

Emotional overeating affected nine in ten female students during the COVID-19 University closure: A cross-sectional study in France

1 Aymery Constant^{1,2,¶}, Alexandra Fortier^{1,¶}, Yann Serrand¹, Elise Bannier^{3,4}, Romain
2 Moirand^{1,5}, Ronan Thibault^{1,6}, Nicolas Coquery¹, Ambre Godet^{1,&}, David Val-Laillet^{1,&,*}

3

4 ¹ INRAE, INSERM, Univ Rennes, CHU Rennes, Nutrition Metabolisms and Cancer, NuMeCan,
5 Rennes, France

6 ² EHESP, School of Public Health, Rennes, France

7 ³ Inria, CRNS, Inserm, IRISA UMR 6074, Empenn U1228, Univ Rennes, Rennes, France

8 ⁴ CHU Rennes, Radiology Department, Rennes, France

9 ⁵ Unité d'Addictologie, CHU Rennes, Rennes, France

10 ⁶ Unité de Nutrition, CHU Rennes, Rennes, France

11

12 [¶] These authors have contributed equally to this work.

13 [&] These authors also contributed equally to this work.

14 * Corresponding author

15 E-mail: david.val-laillet@inrae.fr (DVL)

16 **Keywords: emotion, COVID-19, overeating, female students, coping**

17 **Abstract**

18 *Objectives:* To estimate the proportion of female university students reporting overeating (EO) in
19 response to emotions during the COVID-19 university closures, and to investigate social and
20 psychological factors associated with this response to stress.

21 *Design:* Online survey gathered sociodemographic data, alcohol/drugs use disorders, boredom
22 proneness and impulsivity using validated questionnaires, and EO using the Emotional Overeating
23 Questionnaire (EOQ) assessing eating in response to six emotions (anxiety, sadness, loneliness, anger,
24 fatigue, happiness), whose structure remains to be determined.

25 *Participants:* Sample of 302 female students from Rennes University, France.

26 *Main Outcome Measure:* Frequencies of emotional overeating.

27 *Analysis:* The frequency of emotional overeating was expressed for each emotion as percentages.
28 Exploratory Factor analyses (EFA) were used to determine EOQ structure and provide an index of all
29 EOQ items used for further analysis. Linear regression models were used to explore relationships
30 between EO and others covariates.

31 *Results:* Nine in ten participants reported intermittent EO in the last 28 days, mostly during 6 to 12
32 days, in response to Anxiety (75.5%), Sadness (64.5%), Happiness (59.9%), Loneliness (57.9%),
33 Tiredness (51.7%), and to a lesser extent to Anger (31.1%). EFA evidenced a one-factor latent variable
34 reflecting “Distress-Induced Overeating” positively correlated with internal boredom proneness,
35 tobacco use, attentional impulsivity, inability to resist emotional cues, and loss of control over food
36 intake, and negatively with age and well-being. EO was unrelated to body mass index or substance
37 abuse.

38 *Conclusion and Implications:* Nine in ten female students reported emotional overeating during the
39 COVID-19 university closure. This response to stress was related to eating tendencies typical of young
40 women, but also to personality/behavioral patterns such as boredom and impulsivity proneness. Better
41 understanding of the mechanisms underlying EO in response to stress and lack of external/social
42 stimulation would improve preventive interventions.

43

44 **Introduction**

45 Studying at a university is a period of socialization for young adults, and studies show that contacts
46 with others positively influence well-being [1]. But in the early stages of the COVID-19 crisis,
47 universities and other educational establishments switched from classroom to online teaching,
48 precluding social/external stimulations and support. Apart from a short period between September and
49 October 2021, universities across France remained fully closed between March 2020 and August 2021,
50 and students were already vulnerable to mental health problems [2, 3] when they had to face this
51 unprecedented situation, which drastically changed their social and professional lives [4, 5]. As a result,
52 French students showed higher depressive symptoms than non-students during the first national
53 lockdown (March-May 2020), comparable rates during the easing phase (August-October 2020), and
54 again dramatic increases during the second lockdown (October-December 2020).

55 When individuals have difficulty adapting to stressful situations, they may display coping responses
56 susceptible to jeopardize their health and well-being [6], such as addictive and other maladaptive
57 behaviours [7]. In France, The COVID-19 pandemic and lockdown resulted in frequent and mostly
58 unhealthy changes in lifestyle among the general population, but addictive behaviour such as drinking
59 and smoking remained under control [8, 9]. When it comes to eating habits, however, findings from a
60 systematic review of 23 studies indicated a shift towards modified eating behaviours, characterized by
61 an increased snack frequency and a preference for sweets and ultra-processed food rather than fruits,
62 vegetables, and fresh food [10]. Changes in eating habits amid stressful situations may be related to
63 “emotional eating”, traditionally defined as (over)eating in response to negative emotions [11]. This
64 behaviour may occur as a time-limited response to emotions in individuals without clinical condition
65 [12], but may also correlate with binge frequency, eating disorder features, and depression. From a

66 clinical perspective, emotional eating has received increasing attention, particularly because a negative
67 emotional state is the most widely reported antecedent to binge eating episodes [11].

68 Young women could have been particularly vulnerable to emotional overeating during the COVID-19
69 crisis. Firstly, they were more likely to report the negative impacts of COVID-19 on stress levels to be
70 very much or an extreme amount compared to males, whereas males were more likely to report the
71 negative impacts to be not at all or a little compared to females [13]. Secondly, research suggests a
72 gender difference in stress-related eating, with women choosing more palatable food [14, 15] and being
73 more prone than men to turn to food for psychological comfort rather than physiological need [16-18].
74 Thirdly, women have genetic predisposition for higher impulsivity and higher reward sensitivity,
75 which are associated with dopamine dysregulation during comfort eating [19]. Impulsivity could be
76 defined as a predisposition toward rapid, unplanned reactions to internal or external stimuli without
77 regard to the negative consequences of these reactions [20], which has been found associated with
78 stress eating [21, 22]. Finally, young women are more likely than men to eat while bored, especially
79 when boredom-prone [23], and a review suggested that quarantine, reduced social and physical
80 contacts with others were frequently shown to cause boredom (Brooks et al., 2020). Altogether, as
81 women were more likely to report social isolation as being difficult or very difficult compared to men
82 during the COVID-19 crisis, [13], the COVID-19 university closures may have increased emotional
83 eating in female students, particularly among those prone to boredom and/or impulsivity.

