

1     **A systematic literature review of individual-level psychological and behavioral**  
2     **responses to the health information of COVID-19 from social media and legacy**  
3     **media**

4                                     Wei Zhai, Jian Bian, Jing Zhang, Xueyin Bai

5     1. Wei Zhai\*

6     Department of Geography,  
7     Hong Kong Baptist University

8  
9     2. Jian Bian

10    School of Literature and Journalism & Communication,  
11    Henan University of Economic and Law

12  
13    3. Jing Zhang

14    School of Journalism and Communication,  
15    Wuhan University

16  
17    4. Xueyin Bai

18    School of Landscape Architecture and Planning,  
19    University of Florida,

20  
21    \*Corresponding author: Dr. Wei Zhai, Email: [weizhai@hkbu.edu.hk](mailto:weizhai@hkbu.edu.hk)

40 **Abstract:**

41 Covid-19 has been recognized as a terrifying global health threat since its detection,  
42 with far-reaching consequences that are unprecedented in the modern era. Since the  
43 outbreak of the pandemic, social media and legacy media have collectively delivered  
44 health information related to COVID-19 to the public as a catalyst to community  
45 perception of risk. However, the existing literature exhibits different viewpoints toward  
46 the role of social media and legacy media in disseminating health information of  
47 COVID-19. In this regard, this article conducted a systematic literature review to  
48 provide an overview of the current state of research concerning individuals-level  
49 psychological and behavioral response to COVID-19 related information from different  
50 sources, as well as presents the challenges and future research directions.

51 **Keywords:** COVID-19; Social media; Legacy media; Psychological and behavioral  
52 responses

53 **1. Introduction**

54 The 2020 novel coronavirus pandemic has caused a massive impact on the world, which  
55 is not only a public health crisis but also an unprecedented challenge for economic  
56 development and people's daily lives ([Muhammad et al., 2020](#); [Zhai and Peng, 2021](#)).  
57 According to the World Health Organization (WHO), as of November 23, 2021, over  
58 258 million positive cases of COVID-19 globally have been confirmed, including 5.16  
59 million deaths. In particular, the Delta variant, with its highly infectious nature, is now  
60 exacerbating the global transmission of new coronaviruses. To combat the pandemic,  
61 many countries have implemented different intervention strategies, such as restriction  
62 of mass gatherings, reduced frequency of public transportation, lockdown of city, etc.  
63 ([Musselwhite, Avineri and Susilo, 2020](#); [Brauner et al., 2021](#); [Zhai and Yue, 2021](#)). The  
64 effectiveness of government interventions heavily depends on the general public's  
65 support for, compliance to, and trust in the policies ([Liu et al., 2021](#); [Zhai et al., 2021a](#);  
66 [Zhai et al., 2021b](#); [Zhai et al., 2021c](#)). In this process, it is the social media and legacy  
67 media working as an intermediary bridge between authorities (government/professional  
68 medical institutions) and the public, regulating and influencing public awareness and  
69 behaviors ([Krawczyk et al., 2021](#); [Liu et al., 2020](#); [Zhou et al., 2020](#)). For instance, in  
70 most cases, people would internalize the received information and then adopt protective  
71 actions, such as home quarantine, social distancing, washing hands with alcohol,  
72 wearing masks, and vaccination, to slow virus transmission ([Wang et al., 2021](#);  
73 [Freeman and Eykelbosh, 2020](#); [Fu and Zhai, 2021](#)). In addition, many individuals seek  
74 to receive timely information ([Van et al., 2021](#)), or keep social connections with  
75 important ones ([Minh et al., 2021](#)) to ease anxiety from the infection risk.

76 Even though social media have played an important role in disseminating health-  
77 protection guidelines and delivering the latest information on pandemics to the public,  
78 the impacts of social media communications on the pandemic are mixed. On the one  
79 hand, social media has the advantages of transparency such as the huge number of  
80 accessible channels, various types of resources, up-to-date information, and integrating  
81 hyperlinks ([Patrick et al., 2019](#); [Jin et al., 2019](#); [McInnes and Hornmoen, et al., 2018](#)).

82 To this end, social media users can easily get access to, share, and generate health-  
83 related content on social media (Chen and Wang, 2021). In the meantime, social media  
84 users also can enhance community cohesion and help people gain emotional resonance  
85 and consensus for action during the pandemic. On the other hand, in today's hyper-  
86 networked communication environment, the information is flowing through every  
87 social media user via the huge and complicated network with uncertainties, instead of  
88 being filtered by gatekeepers of information verification, for example, on legacy media  
89 (Shoemaker and Vos, 2009). Thus, social media users are quite prone to problems such  
90 as infodemic (WHO, 2020), referring to widespread misinformation and information  
91 overload (Pulido et al., 2020; Bode et al., 2021).

92 The individuals' responses to the information from legacy media (i.e., radio, television,  
93 newspaper, etc.) are also two-sided. The gatekeeping role of mainstream media is quite  
94 important because it can filter out useless information, especially from the noisy social  
95 media environment, help the general public conduct fact-checking, and alleviate the  
96 psychological fear and anxiety of individuals (Ophir & Jamieson, 2020). In addition,  
97 traditional media can be effective in providing credible information in an effort to  
98 increase public awareness of prevention and intervention strategies (Weick, 1988;  
99 Ophir., 2019; Bao et al., 2020). However, the existing literature indicates that the news  
100 coverage of COVID-19 shows signs of being politicized and used by politicians to serve  
101 particular ideological interests (Earnshaw et al., 2020). For instance, in a highly partisan  
102 environment such as the United States, political bias has damaged the delivery of health  
103 messaging via legacy media due to the contested trust of the science in left-leaning and  
104 right-leaning media (Zhao et al., 2020).

105 Therefore, social media and legacy media have made significant impacts on people's  
106 risk perceptions, emotions, and preventive behaviors during the pandemic (Tsai et al.,  
107 2020). The main objective of this article is to review the existing literature so as to  
108 understand how individuals respond to the health information pertaining to COVID-19  
109 from both social media and legacy media. For this purpose, a methodological approach  
110 based on a systematic literature review is applied, which provides an overview of the  
111 current state of research, as well as presents the challenges and future research  
112 directions. Specifically, this research aims to answer the following research questions.

- 113 • Q1. How many studies have studied the individuals' responses to health  
114 information of COVID-19?
- 115 • Q2. Which disciplines and journals lead this research topic?
- 116 • Q3. What are the differences between social media and legacy media in terms  
117 of affecting individuals' responses during the pandemic?
- 118 • Q4. What are the main concerns addressed by the researchers regarding  
119 individuals' psychological and behavioral responses?
- 120 • Q5. What are challenges that have been identified by researchers in leveraging  
121 social media and legacy media to contain the viral spread?
- 122 • Q6. What are future agendas for researchers and practitioners?

123 To address Q1 and Q2, the articles published in the journal are identified in Section 2.  
124 Regarding Q3, Q4, and Q5, the scopes of the existing studies are analyzed, as well as  
125 the cases and the applied techniques applied by researchers in Section 3 and 4. Finally,  
126 to answer Q6, we will propose several promising agendas for future studies in Section  
127 5. Finally, Section 6 will conclude the research.

## 128 **2. Research design and methods**

### 129 *2.1 Searching protocol*

130 This study applied two strategies to review the current state of research about the  
131 relationship between media exposure, health-protective behaviors, and viral spread  
132 amid COVID-19. The first strategy is to identify all English-language studies that were  
133 published since 2020 from Web of Science and Google Scholar databases. A  
134 combination of the following keywords was used to search for titles and abstracts:  
135 “media” OR “response”. Figure 1 shows two types of search categories with different  
136 keywords in each category of search terms. The category “media” can be specified as  
137 media-related behavior (“media coverage” / “media use”) and media type (“social  
138 media” / “legacy media”). The category “response” mainly includes psychological  
139 responses, for instance, including “risk perception”, “health purposes” and “mental  
140 health consequences” and behavioral responses such as “behavioral response”, “travel”  
141 / “stay at home” / “hand wash”, etc. Each keyword in Figure 1 relates to the pandemic  
142 using “AND” and the keyword “COVID-19” in every search. The second strategy was  
143 collecting articles from the reference list of existing literature.

