DOI: 10.7759/cureus.39388

# The Prevalence and Risk Factors of COVID-Stress Syndrome

Review began 05/10/2023 Review ended 05/19/2023 Published 05/23/2023

© Copyright 2023

Al Houri et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY 4.0., which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Ahmad Al Houri  $^1$ , Abdullah Alhouri  $^2$ , Hanaa Zahrawi  $^1$ , Hasan Al Houri  $^3$ ,  $^4$ , Bilal Abu-Hussein  $^5$ , Douaa Mohammad Nazir Arrouk  $^6$ , Yazan Jarrar  $^5$ , Ahmad Al-Thunaibat  $^7$ , Obada Latifeh  $^8$ , Aiman Al Sharei  $^9$ , Youssef Latifeh  $^{10}$ ,  $^{11}$ 

1. Department of Medicine, Syrian Private University, Damascus, SYR 2. Internal Medicine, Royal Berkshire Hospital, Reading, GBR 3. Department of Internal Medicine, Damascus University, Damascus, SYR 4. Department of Internal Medicine, Syrian Private University, Damascus, SYR 5. Department of Medicine, The University of Jordan, Amman, JOR 6. Applied Statistics - Quantitative Methods Department, Damascus University, Damascus, SYR 7. Department of Medicine, King Hussein Cancer Center, Amman, JOR 8. Faculty of Medicine, Damascus University, Damascus, SYR 9. Faculty of Medicine, The Hashemite University, Amman, JOR 10. Department of Psychiatry, Damascus University, Damascus, SYR 11. Department of Psychiatry, Al Sham Private University, Damascus, SYR

Corresponding author: Ahmad Al Houri, alhouri.ahmad@gmail.com

# **Abstract**

#### **Background**

COVID-19 is a serious disease causing negative psychological effects such as nervousness, isolation, depression, and suicide ideation. The COVID Stress Scale was developed to better understand and assess COVID-19-related distress. University students are predicted to be negatively impacted by the COVID-19 outbreak due to their lack of psychological skills and high levels of academic stress. This study compares the prevalence of COVID stress syndrome (CSS) among university students in Syria and Jordan during the outbreak. The questionnaire used in the study covers multiple aspects and can be applied to future pandemics or infectious diseases.

### Methodology

This is a cross-sectional study conducted in Syria and Jordan between September 1 and December 1, 2021, to evaluate CSS among university students. Data were collected from a convenience sample of 2525 students using a structured, validated, and published questionnaire. Ethical considerations were taken, and informed consent was obtained from participants. The questionnaire had two parts: participant characteristics and CSS. The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, IBM Corp., Armonk, NY), and the chi-square test was used to compare the CSS scale between the two countries.

### Result

The study involved 2525 university students, mostly Syrian (63.6%) and Jordanian (36.4%), aged 18-24 (89.5%), and mostly single (95.6%). Over 50% of students lived in homes with three or more people. More than half reported good to excellent economic status; non-smokers accounted for over 50%. Regarding CSS, 39.8% had a high score, 28% average, 20% severe, and 12.2% low to mild. Jordanian male students and single Syrian students showed a higher probability of experiencing CSS symptoms. The number of people in the household, financial status, and field of study also played a significant role.

#### Conclusion

The COVID-19 pandemic has negative impacts beyond physical health, including the economy, education, and mental health. A stress scale has been developed to measure COVID-19 stress syndrome, which includes Danger and Contamination Fears (DAN), Socioeconomic Consequences Fears (SEC), Xenophobic Fears (XEN), Traumatic Stress Symptoms (TSS), and Compulsive Checking and Reassurance Seeking (CHE). Non-medical faculty students are more likely to acquire CSS symptoms than medical faculty students.

Categories: Psychiatry, Psychology, Public Health Keywords: depression., students, jordanian, syrian, covid-19, css

## Introduction

COVID-19 is a serious disease caused by the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2), which has been assumed to be a pandemic leading to the deaths of over 2 million people worldwide [1]. This pandemic is considered the most serious international health crisis in our modern era [2]. Nervousness, isolation, stigma, depression, and suicide ideation were among the negative psychological effects of the COVID-19 pandemic [3-5]. According to studies, 25% of the Chinese population suffers from various stages of stress and anxiety, with COVID-19 being a significant contributor [6,7]. For that reason, public health strategies dealing with rapidly growing disease outbreaks such as COVID-19 require a delicate balance

between maintaining the public's health and promoting precautionary measures, which, in turn, can lead to emotional and behavioral problems [8]. The concept of COVID-19 in psychiatry has quickly grown. At first, it was considered a form of phobia ("corona phobia") or a vaguely described anxiety-related syndrome [9]. However, observations from previous pandemics suggest that the scope of distress-related symptoms is much broader [8]. Therefore, the COVID Stress Scales were developed to better understand and assess COVID-19-related distress [8]. The CSS has five dimensions: Danger and Contamination Fears (DAN), Socioeconomic Consequences Fears (SEC), Xenophobic Fears (XEN), Traumatic Stress Symptoms (TSS), and Compulsive Checking and Reassurance Seeking (CHE) [10]. Additionally, the five dimensions have demonstrated good to outstanding reliability and validity, with internal consistency (Cronbach alpha) coefficients for each scale being >0.80 and intercorrelated amongst the scales [11]. Students in higher education have significant levels of academic stress and are sensitive to psychosocial issues, yet they lack the psychological abilities to handle their psychological and academic obligations [12,13]. Thus, the COVID-19 outbreak is predicted to have a negative impact on university students' physical and mental health. According to a recent report, university students experienced posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), fear, sadness, nervousness, and emotional disorders during the COVID-19 epidemic [6,14].

This study aims to assess and compare the prevalence of COVID stress syndrome (CSS) among university students in Syria and Jordan during the COVID-19 outbreak.

## **Materials And Methods**

# Study design

This is a cross-sectional study that was conducted in Syria and Jordan to evaluate CSS among university students. Data were collected between September 1 and December 1, 2021. Undergraduate university students aged 18 years and older who signed informed consent were eligible to be included.

#### **Ethical considerations**

This study was approved by the institutional review board (IRB) of Damascus University, Syrian Private University (SPU), and Hashemite University (No. 9/14/2020/2021). The questionnaire included comprehensive information about the study's goals. Informed consent was obtained from participants who volunteered to complete the questionnaire. The data's anonymity and confidentiality were secured by providing each participant with an identification number visible to the research team.

#### **Data collection and measures**

Data were collected from a convenience sample of 2525 students using a structured, validated, and published questionnaire [11]. University students at participating universities were given a detailed explanation of the study. The researchers distributed the questionnaire directly to the students. Each questionnaire came with a cover letter that explained the study, its goals, and how to fill it out and return it. The G Power 3.1 software (Düsseldorf University, Westphalia, Germany) was used for prior statistical power analysis for sample size estimation, with a two-tailed alpha of 0.05 and a power level of 0.5 [15]. Using Cohen's criteria [16], the analysis revealed that a sample size of approximately 768 was needed. Thus, the sample size of 2525 participants included in this study was more than adequate.