84 Characterizing emotional overeating during the COVID-19 pandemic university closure is of
85 importance, since this coping response could further lead to addictive and health problems [24]. We
86 chose female students as the sample of interest since they share personality/behavioural patterns that
87 could increase the likelihood of emotional overeating during the COVID-19 university closures. The
88 specific objectives of our study were to estimate the proportion of female university students reporting

89 overeating (EO) in response to emotions during the COVID-19 university closures, and to investigate
90 social and psychological factors associated with this response to stress.

91 **Materials and methods**

92 **Participants and procedure**

93 To meet the study objectives, we conducted an online survey between February and May 2021. Female
94 students from the University of Rennes (France) aged 18-24 years who responded to a call for
95 volunteers *via* students' mailing lists were eligible. A study number was attributed to each participant
96 for pseudonymisation in a secured database to ensure confidentiality, as email addresses and personal
97 information were recorded in a separate file in a locked computer. Only two researchers implicated in
98 the study had access to the secured file, which was not accessible for the researcher who performed
99 data analyses. In order to obtain consent, participants agreed to participate in the study by sending us
100 an e-mail of acceptance, and then they received their pseudonymisation number and the link to
101 complete the questionnaire. This reply email was then deleted. After free and informed written consent,
102 participants completed questionnaires assessing psychological and behavioural variables, together with
103 sociodemographic characteristics such as age (in year), weight (in kg), height (in cm), tobacco use
104 (never, occasional, regular), and housing (living alone, with a partner, family or with roommates). The
105 INRAE data protection agent approved the declaration of conformity of this online questionnaire study,
106 which was used for the selection of volunteers to be included in a laboratory neurocognitive study
107 conducted in the Rennes University Hospital and approved by an independent national research ethics
108 committee under the supervision of the French Ministry of Higher Education, Research and Innovation
109 (Comité de Protection des Personnes "Ile de France XI", project N°21.02859.000020-21071; N°ID-

110 RCB/EUDRACT 2021-A02314-37; National Clinical Trial number: NCT05200182). This study was
111 conducted in accordance of the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki.

112 **Measures**

113 *Frequency of overeating episodes in response to emotions*

114 The Emotional Overeating Questionnaire (EOQ) is a six-item self-report questionnaire that assesses
115 frequency of overeating episodes in response to six emotions, namely anxiety, sadness, loneliness,
116 tiredness, anger, and happiness , previously used in a French study [25]. Its factor structure in French
117 young women remains however to be determined using Exploratory Factor analyses (EFA). Each item
118 begins with, “Have you eaten an unusually large amount of food given the circumstances in response
119 to feelings of (...)”. Each of the six emotions is presented in all capital letters, followed by three more
120 synonyms in parentheses and in lower case. The response set for the six items is a 7-point scale
121 reflecting the frequency of days on which the behaviour occurred in the past 28 days (*i.e.*, 0= no days,
122 1= 1–5 days, 2= 6–12 days, 3= 13–15 days, 4= 16–22 days, 5= 23–27 days, and 6= every day).

123 *Alcohol or Substance abuse*

124 The CRAFFT Screening Test consists of a series of six questions developed to screen adolescents for
125 high-risk alcohol and other drug use disorders [26, 27]. It is a short, effective screening tool meant to
126 assess whether a longer conversation about the context of use, frequency, and other risks and
127 consequences of alcohol and other drug use is warranted. The questions are the following. 1) Have you
128 ever ridden in a car driven by someone (including yourself) who was "high" or had been using alcohol
129 or drugs? 2) Do you ever use alcohol or drugs to relax, feel better about yourself, or fit in? 3) Do you
130 ever use alcohol/drugs while you are by yourself, alone? 4) Do you ever forget things you did while
131 using alcohol or drugs? 5) Do your family or friends ever tell you that you should cut down on your

132 drinking or drug use? 6) Have you gotten into trouble while you were using alcohol or drugs? A score
133 of two positive answers or above indicates a potential drug issue. Diagnostic threshold for regular
134 substance use in the French version of the CRAFFT was fixed at two positive answers with a sensitivity
135 of 90.3 % and a specificity of 77.7 %

136 ***Boredom Proneness***

137 The Boredom Proneness Scale (BPS) was developed by Farmer and Sundberg as a measure of the
138 tendency to become bored. In the French validation study, factorial analyses yielded a two-factor
139 structure including 26 items out of 28 . The boredom proneness (BP) due to a lack of internal
140 stimulation, or “internal BP” subscale includes 14 items related to one’s inability to generate interesting
141 activities, while the boredom proneness due to a lack of external stimulation, or “external BP” subscale
142 includes 12 items related to the perception of low environmental/social stimulation. Internal-
143 consistency reliability coefficients (Cronbach's α) for each of the two scales were above the 0.70
144 standard ($\alpha = 0.78$ and 0.77 , respectively). These two dimensions found support in the majority of
145 studies on BP.

146 ***Impulsivity***

147 The Barratt Impulsiveness Scale (BIS) is a 30-item self-report scale that is commonly used to measure
148 impulsiveness and was validated in French [28]. Participants responded to each item using a 4-point
149 frequency scale: 1 (rarely/never), 2 (occasionally), 3 (often), and 4 (almost always/always). Factor
150 analysis revealed six primary factors of the scale: 1) attention (*e.g.*, “I am restless at the theatre or
151 lectures”), 2) motor impulsiveness (*e.g.*, “I do things without thinking”), 3) self-control (*e.g.*, “I say
152 things without thinking”), 4), cognitive complexity (*e.g.*, “I get easily bored when solving thought
153 problems”), 5) perseverance (*e.g.*, “I change jobs”), and 6) cognitive instability (*e.g.*, “I have ‘racing’
154 thoughts”). Three secondary factors have been identified: attentional impulsiveness (mixture of

155 primary factors 1 and 6), motor impulsiveness (mixture of primary factors 2 and 5), and non-planning
156 impulsiveness (mixture of primary factors 3 and 4). Internal-consistency reliability coefficients
157 (Cronbach's α) for each of the three secondary factors were 0.70, 0.69 and 0.67, respectively.
158 Attentional impulsiveness is defined as the difficulty focusing on a task at hand, motor (or behavioural)
159 impulsiveness is defined as acting without thinking or on the spur of the moment, while non-planning
160 impulsivity is characterized as present-moment focus without regard for future consequences.

