliness during the lockdown across countries. Although some studies showed that
133 individuals who felt lonely in the pandemic reported symptoms of anxiety and depression [12, 27],
134 and that greater emotion regulation difficulties and depression may be risk factors for loneliness
135 [28], the interplay between feelings of loneliness and fear of COVID-19 across countries facing

136 varying levels of the spread of infection as well as different home-confinement policies, remains
137 unknown.

138 The present study examines individual's experience of fear of COVID-19 and loneliness in
139 response to physical distancing and restriction measures undertaken to contain the outbreak of the
140 COVID-19 in different countries. More specifically, this study aims at examining potential cross-
141 country differences in measures of fear of COVID-19 and loneliness across two groups of European
142 countries with varying impact of the COVID-19 pandemic (e.g., with regards to the number of
143 deaths and measures of total lockdown). Specifically, we expect that countries reporting a high
144 death and infection rate would display a higher fear of COVID-19, with a decreasing feeling of
145 loneliness, compared to countries reporting a low infection and death rate in the midst of the
146 pandemic. We also aim at examining gender and age group differences across countries. We expect
147 gender differences in fear of COVID-19 and loneliness, and it was hypothesized that females would
148 report more fear of COVID-19 and would feel lonelier than males. Finally, we expect that older
149 adults would feel lonelier and would also display higher fear of COVID-19 compared to younger
150 people across countries.

151

152 **Materials and Methods**

153 *Participants and data collection*

154 The sample consisted of 3876 participants (1422 males, 2442 females) from 7 European countries
155 (Italy, Spain, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia), whose age was
156 comprised between 18 and 82 years ($M = 31.94$; $SD = 12.02$). The majority of participants described
157 themselves as female ($N = 2442$, $M_{\text{age}} = 31.88$ years, $SD = 12.96$), 1422 described themselves as
158 male ($M_{\text{age}} = 32.05$ years, $SD = 13.14$), and 12 described themselves as other gender (e.g.,
159 transgender, bigender, non-binary). However, given the low number in this grouping, we limited the
160 analyses to men and women. Participants were recruited by the "snowball" approach (personal
161 transmission of the questionnaire via individual e-addresses databases and posting the link to the

162 questionnaire on social networks, official pages of the partners' organizations, local on-line
163 newspapers). Participants completed an on-line survey "Everyday life practice in COVID-19 time"
164 during the restriction time for COVID-19 pandemic, from April 15, 2020 to April 28, 2020 [29].
165 Participants had to be 18 years or older and living in the included European countries. They were
166 categorized into four age groups: emerging adults (between 18 and 25 years old), young adults
167 (between 26 and 39 years old), middle-aged adults (between 40 and 60 years old), and older adults
168 (60 years or older) (see Table 1).

169 All materials and procedures were reviewed and approved by the consortium of six partners from
170 Science and Research Centre Koper, Slovenia; Faculties of Sport at University of Novi Sad, Serbia;
171 University of Palermo, Italy; University of Zagreb, Croatia; University of Presov, Slovakia, and
172 University of Cadiz, Spain. The study was conducted in accordance with the ethical standards of the
173 Declaration of Helsinki, and all participants signed statements of informed consent to participate in
174 this study. The Ethics Committee of University of BLINDED FOR REVIEW approved this study.
175 Participants were informed that all data would have been processed and managed by the legislation
176 on the protection of personal data and the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). They were
177 able to leave the questionnaire at any stage before the submission process. Only surveys with
178 completed mandatory questions were taken into further analysis.

179

180 *Measures*

181 The survey was made up of socio-demographic questions (detecting age, gender, education, and
182 nationality), the Fear of COVID-19 Scale [17], and the Three-Item Loneliness Scale [30]. The
183 questionnaires were translated and back-translated to ensure that the wording was appropriate for
184 Spain, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Serbia, Slovakia, and Slovenia. The study was conducted
185 in line with the recent recommendations of Swami and Barron [31].

186 *Fear of COVID-19 Scale*

187 Participants completed the Fear of COVID-19 Scale by Ahorsu et al. [17]. It consists of 7 items
188 with answers on 5-point scale, from completely disagree to agree. It was constructed considering
189 existing scales on fears, expert evaluations and interviews, and it shows very good psychometric
190 properties. Specifically, it has shown stable psychometric properties across countries, with a good
191 reliability (Cronbach alphas: Italy, 0.86; Spain, 0.87; Bosnia and Herzegovina, 0.89; Croatia, 0.85;
192 Serbia, 0.85; Slovakia, 0.83; Slovenia, 0.85).