144


145

146

147

148

149



150


151

**Figure 1.** Keywords under the category “media” and “response”

152

### 153 *2.2 Screening protocol*

154 As indicated in Figure 2, the screening process was developed from the PRISMA  
155 (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) flow diagram  
156 with four steps: identification, screening, eligibility, and inclusion (Moher et al., 2009;  
157 Lu et al., 2019). The step of identification selected all articles that explored the impact  
158 of the media or investigated the public's health and behavioral responses during the  
159 pandemic. The step of screening filtered out the studies that ignored the connection  
160 between media coverage and health responses during the pandemic. Articles published  
161 before 2020 were excluded. The step of eligibility excluded literature review articles to  
162 ensure that selected research articles are evidence-based studies. The step of inclusion  
163 further excluded non-peer-review journal articles and articles with duplicated research  
164 themes and findings. As of September 2021, there were 33 articles from Web of Science,  
165 8 articles from Google Scholar, and 14 articles identified from reference lists of those  
166 articles, resulting in a total of 55 articles (Appendix 1).



167

168 **Figure 2.** Flowchart of systematic literature review process and number of included  
169 and excluded papers in each step

170 **3. Review results**

171 *3.1 Type of documents*

172 **Journal impact.** Journal Citation Report (JCR) Impact Factor (IF) reflects the average  
173 number of citations, which is a measure of the quality of a journal to some extent. Table  
174 1 shows the impact factor and the quartile of the recorded articles. Clearly, the majority  
175 of selected papers were published in journals ranked in Q1 and Q2. Especially  
176 noteworthy is that *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, as a Q1 journal, has published  
177 7 articles on this topic, followed by *Health Communication, Social Media + Society*  
178 and *Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering*.

179

**Table 1.** A summary of journals

Journals	Count	Quartile	IF
Journal of Medical Internet Research	7	Q1	5.428
Health Communication	3	Q2	3.198
Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering	3	Q3	2.08
Social Media + Society	3	Q1	4.249
BMJ Global Health	2	Q1	5.558
Technological Forecasting and Social Change	2	Q1	8.593
Plos One	2	Q2	3.24
Journal of Health Communication	2	Q2	2.781
JMIR Public Health and Surveillance	2	Q1	4.112
EPJ Data Science	2	Q1	3.184
Others	29		

180

181 **Discipline.** Table 2 indicates the disciplines that are related to at least two articles. It is  
 182 noticeable that the articles are published in multiple disciplines. *Communication*, as a  
 183 subject correlated with delivering the message to different people, holds the lead  
 184 position on this research topic. Disciplines like *Public Health*, *Computer Science*,  
 185 *Information Science*, *Management*, *Mathematics*, *Behavioral Sciences*, and so on, all  
 186 put their lens to concentrate on a different aspect of this topic. With more  
 187 multidiscipline cooperation, there will be more practicable suggestions to mitigate the  
 188 global crisis made by this novel coronavirus.

189

**Table 2.** A summary of disciplines

Discipline	Numbers
Communication	18
Public Health	6
Computer Science	4
Information Science	4
Mathematics	4
Management	3
Psychology	3
Behavioral Science	2
Journalism	2
Media	2
Medical	2
Medicine	2
Political Science	2
Tourism	2

190

191

192 **Country.** The total number of people infected in the United States was 37,939,641 till  
 193 August 24, 2021, ranking the first in the world. Therefore, it is not surprising that the  
 194 case studies of the United States take the lead position on this theme. China keeps a low  
 195 infectious rate compared to other countries, but scholars are very active on this topic. It  
 196 is worth noting that 11 articles investigated the global impacts of social media or legacy  
 197 media on viral transmission, indicating that understanding this issue is also a global  
 198 challenge, rather than an area-focused topic.

199 **Table 3.** A summary of countries (August 24, 2021)

Countries	Numbers	Confirmed Cases	Deaths
United States	18	37,939,641	629,411
China	11	106,812	4,848
Global	11	212,717,174	4,445,450
United Kingdom	9	6,555,419	132,000
Italy	6	4,488,779	128,795
Germany	4	3,881,633	92,028
France	4	6,708,163	113,857
Spain	4	4,794,352	83,337
Canada	2	1,481,438	26,780
Saudi Arabic	2	541,994	8,481
South Korea	2	239,287	2,228
Nigeria	2	187,588	2,276

200 Note: Some studies conducted a case study in different countries so that the total number is  
 201 greater than the number of articles.

### 202 3.2 Social media and legacy media

203 While individuals' responses to health information are clearly influenced by the media  
 204 platform, the literature found that social media and legacy media exhibit different  
 205 patterns.

206 Social media is known for its nature of real-time. Different from legacy media that relies  
 207 on editors or agencies to publish news, every social media user can publish information  
 208 online without restrictions. There are seven studies that show a strong correlation  
 209 between social media activities about COVID-19 and viral transmission. For instance,  
 210 [Bisanzio et al. \(2020\)](#) and [Cui and Kertész \(2021\)](#) demonstrated that social media (e.g.,  
 211 Twitter, Weibo) can be used to predict the spatial and temporal transmission of  
 212 infectious diseases in pandemic times. [Younis et al.\(2020\)](#) confirmed that the utility of  
 213 social media can be used as an epidemiological tool in the assessment of protection  
 214 measures at the beginning of the pandemic. [Amara \(2021\)](#) traced COVID-19-related  
 215 topics in 7 languages on Facebook and then found that the topics are consistent with  
 216 the pandemic evolution. Furthermore, [Haouari et al. \(2020\)](#) found that the early reported  
 217 cases of COVID-19 were correlated with the heated discussion of topics on Twitter



218 when the virus appeared in the Arab world. [Zhang et al. \(2021\)](#) found significant  
219 associations between human mobility and social media topics concerning COVID-19  
220 dissemination, and societal interventions from February 15 to June 14, 2020, in  
221 Denmark and Sweden. Based on statistics from the multilingual COVID-19 dataset,  
222 [Chen et al. \(2020\)](#) indicated that Twitter activity responds and reacts to COVID-19-  
223 related events across the world.

224 Moreover, four studies illustrated that proper use of social media can be seen as an  
225 effective tool to curb the spread of COVID-19. [Sleigh \(2021\)](#) found that social media  
226 influencers from Twitter can play a crucial role in controlling the dissemination of  
227 health risk messages and promoting solidarity. Besides, [Niburski and Niburski \(2020\)](#)  
228 found that after Donald Trump's Twitter posts about COVID-19, Google searches and  
229 Amazon purchases about the protective supplies were very likely to increase. [Wang et  
230 al. \(2021b\)](#) claimed that public health agencies and the government could take full use  
231 of the COVID-19 related information from Twitter to enact effective measures to curb  
232 the spread of the virus. [Raamkumar et al. \(2020\)](#) developed deep learning-based text  
233 classifiers to characterize health behaviors from social media and suggested that public  
234 health authorities could use the data to enact more effective measures.

235 The information from legacy media plays a vital role, especially during the early  
236 outbreak of the pandemic, offering first-hand virus-related information ([Olagoke et al.,  
237 2020; Abdekhoda et al., 2021](#)). Also, public opinion is mainly influenced by media  
238 coverage. There are seven studies examining the effect of legacy media on the public  
239 response to COVID-19. For example, [Melki \(2020\)](#) found that people often rely more  
240 on legacy media, especially on television, than social media during the early stage of  
241 coronavirus disease. [Soroya et al. \(2021\)](#) found that legacy media were more preferred  
242 than social media, and people were prone to getting news from traditional sources such  
243 as newspapers, radios, cable television, as well as online resources such as official  
244 websites. Likewise, [Niu et al. \(2021\)](#) found that there is a strong relationship between  
245 legacy media exposure for COVID-19-related news and preventive behaviors. They  
246 also found that high-risk groups are more likely to trust the information from TV for  
247 COVID-19-related news. The outlets of legacy media are often accompanied by media  
248 frames, [Ophir et al. \(2021\)](#) found that different media frames, which focused on social,  
249 political, and economic issues, were associated with increased mobility. Although  
250 people like to seek news from traditional media, [Liu et al. \(2020\)](#) found that legacy  
251 media news reports in China lagged behind the spread of COVID-19 in the early stage  
252 of the outbreak. [Zhou et al. \(2020\)](#), for example, used cross-correlation analysis to find  
253 the association between media coverage and infection cases. [Chang et al. \(2020\)](#) found  
254 that as the dissemination rate of health information from legacy media decreases, the  
255 confirmed cases would increase significantly.

256 There are four studies that examined the combined influences of social media, legacy

257 media, and other communication tools. [Krawczyk \(2021\)](#) found that the quality and  
258 quantity of information from various communication channels, including social media  
259 and legacy media platforms, collectively influenced individuals' understanding of  
260 public health measures. [Melki \(2020\)](#) found that those who would like to enhance  
261 protective behaviors were highly exposed to both legacy media and social media. [Gozzi  
262 et al. \(2020\)](#) found that user activity on Reddit and active search on Wikipedia pages  
263 about COVID-19 are primarily driven by media coverage. [Lee and You \(2021\)](#) found  
264 that in addition to social media or legacy media, the warning text messages were also  
265 proved to be an effective way for enhancing protective behaviors in the pandemic.