161

162 ***Well-being***

163 The World Health Organization Well-Being Index (WHO-5) is a 5-item questionnaire assessing
164 subjective psychological well-being in research and clinical settings, and available in 30 languages
165 including French. The WHO-5 consists of five statements, which respondents rate according to a
166 frequency scale (0 = at no time; 5 = all the time) indicative of positive mood (good spirits, relaxation),
167 vitality (being active and waking up fresh and rested), and general interest (being interested in things).
168 Item response theory analyses in studies of younger persons and elderly persons indicate that the
169 measure has good construct validity as a unidimensional scale measuring well-being in these
170 populations (Winther Topp et al., 2015). The total raw score, ranging from 0 to 25, is multiplied by 4
171 to give the final score, with 0 representing the worst imaginable well-being and 100 representing the
172 best imaginable well-being. A score below 50 can indicate poor well-being which may be secondary
173 to a depressive disorder or other etiology and is an indication for further evaluation

174 ***Cognitive and behavioural components of eating***

175 The Three-Factor Eating Questionnaire Revised, 18-item (TFEQ-R18) measures cognitive and
176 behavioural components of eating . It includes three subscales: (1) Cognitive Restraint (conscious

177 restriction of food intake in order to control body weight or to promote weight loss) comprised of six
178 items (e.g., “I consciously hold back at meals in order not to gain weight), (2) Uncontrolled Eating
179 (tendency to eat more than usual due to a loss of control over intake accompanied by subjective feelings
180 of hunger), comprised of nine items (e.g., “When I see a real delicacy, I often get so hungry that I have
181 to eat right away”), and (3) Emotional Eating (inability to resist emotional cues), comprised of three
182 items (e.g., “When I feel blue, I often overeat”). Internal-consistency reliability coefficients
183 (Cronbach's α) for each of the three scales were above the 0.70 standard and below the 0.90 limit
184 recommended for individual assessment. Responses are scored on a 4-point scale and anchors can vary
185 across items (e.g., definitely true to definitely false, or never to at least once a week). The raw scale
186 scores are transformed to a 0–100 scale. Higher scores in the respective scales are indicative of greater
187 cognitive restraint, uncontrolled, or emotional eating.

188 **Statistical analyses**

189 Categorical data were expressed as numbers (N) and percentages (%). Numerical data were expressed
190 as means (M) and standard deviations (\pm SD). An exploratory factor analysis was performed on the
191 EOQ items using an Unweighted Least-Square factor analysis. This method was found to provide
192 accurate and conservative parameter estimates when using ordinal data. Factor analysis was followed
193 by a Promax rotation, a non-orthogonal (oblique) solution in which the factors are allowed to be
194 correlated. This item reduction method established which of the 6 items in EOQ belonged to latent
195 domains or conceptual areas and which items should be maintained in factor scores. Factor scores are
196 composite linear variables which provide information about an individual's placement on the factor(s),
197 and can be used as an index of EOQ items for further analysis. Since our study outcome was a linear
198 variable (factor score), we used a generalized linear regression model to estimate the strength of the
199 association between emotional overeating and each covariate (univariate analysis). In order to

200 determine variables independently associated with EO, all variables that demonstrated an association
201 with $p < 0.05$ in the univariate analysis were considered as candidate variables in the multiple linear
202 regression model. The goodness of fit of the multivariate model was assessed using the Value/df for
203 the Deviance statistics. Statistical analyses were performed using the SPSS statistical package, version
204 19 (SPSS, Chicago, Illinois, United States).

205

206 **Results**

207 **Descriptive analysis**

208 Survey questionnaires were filled by 320 university women students between February and May 2021,
209 but 18 (4.8%) were rejected because of missing data in EOQ. The 302 remaining respondents were
210 aged 20.9 years on average (**Table 1**), with a minority living alone (37.4%). The mean Body Mass
211 Index (\pm SD) was 21.7 ± 3.4 , and most of participants were normal-weight students (75.8%) while 11.3%
212 were underweight and 12.9 % had overweight/obesity. Standardized subscales mean scores (ranging
213 from 0 to 100) of the TFEQ-R18 were 37.0 ± 24.4 for Cognitive Restraint, 43.1 ± 22.4 for Uncontrolled
214 Eating, and 55.5 ± 30.9 for Emotional Eating. Boredom Proneness (BP) Standardized subscales mean
215 scores were 29.2 ± 20.8 for internal and 44.9 ± 21 for external BP, while Barratt Impulsiveness Scale
216 (BIS) Standardized subscales mean scores were 39.9 ± 15.5 for attentional, 28.4 ± 10.1 for motor, and
217 37.9 ± 13.12 for non-planning impulsivity.