193 *Three-Item Loneliness Scale*

194 Loneliness was measured by the 3-item Loneliness Scale by Hughes et al. [30]. It consists of three
195 items detecting the lack of companionship, the feeling of being left out, and the feeling of being
196 isolated from the others, measured on the frequency Hardly Ever, Some of the Time and Often. For
197 the purposes of the present study, the items were treated as three different indicators of feelings of
198 loneliness.

199

200 *Data analysis*

201 Descriptive statistics of the total result for The Fear of Covid-19 Scale and items from Three-Item
202 Loneliness Scale were calculated on the total sample and subgroups regarding gender, age and
203 country. Correlational analysis through Pearson's r was performed to see if loneliness items and
204 fear of COVID-19 were interrelated. Countries were divided in two groups, specifically, the most
205 endangered Italy and Spain (C2) in one group and Slovenia, Croatia, Serbia, Slovakia, and Bosnia
206 and Herzegovina in the other group (C1).

207 The canonical discriminant analysis of groups defined by age, gender, and country was performed
208 on the total result of The Fear of COVID-19 Scale and items from the Three-Item Loneliness Scale
209 using the Discriminant Function Analysis procedure described by Jennrich [32] in STATISTICA
210 (version 13.0, TIBCO, USA). The significance of the first and subsequent discriminant functions
211 was tested by Wilks' lambda values at the level of statistical significance $p < 0,01$. Standardized
212 discriminant coefficients and correlations of independent and discriminant variables were

213 determined. The means for the discriminant functions by group (namely, group centroids) were
214 computed; centroids were represented in three two-dimensional Cartesian space.

215

216 **Results**

217 *Preliminary results*

218 Descriptive statistics are summarized in Supplement Table 1. Twelve participants who identified as
219 in the “other” gender category were excluded. Therefore, the total sample size was $N=3864$ for
220 further testing the Fear of COVID-19 and the Loneliness scale. Fear of COVID-19 and loneliness
221 items (lack of companionship, feeling left out and feeling isolated) were significantly correlated at
222 $p<.01$. Independent variables distributions are significantly different from normal because of
223 skewness, but it should not invalidate the discriminant analysis [33, 34].

224 *Discriminant analysis*

225 Canonical discriminant analysis of groups defined by age, gender and country for the Fear of
226 COVID-19 and the Three-Item Loneliness Scale resulted in three significant discriminants
227 functions (see Table 1), whose discriminant coefficients are represented in Table 2. The first
228 discriminant function is predominantly defined by the result of Fear of COVID-19 (standardized
229 discriminant coefficient= 0.963; correlation with discriminant function= -0.896); feeling less the
230 lack of companionship contributes to a lesser extent (standardized discriminant coefficient= -0.351;
231 correlation with discriminant function= -0.325). The second discriminant function is mainly defined
232 by feeling isolated from the others (standardized discriminant coefficient= -0.709; correlation with
233 discriminant function= -0.926) and tendency to feel more the lack of companionship (standardized
234 discriminant coefficient= -0.313; correlation with discriminant function= -0.689). The third
235 discriminant function is determined by feeling left out (standardized discriminant coefficient=
236 1.233, correlation with discriminant function= 0.74); partial contributions of other two measures of
237 loneliness are also visible, but to a much lesser extent (standardized discriminant coefficients of
238 feeling the lack of companionship and feeling isolated are -0.489 and -0.430, respectively).

239 **Table 1** Discriminant Analysis results

Roots removed	Eigenvalue	Canonical correlation	Wilks' Lambda	Chi-Squared	df	<i>p</i>
0	0.16	0.37	0.82	776.60	60	0.00***
1	0.04	0.18	0.95	203.01	42	0.00***
2	0.01	0.11	0.98	69.44	26	0.00***
3	0.01	0.08	0.99	24.94	12	0.02*

240 (***)*p*<.001; **)*p*<.01; *)*p*<.05).