The questionnaire included two main parts: the first part consisted of questions regarding participant characteristics, including age in years, gender, marital status, country of study, living condition, number of people living with the respondent, having a job or not, financial status, educational level, do the parents work in the medical field, studying field, smoking, and has the participant been infected by the virus before? The second part of the questionnaire consisted of CSS. During pandemics, the CSS was created to evaluate and assess COVID-19-related distress and health-related anxiety [14]. The scale includes 36 items, which are categorized into five domains: (1) DAN and CON (12 items), (2) SEC (6 items), (3) XEN (6 items), (4) TSS (6 items), and (5) CHE (6 items). Items in the DAN, CON, SEC, and XEN domains are rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 4 (extremely). Similarly, the TSS and CHE domains are scored from 0 (never) to 4 (almost always). The sum of ratings for each item in each domain is used to determine the scores for each of the five domains. To interpret the results obtained, higher scores reflect more intense or frequent perceptions experienced within the last seven days. The total scores were categorized as follows: low distress (<5), mild distress (5-16), average distress (17-36), high distress (37-71), or severe distress (>72).

### Statistical analysis

The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software, version 25.0 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY). Categorical variables were presented as numbers and percentages. The chi-square test was used to compare the CSS scale between the two countries. The statistical significance level was set at 0.05.

### Results

A total of 2525 university students were recruited to participate in the study, with Syrian students

accounting for 63.6% (1606) and Jordanian students accounting for the remaining 36.4% (919). The majority of participants (89.5%) were between the ages of 18 and 24. The Jordanian and Syrian samples showed similar percentages of participants between the ages of 18 and 24, with 89.8% and 89.3%, respectively. As regards gender, females were represented (51.7%), while males accounted for 48.3% of the total participating students. Jordanian participants were primarily male (53.1%), whereas Syrian participants were mostly female (54.5%). Regarding their marital status, Jordanian and Syrian students had comparable percentages of unmarried students, who comprise the vast majority of the data, with unmarried Syrian students representing 96.3% and unmarried Jordanian students representing 94.3%. The overall percentage of unmarried students in both nations was 95.6% (Table 1).

Variable (N=2525)		N (%)
	18–24	2259 (89.5%)
Age	25–30	218 (8.6%)
	>30	48 (1.9%)
Gender	Male	1219 (48.3%)
Seriodi	Female	1306 (51.7%)
Marital status	Unmarried	2413 (95.6%)
viantai status	Married	112 (4.4%)
Country of studying	Syria	1606 (63.3%)
Southly of studying	Jordan	919 (36.4%)
	Owned house	1749 (69.3%)
iving condition	Rented house	638 (25.3%)
	University campus	138 (5.5%)
	Alone	123 (4.9 %)
low many people live in your household?	1, 2	373 (14.8%)
	3, 4	954 (37.8%)
	>5	1075 (42.6%)
The job	I don't work	2093 (82.9%)
THE JOD	I have a job	432 (17.1%)
	Low	116 (4.6%)
Financial status	Medium	712 (28.2%)
-ilianciai status	Good	1404 (55.6%)
	Excellent	293 (11.6%)
	Institute degree	30 (1.2%)
Educational level	University degree	2424 (96%)
Laucational level	Master degree	60 (2.4%)
	Doctorate	11 (0.4%)
	No	2074 (82.1%)
Parents working in a medical field	Yes, one of them	352 (13.9 %)
	Yes, both of them	99 (3.9 %)
Studying field	Medical colleges	1193 (47.2%)
Studying field	Non-medical colleges	1332 (52.8%)
Constitue.	Smoker	1041 (41.2%)
Smoking	Non-smoker	1484 (58.8%)

**TABLE 1: Sociodemographic characteristics.** 

More than half of the students lived in privately owned houses in Syria (71.7%) and Jordan (65%). On the other hand, the Jordanian and Syrian students living on campus had the lowest percentage, with 5.8% and 4.9%, respectively. Both Jordanians and Syrians lived with three or more people in the household, with

around 80% of each country's sample. Concerning the economic status, 82.9% of those surveyed were unemployed, of which unemployed Jordanian students made up 79.8% and unemployed Syrian students accounted for 84.7% of the total sample in each country. Good to excellent economic status was reported by more than half of the students in both countries. The medical background was also examined, and the current study revealed that 82% of participants had no parents working in any medical field, a percentage that was divided between both countries by 75.5% for Jordanian students and 85.9% for Syrian students. In contrast, 47.2% of students were studying in medical schools and medical faculties, representing the highest percentage of surveyed students, with around 40% for both countries. Regarding smoking, more than half of the Jordanians and Syrians were non-smokers, with a percentage of 51.9% and 62.7%, respectively (Table 1).

As shown in Table 2, the majority of students in both nations were infected with COVID-19. It is worth mentioning that 52.1% of Syrian respondents had previously been infected with the virus, although it was not confirmed by polymerase chain reaction (PCR).

Categories (N=2525)		Syria	Jordan	Total
Have you been infected with the virus before?	No, I have not	695 (43.3%)	424 (46.1%)	1119 (44.3%)
	Yes, I have had the symptoms, but I have not confirmed it with the PCR	836 (52.1%)	134 (14.6%)	970 (38.4%
	Yes, I have had the symptoms and I have confirmed it with the PCR	67 (4.2%)	329 (35.8%)	396 (15.7%
	Yes, I have confirmed it with the PCR, but I have been asymptomatic	8 (0.5%)	32 (3.5 %)	40 (1.6%)

TABLE 2: Students' response to whether they had previously been infected with the virus.

The second part of the questionnaire assessed CSS symptoms and revealed the following CSS scores: 39.8% (1004) had a high score, 28% (708) had an average score, 20% (505) had a severe score, and 12.2% (308) had a low to mild score. The CSS scores are presented in Table 3.

CSS scores	N (%)	
.ow	75 (3%)	
Mild	233 (9.2%)	
Average	708 (28%)	
High	1004 (39.8%)	
Severe	505 (20%)	
Total	2525 (100%)	

TABLE 3: The total scores of COVID-19 stress syndrome.