218

Table 1. Characteristics of the respondents (N=302).

| Variables | N (%) |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| Age | 20.9±1.8 |
| Living condition | |
| Flatshare | 61 (20.2) |
| In family | 74 (24.5) |
| In couple | 54 (17.9) |
| Alone | 113 (37.4) |
| BMI (mean±SD) | 21.7±3.4 |
| Weight status (BMI) | |
| Obesity (>30) | 8 (2.6) |
| Overweight (25-29.9) | 31 (10.3) |
| Normal (18-24.9) | 229 (75.8) |
| Underweight (<18) | 34 (11.3) |
| Tobacco use | 40 (13.2) |
| Boredom proneness (range 0-100) † | |
| Internal | 29.2±20.8 |
| External | 44.9±21.2 |
| Impulsivity (range 0-100) † | |
| Attentional | 39.9±15.5 |
| Motor | 28.4 ± 10.1 |
| Non planning | 37.9±13.1 |
| WHO Well-being score (range 0 -100) | 55.8±19.8 |
| Alcohol/Substance abuse (CRAFTT) | 44 (14.6) |
| Components of Eating (TFEQ-R18)† | |
| Cognitive restraint | 37.0±24.4 |
| Uncontrolled eating | 43.1±22.4 |
| Emotional eating | 55.5±30.9 |

219 Note: BMI= Body Mass Index; SD = standard deviation.

220 †: The raw scale scores were transformed to a 0–100 scale [((raw score – lowest possible raw score)/possible raw score
221 range) × 100]. Higher scores in the respective scales are indicative of greater cognitive restraint, uncontrolled, or
222 emotional eating.

223

224 **Emotional Overeating frequency in the last 28 days**

225 Nine in ten respondents (91.4%) reported Emotional overeating episodes during at least 1-5 days in the
226 past month. EO episodes exceeded 1-5 days in 60.3% of cases, and 13-15 days in 38.4% of cases. One
227 in four (24.8%) reported EO episodes exceeding 15 days in the last 28-day period. They reported

228 emotional overeating episodes mostly in response to anxiety (75.5%), sadness (64.9%), happiness
229 (59.9%), loneliness (57.9%) and tiredness (51.7%). Only 31.1% of them reported OE episodes in
230 response to anger (**Table 2**). Unweighted Least-Square exploratory factor analysis followed by a
231 Promax rotation was performed on the 6 EOQ items. After the first rotation, the “Happiness” item was
232 removed because it loaded relatively low (< 0.40) on the two-factor solution (Eigen values > 1). A final
233 extraction was performed on the remaining 5 items (Anxiety; Loneliness; Sadness; Anger; and
234 Fatigue), resulting in a one-factor solution explaining 66% of the common variance of the data
235 (**Table 3**). This latent variable was interpreted as “Distress-Induced Overeating” (DIO), and a factor
236 score was computed and used as dependent variable in the multivariate analysis. Frequency of
237 overeating episodes in response to Happiness was used as a single outcome.

238

Table 2. Emotional Eating days in the last 28 days in response to six emotional states among the study sample (N=302). Data are expressed as Number and Percentages (%).

| | 0 day | 1–5 days | 6–12 days | 13–15 days | >16 days |
|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| Anxiety | 74 (24.5) | 115 (38.1) | 44 (14.6) | 19 (16.6) | 50 (16.6) |
| Sadness | 106 (35.1) | 101 (33.4) | 39 (12.9) | 23 (7.6) | 33 (10.9) |
| Loneliness | 127 (42.1) | 87 (28.8) | 39 (12.9) | 23 (7.6) | 26 (8.6) |
| Anger | 208 (68.9) | 65 (21.5) | 13 (4.3) | 4 (1.3) | 13 (4.0) |
| Tiredness | 146 (48.3) | 80 (26.5) | 25 (8.3) | 15 (5.0) | 36 (11.9) |
| Happiness | 121 (40.1) | 87 (28.8) | 37 (12.3) | 27 (8.9) | 30 (9.9) |

239

Table 3. EOQ Items and factor loadings for the two- and the one-factor solutions.

| EOQ Items | First rotation † | | 1 factor solution ‡ |
|-------------------|------------------|----------|---------------------|
| | Factor 1 | Factor 2 | |
| <i>Anxiety</i> | 0.72 | 0.11 | 0.70 |
| <i>Sadness</i> | 0.89 | -0.28 | 0.91 |
| <i>Loneliness</i> | 0.79 | -0.35 | 0.79 |
| <i>Anger</i> | 0.67 | -0.07 | 0.69 |
| <i>Tiredness</i> | 0.76 | 0.34 | 0.69 |
| <i>Happiness</i> | 0.44 | 0.51 | |
| Eigen value | 3.50 | 1.01 | 3.3 |
| % of variance | 58.3 | 16.7 | 66.0 |
| Cronbach Alpha | | | 0.86 |

†: Rotated factor loadings following unweighted least square extraction and oblique (promax) rotation; ‡ Unrotated factor loadings following unweighted least square extraction, after the “Happiness” item was removed.

240

241 **Multivariate analysis**

242 In univariate analysis (**Table 4**; Univariate estimates), the DIO factor score was positively associated
 243 with tobacco use, boredom proneness, substance abuse, inability to resist emotional cues (EE), and loss
 244 of control over food intake (uncontrolled eating, UE). It was negatively associated with age and well-
 245 being. In multivariate analysis (**Table 4**; Multivariate estimates), the DIO factor score was positively
 246 associated with tobacco use, boredom proneness, the inability to resist emotional cues (EE), and loss
 247 of control over food intake (uncontrolled eating, UE). It was negatively associated with age. In
 248 univariate and multivariate analyses, overeating in response to happiness (**Table 5**) was positively

249 associated with well-being and uncontrolled eating, and more frequent in participant living in family
 250 as compared to those living alone.

Table 4. Factors associated with distress-induced overeating factorial score, Generalized Linear Model.

| Variables | Univariate estimates | | Multivariate model | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|---------|--------------------|---------|
| | B | p-value | B | p-value |
| Age | -0.085 | 0.006 | -0.072 | 0.004 |
| Living condition | | | | |
| Flat share | -0.112 | 0.458 | | |
| In family | -0.007 | 0.963 | | |
| In couple | -0.043 | 0.785 | | |
| Alone | Ref | | | |
| Body Mass Index | | | | |
| >25 | 0.203 | 0.215 | | |
| <18 | -0.114 | 0.511 | | |
| 18-24.9 | Ref | | | |
| Boredom proneness | | | | |
| Internal | 0.146 | <0.001 | 0.070 | <0.001 |
| External | 0.147 | <0.001 | 0.027 | 0.250 |
| Impulsiveness | | | | |
| Attentional | 0.075 | <0.001 | 0.029 | 0.038 |
| Motor | 0.017 | 0.410 | | |
| Non Planning | 0.046 | <0.001 | -0.001 | 0.903 |
| Tobacco use | | | | |
| Yes | 0.444 | 0.006 | 0.325 | 0.014 |
| No | Ref | | Ref | |
| WHO Well-being score | -0.018 | <0.001 | -0.007 | 0.130 |
| Alcohol/Substance abuse | | | | |
| Yes | 0.353 | 0.024 | 0.003 | 0.772 |
| No | ref | | Ref | |
| Components of Eating (TFEQ-R18) | | | | |
| Cognitive restraint | -0.023 | 0.761 | | |
| Uncontrolled eating | 0.064 | <0.001 | 0.033 | 0.001 |
| Emotional eating | 0.141 | <0.001 | 0.046 | 0.029 |