241

242

243 **Table 2** – Standardized discriminant coefficients and correlations with discriminant functions

244

Items	Root 1		Root 2		Root 3	
	S	F	S	F	S	F
The Fear of COVID-19 Scale	0.963	0.896	-0.239	-0.405	-0.174	-0.048
How often do you feel that you lack companionship?	-0.351	-0.325	-0.313	-0.689	-0.489	-0.214
How often do you feel left out?	-0.028	-0.056	-0.049	-0.653	1.233	0.740
How often do you feel isolated from others?	-0.141	-0.155	-0.709	-0.926	-0.430	0.060

245 *Note: S – Standardized discriminant coefficient; F – correlation with discriminant function.*

246

247 At the negative side of the first discriminant function (See Figure 1), described dominantly by the

248 lower level of Fear of COVID-19, three centroids of groups lay from less endangered countries

249 (C1); the results of males from C1 countries are either negative or near-zero, values rising from

250 youngest group onwards (Table 3, Figure 1). The centroids of female groups from C1 countries

251 show also that fear is getting higher with age; compared with males, female centroids are shifted to

252 higher values and only the youngest group centroid is positioned at the negative side of function.

253 All the centroids of groups from Italy and Spain (C2) on the first discriminant function are on the

254 positive side of function; they do not show the same regularity as for groups from less endangered
 255 countries; the first three age groups of males have lower values then corresponding female groups,
 256 but, the eldest males have the highest centroid value on the first function. The emerging female
 257 group have the lowest value, whereas the highest value is in young adult female group.
 258 The centroids of groups from less endangered countries (C1) on the second discriminant function
 259 show that females feel more often isolated from others and feel the lack of companionship more
 260 than males. Three female groups from Italy and Spain (C2) have near-zero values and only the
 261 young adult female group has centroid on the negative side of function; males from the first three
 262 age groups have centroids on the positive side of function, and the eldest male group has the
 263 centroid on the negative side of the function.
 264 The third discriminant function is defined by the feeling of being left out. In the groups from less
 265 endangered countries (C1) only elderly males and middle-aged females have centroids on the
 266 positive side of the function, the others have near-zero values. Seven groups from Italy and Spain
 267 (C2) have near-zero or centroids on the negative side of the function; only the group of middle-aged
 268 males felt more often to be left out.

269 **Table 3** Centroids distinguished according to country (C1 and C2), gender (M, F) and age (1- emerging adults
 270 18-25 years, 2- young adults 26-39 years, 3 – middle-aged adults 40 – 59 years and 4 - elderly of 60 years and
 271 more)

272

	Countries 1 (C1)			Countries 2 (C2)		
	Root 1	Root 2	Root 3	Root 1	Root 2	Root 3
M1	-0.587	0.141	-0.047	0.281	0.226	-0.138
M2	-0.316	0.244	-0.075	0.252	0.164	-0.083
M3	-0.003	0.309	0.082	0.558	0.413	0.223
M4	0.082	0.087	0.167	1.206	-0.164	-0.030
F1	-0.286	-0.229	-0.004	0.504	0.007	-0.151
F2	0.078	-0.017	0.001	0.902	-0.248	-0.192
F3	0.269	-0.036	0.207	0.859	0.036	-0.108
F4	0.727	-0.153	-0.053	0.613	0.009	0.087

273

274 **Figure 1** Centroids representation on first, second and third discriminant functions

275

276 **Discussion**

277 The present study examined cross-country differences concerning the fear of COVID-19 and
278 loneliness due to varying degrees of outbreak severity. Our results suggest that both males and
279 females in European countries suffering from a strong impact of the COVID-19 pandemic (i.e. Italy
280 and Spain) reported higher fear of COVID-19 and sense of loneliness than countries with a low
281 spread of the virus in April 2020. From the analyses, it resulted that people who had high level of
282 fear of COVID-19 tended to suffer loneliness in a less extent, and who was feeling more isolated,
283 tended also to feel the lack of companionship. However, discriminant analysis showed that this
284 pattern of results can be examined in more detail by considering the different age and gender
285 groups.

286 As expected, from the analysis of the centroids, in countries with low death rate and mild social
287 restrictions (C1), both the emerging and young adults did not show high level of fear, but felt the
288 lack of companionship, especially for men; whereas middle-aged and older women showed higher
289 level of fear and low lack of companionship. Conversely, people from high death rate countries and
290 harsh restrictions (C2) experienced higher fear of COVID-19, without feeling the lack of
291 companionship. Furthermore, middle-aged men and young adult women felt both the lack of
292 companionship and to be left out. These results are not surprising if we consider that during the
293 time-lag of the survey, Italy and Spain faced strict restrictions and lockdown, which could have
294 impacted on people's sense of loneliness. Moreover, Italy and Spain faced over 10,000 deaths only
295 in the two weeks of the survey, while Bosnia and Herzegovina, Slovenia, Slovakia, and Serbia had
296 160 deaths in total. Previous data from the USA also showed that fears appeared to be concentrated
297 in regions with the highest reported COVID-19 cases [24].