Various significant correlations were found between sociodemographic characteristics and CSS scores among Jordanian and Syrian students (Table 4). For instance, there is a significant correlation between age and CSS among Jordanian students, with students between the ages of 18 and 25 having the highest risk of developing CSS symptoms (89.8%), compared to students between the ages of 25 and 30 (7.9%) or those older than 30 (2.3%). Among Syrian students, however, there is no significant association between age and CSS.

able (N=2525)	CSS	SS	Syria N (%)	P-value	Jordan N (%)	P-value
	Low	w	45 (97.8%)		27 (93.1%)	
	Mild	ld	134 (87.6%)		68 (85%)	

	40.04	A	404 (00 00()		400 (000()	
	18–24	Average	464 (89.9%)		169 (88%)	
		High Severe	627 (89.1%)		262 (87.3%)	
			164 (87.7%)		299 (94%)	
		Low	1 (2.2%)		0 (0%)	
	05.00	Mild	14 (9.2%)	0.445	11 (13.8%)	2.00
Age	25–30	Average	46 (8.9%)	0.415	17 (8.9%)	0.22
		High	66 (9.4%)		30 (10%)	
		Severe	18 (9.6%)		15 (4.7%)	
		Low	0 (0%)		2 (6.9%)	
		Mild	5 (3.3%)		1 (1.3%)	
	>30	Average	6 (1.2%)		6 (3.1%)	
		High	11 (1.6%)		8 (2.7%)	
		Severe	5 (2.7%)		4 (1.3%)	
		Low	25 (54.3%)		15 (51.7%)	
		Mild	88 (57.5%)		49 (61.3%)	
	Male	Average	257 (49.8%)		103 (53.6%)	
ender		High	296 (42.0%)		177 (59%)	
		Severe	65 (34.8%)	0.000	144 (45.3%)	0.007
		Low	21 (45.7%)		14 (48.3%)	
		Mild	65 (42.5%)		31 (38.8%)	
	Female	Average	259 (50.2%)		89 (46.4%)	
		High	408 (58%)		123 (41%)	
		Severe	122 (65.2%)		174 (54.7%)	
		Low	45 (97.8%)		26 (89.7%)	
		Mild	149 (97.4%)		76 (95%)	
	Unmarried	Average	503 (97.5%)		180 (93.8%)	
		High	675 (95.9%)		280 (93.3%)	
Marital status		Severe	174 (93%)	0.071	305 (95.9%)	0.489
		Low	1 (2.2%)		3 (10.3%)	
		Mild	4 (2.6%)		4 (5%)	
	Married	Average	13 (2.5%)		12 (6.3%)	
		High	29 (4.1%)		20 (6.7%)	
		Severe	13 (7%)		13 (4.1%)	
		Low	38 (3.3%)		18 (62.1%)	
		Mild	106 (9.2%)		57 (71.3%)	
	Owned house	Average	368 (31.9%)		126 (65.6%)	
		High	497 (43.1%)		190 (63.3%)	
		Severe	143 (12.4%)		206 (64.8%)	
		Low	8 (17.4%)		10 (34.5%)	
		Mild	42 (27.5%)		19 (23.8%)	

Living condition	Rented house	Average	117 (22.7%)	0.139	55 (28.6%)	0.917
		High	157 (22.3%)	550	49 (31.3%)	3.317
		Severe	37 (19.8%)		99 (31.1%)	
		Low	0 (0%)		1 (3.4%)	
		Mild	5 (3.3%)		4 (5%)	
	University campus	Average	31 (6%)		11 (5.7%)	
		High	50 (7.1%)		16 (5.3%)	
		Severe	7 (3.7%)		13 (4.1%)	
		Low	6 (13%)		3 (10.3%)	
		Mild	8 (5.2%)		3 (3.8%)	
	Alone	Average	25 (4.8%)		17 (8.9%)	
		High	30 (4.3%)		13 (4.3%)	
		Severe	11 (5.9%)		7 (2.2%)	
		Low	7 (15.2%)		3 (10.3%)	
		Mild	28 (18.3%)		8 (10%)	
How many people live in your household?	1, 2	Average	95 (18.4%)		28 (14.6%)	
		High	120 (17%)		35 (11.7%)	
		Severe	24 (12.8%)		25 (7.9%)	
		Low	13 (28.3%)	0.243	7 (24.1%)	0.000
	3, 4	Mild	55 (35.9%)		24 (30%)	
		Average	207 (40.1%)		79 (41.1%)	
		High	283 (40.2%)		102 (34%)	
		Severe	86 (46%)		98 (30.8%)	
		Low	20 (43.5%)		16 (55.2%)	
		Mild	62 (40.5%)		45 (56.3%)	
	>5	Average	189 (36.6%)		68 (35.4%)	
		High	271 (38.5%)		150 (50%)	
		Severe	66 (35.3%)		188 (59.1%)	
		Low	41 (89.1%)		19 (65.5%)	
		Mild	128 (83.7%)		62 (77.5%)	
	I don't work	Average	440 (85.3%)		156 (81.3%)	
The Job		High	592 (84.1%)		236 (78.7%)	
		Severe	159 (85%)	0.863	260 (81.8%)	0.270
		Low	5 (10.9%)	0.883	10 (34.5%)	0.270
		Mild	25 (16.3%)		18 (22.5%)	
	I have a job	Average	76 (14.7%)		36 (18.8%)	
		High	112 (15.9%)		64 (21.3%)	
		Severe	28 (15%)		58 (18.2%)	
		Low	1 (2.2%)		3 (10.3%)	