251

Table 5: Factors associated with the overeating frequency in response to happiness, Generalized Linear Model

| Variables | Model 1 | | Model 2 | |
|-----------------------------|----------|---------|----------|---------|
| | Estimate | p-value | Estimate | p-value |
| Age | -0.078 | NS | | |
| Living condition | | | | |
| Flat share | -0.196 | NS | -0.155 | NS |
| In family | 0.578 | 0.009 | 0.547 | 0.011 |
| In couple | 0.421 | NS | 0.418 | 0.079 |
| Alone | Ref | | Ref | |
| Weight status | | | | |
| Overweight /obesity | 0.058 | NS | | |
| Underweight | -0.301 | NS | | |
| Normal weight | Ref | | | |
| Boredom proneness | | | | |
| Internal | -0.007 | NS | | |
| External | -0.035 | NS | | |
| Tobacco use | | | | |
| Yes | 0.404 | NS | | |
| No | Ref | | | |
| WHO Well-being score | 0.013 | 0.002 | 0.014 | 0.001 |
| Impulsivity | | | | |
| Attentional | 0.028 | NS | | |
| Motor | 0.062 | 0.017 | | |
| Planning | 0.061 | 0.002 | | |
| Alcohol/Substance abuse | | | | |
| Yes | -0.242 | NS | | |
| No | ref | | | |
| Components of Eating (TFEQ- | | | | |
| Cognitive restraint | 0.016 | NS | | |
| Uncontrolled eating | 0.047 | 0.001 | 0.051 | <0.001 |
| Emotional eating | 0.020 | NS | | |

252

253

254 **Discussion**

255 Our results showed that 9 in 10 female students included in our study reported intermittent Emotional
256 Overeating in the last 28 days, mostly during 6 to 12 days, in response to Anxiety (75.5%), Sadness
257 (64.5%), Happiness (59.9%), Loneliness (57.9%), Tiredness (51.7%), and to a lesser extent in response
258 to Anger (31.1%). Exploratory factor analysis evidenced a one-factor latent variable reflecting
259 “Distress-Induced Overeating” (DIO) including all EOQ items except Happiness, as previously
260 described in a comparable population before the COVID-19 pandemic [12]. In multivariate analysis,
261 the DIO factor score correlated positively with internal boredom proneness, tobacco use, attentional
262 impulsivity, inability to resist emotional cues, and loss of control over food intake. It correlated
263 negatively with age and well-being. Overeating in response to happiness correlated positively with
264 living in family, well-being and loss of control over food intake. Overeating was not significantly
265 related to BMI or substance abuse.

266 Studies on the effects of the pandemic on student mental health showed significant levels of stress,
267 anxiety, depressive symptoms, concerns for oneself and one’s family’s health, reduced social
268 interactions, and increased concerns over academic achievements [29]. Accordingly, the standardized
269 well-being score in our study population was barely above the average of 50 (over 100) in our
270 participants. In normal situations, students may use social and physical activities to cope with stress
271 [30], but the reduction in social (collective training sessions or sport events) and physical (restricted
272 access to exercise facilities, sport grounds and parks) opportunities to exercise increased sedentary
273 behaviour [8]. The proportion of female student reporting alcohol or substance abuse (12.2%) or
274 regular smoking (7.2%) was however quite low in our study sample and similar to pre-pandemic levels
275 [12]. While addictive disorders remained relatively under control, it seems that the COVID-19 crisis
276 affected deeply eating behaviours in female students, since 91.4% of female students reported

277 emotional overeating in the last month against half of the female students from the same university
278 surveyed three years before [12]. Environmental constraints are likely to influence the type of coping
279 strategies available such as social drinking, given that access to pubs and outdoor gatherings were
280 restricted. And overeating was perhaps perceived as a coping response safer than alcohol consumption
281 in female students continuing their courses and programs online amid social disruptions, which would
282 need to be confirmed by specific questionnaires on individual motivation and perception. These
283 behaviours were however not significantly related to short-term weight outcomes since the proportion
284 of female students with overweight/obesity in our study sample was similar to national estimates prior
285 the COVID-19 crisis [31].

286 Previous studies have underscored the specific role of anxiety on overeating [32-34], but descriptive
287 and factor analyses indicated that sadness and loneliness also contributed greatly to distress-induced
288 overeating (DIO) in our participants, reflecting the particular situations of students working remotely.
289 In addition, personality/behavioural patterns typical of our French young women such as uncontrolled
290 eating (UE) and inability to resist emotional cues (EE) were also related to DIO, together with BP and
291 impulsivity. In univariate analysis, DIO had the strongest independent association with internal and
292 external BP. Under non-pandemic circumstances, boredom-prone individuals tend to experience
293 varying degrees of hopelessness, loneliness, distractibility, lack of motivation, and general
294 dissatisfaction , and may use unhealthy and potentially addictive behaviours as coping mechanisms
295 [23, 35-37]. It must be noted that eating in response to happiness was related but distinct from DIO,
296 and seemed to influence food intake in relation to normal (*i.e.*, uncontrolled eating, well-being, and
297 family life) rather than pathological forms of eating tendencies [38, 39].