298 Regarding the influence of gender, our results confirmed that women reported greater fear than men
299 both in C1 and C2 countries. This finding is consistent with literature showing that females can be

300 more vulnerable to develop psychosocial distress during the pandemic [5, 7]. Research on the
301 impact of COVID-19 pandemic on men's and women's well-being separately is still scarce and
302 there is a need for addressing gender equality in any decision making for the COVID-19 [35]. The
303 findings of the current study suggest that the discriminant functions can be used to identify sub-
304 groups at high risk of distress during the COVID-19 pandemic. The elderly females from countries
305 with low death rate could be considered a group at moderate risk of excessive fear of COVID-19
306 and lack of companionship. Given the mild restrictions assigned in these countries, this vulnerable
307 group could be supported by improving regular exercising and maintaining a healthy diet pattern, to
308 prevent symptoms of stress during the pandemic.

309 Of note, in Italy and Spain the older men who are at higher risk for COVID-19 complications
310 represents a class of individuals at risk of high fear of COVID-19 and feelings of social isolation.
311 From a policymaking perspective, more attention should be paid to these vulnerable groups by
312 enhancing on-line health services and support. Moreover, these vulnerable groups should be helped
313 to avoid potential false reports and continuously checking COVID-19 related news to ease their
314 feelings of fear and anxiety.

315 The COVID-19 outbreak is likely worsening individual's perception of loneliness by reducing
316 social interactions and contacts. Given that loneliness is a risk to physical and mental health, there
317 was a call for a public health framework for addressing loneliness during COVID-19, especially in
318 older adults[36]. Our results showed that the elderly male group in Italy and Spain felt more often
319 isolated from others and felt the lack of companionship. They also reported higher fear of COVID-
320 19 than other age groups. Thus, they may be identified as a sub-group at high risk of social distress
321 during the COVID-19 pandemic [37]. Physicians could help lonely adults to use social services and
322 community-based organizations, and support them to alleviate loneliness and address essential
323 needs [38]. Moreover, our results showed that females in C1 countries felt more often isolated from
324 others and with a lack of companionship than males. It could be speculated that in countries with

325 mild social restrictions due to the COVID-19 outbreak, women were more engaged with demanding
326 family activities than men and had less opportunities for social interactions, thus feeling lonelier in
327 this difficult time.

328 *Strengths and limitations of the study*

329 The main strength of the current study is that we examined the impact of the COVID-19 outbreak
330 on fear and sense of loneliness in a large sample of population from different European countries.
331 This study also has several limitations: first, well-educated people are more likely to participate in
332 an on-line survey than less-educated, as confirmed by Smith [41]. Moreover, people from low
333 socioeconomic status might not be equipped with the Internet and IT technology. Finally, using
334 self-report measures could not reflect people's real opinions and feelings, due to the social
335 desirability [42].

336 **Conclusions**

337 Overall, our results show that people from European countries with a high number of infections and
338 deaths during the COVID-19 pandemic reported different levels of fear and feelings of loneliness
339 than people from countries with a very low death and infection rates. Moreover, our results
340 highlight that future research on the negative health consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic
341 should examine different age and gender groups separately. The analysis of emotional well-being in
342 groups at risk of mental health issues can help to lessen the long term social and economic costs due
343 to the COVID-19 outbreak, and to integrate behavioral health expertise into public health responses
344 to pandemic [39, 40].