### 266 *3.3 Psychological responses*

267 Social media and legacy media will directly impact individuals' psychological  
268 responses to the pandemic. In the early stage of COVID-19, exploding untrustworthy  
269 information can cause social media fatigue, thereby reducing personal information  
270 processing capabilities and increasing cognitive overload. First, two studies  
271 investigated how media outlets constructed people's perceptions of COVID-19. [Bekalu  
272 et al. \(2021\)](#) found that exposure to different media platforms is correlated with different  
273 perceptions about the mortality of the infection, while the perception of virus threat is  
274 related to the high level of trust in the healthcare system and government. By analyzing  
275 the effectiveness of YouTube animated cartoons on health behaviors, [Onuora \(2021\)](#)  
276 determined that the perception of the seriousness of COVID-19 was the most prominent  
277 factor that influence individuals' behaviors.

278 Second, the fears and uncertainty accompanied by the virus, along with anxiety and  
279 stress, have exacerbated mental health issues to some degrees throughout society ([Su  
280 et al., 2021](#)). Due to the lack of effective treatments, [Ngien and Jiang \(2021\)](#) found that  
281 social media affects stress through fatalism, which means human health is pre-  
282 determined by fate, chance, luck, or God, and beyond ability. [Krawczyk et al. \(2021\)](#)  
283 analyzed the topics from COVID-19 news and found that articles that mentioned fear,  
284 crisis, and death accounted for 16% of COVID-19 online news. [Bendau et al. \(2020\)](#)  
285 conducted a web-based survey in Germany and found that media usage was positively  
286 correlated with COVID-19 fear and anxiety. After a cross-sectional survey of adults  
287 living in Lebanon, [Melki \(2020\)](#) found that people who show a higher fear level were  
288 more likely to be exposed to a large volume of information from TV. Also, those who  
289 obtained information frequently from both TV and social media are more likely to  
290 exhibit a high level of anxiety.

291 Third, there is a link between conspiracy beliefs and the frequent use of social media.  
292 [Chadwick et al. \(2021\)](#) found that there is a strong correlation between medical  
293 conspiracy beliefs and reluctance to engage in health protection behaviors. [Earnshaw  
294 et al. \(2020\)](#) found that 33% of participants in their survey believed one or more  
295 conspiracies of COVID-19. [Allington et al. \(2020\)](#) found that the more conspiracy

296 social media users believe, the less protective behaviors will be done. [Tang et al. \(2021\)](#)  
297 found that government social media promote users' information security behavior  
298 towards COVID-19 scams.

### 299 *3.4 Behavioral responses*

300 Evidence from CDC shows that COVID-19 can be largely mitigated by protective  
301 behaviors. Due to the lack of efficient medication and vaccination in the early outbreak  
302 of the pandemic, [Perrotta \(2021\)](#) argued that protective behaviors, which are influenced  
303 by media platforms or agencies, are key to curbing the spread of the virus. [Feng et al.](#)  
304 [\(2020\)](#) developed a COVID-19 epidemic model based on the efficacy of media  
305 coverage to provide a possible intervention to reduce COVID-19 infection. [Gozzi et al.](#)  
306 [\(2020\)](#) discovered that media coverage has the potential to influence viral transmission  
307 by triggering behavioral changes. Specifically, three types of behavioral responses can  
308 be documented.

309 First, wearing face masks might be seen as a case of bottom-up behavioral change in  
310 Western civilizations. [Perrotta et al. \(2021\)](#) found that individuals' risk perceptions of  
311 COVID-19 from media coverage were comparatively low, while they saw a rapid  
312 increase in mask use when mask-wearing was not yet mandated. The resistance of  
313 behavioral change still exists in the context of preventing and slowing the spread of the  
314 virus, evidenced by stories of individuals' refusal to wear masks or follow social  
315 distancing guidelines that have circulated in the news during the pandemic ([Ball and](#)  
316 [Wozniak, 2021](#)). But in different countries, wearing face masks varies greatly, ranging  
317 from about 7% in the Netherlands to about 60% in Italy ([Perrotta et al., 2021](#)).

318 Second, information from media coverage has a major impact on raising the risk  
319 awareness of potential travelers during the pandemic, thereby affecting people's  
320 mobility. [Chemli et al. \(2020\)](#) discovered that the trustworthy media coverage had a  
321 positive effect on potential travelers' awareness of the risk of COVID-19 infection (e.g.,  
322 outbound tourists' awareness) at a national level. By collecting the data from different  
323 countries, [Perrota et al. \(2021\)](#) found that reduced transportation usage was found to be  
324 the most frequently reported behavior based on a survey with Facebook users, with  
325 estimates ranging from 67% in the Netherlands to 82% in Spain. [Ophir et al. \(2021\)](#)  
326 found that different media frames were associated with mobility changes in Italy. [Huang](#)  
327 [et al. \(2020\)](#) found that Twitter activities may be used to signal mobility dynamics and  
328 evaluate the effectiveness of containment measures during the pandemic. [Liu et al.](#)  
329 [\(2021\)](#) found an inverse U-shaped curvature in the effect of media coverage on the  
330 spread of COVID-19 in China and then mediated by intra-and inter-provincial  
331 population mobility. [Melki et al. \(2020\)](#) demonstrated that media exposure to COVID-  
332 19 news positively relates to people's compliance with prevention measures. [Wu and](#)  
333 [Shen \(2021\)](#) found that using central government media and WeChat is associated with  
334 higher levels of compliance with health behaviors in China, but using local media and

335 Weibo is linked to lower levels of compliance.

336 Third, getting a vaccine or not may also be influenced by the individuals' exposure to  
337 information from different media sources. For instance, [Chan et al. \(2020\)](#) found that  
338 the more discussion of vaccination on social media, the higher vaccine willingness, and  
339 increased vaccination rate. [Chadwick et al. \(2021\)](#) argued that people who gain  
340 information from more different types of media are more likely to be encouraged to get  
341 a vaccine. [Earnshaw et al. \(2020\)](#) found that individuals, who believed conspiracies  
342 about the information from legacy media, are less likely to get a vaccine.

#### 343 **4. Challenges**

##### 344 *4.1 Partisan effects*

345 During the pandemic, some health information from legacy media was not effective in  
346 containing misleading information due to the highly partisan environment. By drawing  
347 attention to the partisan effect during the early outbreak of COVID-19, [Motta et al.](#)  
348 [\(2020\)](#) examined two types of media sources, one for mainstream news like New York  
349 Times or USA Today, and another for conservative media outlets such as Fox News.  
350 The results indicate that, compared to left-leaning media, right-leaning media discussed  
351 more misinformation about COVID-19. Moreover, people who obtained information  
352 from right-leaning media in the early stage were more inclined to believe the untruths  
353 than those who received information from left-leaning media. The COVID-19-related  
354 news from legacy media like the New York Times and Global Times, according to  
355 [Abbas \(2020\)](#), politicized the epidemic to serve the interests and ideologies of the  
356 governments from where they come from. Right-leaning and left-leaning politicians, as  
357 well as the media, have spread polarized information about COVID-19 through media.  
358 [Krawczyk et al. \(2021\)](#) set a sentiment analysis for media coverage of COVID-19 and  
359 found that the pandemic contents cannot be simply categorized as negatively nor  
360 positively polarized, 16% of COVID-19 related news could be classified as highly  
361 polarized.

362 Even though legacy media plays a crucial role in disseminating health information,  
363 several studies have shown that misinformation from different partisan media imposed  
364 a huge impact on individuals' protective behaviors. [Allcott et al. \(2020\)](#) and [Ananyev](#)  
365 [et al. \(2021\)](#) found that there are significant conflicts between Republicans and  
366 Democrats in prevention behaviors like social distancing and wearing masks. [Simonov](#)  
367 [et al. \(2020\)](#) discovered that for every 10% increase in Fox News cable TV ratings, the  
368 tendency to stay at home decreased by 1.3 percentage points. Slanted information,  
369 according to [Zhao et al. \(2020\)](#), can impair containment efforts by influencing people's  
370 behavior. In the United States, right-leaning media followers engaged in fewer COVID-  
371 19-related preventive actions and were involved in more risky behavior than left-  
372 leaning media followers. For example, [Bekalu et al. \(2021\)](#) discovered that republicans

373 who are exposed to conservative media outlets had low trust in the reliability of  
374 scientists' information, while democrats have high confidence in science. Hence, it is  
375 especially essential for authorities to spread unbiased information without partisan  
376 splits during a health crisis. However, [Liu et al. \(2020\)](#) found that people are more  
377 willing to trust the information from the government in China, irrespective of social  
378 media platforms or state-controlled media, which is directly related to their compliance  
379 with health behaviors.