298 In multivariate analysis, our findings suggest that emotional overeating was related to the inability to
299 generate interesting activities during the pandemic in a context of limited social/external stimulations.
300 This is in line with a study conducted in France showing that failure in engaging in a creative activity

301 to overcome uncertainty and solitude fostered responses not requiring special or creative skills, such
302 as overeating, particularly in women [40]. When it comes to impulsivity, higher impulsivity scores in
303 healthy normal-weight women tend to predict higher food intake [41], and attentional impulsivity (*i.e.*,
304 the difficulty focusing on a task at hand) is consistently related to various measures related to
305 overeating, because of attention diverted to palatable food [42]. In contrast, non-planning impulsivity,
306 when the immediately available small reward is preferentially chosen over a delayed larger reward
307 [43], seems to be only weakly related to overeating [44]. Our results are in line with these studies, as
308 only attentional impulsivity was related to DIO in the multivariate analysis. Finally, DIO seemed more
309 frequent in smokers and less frequent in younger students, which may correlate with indicators of
310 academic stress [45].

311 This study must be interpreted in light of its limitations. First, the cross-sectional design did not allow
312 determining causal inferences about relationships between Emotional Overeating and other covariates
313 under investigation, although personality/behavioural patterns theoretically precede current
314 behaviours. Better understanding of the interactions between stress, coping, personality/behavioural
315 patterns, emotional overeating and the risk of diseases, such as metabolic diseases, overweight and
316 obesity, among students warrants a prospective study and follow-up assessments over the university
317 year or cycle. Second, the EOQ has a single item for assessing each emotion-related eating. Although
318 the factor structure and psychometrics properties of the EOQ were investigated in the present study, it
319 still warrants a full validation study including diverse subgroups from the French general population.
320 Finally, eating and psychological disorders, which may be influential on emotional overeating, could
321 not be properly assessed in the present online survey using self-report questionnaires.

322 **Implications for Research and Practice**

323 Nine in ten female students reported emotional overeating during the COVID-19 university closure.
324 This response to stress was related to eating tendencies typical of young women, such as uncontrolled
325 eating or inability to resist emotional cues, but also to personality/behavioural patterns such as boredom
326 and impulsivity proneness. In terms of perspective, a better understanding of the attentional,
327 neurobiological and neurocognitive mechanisms underlying emotional eating in response to
328 stress/emotions and lack of external/social stimulation would improve preventive interventions related
329 to disordered eating in women coping with stress and/or isolation [46, 47].

330

331 **Acknowledgements**

332 None.

333 **References**

- 334 1. Sandstrom GM, Dunn EW. Social Interactions and Well-Being: The Surprising Power of
335 Weak Ties. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 2014;40(7):910-22. doi:
336 10.1177/0146167214529799.
- 337 2. Boujut E, Bruchon-Schweitzer M. A construction and validation of a Freshman Stress
338 Questionnaire: an exploratory study. *Psychol Rep*. 2009;104(2):680-92. doi: 10.2466/pr0.104.2.680-
339 692. PubMed PMID: 19610500.
- 340 3. Adams DR, Meyers SA, Beidas RS. The relationship between financial strain, perceived
341 stress, psychological symptoms, and academic and social integration in undergraduate students. *J Am*
342 *Coll Health*. 2016;64(5):362-70. doi: 10.1080/07448481.2016.1154559. PubMed PMID: 26943354;
343 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5086162.
- 344 4. Elmer T, Mepham K, Stadtfeld C. Students under lockdown: Comparisons of students' social
345 networks and mental health before and during the COVID-19 crisis in Switzerland. *PLoS One*.
346 2020;15(7):e0236337. Epub 2020/07/24. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0236337. PubMed PMID:
347 32702065; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7377438.
- 348 5. Meda N, Pardini S, Slongo I, Bodini L, Zordan MA, Rigobello P, et al. Students' mental
349 health problems before, during, and after COVID-19 lockdown in Italy. *J Psychiatr Res*.
350 2021;134:69-77. Epub 2020/12/29. doi: 10.1016/j.jpsychires.2020.12.045. PubMed PMID:
351 33360865.
- 352 6. Deasy C, Coughlan B, Pironom J, Jourdan D, McNamara PM. Psychological distress and
353 lifestyle of students: implications for health promotion. *Health Promot Int*. 2015;30(1):77-87. doi:
354 10.1093/heapro/dau086. PubMed PMID: 25315646.

- 355 7. Tavolacci MP, Wouters E, Van de Velde S, Buffel V, Déchelotte P, Van Hal G, et al. The
356 Impact of COVID-19 Lockdown on Health Behaviors among Students of a French University. *Int J*
357 *Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(8):4346. doi: 10.3390/ijerph18084346. PubMed PMID:
358 33923943.
- 359 8. Constant A, Conserve DF, Gallopel-Morvan K, Raude J. Socio-Cognitive Factors Associated
360 With Lifestyle Changes in Response to the COVID-19 Epidemic in the General Population: Results
361 From a Cross-Sectional Study in France. *Front Psychol*. 2020;11:579460. Epub 2020/11/03. doi:
362 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.579460. PubMed PMID: 33132989; PubMed Central PMCID:
363 PMCPMC7550454.
- 364 9. Bennett G, Young E, Butler I, Coe S. The Impact of Lockdown During the COVID-19
365 Outbreak on Dietary Habits in Various Population Groups: A Scoping Review. *Frontiers in Nutrition*.
366 2021;8. doi: 10.3389/fnut.2021.626432.
- 367 10. González-Monroy C, Gómez-Gómez I, Olarte-Sánchez CM, Motrico E. Eating Behaviour
368 Changes during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Systematic Review of Longitudinal Studies. *Int J*
369 *Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(21). Epub 2021/11/14. doi: 10.3390/ijerph182111130. PubMed
370 PMID: 34769648; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8582896.
- 371 11. Reichenberger J, Schnepfer R, Arend AK, Blechert J. Emotional eating in healthy individuals
372 and patients with an eating disorder: evidence from psychometric, experimental and naturalistic
373 studies. *Proc Nutr Soc*. 2020;79(3):290-9. Epub 2020/05/14. doi: 10.1017/s0029665120007004.
374 PubMed PMID: 32398186; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7663318.
- 375 12. Constant A, Gautier Y, Coquery N, Thibault R, Moirand R, Val-Laillet D. Emotional
376 overeating is common and negatively associated with alcohol use in normal-weight female university