High 75 (10.7%) 64 (21.3%)  Severe 20 (10.7%) 62 (19.5%)  Low 0 (0%) 2 (6.9%)  Mild 5 (3.3%) 5 (6.3%)  High 23 (3.3%) 11 (3.7%)  Severe 2 (1.1%) 22 (6.9%)  Low 17 (37%) 13 (44.8%)  Mild 81 (52.9%) 42 (52.5%)  Medical colleges Average 285 (55.2%) 123 (64.1%)  High 341 (48.4%) 116 (38.7%)  Severe 66 (35.3%) 109 (34.3%)  Severe 66 (35.3%) 0.000			Mild	8 (5.2%)		2 (2.5%)	
Parameter working in a medical field   Parameter workin		Low	Average	20 (3.9%)		3 (1.6%)	
			High	43 (6.1%)		9 (3%)	
Mild   43 (28.1%)   27 (38.8%)   46 (23.4%			Severe	15 (8%)		12 (3.8%)	
Medium			Low	9 (19.6%)		12 (41.4%)	
Financial status  Financia status  Financia status  Financia status  Financia status			Mild	43 (28.1%)		27 (33.8%)	
Financial status    Low   20 (38.9)   (38.9)   (9 (38.		Medium	Average	164 (31.8%)		45 (23.4%)	
Financial status    Low   29 (63%)   9 (31%)   9 (41.2%)   9 (41			High	229 (32.5%)		82 (27.3%)	
Conv   29 (63%)   9 (31%	Financial status		Severe	69 (36.9%)	0.157	32 (10.1%)	0.000
Good   Average   278 (53.9%)   104 (54.2%)     High   371 (52.7%)   180 (60%)     Severe   86 (46%)   221 (69.5%)     Low   7 (15.2%)   5 (17.2%)     Mild   13 (6.5%)   14 (17.5%)     Mild   13 (6.5%)   40 (20.8%)     High   61 (8.7%)   29 (9.7%)     Severe   17 (9.1%)   53 (18.7%)     Low   38 (82.6%)   23 (73.9%)     Mild   129 (84.3%)   64 (80%)     Average   442 (85.7%)   148 (77.1%)     High   606 (86.1%)   225 (75%)     Severe   165 (88.2%)   234 (73.6%)     Low   8 (17.4%)   4 (13.8%)     Mild   19 (12.4%)   11 (13.8%)     Average   33 (10.3%)   64 (21.3%)     Farents working in a medical field   Yes, one of them   Average   53 (10.3%)   64 (21.3%)     Farents working in a medical field   Yes, one of them   Average   20 (10.7%)   62 (19.5%)     Low   0 (0%)   6 (4.2%)     High   23 (3.3%)   11 (3.7%)     Severe   20 (11.1%)   6 (4.2%)     High   23 (3.3%)   11 (3.7%)     Severe   24 (1.1%)   6 (4.2%)     High   34 (48.4%)   16 (38.7%)     Medical colleges   Average   285 (55.2%)   123 (64.1%)     High   341 (48.4%)   116 (38.7%)     Suudying field   0.000   0.000     Suudying field   0.000   0.000     Low   0.000   0.000     Low   0.000   0.000     Coulond   0.000   0.000     Coulond   0.000   0.000     High   341 (48.4%)   116 (38.7%)     Coulond   0.000   0.000     Coulond   0.000   0.0	Finditudi Status		Low	29 (63%)	0.137	9 (31%)	0.000
High   371 (52.7%)   180 (60%)			Mild	89 (58.2%)		37 (46.3%)	
Severe   86 (46%)   221 (69.5%)		Good	Average	278 (53.9%)		104 (54.2%)	
Excellent   Excellent   Average   54 (10.5%)   14 (17.5%)   14 (17.5%)   14 (17.5%)   14 (17.5%)   14 (17.5%)   14 (17.5%)   14 (17.5%)   14 (17.5%)   16 (18.5%)   16 (18.5%)   16 (18.5%)   16 (18.5%)   17 (9.1%)   17 (9.1%)   17 (9.1%)   18 (18.5%)   18 (17.1%)   18 (18.5%)   18 (17.1%)   18 (18.5%)   18 (17.1%)   18 (18.5%)   18 (17.1%)   18 (18.5%)   18 (17.1%)   18 (18.5%)   18 (17.1%)   18 (18.5%)			High	371 (52.7%)		180 (60%)	
Excellent    Average   54 (10.5%)   40 (20.8			Severe	86 (46%)		221 (69.5%)	
Excellent  Average 54 (10.5%) High 61 (8.7%) Severe 17 (9.1%)  Low 38 (82.6%) Mild 129 (84.3%) No  Average 442 (85.7%) High 606 (86.1%) Severe 165 (89.2%) Low 8 (17.4%) High 606 (86.1%) Severe 165 (89.2%) Average 53 (10.3%) Average 53 (10.3%) Average 53 (10.3%) Average 53 (10.7%)  Example 10 (11.3.8%) Average 20 (10.7%) Average 20 (10.7%) Average 21 (4.1%) Average 21 (4.1%) Average 21 (4.1%) Average 21 (4.1%) Average 22 (1.1%) Average 22 (1.1%) Average 23 (55.2%) Average 285 (55.2%) Average 341 (48.4%) Average 341 (48.4%			Low	7 (15.2%)		5 (17.2%)	
High 61 (8.7%) 29 (9.7%) 53 (16.7%)  Severe 17 (9.1%) 53 (16.7%) 53 (16.7%)  Low 38 (82.6%) 23 (79.3%) 64 (80%)  Mild 129 (84.3%) 64 (80%) 148 (77.1%)  High 606 (86.1%) 225 (75%)  Severe 165 (88.2%) 234 (73.6%) 4 (13.8%) 11 (13.8%)  Mild 19 (12.4%) 11 (13.8%) 11 (13.8%)  Parents working in a medical field  Yes, one of them Average 53 (10.3%) 64 (21.3%) 64 (21.3%) 64 (21.3%) 65 (63.5%)  Yes, both of them Average 20 (10.7%) 62 (19.5%) 64 (21.3%) 66 (4.2%) 11 (13.7%) 65 (63.5%) 11 (13.7%) 65 (63.5%) 11 (13.7%) 65 (63.5%) 11 (13.7%) 65 (63.5%) 11 (13.7%) 65 (63.5%) 11 (13.7%) 65 (63.5%) 11 (13.7%) 13 (44.8%) 13 (44.8%) 13 (44.8%) 13 (44.8%) 13 (44.8%) 13 (44.8%) 14 (44.8%) 14 (44.8%) 14 (44.8%) 14 (44.8%) 14 (44.8%) 14 (			Mild	13 (8.5%)		14 (17.5%)	
Severe   17 (9.1%)   53 (16.7%)		Excellent	Average	54 (10.5%)		40 (20.8%)	
Low   38 (82.6%)     23 (79.3%)     64 (80%)     64 (80%)			High	61 (8.7%)		29 (9.7%)	
Mild 129 (84.3%)  Average 442 (85.7%)  High 606 (86.1%)  Severe 165 (88.2%)  Low 8 (17.4%)  Mild 19 (12.4%)  Parents working in a medical field  Yes, one of them  Average 53 (10.3%)  Severe 20 (10.7%)  Low 0 (0%)  Mild 5 (3.3%)  Yes, both of them  Average 21 (4.1%)  High 23 (3.3%)  Severe 2 (1.1%)  Severe 2 (1.1%)  Low 17 (37%)  Low 17 (37%)  Mild 81 (52.9%)  Medical colleges  Average 285 (55.2%)  Medical colleges  Average 285 (55.2%)  Medical colleges  Average 285 (55.5%)  109 (34.3%)  Studying field			Severe	17 (9.1%)		53 (16.7%)	
No Average 442 (85.7%) High 606 (86.1%) Severe 165 (88.2%) 234 (73.6%) Low 8 (17.4%) Mild 19 (12.4%) 11 (13.8%) Average 53 (10.3%) Average 53 (10.3%) Severe 20 (10.7%) Severe 20 (10.7%) Average 53 (3.3%) Yes, both of them Average 21 (4.1%) High 23 (3.3%) Average 21 (4.1%) Severe 2 (1.1%) Severe 2 (1.1%) Severe 2 (1.1%) Average 31 (44.8%) Mild 81 (52.9%) Average 285 (55.2%) High 341 (48.4%) High 341 (48.4%) Severe 66 (35.3%)  Severe 66 (35.3%)  109 (34.3%) Studying field			Low	38 (82.6%)		23 (79.3%)	