#### 380 *4.2 Infodemics*

381 Not only is the coronavirus causing chaos, but COVID-19-related infodemics, which  
382 are transmitted by individuals or groups with various political or economic motivations.  
383 Infodemics, according to [Su et al. \(2021\)](#), are the deliberate spread of misinformation  
384 and disinformation by the mass media, particularly on social media platforms. [Wang et  
385 al. \(2021a\)](#) found that that the number of users tweeting about COVID-19 health beliefs  
386 was amplifying in an epidemic manner and could partially intensify the infodemic.  
387 According to [Motta et al. \(2020\)](#), social media users are frequently exposed to  
388 misinformation and are prone to believe that public health officials overestimated the  
389 seriousness of the pandemic. People were often influenced by a variety of factors to  
390 spread misleading information COVID-19. [Apuke and Omar \(2021\)](#), for example,  
391 discovered that altruism motivation was the most important factor that determines  
392 COVID-19 fake news sharing. Some scholars have also proven that political ideologies,  
393 racial discrimination, and stigmatization in the media promoted the dissemination of  
394 misinformation in the early phases of the global epidemic ([Wen et al., 2020](#); [Motta et  
395 al., 2020](#); [Cho et al., 2021](#)).

396 Some other studies focus on modeling the predictors of fake news transmission among  
397 social media users such as altruism, unawareness, peer pressure, and also investigate  
398 how ideologies interfere with the spread of information ([Apuke and Omar, 2021](#)). [Bode  
399 and Vraga \(2021\)](#) found that correction behaviors on social media are common and  
400 even across the partisan divides and those with better education are more likely to  
401 engage in correction misinformation. After investigating the usefulness and reliability  
402 of the most popular YouTube videos, [Li et al. \(2020\)](#) found that approximately 33% of  
403 the most popular COVID-19-related YouTube videos included incorrect facts. People  
404 who are driven by self-promotion and entertainment, as well as those with poor self-  
405 regulation, are more likely to disseminate unconfirmed information, according to [Islam  
406 et al. \(2020\)](#). To mitigate the misinformation during the COVID-19 pandemic, [Shirish  
407 \(2021\)](#) believed that economic and media freedom is the most important.

408 Information overload can also be seen as one representative type of infodemics. Social  
409 media exposure has a close relationship with information overload ([Soroya et al., 2021](#);  
410 [Olagoke et al., 2020](#)). According to [Gao et al. \(2020\)](#), there is a substantial prevalence  
411 of mental health issues, which is strongly correlated with frequent social media  
412 exposure during the COVID-19. In addition, three studies found that information and  
413 communication overload is the most important factors that lead to social media fatigue  
414 about COVID-19 information. For example, [Bendau et al. \(2021\)](#) found that the usage

415 of social media was associated with psychological strain such as a higher degree of  
416 unspecific anxiety and depression about COVID-19. [Ball and Wozniak \(2021\)](#) found  
417 differences in information fatigue based on political affiliation such that republicans  
418 and independents scored significantly higher than democrats in information fatigue.  
419 [Solomon et al. \(2021\)](#) discovered that increased television news watching was related  
420 to a heightened risk for PTSD of COVID-19 infections, especially for vulnerable people.

421 The lack of mental health services, the overload of media outlets, and the uncertainty  
422 about the virus are all making the consequences of infodemics even worse. [Su \(2021\)](#)  
423 argued that media organizations paid little attention to how coverage would affect  
424 people's mental health. Therefore, there is an urgent need for media agencies to develop  
425 a fact-based, person-centered, and collaborative response to COVID-19. [Mauri-Ríos](#)  
426 [\(2021\)](#) suggested that it is essential for journalists to receive clear guidelines describing  
427 how to deal with both current and future coverage of COVID-19, or other health crises.  
428 [Gozzi et al. \(2020\)](#) found that public health authorities need to explore more  
429 possibilities of communication channels, such as setting up accounts on social media  
430 platforms.

#### 431 *4.3 Social equality*

432 The stigmatization of social equity during the pandemic has been evidenced. First, the  
433 mental health of ethnic/racial minorities might also be affected as a result of improper  
434 and biased media coverage. Specifically, [Wen et al. \(2020\)](#) suggested that racial  
435 discrimination stemming from the pandemic should be treated as a public health crisis.  
436 [Tsai et al. \(2020\)](#) found that people who rely more on legacy media and higher levels  
437 of trust on social media were positively related to prejudice against Asians. On the  
438 contrary, consuming news from left-leaning media and non-partisan media was linked  
439 to prejudicial attitudes toward Asians. [Cho et al. \(2021\)](#) found that racial prejudice is  
440 the main factor, while the use of social media and partisan cable television further  
441 exacerbated the prejudice. Although African Americans had lower vaccination intention  
442 than other groups, according to [Woko et al. \(2020\)](#), belief in information sources alone  
443 cannot explain the association between race and vaccination willingness. Second,  
444 gender and age also influenced the media exposure to various COVID-19 related  
445 information. [Melki et al. \(2020\)](#) discovered that women are more adept at mediating  
446 perceived knowledge and fear. [Perrotta et al. \(2021\)](#) determined that women showed  
447 higher threat perceptions than men and were more likely to have lower confidence in  
448 the health care system on social media than the man during the pandemic. Also,  
449 COVID-19 infection placed elderly people at the highest risk of serious consequences  
450 ([Perrotta et al., 2021](#)). Therefore, public health organizations should effectively use  
451 strategic health messaging tools to enhance awareness among people from all  
452 socioeconomic and demographic backgrounds.

## 453 **5. Future directions**

### 454 *5.1 Reducing information overload*

455 The existing studies indicated that multiple information sources are significantly  
456 associated with information overload, which can further result in various psychological  
457 and behavioral responses, such as information seeking (Soroya et al., 2021), and  
458 information anxiety (Ball and Wozniak, 2021). Thus, to reduce the effects of  
459 information overload, future studies should consider the relationship between  
460 information anxiety, familiarity with social media channels, and the technostress of  
461 social media use (Ahmad and Amin, 2012). Furthermore, the way social media  
462 messages are organized (e.g., images, language style) is also worth investigating in  
463 future studies. In addition, how personal attributes and motivational factors influence  
464 social media fatigue also remains to be examined in further research, such as a focus on  
465 the influential relationship between different purposes of social media use  
466 (entertainment, self-promotion, information seeking, information sharing) and media  
467 fatigue (Islam et al., 2020). It is also essential to explore how the public responds to the  
468 dissemination of misinformation after ideological involvement by exploring how to  
469 correct and offer more recommendations on self-regulation (Bode et al., 2021). From  
470 the perspective of the research method, in addition to using interviews and retrospective  
471 surveys, future research can conduct control experiments to test whether the factors of  
472 messages (e.g., narrative perspective, references, emotional stance) influence reactance  
473 toward COVID-19 messaging (Soroya et al., 2021).

### 474 *5.2 Applying Artificial Intelligence*

475 Artificial intelligence (AI) can analyze public attitudes in real-time and track changing  
476 public sentiments, using Natural Language Processing (NLP) and Machine Learning  
477 (ML) (Khan et al., 2020). Sentiment analysis uses computational methods to identify  
478 points of view in text, audio, and/or video to determine the author's attitudes toward  
479 the topic under discussion during the pandemic (Hussain and Sheikh, 2021), offering  
480 the opportunity to detect the text polarity and identify trends in public opinion. For  
481 instance, in future studies, sentiment analysis can be performed to assess public  
482 confidence in ongoing vaccine trials in real-time and tap into constructive opinions.  
483 Thus, the AI approach can promote participatory dialogue on vaccine-related issues and  
484 other risk management topics (Ahuja et al., 2020; Hussain et al., 2021). Second, AI  
485 technology can also help disseminate credible information globally and reduce the  
486 spread of disinformation about COVID-19. Future studies should focus on the role of  
487 AI technology in fact-checking media coverage and detect the sources of the viral  
488 spread of fake news, including deceptive and sarcastic language sometimes used by  
489 vaccine skeptics. Also, scholars can use AI-enabled chatbots for information sharing,  
490 fake news verification, and other functions during an epidemic. Specifically, the AI-  
491 enabled chatbot has intelligent outbound call capability, and can actively explore and  
492 rank epidemic information, and conduct intelligent statistics, analysis, and processing.