- 377 students. *Appetite*. 2018;129:186-91. Epub 2018/07/17. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2018.07.012. PubMed
378 PMID: 30009932.
- 379 13. Prowse R, Sherratt F, Abizaid A, Gabrys RL, Hellemans KGC, Patterson ZR, et al. Coping
380 With the COVID-19 Pandemic: Examining Gender Differences in Stress and Mental Health Among
381 University Students. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*. 2021;12. doi: 10.3389/fpsy.2021.650759.
- 382 14. Bennett J, Greene G, Schwartz-Barcott D. Perceptions of emotional eating behavior. A
383 qualitative study of college students. *Appetite*. 2013;60(1):187-92. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2012.09.023.
384 PubMed PMID: 23046706.
- 385 15. Wansink B, Cheney MM, Chan N. Exploring comfort food preferences across age and
386 gender. *Physiol Behav*. 2003;79(4-5):739-47. PubMed PMID: 12954417.
- 387 16. Kandiah J, Yake M, Jones J, Meyer M. Stress Influences appetite and comfort food
388 preferences in college women. *Nutrition Research*. 2006;26:118 - 23.
- 389 17. Oliver G, Wardle J. Perceived effects of stress on food choice. *Physiol Behav*.
390 1999;66(3):511-5. PubMed PMID: 10357442.
- 391 18. Jaaskelainen A, Kaila-Kangas L, Leino-Arjas P, Lindbohm ML, Nevanpera N, Remes J, et al.
392 Psychosocial factors at work and obesity among young finnish adults: a cohort study. *J Occup
393 Environ Med*. 2015;57(5):485-92. doi: 10.1097/JOM.0000000000000432. PubMed PMID:
394 25793463.
- 395 19. Gibson EL. The psychobiology of comfort eating: implications for neuropharmacological
396 interventions. *Behav Pharmacol*. 2012;23(5-6):442-60. Epub 2012/08/03. doi:
397 10.1097/FBP.0b013e328357bd4e. PubMed PMID: 22854304.

- 398 20. Moeller FG, Barratt ES, Dougherty DM, Schmitz JM, Swann AC. Psychiatric aspects of
399 impulsivity. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2001;158(11):1783-93. Epub 2001/11/03. doi:
400 10.1176/appi.ajp.158.11.1783. PubMed PMID: 11691682.
- 401 21. Van Blyderveen S, Lafrance A, Emond M, Kosmerly S, O'Connor M, Chang F. Personality
402 differences in the susceptibility to stress-eating: The influence of emotional control and impulsivity.
403 *Eat Behav*. 2016;23:76-81. Epub 2016/08/28. doi: 10.1016/j.eatbeh.2016.07.009. PubMed PMID:
404 27565374.
- 405 22. Bénard M, Bellisle F, Etilé F, Reach G, Kesse-Guyot E, Hercberg S, et al. Impulsivity and
406 consideration of future consequences as moderators of the association between emotional eating and
407 body weight status. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*.
408 2018;15(1):84. doi: 10.1186/s12966-018-0721-1.
- 409 23. Crockett AC, Myhre SK, Rokke PD. Boredom proneness and emotion regulation predict
410 emotional eating. *J Health Psychol*. 2015;20(5):670-80. Epub 2015/04/24. doi:
411 10.1177/1359105315573439. PubMed PMID: 25903253.
- 412 24. Constant A, Moirand R, Thibault R, Val-Laillet D. Meeting of Minds around Food Addiction:
413 Insights from Addiction Medicine, Nutrition, Psychology, and Neurosciences. *Nutrients*.
414 2020;12(11). Epub 2020/11/26. doi: 10.3390/nu12113564. PubMed PMID: 33233694; PubMed
415 Central PMCID: PMC7699750.
- 416 25. Brunault P, Courtois R, Gearhardt AN, Gaillard P, Journiac K, Cathelain S, et al. Validation
417 of the French Version of the DSM-5 Yale Food Addiction Scale in a Nonclinical Sample. *Can J*
418 *Psychiatry*. 2017;62(3):199-210. doi: 10.1177/0706743716673320. PubMed PMID: 28212499;
419 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5317020.

- 420 26. Karila L, Legleye S, Beck F, Corruble E, Falissard B, Reynaud M. [Validation of a
421 questionnaire to screen for harmful use of alcohol and cannabis in the general population: CRAFFT-
422 ADOSPA]. *Presse Med.* 2007;36(4 Pt 1):582-90. doi: 10.1016/j.lpm.2007.01.005. PubMed PMID:
423 17276648.
- 424 27. Knight JR, Sherritt L, Shrier LA, Harris SK, Chang G. Validity of the CRAFFT substance
425 abuse screening test among adolescent clinic patients. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med.* 2002;156(6):607-
426 14. PubMed PMID: 12038895.
- 427 28. Baylé FJ, Bourdel MC, Caci H, Gorwood P, Chignon J-M, Adés J, et al. Structure factorielle
428 de la traduction française de l'échelle d'impulsivité de Barratt (BIS-10). *The Canadian Journal of*
429 *Psychiatry.* 2000;45(2):156-65. doi: 10.1177/070674370004500206.
- 430 29. Son C, Hegde S, Smith A, Wang X, Sasangohar F. Effects of COVID-19 on College Students'
431 Mental Health in the United States: Interview Survey Study. *J Med Internet Res.* 2020;22(9):e21279-
432 e. doi: 10.2196/21279. PubMed PMID: 32805704.
- 433 30. Kharissova N, Smirnova L, Kuzmin A, Komkina Y, Salikhova Y. The Influence of the
434 Physical Activity of a Modern Student on the Characteristics of the Cardiovascular and Respiratory
435 Systems and Their Resistance to Stress during Educational Process. *Georgian Med News.*
436 2019;(297):124-9. Epub 2020/02/06. PubMed PMID: 32011307.
- 437 31. Czernichow S, Renuy A, Rives-Lange C, Carette C, Airagnes G, Wiernik E, et al. Evolution
438 of the prevalence of obesity in the adult population in France, 2013–2016: the Constances study.
439 *Scientific Reports.* 2021;11(1):14152. doi: 10.1038/s41598-021-93432-0.
- 440 32. Rosenbaum DL, White KS. The relation of anxiety, depression, and stress to binge eating
441 behavior. *J Health Psychol.* 2015;20(6):887-98. doi: 10.1177/1359105315580212. PubMed PMID:
442 26032804.