Parents working in a medical field  Yes, one of them  Average 53 (10.3%)  Severe 20 (10.7%)  Severe 20 (10.7%)  Low 0 (0%)  Mild 5 (3.3%)  Yes, both of them  Average 21 (4.1%)  Figh 23 (3.3%)  Yes, both of them  Average 21 (4.1%)  Severe 2 (1.1%)  Severe 2 (1.1%)  Severe 2 (1.1%)  Severe 2 (6.9%)  Mild 81 (52.9%)  Average 285 (55.2%)  Medical colleges  Average 285 (55.2%)			Mild	129 (84.3%)		64 (80%)	
Severe   165 (88.2%)   234 (73.6%)   234 (73.6%)   4 (13.8%)   4 (13.8%)   11 (13.8%)   11 (13.8%)   0.560     11 (13.8%)   0.560     11 (13.8%)   0.560     12 (13.8%)   12 (13.8%)   0.560     13 (14.8%)   14 (13.8%)   0.560     15 (13.8%)   15 (13.3%)   16 (14.2%)   17 (13.8%)   17 (13.8%)   18 (14.8%)   18 (14.8%)   18 (14.8%)   19 (14.1		No	Average	442 (85.7%)		148 (77.1%)	
Parents working in a medical field  Yes, one of them  Average 53 (10.3%) 0.438 36 (18.8%) 0.560  High 75 (10.7%) 64 (21.3%)  Severe 20 (10.7%) 62 (19.5%)  Low 0 (0%) 2 (6.9%)  Mild 5 (3.3%) 5 (6.3%)  Yes, both of them  Average 21 (4.1%) 6 (4.2%)  High 23 (3.3%) 11 (3.7%)  Severe 2 (1.1%) 22 (6.9%)  Low 17 (37%) 13 (44.8%)  Mild 81 (52.9%) 42 (52.5%)  Medical colleges  Average 285 (55.2%) 123 (64.1%)  High 341 (48.4%) 116 (38.7%)  Severe 66 (35.3%) 0.000  Studying field			High	606 (86.1%)		225 (75%)	
Parents working in a medical field  Yes, one of them  Average 53 (10.3%)  Bevere 20 (10.7%)  Average 21 (4.1%)  Figh 23 (3.3%)  Severe 2 (1.1%)  Severe 2 (1.1%)  Figh 23 (3.3%)  Mild 81 (52.9%)  Mild 81 (4.1%)  Mild 81 (4.1%)  Mild 81 (4.1%)  Mild 81 (52.9%)  Average 285 (55.2%)  Mild 81 (4.1%)  Mild 81 (4.1%)  Mild 81 (4.1%)  Mild 81 (4.1%)  Mild 81 (52.9%)  Medical colleges  Average 285 (55.2%)  Medical colleges  Average 285 (55.2%)  Medical colleges  Average 66 (35.3%)  Severe 66 (35.3%)  Medical colleges  Average 285 (55.2%)  Medical colleges			Severe	165 (88.2%)		234 (73.6%)	
Parents working in a medical field  Yes, one of them  Average 53 (10.3%) 0.438 36 (18.8%) 0.560  High 75 (10.7%) 64 (21.3%) 62 (19.5%)  Low 0 (0%) 2 (6.9%)  Mild 5 (3.3%) 5 (6.3%) 5 (6.3%)  Yes, both of them  Average 21 (4.1%) 6 (4.2%)  High 23 (3.3%) 11 (3.7%) 22 (6.9%)  Low 17 (37%) 13 (44.8%)  Mild 81 (52.9%) 42 (52.5%)  Medical colleges  Average 285 (55.2%) 123 (64.1%)  High 341 (48.4%) 116 (38.7%)  Severe 66 (35.3%) 109 (34.3%)  Studying field			Low	8 (17.4%)		4 (13.8%)	
High 75 (10.7%) 64 (21.3%) Severe 20 (10.7%) 62 (19.5%)  Low 0 (0%) 2 (6.9%)  Mild 5 (3.3%) 5 (6.3%)  High 23 (3.3%) 11 (3.7%)  Severe 2 (1.1%) 22 (6.9%)  Low 17 (37%) 13 (44.8%)  Mild 81 (52.9%) 42 (52.5%)  Medical colleges Average 285 (55.2%) 123 (64.1%)  High 341 (48.4%) 116 (38.7%)  Severe 66 (35.3%) 109 (34.3%)  Severe 66 (35.3%) 0.000			Mild	19 (12.4%)		11 (13.8%)	
Severe   20 (10.7%)   62 (19.5%)	Parents working in a medical field	Yes, one of them	Average	53 (10.3%)	0.438	36 (18.8%)	0.560
Low   0 (0%)   2 (6.9%)			High	75 (10.7%)		64 (21.3%)	
Yes, both of them       Mild       5 (3.3%)       5 (6.3%)         Average       21 (4.1%)       6 (4.2%)         High       23 (3.3%)       11 (3.7%)         Severe       2 (1.1%)       22 (6.9%)         Low       17 (37%)       13 (44.8%)         Mild       81 (52.9%)       42 (52.5%)         Medical colleges       Average       285 (55.2%)       123 (64.1%)         High       341 (48.4%)       116 (38.7%)         Severe       66 (35.3%)       109 (34.3%)         O.000       0.000			Severe	20 (10.7%)		62 (19.5%)	
Yes, both of them  Average 21 (4.1%)  High 23 (3.3%)  Severe 2 (1.1%)  Low 17 (37%)  Mild 81 (52.9%)  Medical colleges  Average 285 (55.2%)  High 341 (48.4%)  High 341 (48.4%)  Severe 66 (35.3%)  Studying field  Average 21 (4.1%)  6 (4.2%)  11 (3.7%)  12 (6.9%)  12 (64.1%)  116 (38.7%)  0.000  0.000			Low	0 (0%)		2 (6.9%)	
High 23 (3.3%) 11 (3.7%)  Severe 2 (1.1%) 22 (6.9%)  Low 17 (37%) 13 (44.8%)  Mild 81 (52.9%) 42 (52.5%)  Medical colleges Average 285 (55.2%) 123 (64.1%)  High 341 (48.4%) 116 (38.7%)  Severe 66 (35.3%) 0.000 0.000			Mild	5 (3.3%)		5 (6.3%)	
Severe 2 (1.1%) 22 (6.9%)  Low 17 (37%) 13 (44.8%)  Mild 81 (52.9%) 42 (52.5%)  Medical colleges Average 285 (55.2%) 123 (64.1%)  High 341 (48.4%) 116 (38.7%)  Severe 66 (35.3%) 0.000 0.000		Yes, both of them	Average	21 (4.1%)		6 (4.2%)	
Low 17 (37%) 13 (44.8%)  Mild 81 (52.9%) 42 (52.5%)  Medical colleges Average 285 (55.2%) 123 (64.1%)  High 341 (48.4%) 116 (38.7%)  Severe 66 (35.3%) 0.000 0.000			High	23 (3.3%)		11 (3.7%)	
Medical colleges  Average 285 (55.2%) 123 (64.1%)  High 341 (48.4%) 116 (38.7%)  Studying field  Average 285 (55.2%) 109 (34.3%)  0.000 0.000			Severe	2 (1.1%)		22 (6.9%)	
Medical colleges       Average       285 (55.2%)       123 (64.1%)         High       341 (48.4%)       116 (38.7%)         Severe       66 (35.3%)       109 (34.3%)         O.000       0.000			Low	17 (37%)		13 (44.8%)	
High 341 (48.4%) 116 (38.7%)  Severe 66 (35.3%) 109 (34.3%)  Studying field 0.000 0.000			Mild	81 (52.9%)		42 (52.5%)	
Severe 66 (35.3%) 109 (34.3%) Studying field 0.000 0.000		Medical colleges	Average	285 (55.2%)		123 (64.1%)	
Studying field 0.000 0.000			High	341 (48.4%)		116 (38.7%)	
	Chadaine field		Severe	66 (35.3%)	0.000	109 (34.3%)	0.000
Low 29 (05%) 10 (55.2%)	Studying field		Low	29 (63%)	0.000	16 (55.2%)	0.000