345

346

347

348

349

350

References

351

- 352 1. Flaxman S, Mishra S, Gandy A, Unwin HJT, Coupland H, Mellan TA, et al. Estimating the
353 number of infections and the impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in
354 European countries: technical description update. arXiv preprint arXiv:200411342. 2020.
- 355 2. Brooks SK, Webster RK, Smith LE, Woodland L, Wessely S, Greenberg N, et al. The
356 psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. *The Lancet*.
357 2020;395(10227):912-20. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(20)30460-8.
- 358 3. Duan L, Zhu G. Psychological interventions for people affected by the COVID-19 epidemic.
359 *The lancet Psychiatry*. 2020;7(4):300-2. doi: 10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30073-0. PubMed PMID:
360 32085840; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7128328.
- 361 4. Vindegaard N, Benros ME. COVID-19 pandemic and mental health consequences:
362 systematic review of the current evidence. *Brain, behavior, and immunity*. 2020;89:531-42. doi:
363 10.1016/j.bbi.2020.05.048. PubMed PMID: 32485289; PubMed Central PMCID:
364 PMC7260522.
- 365 5. Xiong J, Lipsitz O, Nasri F, Lui LMW, Gill H, Phan L, et al. Impact of COVID-19
366 pandemic on mental health in the general population: A systematic review. *J Affect Disord*.
367 2020;277:55-64. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2020.08.001. PubMed PMID: 32799105; PubMed Central
368 PMCID: PMC7413844.
- 369 6. Wang C, Pan R, Wan X, Tan Y, Xu L, Ho CS, et al. Immediate psychological responses and
370 associated factors during the initial stage of the 2019 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) epidemic
371 among the general population in China. *International journal of environmental research and public
372 health*. 2020;17(5):1729.
- 373 7. Cao W, Fang Z, Hou G, Han M, Xu X, Dong J, et al. The psychological impact of the
374 COVID-19 epidemic on college students in China. *Psychiatry Res*. 2020;287:112934. doi:
375 10.1016/j.psychres.2020.112934. PubMed PMID: 32229390; PubMed Central PMCID:
376 PMC7102633.
- 377 8. Zhang SX, Wang Y, Rauch A, Wei F. Unprecedented disruption of lives and work: Health,
378 distress and life satisfaction of working adults in China one month into the COVID-19 outbreak.
379 *Psychiat Res*. 2020:112958.
- 380 9. Ammar A, Brach M, Trabelsi K, Chtourou H, Boukhris O, Masmoudi L, et al. Effects of
381 COVID-19 home confinement on physical activity and eating behaviour Preliminary results of the
382 ECLB-COVID19 international online-survey. medRxiv. 2020.
- 383 10. Lai J, Ma S, Wang Y, Cai Z, Hu J, Wei N, et al. Factors associated with mental health
384 outcomes among health care workers exposed to coronavirus disease 2019. *JAMA network open*.
385 2020;3(3):e203976-e.
- 386 11. Elbay RY, Kurtulmus A, Arpacioğlu S, Karadere E. Depression, anxiety, stress levels of
387 physicians and associated factors in Covid-19 pandemics. *Psychiatry Res*. 2020;290:113130. doi:
388 10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113130. PubMed PMID: 32497969; PubMed Central PMCID:
389 PMC7255248.
- 390 12. Newby JM, O'Moore K, Tang S, Christensen H, Faasse K. Acute mental health responses
391 during the COVID-19 pandemic in Australia. *PloS one*. 2020;15(7):e0236562. doi:
392 10.1371/journal.pone.0236562. PubMed PMID: 32722711; PubMed Central PMCID:
393 PMC7386645.
- 394 13. Tull MT, Edmonds KA, Scamaldo K, Richmond JR, Rose JP, Gratz KL. Psychological
395 Outcomes Associated with Stay-at-Home Orders and the Perceived Impact of COVID-19 on Daily
396 Life. *Psychiat Res*. 2020;289:113098. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113098. PubMed PMID:
397 32434092; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7252159.