### 493 *5.3 Enhancing eHealth literacy*

494 Another research avenue that can be looked into is how to improve the public's

495 information literacy skills facing the fact message fatigue, misinformation, and equity  
496 gaps. The concept of eHealth literacy should be included in future work, which is  
497 integrated into the concepts of health and media literacy (Norman and Skinner, 2006).  
498 Future research needs to discuss eHealth Literacy during the pandemic in three ways.  
499 First, the ability of health information acquisition from multiple information resources  
500 should be exploited (Farhan et al., 2020). Second, paying attention to good information  
501 literacy skills is essential, particularly in terms of the impacts of information literacy on  
502 appraisals of information, which can help filter overloaded information such as fake  
503 news and redundant messages (Chong et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2020). Third, developing  
504 training modules to improve eHealth literacy skills such as inviting participants to do a  
505 message deconstruction exercise. Policymakers will be suggested to encourage  
506 communities of color to engage in more social participation and dialogue through media  
507 literacy, to strengthen community capabilities, and to improve political engagement in  
508 response to information inequity (Austin et al., 2021).

509 From a social equity perspective, enhancing literacy on health matters should not leave  
510 behind socially disadvantaged individuals, such as people with disabilities and non-  
511 English speakers (Velasquez et al., 2020; Mein, 2020). Also, future research can  
512 propose solutions to help vulnerable populations gain equitable access to health  
513 information. Previous studies show that there is a digital divide in the contemporary  
514 information environment, and the ongoing pandemic has accentuated information  
515 disparities when many health messages are disseminated primarily on the Internet.  
516 Hence, the expansion of language services and equitable development of advanced  
517 accessible technologies would expand the availability of health networks to vulnerable  
518 populations. Moreover, it is essential to enhance the eHealth literacy of grassroots  
519 communities. People in rural areas can benefit from a community network of village  
520 health volunteers who provide information during the pandemic because they are often  
521 misinformed by social media messages. Therefore, grassroots vaccine campaigns that  
522 meet with community residents through mobile health centers or clinics at non-  
523 traditional sites like shelters will need to be examined in future research (Vicerra, 2021;  
524 Dror et al., 2021).

## 525 **6. Conclusion**

526 To sum up, in this research, we applied a systematic literature review to analyze  
527 individuals' responses to COVID-19 information. The main motive of applying this  
528 methodology is the confidence that the available literature has been thoroughly and  
529 systematically searched. We found that the *Communication* discipline has the most  
530 publications on this topic. Most of the studies are primarily focused on the United States  
531 and China. Regarding the psychological responses, people's perceptions, anxiety, fear,  
532 and conspiracy beliefs have been explored in the literature. We also combed the  
533 behavioral responses to social media and legacy media, such as wearing masks,  
534 mobility changes, and getting vaccinations. Furthermore, we found that some  
535 challenges still exist. First, during the pandemic, some health information from legacy



536 media was not effective in containing misleading information due to the highly partisan  
537 environment. Second, COVID-19-related infodemics are exacerbating the global health  
538 crisis. Third, socially vulnerable populations are unevenly impacted by the COVID-19  
539 information, which in turn misled their psychological and behavioral responses. Finally,  
540 we proposed a series of research agendas for future researchers.

541

## References

- 542 Abbas, A. H. (2020). Politicizing the Pandemic: A Schemata Analysis of COVID-19  
543 News in Two Selected Newspapers. *International Journal for the Semiotics of*  
544 *Law - Revue Internationale de Sémiotique Juridique*.
- 545 Abdekhoda, M., Ranjbaran, F., & Sattari, A. (2021). Information and information  
546 resources in COVID-19: Awareness, control, and prevention. *Journal of*  
547 *Librarianship and Information Science*, 096100062110165.
- 548 Ahuja, A. S., Reddy, V. P., & Marques, O. (2020). Artificial intelligence and  
549 COVID-19: A multidisciplinary approach. *Integrative medicine research*, 9(3).
- 550 Allington, D., Duffy, B., Wessely, S., Dhavan, N., & Rubin, J. (2020). Health-  
551 protective behaviour, social media usage and conspiracy belief during the  
552 COVID-19 public health emergency. *Psychological Medicine*, 1–7.
- 553 Amara, A., Hadj Taieb, M. A., & Ben Aouicha, M. (2021). Multilingual topic  
554 modeling for tracking COVID-19 trends based on Facebook data analysis.  
555 *Applied Intelligence*, 51(5), 3052–3073.
- 556 Ananyev, M., Poyker, M., & Tian, Y. (2021). The safest time to fly: Pandemic  
557 response in the era of Fox News. *Journal of Population Economics*, 34(3), 775–  
558 802.
- 559 Apuke, O. D., & Omar, B. (2021). Fake news and COVID-19: Modelling the  
560 predictors of fake news sharing among social media users. *Telematics and*  
561 *Informatics*, 56, 101475.
- 562 Austin, E. W., Borah, P., & Domgaard, S. (2021). COVID-19 disinformation and  
563 political engagement among communities of color: The role of media literacy.  
564 *The Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review*.
- 565 Ball, H., & Wozniak, T. R. (2021). Why Do Some Americans Resist COVID-19  
566 Prevention Behavior? An Analysis of Issue Importance, Message Fatigue, and  
567 Reactance Regarding COVID-19 Messaging. *Health Communication*, 1–8.
- 568 Bao, Y., Sun, Y., Meng, S., Shi, J., & Lu, L. (2020). 2019-nCoV epidemic: address  
569 mental health care to empower society. *The Lancet*, 395(10224), e37-e38.
- 570 Bekalu, M. A., Dhawan, D., McCloud, R., Pinnamaneni, R., & Viswanath, K.  
571 (2021). Adherence to COVID-19 mitigation measures among American adults:  
572 The need for consistent and unified messaging. *Health Education Research*,  
573 36(2), 178–191.
- 574 Bendau, A., Petzold, M. B., Pyrkosch, L., Mascarell Maricic, L., Betzler, F., Rogoll,  
575 J., Große, J., Ströhle, A., & Plag, J. (2021). Associations between COVID-19

- 576 related media consumption and symptoms of anxiety, depression and COVID-19  
577 related fear in the general population in Germany. *European Archives of*  
578 *Psychiatry and Clinical Neuroscience*, 271(2), 283–291.
- 579 Bisanzio, D., Kraemer, M. U. G., Bogoch, I. I., Brewer, T., Brownstein, J. S., &  
580 Reithinger, R. (2020). Use of Twitter social media activity as a proxy for human  
581 mobility to predict the spatiotemporal spread of COVID-19 at global scale.  
582 *Geospatial Health*, 15(1).
- 583 Bode, L., & Vraga, E. K. (2021). Correction Experiences on Social Media During  
584 COVID-19. *Social Media + Society*, 7(2), 205630512110088.
- 585 Brauner, J. M., Mindermann, S., Sharma, M., Johnston, D., Salvatier, J., Gavenčiak,  
586 T., ... & Kulveit, J. (2021). Inferring the effectiveness of government  
587 interventions against COVID-19. *Science*, 371(6531).
- 588 Chadwick, A., Kaiser, J., Vaccari, C., Freeman, D., Lambe, S., Loe, B. S.,  
589 Vanderslott, S., Lewandowsky, S., Conroy, M., Ross, A. R. N., Innocenti, S.,  
590 Pollard, A. J., Waite, F., Larkin, M., Rosebrock, L., Jenner, L., McShane, H.,  
591 Giubilini, A., Petit, A., & Yu, L.-M. (2021). Online Social Endorsement and  
592 Covid-19 Vaccine Hesitancy in the United Kingdom. *Social Media + Society*,  
593 7(2), 205630512110088.
- 594 Chan, M. S., Jamieson, K. H., & Albarracin, D. (2020). Prospective associations of  
595 regional social media messages with attitudes and actual vaccination: A big data  
596 and survey study of the influenza vaccine in the United States. *Vaccine*, 38(40),  
597 6236–6247.
- 598 Chang, X., Liu, M., Jin, Z., & Wang, J. (2020). Studying on the impact of media  
599 coverage on the spread of COVID-19 in Hubei Province, China. *Math. Biosci.*  
600 *Eng*, 17(4), 3147-3159.
- 601 Chemli, S., Toanoglou, M., & Valeri, M. (2020). The impact of Covid-19 media  
602 coverage on tourist's awareness for future travelling. *Current Issues in Tourism*,  
603 1–8.
- 604 Chen, J., & Wang, Y. (2021). Social Media Use for Health Purposes: Systematic  
605 Review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 23(5), e17917.
- 606 Cho, H., Li, W., Cannon, J., Lopez, R., & Song, C. (Chuck). (2021). Testing three  
607 explanations for stigmatization of people of Asian descent during COVID-19:  
608 Maladaptive coping, biased media use, or racial prejudice? *Ethnicity & Health*,  
609 26(1), 94–109.
- 610 Chong, Y. Y., Cheng, H. Y., Chan, H. Y. L., Chien, W. T., & Wong, S. Y. S. (2020).  
611 COVID-19 pandemic, infodemic and the role of eHealth literacy. *International*  
612 *journal of nursing studies*, 108, 103644.
- 613 Chen, E., Lerman, K., & Ferrara, E. (2020). Tracking social media discourse about  
614 the covid-19 pandemic: Development of a public coronavirus twitter data set.  
615 *JMIR Public Health and Surveillance*, 6(2), e19273.
- 616 Cui, H., & Kertész, J. (2021). Attention dynamics on the Chinese social media Sina  
617 Weibo during the COVID-19 pandemic. *EPJ Data Science*, 10(1), 8.