		Mild	72 (47.1%)		38 (47.5%)	
	Non-medical colleges	Average	231 (44.8%)		69 (35.9%)	
		High	363 (51.6%)		184 (61.3%)	
		Severe	121 (46.7%)		209 (65.7%)	
		Low	18 (39.1%)		11 (37.9%)	
		Mild	53 (34.6%)		31 (38.8%)	
	Smoker	Average	189 (36.6%)		67 (34.9%)	0.000
		High	261 (37.1%)		151 (50.3%)	
		Severe	78 (41.7%)	0.699	182 (57.2%)	
		Low	28 (60.9%)	0.000	18 (62.1%)	
		Mild	100 (65.4%)		49 (61.3%)	
	Non-smoker	Average	327 (63.4%)		125 (65.1%)	
		High	443 (62.9%)		149 (49.7%)	
		Severe	109 (58.3%)		136 (42.8%)	

**TABLE 4: Sociodemographic characteristics.** 

Gender and CSS symptoms were significantly related in both Jordanian and Syrian students. Male Jordanian students had a greater risk of developing CSS symptoms (53.1%), whereas females had a higher likelihood of severe CSS symptoms (54.7%). Syrian students demonstrated a different association, in which females had a higher risk for CSS (54.4%). However, similar to the Jordanian study, it was also observed that Syrian female students tended to score higher toward average to severe, with greater than 50%, compared to males, who tended to score higher toward low to mild, with greater than 50%. Compared to married students, being single increased the likelihood of acquiring CSS symptoms by a high proportion (96.3%) for Syrian students, with 90% or more for mild to severe scores. On the other hand, there was no significant relationship between marital status and CSS among Jordanian students.

The overall CSS score for Jordanian students who lived with five or more people was 50.8%. Students who live with such a large number of people have a higher risk of developing high-to-severe CSS symptoms, with a score of more than 50% for each sub-score, compared to students who live with fewer than five people. Nonetheless, no association was discovered between the number of people living in the household and CSS for Syrian students. In the sample from Jordan, there was a significant association between financial status and CSS score, with students who had a good financial status having a higher chance of developing CSS symptoms, with a total CSS score of 60%. In the sample from Syria, there was no significant relationship between financial level and CSS score.

Both Jordanian and Syrian students showed significant correlations between their field of study and their CSS scores. Students studying at non-medical faculties had a greater probability of acquiring CSS symptoms, with 56.1 % for Jordanian students and 50.8 % for Syrian students. Medical faculty students in both countries tended to score higher toward mild to average sub-scores (50%) and higher. On the other hand, non-medical faculties' students had a higher tendency for high and severe CSS sub-scores of 50% or more.

Non-smoker Jordanian students had a significantly higher overall CSS score (51.9%) and a significant tendency toward low to average sub-scores of 60% or higher in comparison to smoker students who scored high to severe sub-scores of 50% and above. There were no significant correlations between smoking and CSS scores among Syrian students.

The previous virus infection history has significant correlations with the CSS scores for the students from both countries. Jordanian students who had never been infected with the virus had the highest probability of acquiring CSS symptoms at 46.1%, followed by previously infected students who confirmed their infection by PCR test at 35.8%. Syrian students who had COVID-19 symptoms but were not tested had a greater probability of acquiring CSS symptoms, with an overall CSS score of 52.1%, followed by students who were never infected with the virus, whose overall CSS score was 43.3%. COVID-19 stress syndrome has five domains, each representing a group of symptoms, and each domain has a severity scale ranging from mild to severe, as demonstrated in Table *5*.

COVID-19 stress syndrome domains	Country	Absent	Mild	Moderate	Severe
Decree wheels and contamination wheels	Syria	28%	47%	22%	4%
Danger subscale and contamination subscale	Jordan	24%	26%	27%	23%
Socio-economic consequences subscale	Syria	46%	29%	18%	7%
	Jordan	51%	27%	18%	5%
	Syria	66%	22%	10%	2%
Xenophobia subscale	Jordan	44%	23%	21%	13%
Tenum dia dana andra ada	Syria	87%	10%	3%	0.2%
Traumatic stress subscale	Jordan	63%	26%	9%	3%
Compulsive checking subscale	Syria	49%	33%	14%	3%
	Jordan	34%	40%	18%	9%

TABLE 5: COVID-19 stress syndrome domains and distribution between the countries.

On the danger and contamination domains, more than half of the Syrian students were experiencing symptoms related to them. In contrast, these symptoms were absent in 24% of Jordanian students and were evenly distributed on the severity scale, with each mild, moderate, and severe representing around 25%. Both Jordanian and Syrian participants significantly experienced symptoms related to the socioeconomic consequences domain, which were seen in around half of the students from both countries. Most of them were of mild presentation, with a percentage of approximately 25% for each country. Similarly, students from both countries have shown mild symptoms related to xenophobia, with a percentage of approximately 25% for each. However, the overall percentage of symptoms related to this domain was 34% among Syrian participants and 56% among Jordanian participants. Eighty-seven percent of the Syrian population has not shown any symptoms related to the posttraumatic domain; similar results were demonstrated in Jordan, where such symptoms were absent in 63% of the total sample. The same pattern of around half of the participants showing symptoms and most of them falling under the mild category was also seen with symptoms related to the compulsive checking domain (Table 5).

#### **Discussion**

The COVID-19 pandemic is going beyond being a physical health catastrophe [17]. Public health strategies dealing with rapidly spreading diseases, such as COVID-19, require strict precautionary measures to control the disease; such measures negatively impact the economy, business, and educational systems, as well as, to some extent, mental health [16,17]. Stress and worry about the consequences of the pandemic are the central features of CSS. A stress scale was developed to measure CSS. Thus, understanding the COVID-19 stress syndrome and assessing its prevalence in an area with a specific culture that might have its influences is paramount to facing the mental and psychological challenges associated with the COVID-19 pandemic.

This study showed a significant correlation between CSS and age among Jordanian students, in which younger students had higher CSS scores than older students. Although this correlation was not established among Syrian students, according to the study by Taylor et al., age and the total score on the CSS scales had a negative correlation [18]. Similar results were also reported by Clemente-Suárez et al., in which younger age groups had a high risk of developing psychiatric symptoms during the COVID-19 pandemic [19]. This relationship can be explained by the fact that Middle Eastern culture considers shifting from school to university a major life event with stressful responsibilities. However, this is not the case in Syria. Although it has the same cultural background as Jordan, it has been witnessing exceptional circumstances that divert the general population's attention, including students, to the basic life demands and conditions of war. A significant correlation between gender and CSS scores was observed in both countries. Both Jordanian and Syrian female students tended to have severe CSS symptoms. Consistent with our results, the data from the literature suggests that females are more likely to suffer from the significant psychological impact of the outbreak as well as higher levels of stress, anxiety, and depression [7,20]. On the other hand, in a study conducted in Iran, the researchers found no correlation between depression, anxiety, and gender during the COVID-19 pandemic [21]. Another study conducted by Bäuerle et al. indicated that the male gender is a risk factor associated with a higher level of PTSD post-COVID-19 [22]. Our results can be attributed to the differences in the hormonal response to stress along with structural and anatomical differences between males' and females' brains [23].