- 443 33. Peterson RE, Latendresse SJ, Bartholome LT, Warren CS, Raymond NC. Binge Eating
444 Disorder Mediates Links between Symptoms of Depression, Anxiety, and Caloric Intake in
445 Overweight and Obese Women. *J Obes.* 2012;2012:407103. doi: 10.1155/2012/407103. PubMed
446 PMID: 22778917; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3385667.
- 447 34. Bittencourt SA, Lucena-Santos P, Moraes JF, Oliveira Mda S. Anxiety and depression
448 symptoms in women with and without binge eating disorder enrolled in weight loss programs. *Trends*
449 *Psychiatry Psychother.* 2012;34(2):87-92. PubMed PMID: 25922927.
- 450 35. Chou WJ, Chang YP, Yen CF. Boredom proneness and its correlation with Internet addiction
451 and Internet activities in adolescents with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Kaohsiung J Med*
452 *Sci.* 2018;34(8):467-74. Epub 2018/07/26. doi: 10.1016/j.kjms.2018.01.016. PubMed PMID:
453 30041765.
- 454 36. Wegmann E, Ostendorf S, Brand M. Is it beneficial to use Internet-communication for
455 escaping from boredom? Boredom proneness interacts with cue-induced craving and avoidance
456 expectancies in explaining symptoms of Internet-communication disorder. *PLoS One.*
457 2018;13(4):e0195742. Epub 2018/04/20. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0195742. PubMed PMID:
458 29672574; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5908169.
- 459 37. Biolcati R, Mancini G, Trombini E. Proneness to Boredom and Risk Behaviors During
460 Adolescents' Free Time. *Psychol Rep.* 2018;121(2):303-23. Epub 2017/08/05. doi:
461 10.1177/0033294117724447. PubMed PMID: 28776483.
- 462 38. Bongers P, Jansen A, Havermans R, Roefs A, Nederkoorn C. Happy eating: the
463 underestimated role of overeating in a positive mood. *Appetite.* 2013;67:74-80. Epub 2013/04/16.
464 doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2013.03.017. PubMed PMID: 23583314.

- 465 39. Braden A, Musher-Eizenman D, Watford T, Emley E. Eating when depressed, anxious,
466 bored, or happy: Are emotional eating types associated with unique psychological and physical
467 health correlates? *Appetite*. 2018;125:410-7. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2018.02.022. PubMed PMID:
468 29476800.
- 469 40. Attanasi G, Maffioletti A, Shalukhina T, Bel C, Cherikh F. Gender Differences in the Impact
470 of COVID-19 Lockdown on Potentially Addictive Behaviors: An Emotion-Mediated Analysis.
471 *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2021;12(5112). doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.703897.
- 472 41. Guerrieri R, Nederkoorn C, Stankiewicz K, Alberts H, Geschwind N, Martijn C, et al. The
473 influence of trait and induced state impulsivity on food intake in normal-weight healthy women.
474 *Appetite*. 2007;49(1):66-73. Epub 2007/01/31. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2006.11.008. PubMed PMID:
475 17261343.
- 476 42. Hou R, Mogg K, Bradley BP, Moss-Morris R, Peveler R, Roefs A. External eating,
477 impulsivity and attentional bias to food cues. *Appetite*. 2011;56(2):424-7. doi:
478 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2011.01.019>.
- 479 43. Dalley Jeffrey W, Everitt Barry J, Robbins Trevor W. Impulsivity, Compulsivity, and Top-
480 Down Cognitive Control. *Neuron*. 2011;69(4):680-94. doi:
481 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2011.01.020>.
- 482 44. Meule A. Impulsivity and overeating: a closer look at the subscales of the Barratt
483 Impulsiveness Scale. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2013;4(177). doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00177.
- 484 45. Nichter M, Nichter M, Carkoglu A, Tobacco Etiology Research N. Reconsidering stress and
485 smoking: a qualitative study among college students. *Tob Control*. 2007;16(3):211-4. doi:
486 10.1136/tc.2007.019869. PubMed PMID: 17565143.

487 46. Val-Laillet D, Aarts E, Weber B, Ferrari M, Quaresima V, Stoeckel LE, et al. Neuroimaging
488 and neuromodulation approaches to study eating behavior and prevent and treat eating disorders and
489 obesity. *Neuroimage Clin.* 2015;8:1-31. doi: 10.1016/j.nicl.2015.03.016. PubMed PMID: 26110109;
490 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4473270.

491 47. Moore CF, Sabino V, Koob GF, Cottone P. Neuroscience of Compulsive Eating Behavior.
492 *Front Neurosci.* 2017;11:469. doi: 10.3389/fnins.2017.00469. PubMed PMID: 28883784; PubMed
493 Central PMCID: PMC5573809.

494 **Supporting information captions**

495 **Author Contributions**

496 DVL, NC, EB and AG conceptualized the study. AG and AF contributed to the investigation by being
497 in charge of the inclusion of volunteers and data collection. YS, AF and AC performed data pre-
498 processing and statistical analyses. AC wrote the first draft of the paper and all authors contributed to
499 the subsequent versions.

500 **Financial Disclosure Statement**

501 The present research was funded by the University of Rennes 1, Fondation de l'Avenir, the Benjamin
502 Delessert Institute, and INRAE. A. Godet received a PhD grant from the University of Rennes 1.

503 **Data Availability Statement**

504 The datasets generated and analyzed for this study will be available from the publication date of the
505 paper at the following address: <https://doi.org/10.57745/87KZFH>