- 618 Dror, A. A., Morozov, N. G., Layous, E., Mizrachi, M., Daoud, A., Eisenbach, N., ...  
619 & Sela, E. (2021). United by hope, divided by access: country mapping of  
620 COVID-19 information accessibility and its consequences on pandemic  
621 eradication. *Frontiers in Medicine*, 7, 1133.
- 622 Earnshaw, V. A., Eaton, L. A., Kalichman, S. C., Brousseau, N. M., Hill, E. C., &  
623 Fox, A. B. (2020). COVID-19 conspiracy beliefs, health behaviors, and policy  
624 support. *Translational Behavioral Medicine*, 10(4), 850–856.
- 625 Zhou, W., Wang, A., Xia, F., Xiao, Y., & Tang, S. (2020). Effects of media reporting  
626 on mitigating spread of COVID-19 in the early phase of the outbreak. *Math  
627 Biosci Eng*, 17(3), 2693-2707.
- 628 Ahmad, F., Widen, G., & Huvila, I. (2020). The impact of workplace information  
629 literacy on organizational innovation: An empirical study. *International Journal of  
630 Information Management*, 51, 102041.
- 631 Feng, L. X., Jing, S. L., Hu, S. K., Wang, D. F., & Huo, H. F. (2020). Modelling the  
632 effects of media coverage and quarantine on the COVID-19 infections in the UK.  
633 *Math Biosci Eng*, 17(4), 3618-3636.
- 634 Freeman, S., & Eykelbosh, A. (2020). COVID-19 and outdoor safety:  
635 Considerations for use of outdoor recreational spaces. National Collaborating  
636 Centre for Environmental Health .
- 637 Fu, X., & Zhai, W. (2021). Examining the spatial and temporal relationship between  
638 social vulnerability and stay-at-home behaviors in New York City during the  
639 COVID-19 pandemic. *Sustainable cities and society*, 67, 102757.
- 640 Gao, J., Zheng, P., Jia, Y., Chen, H., Mao, Y., Chen, S., Wang, Y., Fu, H., & Dai, J.  
641 (2020). Mental health problems and social media exposure during COVID-19  
642 outbreak. *PLOS ONE*, 15(4), e0231924.
- 643 Gong, X., & Ye, X. (2021). Governors Fighting Crisis: Responses to the COVID-19  
644 Pandemic across US States on Twitter. *The Professional Geographer*, 1-19.
- 645 Gozzi, N., Tizzani, M., Starnini, M., Ciulla, F., Paolotti, D., Panisson, A., & Perra,  
646 N. (2020). Collective Response to Media Coverage of the COVID-19 Pandemic  
647 on Reddit and Wikipedia: Mixed-Methods Analysis. *Journal of Medical Internet  
648 Research*, 22(10), e21597.
- 649 Haouari, F., Hasanain, M., Suwaileh, R., & Elsayed, T. (n.d.). ArCOV-19: The First  
650 Arabic COVID-19 Twitter Dataset with Propagation Networks. 10.
- 651 Huang, X., Li, Z., Jiang, Y., Li, X., & Porter, D. (2020). Twitter reveals human  
652 mobility dynamics during the COVID-19 pandemic. *PloS one*, 15(11), e0241957.
- 653 Hussain, A., & Sheikh, A. (2021). Opportunities for artificial intelligence-enabled  
654 social media analysis of public attitudes toward Covid-19 vaccines. *NEJM  
655 Catalyst Innovations in Care Delivery*, 2(1).
- 656 Hussain, A., Tahir, A., Hussain, Z., Sheikh, Z., Gogate, M., Dashtipour, K., ... &  
657 Sheikh, A. (2021). Artificial intelligence-enabled analysis of public attitudes on

- 658 facebook and twitter toward covid-19 vaccines in the united kingdom and the  
659 united states: Observational study. *Journal of medical Internet research*, 23(4),  
660 e26627.
- 661 Islam, A. K. M. N., Laato, S., Talukder, S., & Sutinen, E. (2020). Misinformation  
662 sharing and social media fatigue during COVID-19: An affordance and cognitive  
663 load perspective. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 159, 120201.  
664 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120201>
- 665 Jin, Y., Austin, L., Vijaykumar, S., Jun, H., & Nowak, G. (2019). Communicating  
666 about infectious disease threats: Insights from public health information officers.  
667 *Public Relations Review*, 45(1), 167-177.
- 668 Khan, R., Shrivastava, P., Kapoor, A., Tiwari, A., & Mittal, A. (2020). Social media  
669 analysis with AI: sentiment analysis techniques for the analysis of twitter covid-  
670 19 data. *J. Critical Rev*, 7(9), 2761-2774.
- 671 Krawczyk, K., Chelkowski, T., Laydon, D. J., Mishra, S., Xifara, D., Flaxman, S., ...  
672 & Bhatt, S. (2021). Quantifying Online News Media Coverage of the COVID-19  
673 Pandemic: Text Mining Study and Resource. *Journal of medical Internet  
674 research*, 23(6), e28253.
- 675 Lee, M., & You, M. (2021). Effects of COVID-19 Emergency Alert Text Messages  
676 on Practicing Preventive Behaviors: Cross-sectional Web-Based Survey in South  
677 Korea. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 23(2), e24165.
- 678 Lee, T., Lee, B. K., & Lee-Geiller, S. (2020). The effects of information literacy on  
679 trust in government websites: Evidence from an online experiment. *International  
680 Journal of Information Management*, 52, 102098.
- 681 Li, H. O.-Y., Bailey, A., Huynh, D., & Chan, J. (2020). YouTube as a source of  
682 information on COVID-19: A pandemic of misinformation? *BMJ Global Health*,  
683 5(5), e002604.
- 684 Liu, N., Chen, Z., & Bao, G. (2021). Role of media coverage in mitigating COVID-  
685 19 transmission: Evidence from China. *Technological Forecasting and Social  
686 Change*, 163, 120435.
- 687 Liu, Q., Zheng, Z., Zheng, J., Chen, Q., Liu, G., Chen, S., Chu, B., Zhu, H.,  
688 Akinwunmi, B., Huang, J., Zhang, C. J. P., & Ming, W.-K. (2020). Health  
689 Communication Through News Media During the Early Stage of the COVID-19  
690 Outbreak in China: Digital Topic Modeling Approach. *Journal of Medical  
691 Internet Research*, 22(4), e19118.
- 692 Lu, X., Park, N. K., & Ahrentzen, S. (2019). Lighting effects on older adults' visual  
693 and nonvisual performance: A systematic review. *Journal of housing for the  
694 elderly*, 33(3), 298-324.
- 695 Mauri-Ríos, M., Ramon-Vegas, X., & Rodríguez-Martínez, R. (2021). Media  
696 coverage of the Covid-19 crisis: Recommendations and proposals for self-  
697 regulation. *El Profesional de La Información*, e290622.
- 698 McInnes, C., & Hornmoen, H. (2018). 'Add Twitter and Stir': The use of Twitter by  
699 public authorities in Norway and UK during the 2014-15 Ebola outbreak.