Although there was no significant relationship between marital status and CSS in the Jordan division of the

study, single Syrian students had higher CSS scores, indicating that being a single Syrian student is a risk factor for developing the syndrome's symptoms. Similar to our results from Jordan, marital status was not found to have a significant association with the psychological impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic among Jordanian nurses and the general Chinese population [7,20]. As per our findings from Syria, Monistrol-Mula et al. found that being married decreased the probability of screening positive for anxiety and reduced the risk of anxiety for pre-pandemic mentally disordered patients [24]. Marriage may offer a strong social support system to deal with stressors, which helps explain why marriage has a favorable effect on overall psychological health. The same idea still holds true even though Jordan has not demonstrated the same outcomes, as Jordanian culture may have its own social support system that may include married status but may also extend beyond it, an area of study that requires further research. This study showed a high risk of developing CSS symptoms among Jordanian students living in households of five or more. However, no significant effect on Syrian students was established. Although no studies assessed the relationship between CSS and household size, it was found that COVID-19 stress is highest among individuals who live alone and among those with many other adults [25]. Our findings can be explained by the fact that each additional resident increases the risk of COVID-19 exposure. Moreover, opportunities for alone time and privacy were reduced as many individuals worked and studied from home. Online working and studying were only partially activated in Syria.

Our findings indicated that Jordanian students who were financially stable had a higher risk of experiencing CSS symptoms. But no noticeable impact on Syrian students was found. A Jordanian study demonstrated that students with a medium or low financial situation, compared to economically stable students, tend to be more concerned about educational costs than COVID-19 [26]. However, during the COVID-19 pandemic, it has been reported that individuals with lower economic resources had a more significant burden of depression symptoms [27,28]. Non-medical faculty students in both Syria and Jordan had a greater probability of acquiring CSS symptoms compared with medical faculty students. These results were consistent with a prior study that revealed non-medical students to have a higher prevalence of psychological distress [29]. Additionally, AlJaber found that non-medical students were more likely to experience depression than medical students [30]. On the other hand, several previous studies have illustrated the high level of stress among medical, dental, and nursing students [31,32]. However, during the COVID pandemic, it has been reported that medical students' anxiety levels decreased while those of nonmedical students increased [33]. Several factors can explain our findings: first, the introduction of online learning protects medical students from the perceived risk of COVID-19 as there is no direct contact with patients; second, the variable sources of information about the pandemic among both groups. For instance, limited knowledge about the disease might contribute to negative implications and feelings of fear and anxiety about catching the infection, its symptoms, and its complications [33]. This may be due to several factors, including medical students' being far from the perceived risk of COVID-19 given the introduction of online teaching or the variable sources of information about the pandemic among both groups. Students' fears and anxiety might be reduced by knowledge of the virus. At the same time, an inadequate understanding of COVID-19, its prognosis, transmission, and control measures might contribute to negative implications and a fear of the unknown [33].

The results of our study demonstrated that Jordanian smoker students had a significantly higher CSS score in comparison to non-smokers, and there was no significant correlation between smoking and CSS among Syrian students. It is well established that smoking is one of the coping strategies for stress [34]. Furthermore, consistent with our results, Taylor et al. studied coping strategies with self-isolation and found that people with high CSS scores were more likely to have tried coping strategies [18]. Several studies emphasize this concept, in which they have found that mental distress caused by the effect of precautionary measures formed the primary driving force that led to the significant increase in smoking levels and high rates of ex-smokers relapse, and as a consequence, higher negative mental health impacts were seen with those who smoked more [35,36]. This study is crucial in identifying the root causes of COVID-19 stress syndrome among university students. By reducing the prevalence of this syndrome, we may also mitigate its negative effects, which include academic challenges, social isolation, bullying, and psychological disorders. Using self-reported questionnaires in a cross-sectional study design can limit the validity and reliability of the data, as it can be affected by response bias. Additionally, this type of study design can only suggest correlations or associations but not establish causality. Therefore, further research using different methods is needed to confirm the results and establish causality.

#### **Conclusions**

Beyond just harming people's physical health, the COVID-19 epidemic has had a wide range of detrimental repercussions on the economy, education, and mental health. A stress scale that covers different kinds of concerns and symptoms like DAN, SEC, XEN, TSS, and CHE has been established to gauge the severity of CSS. The development of CSS symptoms has been significantly linked to gender, with higher scores among female pupils. Household size and other characteristics, such as marital status, may also be important. Compared to students in the medical faculty, non-medical faculty students are more likely to have CSS symptoms. Furthermore, Jordanian students' chances of exhibiting CSS symptoms are higher when their financial situation is stable.

# **Additional Information**

#### **Disclosures**

Human subjects: Consent was obtained or waived by all participants in this study. Damascus University, Syrian Private University, and Hashemite University issued approval No. 9/14/2020/2021. Animal subjects: All authors have confirmed that this study did not involve animal subjects or tissue. Conflicts of interest: In compliance with the ICMJE uniform disclosure form, all authors declare the following: Payment/services info: All authors have declared that no financial support was received from any organization for the submitted work. Financial relationships: All authors have declared that they have no financial relationships at present or within the previous three years with any organizations that might have an interest in the submitted work. Other relationships: All authors have declared that there are no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

# Acknowledgements

We want to acknowledge Malaz Shammout, Nour Zuhair Abd Alaal, and Mohamad Sami Al Zain for their contributions to data collection. Ahmad Al Houri and Abdullah Alhouri contributed equally to this manuscript and are joint first authors.