- 398 14. Zacher H, Rudolph CW. Individual differences and changes in subjective wellbeing during
399 the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Am Psychol*. 2020. doi: 10.1037/amp0000702.
400 PubMed PMID: 32700938.
- 401 15. Schimmenti A, Billieux J, Starcevic V. The four horsemen of fear: An integrated model of
402 understanding fear experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Clinical Neuropsychiatry*.
403 2020;17(2):41-5.
- 404 16. Fiorillo A, Gorwood P. The consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic on mental health and
405 implications for clinical practice. *Eur Psychiatry*. 2020;63(1):e32. doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2020.35.
406 PubMed PMID: 32234102; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7156565.
- 407 17. Ahorsu DK, Lin CY, Imani V, Saffari M, Griffiths MD, Pakpour AH. The Fear of COVID-
408 19 Scale: Development and Initial Validation. *Int J Ment Health Addict*. 2020:1-9. doi:
409 10.1007/s11469-020-00270-8. PubMed PMID: 32226353; PubMed Central PMCID:
410 PMC7100496.
- 411 18. Qiu J, Shen B, Zhao M, Wang Z, Xie B, Xu Y. A nationwide survey of psychological
412 distress among Chinese people in the COVID-19 epidemic: implications and policy
413 recommendations. *General psychiatry*. 2020;33(2).
- 414 19. Taylor S, Landry C, Paluszek M, Fergus TA, McKay D, Asmundson GJ. Development and
415 initial validation of the COVID Stress Scales. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*. 2020;72:102232. doi:
416 10.1016/j.janxdis.2020.102232. PubMed PMID: 32408047; PubMed Central PMCID:
417 PMC7198206.
- 418 20. Sakib N, Bhuiyan A, Hossain S, Al Mamun F, Hosen I, Abdullah AH, et al. Psychometric
419 Validation of the Bangla Fear of COVID-19 Scale: Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Rasch
420 Analysis. *Int J Ment Health Addict*. 2020:1-12. doi: 10.1007/s11469-020-00289-x. PubMed PMID:
421 32395096; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7213549.
- 422 21. Harper CA, Satchell LP, Fido D, Latzman RD. Functional Fear Predicts Public Health
423 Compliance in the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Int J Ment Health Addict*. 2020:1-14. doi:
424 10.1007/s11469-020-00281-5. PubMed PMID: 32346359; PubMed Central PMCID:
425 PMC7185265.
- 426 22. Pakpour AH, Griffiths MD. The fear of COVID-19 and its role in preventive behaviors.
427 *Journal of Concurrent Disorders*. 2020.
- 428 23. Mertens G, Gerritsen L, Duijndam S, Salemink E, Engelhard IM. Fear of the coronavirus
429 (COVID-19): Predictors in an online study conducted in March 2020. *J Anxiety Disord*.
430 2020;74:102258. doi: 10.1016/j.janxdis.2020.102258. PubMed PMID: 32569905; PubMed Central
431 PMCID: PMC7286280.
- 432 24. Fitzpatrick KM, Harris C, Drawve G. Fear of COVID-19 and the mental health
433 consequences in America. *Psychol Trauma*. 2020;12(S1):S17-S21. doi: 10.1037/tra0000924.
434 PubMed PMID: 32496100.
- 435 25. Miller G. Social distancing prevents infections, but it can have unintended consequences.
436 *Science*. 2020.
- 437 26. Luchetti M, Lee JH, Aschwanden D, Sesker A, Strickhouser JE, Terracciano A, et al. The
438 trajectory of loneliness in response to COVID-19. *Am Psychol*. 2020;75(7):897-908. doi:
439 10.1037/amp0000690. PubMed PMID: 32567879.
- 440 27. Losada-Baltar A, Jiménez-Gonzalo L, Gallego-Alberto L, Pedroso-Chaparro MdS,
441 Fernandes-Pires J, Márquez-González M. "We're staying at home". Association of self-perceptions
442 of aging, personal and family resources and loneliness with psychological distress during the lock-
443 down period of COVID-19. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B*. 2020.
- 444 28. Groarke JM, Berry E, Graham-Wisener L, McKenna-Plumley PE, McGlinchey E, Armour
445 C. Loneliness in the UK during the COVID-19 pandemic: Cross-sectional results from the COVID-
446 19 Psychological Wellbeing Study. *PloS one*. 2020;15(9):e0239698. doi:
447 10.1371/journal.pone.0239698. PubMed PMID: 32970764; PubMed Central PMCID:
448 PMC7513993.

- 449 29. Pišot S, Milovanović I, Šimunič B, Gentile A, Bosnar K, Prot F, et al. Maintaining everyday
450 life praxis in the time of COVID-19 pandemic measures (ELP-COVID-19 survey). *European*
451 *journal of public health*. 2020.
- 452 30. Hughes ME, Waite LJ, Hawkey LC, Cacioppo JT. A Short Scale for Measuring Loneliness
453 in Large Surveys: Results From Two Population-Based Studies. *Res Aging*. 2004;26(6):655-72.
454 doi: 10.1177/0164027504268574. PubMed PMID: 18504506; PubMed Central PMCID:
455 PMCPMC2394670.
- 456 31. Swami V, Barron D. Translation and validation of body image instruments: Challenges,
457 good practice guidelines, and reporting recommendations for test adaptation. *Body image*.
458 2019;31:204-20. doi: 10.1016/j.bodyim.2018.08.014. PubMed PMID: 30220631.
- 459 32. Jennrich RI. Stepwise discriminant analysis. *Statistical methods for digital computers*. 1977.
- 460 33. Ghasemi A, Zahediasl S. Normality tests for statistical analysis: a guide for non-statisticians.
461 *Int J Endocrinol Metab*. 2012;10(2):486-9. doi: 10.5812/ijem.3505. PubMed PMID: 23843808;
462 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3693611.
- 463 34. Tabachnick BG, Fidell LS. *Using multivariate statistics* . Northridge. Cal: Harper Collins.
464 1996.
- 465 35. King T, Hewitt B, Crammond B, Sutherland G, Maheen H, Kavanagh A. Reordering gender
466 systems: can COVID-19 lead to improved gender equality and health? *The Lancet*.
467 2020;396(10244):80-1.
- 468 36. Jeste DV, Lee EE, Cacioppo S. Battling the Modern Behavioral Epidemic of Loneliness:
469 Suggestions for Research and Interventions. *JAMA psychiatry*. 2020;77(6):553-4. doi:
470 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.0027. PubMed PMID: 32129811; PubMed Central PMCID:
471 PMCPMC7483387.
- 472 37. Monahan C, Macdonald J, Lytle A, Apriceno M, Levy SR. COVID-19 and ageism: How
473 positive and negative responses impact older adults and society. *American Psychologist*. 2020.
- 474 38. Trad NK, Wharam JF, Druss B, editors. *Addressing Loneliness in the Era of COVID-19*.
475 *JAMA Health Forum*; 2020: American Medical Association.
- 476 39. Smith BJ, Lim MH. How the COVID-19 pandemic is focusing attention on loneliness and
477 social isolation. *Public Health Res Pract*. 2020;30:e3022008.
- 478 40. Kaslow NJ, Friis-Healy EA, Cattie JE, Cook SC, Crowell AL, Cullum KA, et al. Flattening
479 the emotional distress curve: A behavioral health pandemic response strategy for COVID-19. *Am*
480 *Psychol*. 2020;75(7):875-86. doi: 10.1037/amp0000694. PubMed PMID: 32538638.
- 481 41. Smith G. Does gender influence online survey participation?: A record-linkage analysis of
482 university faculty online survey response behavior. *ERIC Document Reproduction Service No ED*
483 *501717*. 2008.
- 484 42. Van de Mortel TF. Faking it: social desirability response bias in self-report research.
485 *Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing, The*. 2008;25(4):40.

486

487 **Funding:** This research received no external funding.

488 **Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

489

490 **S1 Appendix** Descriptive statistics of the results of the survey

491

492

	N	Fear of COVID-19 Mean, SD	Lack of companionship Mean, SD	Feeling left out Mean, SD	Feeling isolated Mean, SD
Total Sample	3876	13.62 (5.14)	2.31 (0.70)	1.56 (0.70)	1.88 (0.77)
Males	1422	12.57 (4.80)	2.25 (0.69)	1.45 (0.64)	1.75 (0.73)
Females	2442	14.23 (5.24)	2.34 (0.70)	1.62 (0.72)	1.95 (0.78)
Other	12	12.83 (4.47)	1.92 (0.79)	1.75 (0.97)	1.75 (0.87)
Age					
18-25 years (age1)	1885	12.81 (4.90)	2.40 (0.69)	1.57 (0.71)	1.94 (0.79)
26-39 years (age2)	954	14.00 (5.28)	2.26 (0.70)	1.50 (0.68)	1.83 (0.75)
40-59 years (age3)	881	14.50 (5.15)	2.18 (0.70)	1.58 (0.69)	1.79 (0.74)
> 59 years (age4)	156	16.08 (5.22)	2.22 (0.69)	1.58 (0.68)	1.85 (0.74)
Country					
Slovenia, Croatia, Serbia, Slovakia and Bosnia and Herzegovina (C1)	3066	13.06 (4.86)	2.34 (0.69)	1.59 (0.70)	1.91 (0.77)
Italy and Spain (C2)	810	15.72 (5.61)	2.17 (0.73)	1.45 (0.65)	1.75 (0.76)
Gender & Age					
males, age 1 (M1)	672	11.90 (4.57)	2.32 (0.68)	1.46 (0.64)	1.79 (0.75)
males, age 2 (M2)	378	12.67 (4.95)	2.22 (0.71)	1.42 (0.60)	1.75 (0.71)
males, age 3 (M3)	306	13.40 (4.82)	2.12 (0.69)	1.46 (0.64)	1.64 (0.70)
males, age4 (M4)	66	14.94 (4.77)	2.26 (0.69)	1.61 (0.72)	1.79 (0.73)
females, age 1 (F1)	1208	13.31 (5.01)	2.45 (0.68)	1.64 (0.73)	2.02 (0.79)
females, age 2 (F2)	570	14.87 (5.34)	2.29 (0.68)	1.56 (0.71)	1.89 (0.77)
females, age 3 (F3)	574	15.10 (5.22)	2.21 (0.70)	1.64 (0.73)	1.87 (0.75)
females, age 4 (F4)	90	16.91 (5.40)	2.20 (0.69)	1.57 (0.65)	1.89 (0.74)
Gender & Country					
males, countries 1 (MC1)	1014	11.74 (4.33)	2.30 (0.68)	1.47 (0.65)	1.77 (0.73)
males, countries 2 (MC2)	408	14.64 (5.23)	2.12 (0.72)	1.41 (0.61)	1.69 (0.73)
females, countries 1 (FC1)	2042	13.72 (4.98)	2.37 (0.69)	1.64 (0.72)	1.98 (0.78)
females, countries 2 (MC2)	400	16.84 (5.76)	2.23 (0.72)	1.49 (0.68)	1.82 (0.78)
Age & Country					
age 1, countries 1 (1C1)	1494	12.18 (4.58)	2.45 (0.67)	1.61 (0.72)	2.00 (0.79)
age 1, countries 2 (1C2)	391	15.19 (5.35)	2.23 (0.71)	1.42(0.62)	1.71 (0.73)
age 2, countries 1 (2C1)	693	13.20 (4.79)	2.28 (0.69)	1.51 (0.68)	1.84 (0.74)
age 2, countries 2 (2C2)	261	16.11 (5.90)	2.21 (0.70)	1.48 (0.67)	1.83 (0.77)

age 3, countries 1 (3C1)	751	14.22 (5.02)	2.22 (0.68)	1.60 (0.69)	1.80 (0.73)
age 3, countries 2 (3C2)	130	16.13 (5.59)	1.94 (0.75)	1.43 (0.65)	1.72 (0.79)
age 4, countries 1 (4C1)	128	15.74 (5.02)	2.24 (0.67)	1.59 (0.66)	1.85 (0.71)
age 4, countries 2 (4C2)	28	17.61 (5.90)	2.14 (0.76)	1.57 (0.79)	1.82 (0.86)

Gender, Age & Country

males, age 1, countries 1 (M1C1)	471	10.81 (3.87)	2.38 (0.67)	1.49 (0.66)	1.84 (0.77)
males, age 1, countries 2 (M1C2)	201	14.46 (5.05)	2.18 (0.70)	1.38 (0.61)	1.67 (0.71)
males, age 2, countries 1 (M2C1)	242	11.76 (4.49)	2.26 (0.70)	1.42 (0.62)	1.75 (0.70)
males, age 2, countries 2 (M2C2)	136	14.31 (5.30)	2.14 (0.72)	1.42 (0.58)	1.76 (0.74)
males, age 3, countries 1 (M3C1)	248	13.02 (4.63)	2.17 (0.66)	1.46 (0.64)	1.65 (0.68)
males, age 3, countries 2 (M3C2)	58	15.05 (5.31)	1.90 (0.77)	1.45 (0.65)	1.57 (0.77)
males, age 4, countries 1 (M4C1)	53	13.96 (3.81)	2.32 (0.64)	1.62 (0.71)	1.75 (0.70)
males, age 4, countries 2 (M4C2)	13	18.92 (6.26)	2.00 (0.82)	1.54 (0.78)	1.92 (0.86)
females, age 1, countries 1 (F1C1)	1018	12.82 (4.74)	2.48 (0.67)	1.67 (0.74)	2.07 (0.79)
females, age 1, countries 2 (F1C2)	190	15.96 (5.55)	2.28 (0.73)	1.47 (0.64)	1.76 (0.76)
females, age 2, countries 1 (F2C1)	447	13.97 (4.79)	2.29 (0.69)	1.56 (0.70)	1.88 (0.76)
females, age 2, countries 2 (F2C2)	123	18.14 (5.94)	2.29 (0.67)	1.54 (0.74)	1.91 (0.80)
females, age 3, countries 1 (F3C1)	502	14.82 (5.10)	2.24 (0.69)	1.67 (0.71)	1.87 (0.74)
females, age 3, countries2 (F3C2)	72	17.00 (5.70)	1.97 (0.75)	1.42 (0.64)	1.83 (0.79)
females, age 4, countries 1 (F4C1)	75	17.00 (5.40)	2.19 (0.69)	1.56 (0.62)	1.92 (0.71)
females, age 4, countries 2 (F4C2)	15	16.47 (5.53)	2.27 (0.70)	1.60 (0.83)	1.73 (0.88)

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504


505

506

507

508

Figure 1 Centroids representation on first, second and third discriminant functions



Note: country (C1 and C2), (M, F) and age 1-emerging adults 18-25 years, 2- young adults 26-39 years, 3 – middle-agedlife adults 40 – 59 years and 4 - elderly of 60 years and more)