- 700 Observatorio, 12(2), 23-46.
- 701 Mein, S. A. (2020). COVID-19 and health disparities: the reality of “the Great  
702 Equalizer”. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 35(8), 2439.
- 703 Melki, J., Tamim, H., Hadid, D., Farhat, S., Makki, M., Ghandour, L., & Hitti, E.  
704 (2020). Media Exposure and Health Behavior during Pandemics: The Mediating  
705 Effect of Perceived Knowledge and Fear on Compliance with COVID-19  
706 Prevention Measures. *Health Communication*, 1–11.
- 707 Motta, M., Stecula, D., & Farhart, C. (2020). How Right-Leaning Media Coverage  
708 of COVID-19 Facilitated the Spread of Misinformation in the Early Stages of the  
709 Pandemic in the U.S. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 53(2), 335–342.
- 710 Musselwhite, C., Avineri, E., & Susilo, Y. (2020). Editorial JTH 16–The  
711 Coronavirus Disease COVID-19 and implications for transport and health.  
712 *Journal of Transport & Health*, 16, 100853.
- 713 Ngien, A., & Jiang, S. (2021). The Effect of Social Media on Stress among Young  
714 Adults during COVID-19 Pandemic: Taking into Account Fatalism and Social  
715 Media Exhaustion. *Health Communication*, 1–8.
- 716 Niburski, K., & Niburski, O. (2020). Impact of Trump’s Promotion of Unproven  
717 COVID-19 Treatments on Social Media and Subsequent Internet Trends:  
718 Observational Study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 22(11), e20044.
- 719 Niu, Z., Qin, Z., Hu, P., & Wang, T. (2021). Health Beliefs, Trust in Media Sources,  
720 Health Literacy, and Preventive Behaviors among High-Risk Chinese for  
721 COVID-19. *Health Communication*, 1–9.
- 722 Norman, C. D., & Skinner, H. A. (2006). eHealth literacy: essential skills for  
723 consumer health in a networked world. *Journal of medical Internet research*, 8(2),  
724 e506.
- 725 Oh, S. H., Lee, S. Y., & Han, C. (2021). The effects of social media use on  
726 preventive behaviors during infectious disease outbreaks: The mediating role of  
727 self-relevant emotions and public risk perception. *Health communication*, 36(8),  
728 972-981.
- 729 Olagoke, A. A., Olagoke, O. O., & Hughes, A. M. (2020). Exposure to coronavirus  
730 news on mainstream media: the role of risk perceptions and depression. *British  
731 journal of health psychology*, 25(4), 865-874.
- 732 Onuora, C., Torti Obasi, N., Ezeah, G. H., & Gever, V. C. (2021). Effect of  
733 dramatized health messages: Modelling predictors of the impact of COVID-19  
734 YouTube animated cartoons on health behaviour of social media users in Nigeria.  
735 *International Sociology*, 36(1), 124–140.
- 736 Ophir, Y. (2019). The effects of news coverage of epidemics on public support for  
737 and compliance with the CDC—An experimental study. *Journal of health  
738 communication*, 24(5), 547-558.
- 739 Ophir, Y., & Jamieson, K. H. (2020). The effects of Zika virus risk coverage on  
740 familiarity, knowledge and behavior in the US—A time series analysis combining  
741 content analysis and a nationally representative survey. *Health communication*,

- 742 35(1), 35-45.
- 743 Ophir, Y., Walter, D., Arnon, D., Lokmanoglu, A., Tizzoni, M., Carota, J., D'Antiga,  
744 L., & Nicastro, E. (2021). The Framing of COVID-19 in Italian Media and Its  
745 Relationship with Community Mobility: A Mixed-Method Approach. *Journal of*  
746 *Health Communication*, 26(3), 161–173.
- 747 Patrick, M. D., Stukus, D. R., & Nuss, K. E. (2019). Using podcasts to deliver  
748 pediatric educational content: development and reach of PediaCast CME. *Digital*  
749 *health*, 5, 2055207619834842.
- 750 Perrotta, D., Grow, A., Rampazzo, F., Cimentada, J., Del Fava, E., Gil-Clavel, S., &  
751 Zagheni, E. (2021). Behaviours and attitudes in response to the COVID-19  
752 pandemic: Insights from a cross-national Facebook survey. *EPJ Data Science*,  
753 10(1), 17.
- 754 Pulido, C. M., Villarejo-Carballido, B., Redondo-Sama, G., & Gómez, A. (2020).  
755 COVID-19 infodemic: More retweets for science-based information on  
756 coronavirus than for false information. *International Sociology*, 35(4), 377-392.
- 757 Sesagiri Raamkumar, A., Tan, S. G., & Wee, H. L. (2020). Use of Health Belief  
758 Model–Based Deep Learning Classifiers for COVID-19 Social Media Content to  
759 Examine Public Perceptions of Physical Distancing: Model Development and  
760 Case Study. *JMIR Public Health and Surveillance*, 6(3), e20493.
- 761 Shirish, A., Srivastava, S. C., & Chandra, S. (2021). Impact of mobile connectivity  
762 and freedom on fake news propensity during the COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-  
763 country empirical examination. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 30(3),  
764 322–341.
- 765 Shoemaker, P. J., & Vos, T. (2009). *Gatekeeping theory*. Routledge.
- 766 Sleight, J., Amann, J., Schneider, M., & Vayena, E. (2021). Qualitative analysis of  
767 visual risk communication on twitter during the Covid-19 pandemic. *BMC*  
768 *Public Health*, 21(1), 810. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-10851-4>
- 769 Simonov, A., Sacher, S. K., Dubé, J. P. H., & Biswas, S. (2020). The persuasive  
770 effect of fox news: non-compliance with social distancing during the covid-19  
771 pandemic (No. w27237). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- 772 Solomon, Z., Ginzburg, K., Ohry, A., & Mikulincer, M. (2021). Overwhelmed by the  
773 news: A longitudinal study of prior trauma, posttraumatic stress disorder  
774 trajectories, and news watching during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Social Science*  
775 *& Medicine*, 278, 113956.
- 776 Soroya, S. H., Farooq, A., Mahmood, K., Isoaho, J., & Zara, S. E. (2021). From  
777 information seeking to information avoidance: Understanding the health  
778 information behavior during a global health crisis. *Information processing &*  
779 *management*, 58(2), 102440.
- 780 Su, Z., McDonnell, D., Wen, J., Kozak, M., Abbas, J., Šegalo, S., Li, X., Ahmad, J.,  
781 Cheshmehzangi, A., Cai, Y., Yang, L., & Xiang, Y.-T. (2021). Mental health  
782 consequences of COVID-19 media coverage: The need for effective crisis  
783 communication practices. *Globalization and Health*, 17(1), 4.

- 784 Tang, Z., Miller, A. S., Zhou, Z., & Warkentin, M. (2021). Does government social  
785 media promote users' information security behavior towards COVID-19 scams?  
786 Cultivation effects and protective motivations. *Government Information*  
787 *Quarterly*, 38(2), 101572.
- 788 Tizzoni M, Panisson A, Paolotti D, Cattuto C (2020).The impact of news exposure  
789 on collective attention in the United States during the 2016 Zika epidemic. *PLoS*  
790 *Comput Biol* 16(3): e1007633.
- 791 Tsai, J.-Y., Phua, J., Pan, S., & Yang, C. (2020). Intergroup Contact, COVID-19  
792 News Consumption, and the Moderating Role of Digital Media Trust on  
793 Prejudice Toward Asians in the United States: Cross-Sectional Study. *Journal of*  
794 *Medical Internet Research*, 22(9), e22767.
- 795 Velasquez, D., Uppal, N., & Perez, N. (2020). Equitable access to health information  
796 for non-English speakers amidst the novel coronavirus pandemic. *Health affairs*  
797 *blog*.
- 798 Vicerra, P. M. M. (2021). Knowledge-Behavior gap on COVID-19 among older  
799 people in rural Thailand. *Gerontology and Geriatric Medicine*, 7,  
800 2333721421997207.
- 801 Wang, H., Li, Y., Hutch, M., Naidech, A., & Luo, Y. (2021a). Using Tweets to  
802 Understand How COVID-19–Related Health Beliefs Are Affected in the Age of  
803 Social Media: Twitter Data Analysis Study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*,  
804 23(2), e26302.
- 805 Wang, Y., Hao, H., & Platt, L. S. (2021b). Examining risk and crisis communications  
806 of government agencies and stakeholders during early-stages of COVID-19 on  
807 Twitter. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 114, 106568.
- 808 Weick, K. E. (1988). Enacted sensemaking in crisis situations. *Journal of*  
809 *management studies*, 25(4), 305-317.
- 810 Wen, J., Aston, J., Liu, X., & Ying, T. (2020). Effects of misleading media coverage  
811 on public health crisis: A case of the 2019 novel coronavirus outbreak in China.  
812 *Anatolia*, 31(2), 331–336.
- 813 Woko, C., Siegel, L., & Hornik, R. (2020). An Investigation of Low COVID-19  
814 Vaccination Intentions among Black Americans: The Role of Behavioral Beliefs  
815 and Trust in COVID-19 Information Sources. *Journal of Health Communication*,  
816 25(10), 819–826.
- 817 Wu, Y., & Shen, F. (2021). Exploring the impacts of media use and media trust on  
818 health behaviors during the COVID-19 pandemic in China. *Journal of Health*  
819 *Psychology*, 1359105321995964
- 820 Younis, J., Freitag, H., Ruthberg, J. S., Romanes, J. P., Nielsen, C., & Mehta, N.  
821 (2020). Social Media as an Early Proxy for Social Distancing Indicated by the  
822 COVID-19 Reproduction Number: Observational Study. *JMIR Public Health and*  
823 *Surveillance*, 6(4), e21340.
- 824 Zhao, E., Wu, Q., Crimmins, E. M., & Ailshire, J. A. (2020). Media trust and  
825 infection mitigating behaviours during the COVID-19 pandemic in the USA.