#### References

- Sheu JC, McKay D, Storch EA: COVID-19 and OCD: potential impact of exposure and response prevention therapy. J Anxiety Disord. 2020, 76:102314. 10.1016/j.janxdis.2020.102314
- Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). (2020). Accessed: April 18, 2023: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/index.html.
- Huang Y, Zhao N: Generalized anxiety disorder, depressive symptoms and sleep quality during COVID-19 outbreak in China: a web-based cross-sectional survey. Psychiatry Res. 2020, 288:112954.
   10.1016/j.psychres.2020.112954
- Al Omari O, Al Sabei S, Al Rawajfah O, et al.: Prevalence and predictors of depression, anxiety, and stress among youth at the time of COVID-19: an online cross-sectional multicountry study. Depress Res Treat. 2020, 2020;8887727, 10.1155/2020/8887727
- Al Houri HN, Alhouri A, Akasheh RT, et al.: The development and validation of a novel COVID19 stigma scale among healthcare workers (COVISS-HCWs). BMC Health Serv Res. 2022, 22:1481. 10.1186/s12913-022-08911-5
- Qiu J, Shen B, Zhao M, Wang Z, Xie B, Xu Y: A nationwide survey of psychological distress among Chinese people in the COVID-19 epidemic: implications and policy recommendations. Gen Psychiatr. 2020, 33:e100213. 10.1136/gpsych-2020-100213
- Wang C, Pan R, Wan X, Tan Y, Xu L, Ho CS, Ho RC: Immediate psychological responses and associated factors during the initial stage of the 2019 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) epidemic among the general population in China. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2020, 17: 10.3390/ijerph17051729
- Person B, Sy F, Holton K, Govert B, Liang A: Fear and stigma: the epidemic within the SARS outbreak.
   Emerg Infect Dis. 2004, 10:358-63. 10.3201/eid1002.030750
- Arora A, Jha AK, Alat P, Das SS: Understanding coronaphobia. Asian J Psychiatr. 2020, 54:102384. 10.1016/j.ajp.2020.102384
- 10. Taylor S: Covid stress syndrome: Clinical and nosological considerations. Curr Psychiatry Rep. 2021, 23:19.
- Taylor S, Landry CA, Paluszek MM, Fergus TA, McKay D, Asmundson GJ: Development and initial validation of the COVID Stress Scales. J Anxiety Disord. 2020, 72:102232. 10.1016/j.janxdis.2020.102232
- Hamaideh SH, Hamdan-Mansour AM: Psychological, cognitive, and personal variables that predict college academic achievement among health sciences students. Nurse Educ Today. 2014, 34:703-8.
   10.1016/j.nedt.2013.09.010
- Hamdan-Mansour AM, Mahmoud KF, Al Shibi AN, Arabiat DH: Impulsivity and sensation-seeking personality traits as predictors of substance use among university students. J Psychosoc Nurs Ment Health Serv. 2018, 56:57-63. 10.3928/02793695-20170905-04
- Al-Rabiaah A, Temsah MH, Al-Eyadhy AA, et al.: Middle East respiratory syndrome-coronavirus (MERS-CoV)
  associated stress among medical students at a university teaching hospital in Saudi Arabia. J Infect Public
  Health. 2020, 13:687-91. 10.1016/j.jiph.2020.01.005
- Faul F, Erdfelder E, Buchner A, Lang AG: Statistical power analyses using G\*Power 3.1: tests for correlation and regression analyses. Behav Res Methods. 2009, 41:1149-60. 10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149
- $16. \quad \text{Cohen J: Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale;} \\ 1988.$
- Socio-economic impact of COVID-19 | United Nations Development Programme . (2023). Accessed: April 18, 2023: https://www.undp.org/coronavirus/socio-economic-impact-covid-19.
- Taylor S, Landry CA, Paluszek MM, Fergus TA, McKay D, Asmundson GJ: COVID stress syndrome: concept, structure, and correlates. Depress Anxiety. 2020, 37:706-14. 10.1002/da.23071
- Clemente-Suárez VJ, Martínez-González MB, Benitez-Agudelo JC, et al.: The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on mental disorders. A critical review. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021, 18:10.3390/ijerph181910041
- Qutishat M, Abu Sharour L, Al-Dameery K, Al-Harthy I, Al-Sabei S: COVID-19-related posttraumatic stress disorder among Jordanian nurses during the pandemic. Disaster Med Public Health Prep. 2021, 1-8. 10.1017/dmp.2021.199
- Khademian F, Delavari S, Koohjani Z, Khademian Z: An investigation of depression, anxiety, and stress and its relating factors during COVID-19 pandemic in Iran. BMC Public Health. 2021, 21:275. 10.1186/s12889-021-10329-3

- Bäuerle A, Teufel M, Musche V, et al.: Increased generalized anxiety, depression and distress during the COVID-19 pandemic: a cross-sectional study in Germany. J Public Health (Oxf). 2020, 42:672-8.
   10.1093/pubmed/fdaa106
- Verma R, Balhara YP, Gupta CS: Gender differences in stress response: role of developmental and biological determinants. Ind Psychiatry J. 2011, 20:4-10. 10.4103/0972-6748.98407
- Monistrol-Mula A, Felez-Nobrega M, Domènech-Abella J, et al.: The impact of COVID-related perceived stress and social support on generalized anxiety and major depressive disorders: moderating effects of prepandemic mental disorders. Ann Gen Psychiatry. 2022, 21:7. 10.1186/s12991-022-00385-3
- Oh J, Neal ZP: Two's company, but four's a crowd: the relationship among COVID-19 stress, household size, and life satisfaction. Collabra: Psychol. 2021, 7:24923. 10.1525/collabra.24923
- Al-Husban N, Alkhayat A, Aljweesri M, et al.: Effects of COVID-19 pandemic on medical students in Jordanian universities: a multi-center cross-sectional study. Ann Med Surg (Lond). 2021, 67:102466. 10.1016/j.amsu.2021.102466
- Ettman CK, Abdalla SM, Cohen GH, Sampson L, Vivier PM, Galea S: Prevalence of depression symptoms in US adults before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. JAMA Netw Open. 2020, 3:e2019686.
   10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.19686
- Hertz-Palmor N, Moore TM, Gothelf D, et al.: Association among income loss, financial strain and depressive symptoms during COVID-19: Evidence from two longitudinal studies. J Affect Disord. 2021, 291:1-8. 10.1016/j.jad.2021.04.054
- Bhat U S, Amaresha AC, Kodancha P, et al.: Psychological distress among college students of coastal district of Karnataka: a community-based cross-sectional survey. Asian J Psychiatr. 2018, 38:20-4. 10.1016/j.aip.2018.10.006
- AlJaber MI: The prevalence and associated factors of depression among medical students of Saudi Arabia: a systematic review. J Family Med Prim Care. 2020, 9:2608-14. 10.4103/jfmpc.jfmpc\_255\_20
- 31. Systematic review of depression, anxiety, and other indicator. (2006). Accessed: April 18, 2023: https://journals.lww.com/academicmedicine/Fulltext/2006/04000/Systematic\_Review\_of\_Depression.
- Labrague LJ, McEnroe-Petitte DM, Gloe D, Thomas L, Papathanasiou IV, Tsaras K: A literature review on stress and coping strategies in nursing students. J Ment Health. 2017, 26:471-80. 10.1080/09638237.2016.1244721
- Saddik B, Hussein A, Sharif-Askari FS, et al.: Increased levels of anxiety among medical and non-medical university students during the COVID-19 pandemic in the United Arab Emirates. Risk Manag Healthc Policy. 2020, 13:2395-406. 10.2147/RMHP.S273333
- Fidler JA, West R: Self-perceived smoking motives and their correlates in a general population sample. Nicotine Tob Res. 2009, 11:1182-8. 10.1093/ntr/ntp120
- Chen-Sankey JC, Broun A, Duarte DA, et al.: Exploring changes in cigar smoking patterns and motivations to quit cigars among black young adults in the time of COVID-19. Addict Behav Rep. 2020, 12:100317. 10.1016/j.abrep.2020.100317
- Tzu-Hsuan Chen D: The psychosocial impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on changes in smoking behavior: evidence from a nationwide survey in the UK. Tob Prev Cessat. 2020, 6:59. 10.18332/tpc/126976