- 826 BMJ Global Health, 5(10), e003323.
- 827 Zhang, L., Brikell, I., Dalsgaard, S., & Chang, Z. (2021). Public mobility and social  
828 media attention in response to Covid-19 in Sweden and Denmark. JAMA  
829 network open, 4(1), e2033478-e2033478.
- 830 Zhou, W., Wang, A., Xia, F., Xiao, Y., & Tang, S. (2020). Effects of media reporting  
831 on mitigating spread of COVID-19 in the early phase of the outbreak. Math  
832 Biosci Eng, 17(3), 2693-2707
- 833 Zhai, W., & Peng, Z. R. (2021). Where to buy a house in the United States amid  
834 COVID-19?. Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space, 53(1), 9-11.
- 835 Zhai, W., Liu, M., & Peng, Z. R. (2021a). Social distancing and inequality in the  
836 United States amid COVID-19 outbreak. Environment and Planning A: Economy  
837 and Space, 53(1), 3-5.
- 838 Zhai, W., Liu, M., Fu, X., & Peng, Z. R. (2021b). American Inequality Meets  
839 COVID-19: Uneven Spread of the Disease across Communities. Annals of the  
840 American Association of Geographers, 1-21.
- 841 Zhai, W., Fu, X., Liu, M., & Peng, Z. R. (2021c). The impact of ethnic segregation  
842 on neighbourhood-level social distancing in the United States amid the early  
843 outbreak of COVID-19. Urban Studies, 00420980211050183.
- 844 Zhai, W., & Yue, H. (2021). Economic resilience during COVID-19: An insight from  
845 permanent business closures. Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space,  
846 0308518X211055181.



Appendix 1.

No.	Author	Year	Media	Response	Study area (Country)	Journal
1	Abdekhoda et al.	2021	Social Media, Legacy Media	Behavioral Response, Psychological Response	Iran	Journal of Librarianship and Information Science
2	Abbas	2020	Legacy Media	Psychological Response	China and United States	International Journal for the Semiotics of Law
3	Allington et al.	2020	Social Media, Legacy Media	Behavioral Response, Psychological Response	United Kingdom	Psychological Medicine
4	Amara et al.	2021	Social Media	Behavioral Response	Arabic, France, Germany, Italy, Japan., Spain, United Kingdom.	Applied Intelligence
5	Ananyev et al.	2021	Social Media, Legacy Media	Behavioral Response	United States	Journal of Population Economics
6	Apuke and Omar	2021	Social Media	Behavioral Response, Psychological Response	Nigeria	Telematics and Informatics
7	Ball and Wozniak	2021	Legacy Media	Behavioral Response, Psychological Response	United States	Social Media + Society
8	Bekalu et al.	2021	Social Media, Legacy Media	Behavioral Response, Psychological Response	United States	Health Education Research
9	Bendau et al.	2021	Social Media, Legacy Media	Psychological Response	Germany	European Archives of Psychiatry and Clinical Neuroscience
10	Bisanzio et al.	2020	Social Media	Behavioral Response	Global	Geospatial Health
11	Bode and Vraga	2021	Social Media	Behavioral Response	United States	Social Media + Society
12	Chadwick et al.	2021	Social Media, Legacy Media	Behavioral Response, Psychological Response	United Kingdom	Social Media + Society
13	Chang et al.	2020	Social Media, Legacy Media	Behavioral Response	China	Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering

14	Chemli et al.	2020	Social Media, Legacy Media	Psychological Response	China, France, Greece, Italy, South Korea, Spain, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Uzbekistan.	Current Issues in Tourism
15	Chen et al.	2020	Social Media	Behavioral Response	Global	JMIR Public Health and Surveillance
16	Cho et al.	2021	Social Media, Legacy Media	Behavioral Response, Psychological Response	United States	Ethnicity & Health
17	Cui and Kertész	2021	Social Media	Behavioral Response, Psychological Response	China	EPJ Data Science
18	Earnshaw et al.	2020	Social Media, Legacy Media	Behavioral Response, Psychological Response	United States	Translational Behavioral Medicine
19	Feng et al.	2020	Social Media, Legacy Media	Behavioral Response	United Kingdom	Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering
20	Gao et al.	2020	Social Media	Psychological Response	United Kingdom	PloS one
21	Gozzi et al.	2020	Social Media	Behavioral Response, Psychological Response	Canada, Italy, United Kingdom, United States.	Journal of Medical Internet Research
22	Huang et al.	2020	Social Media	Behavioral Response	Global	PloS one
23	Islam et al.	2020	Social Media	Psychological Response	Bangladesh	Technological Forecasting & Social Change
24	Krawczyk et al.	2021	Social Media, Legacy Media	Behavioral Response, Psychological Response	Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, New Zealand, Russia, Spain, United Kingdom, United States	Journal of Medical Internet Research
25	Lee and You	2021	Social Media	Behavioral Response	South Korea	Journal of Medical Internet Research
26	Li et al.	2020	Social Media	Psychological Response	Global	BMJ Global Health
27	Liu et al.	2021	Social Media, Legacy Media	Behavioral Response	China	Technological Forecasting & Social Change
28	Liu et al.	2020	Legacy Media	Behavioral Response, Psychological Response	China	Journal of Medical Internet Research

29	Mauri-Ríos et al.	2021	Social Media, Legacy Media	Behavioral Response, Psychological Response	Global	Profesional de la Información
30	Melki et al.	2020	Social Media, Legacy Media	Behavioral Response, Psychological Response	Lebanon	Health Communication
31	Motta et al.	2020	Legacy Media	Psychological Response	United States	Canadian Journal of Political Science
32	Ngien and Jiang	2021	Social Media	Behavioral Response	China	Health Communication
33	Niburski and Niburski	2020	Social Media	Behavioral Response	Global	Journal of Medical Internet Research
34	Niu et al.	2021	Social Media, Legacy Media	Behavioral Response, Psychological Response	China	Health Communication
35	Olagoke et al.	2020	Legacy Media	Psychological Response	United States	British Journal of Health Psychology
36	Onuora et al.	2021	Social Media	Behavioral Response, Psychological Response	Nigeria	International Sociology
37	Ophir et al.	2021	Legacy Media	Behavioral Response	Italy	Journal of Health Communication
38	Perrotta et al.	2021	Social Media	Behavioral Response, Psychological Response	Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Spain, United Kingdom, United States.	EPJ Data Science
39	Raamkumar et al.	2020	Social Media	Behavioral Response, Psychological Response	Singapore	JMIR Public Health and Surveillance
40	Shirish et al.	2021	Social Media, Legacy Media	Psychological Response	Global	European Journal of Information Systems
41	Sleigh et al.	2021	Social Media	Behavioral Response	Global	BMC Public Health
42	Solomon et al.	2021	Legacy Media	Psychological Response	Israeli	Social Science & Medicine
43	Soroya et al.	2021	Social Media, Legacy Media	Behavioral Response, Psychological Response	Finland	Information Processing and Management
44	Su et al.	2021	Social Media, Legacy Media	Psychological Response	Global	Globalization and Health

45	Tang et al.	2021	Social Media	Behavioral Response	China	Government Information Quarterly
46	Tsai et al.	2021	Social Media, Legacy Media	Behavioral Response, Psychological Response	United States	Journal of Medical Internet Research
47	Wang et al.	2021a	Social Media	Psychological Response	Global	Journal of Medical Internet Research
48	Wang et al.	2021b	Social Media	Behavioral Response, Psychological Response	United States	Computers in Human Behavior
50	Wen et al.	2020	Social Media	Behavioral Response, Psychological Response	Global	An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research
49	Woko et al.	2020	Social Media, Legacy Media	Behavioral Response, Psychological Response	United States	Journal of Health Communication
51	Wu and Shen	2021	Social Media, Legacy Media	Behavioral Response	China	Journal of Health Psychology
52	Younis et al.	2020	Social Media	Behavioral Response	United States	JMIR Public Health and Surveillance
53	Zhang et al.	2021	Social Media	Behavioral Response	Sweden and Demark	JAMA Network Open
54	Zhao et al.	2020	Legacy Media	Behavioral Response	United States	BMJ Global Health
55	Zhou et al.	2020	Legacy Media	Behavioral Response	China	Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering