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ABSTRACT

Objectives: We aimed to investigate the psychological problems on people infected with SARS-CoV-2 during the pandemic.

Methods: In this living systematic review and meta-analyses, we searched seven electronic databases for cross-sectional studies and longitudinal studies on psychological problems on COVID-19 patients from Jan 1, 2020 to Oct 7, 2020. The primary outcome was prevalence of various psychological problems such as anxiety, depression, stress, insomnia, somatization, and fear. We pooled data for prevalence with their 95% confidence interval (CI) using random effect models and assessed the study quality based on the 11-item checklist recommended by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.

Results: Forty-four studies, including studies from China (35), Italy (2), Iran (2), India (1), Korea (1), Ecuador (1), Switzerland (1), Germany (1), Ontario (1), were identified by comprising a total of 8587 completed questionnaires and 38 studies for meta-analyses. The prevalence of anxiety, depression, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), insomnia, somatization, and fear in patients with COVID-19 was 16.6% (10.1%-23.1%), 37.7% (29.3%-46.2%), 41.5% (9.3%-73.7%), 68.3% (48.6%-88.0%), 36.5% (20.2%-52.8%), 47.6% (9.4%-85.7%), respectively. The prevalence of anxiety, depression, and insomnia in severe COVID-19 patients (intensive care unit inpatients) was higher than mild or clinically stable COVID-19 patients.

Limitations: A significant degree of heterogeneity in terms of populations, sampling methods, scales was noted across studies.

Conclusions: There existed high proportions of COVID-19 patients with psychological problem. The prevalence of psychological problems was closely related to the patients themselves, their surroundings and social support. It is imperative to provide ontime psychological care service for COVID-19 patients and to follow-up them for a longer period.

1. Introduction

The cumulative number of people infected with SARS-CoV-2 has exceeded 100 million across the globe (WHO, 2021). Many studies have confirmed that the global pandemic has caused a wide range of psychosocial problems (Brooks et al., 2020; Galea et al., 2020; Kisely et al., 2020; Naqos and Khouchani, 2020). As for people infected by SARS-CoV-2, who have attracted the most concern, great attention must be paid to their psychological problems, regardless of asymptomatic patients, patients with mild symptoms, or clinically cured patients (Bo et al., 2020; Mazza et al., 2020; Wu et al., 2020).

Conditions and degrees vary greatly among the people infected with SARS-CoV-2. The psychological problems of COVID-19 patients are closely related to the medical and social environment. Some studies have shown that COVID-19 patients have obvious adverse mental health effects and apparent sleep difficulties after being discharged from the hospital (Cai et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2020). SARS-CoV-2 is so highly infectious that families are prone to infection in clusters. Meanwhile, COVID-19 patients whose family members also infected with COVID-19 or died of COVID-19 are more likely to suffer from depression and
anxiety than other patients (Nie et al., 2020). The quality of life in COVID-19 patients who suffer from depression was significantly lower than that of non-depressed patients (Ma et al., 2020). A meta-analyses showed that more than 40% of COVID-19 patients had depression or anxiety, and nearly a third had sleep disorders (Deng et al., 2020). With a clearer understanding of SARS-CoV-2, vaccine research and development, and large-scale vaccination, is there any change in the psychological experience of people infected by SARS-CoV-2? What psychological problems do COVID-19 patients have after the pandemic? If we fail to add the time dimension to evaluate the existing research, it is difficult to answer these questions. According to previous studies, survivors of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) in China reported their anxiety and/or depression symptoms and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) (Cheng et al., 2004; Hong et al., 2009). We need to focus long-term attention on psychological problems caused by the COVID-19 outbreak, especially the psychological problems of SARS-CoV-2 infected.

Living systematic review is a continuously updated systematic review, which involves the latest research evidence in a timely manner (Elliott et al., 2017; Siemieniuk et al., 2020). The research method of living systematic review can be applied to any systematic review. The literature retrieval frequency and the time of integrating new information into systematic review can exert an important effect on the application of systematic review. At present, there is no designated time frequency for living systematic review updates.

In the context of COVID-19 pandemic, living research evidence update plays an essential role in better understanding the impacts of the disease. Due to the changing evidence and increasing quantity and quality, the living systematic review research paradigm has more prominent advantages. There was a report on a living systematic review on the psychological health of COVID-19 patients (Thombs et al., 2020). However, in September 2020, the team announced that it would stop updating the research on "Factors Related to the Degree or Changes of Psychological Symptoms", because cross-sectional studies related to the research problem have a rapidly growing number and lower quality, and the team was shorthanded. In other words, this living systematic review could no longer provide the latest evidence of psychological symptom changes in different groups.

Therefore, there has been no living systematic review of the psychological abnormal states of COVID-19 patients as other team has stopped updating. This research aims to explore the characteristics and related factors of psychological problems in the global COVID-19 patients by using the living systematic review method, thus may exerting a positive effect on improving the psychological health of COVID-19 patients.

2. Methods

A protocol provides the details methods of this systematic review (see supplementary file). Methods and results were formatted based on the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses guidelines 2020 (PRISMA) (Page et al., 2021) and Meta-analyses of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) guidelines (Stroup et al., 2000).

2.1. Search strategy

Based on the comprehensive search of seven electronic databases, including PubMed, Embase, PsycInfo, Wanfang Data, Chongqing VIP, Sinomed, and China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI), the COVID-19 mental health database was established via the NaviExpress software (V3.3.0, Beijing Aiqinhai Lezhi Technology Co., Ltd.), which included the literature on mental health studies related to COVID-19 since January 1, 2020. The search strategy for all electronic databases were shown in the supplementary file. The COVID-19 mental health database will update the search every six months. The publication language included in the study was English or Chinese. The latest version of the COVID-19 mental health database had been updated to 7th October 2020. The building of the COVID-19 mental health database can allow us to quickly find the related research papers related to this living systematic review. We conducted the research based on the data selection from this database according to inclusion and exclusion criteria. To ensure the comprehensiveness of published data, this research expanded and retrieved the reference list of literature.

2.2. Selection criteria

Inclusion Criteria

1) Population: people infected by SARS-CoV-2, regardless of age, gender, race, including suspected SARS-CoV-2 infected patients without a clear nucleic acid diagnosis but with highly suspected clinical performance;
2) Research design: Observational studies, including cross-sectional studies (such as epidemiological survey, questionnaire survey, online survey, etc) and longitudinal studies;
3) Published or pre-print published articles, conference articles or other gray documents;
4) Outcome indicators: prevalence of different psychological problems and associated factors, such as depression, anxiety, stress, insomnia, somatization, and fear.

Exclusion criteria

1) Repeated studies;
2) Unrepresentative or unclear sample population, which could not be determined whether the patient had SARS-CoV-2 infection;
3) Letters to the editors or correspondence, without providing any original data.

2.3. Data selection and extraction

The two authors (F Dong and HL Liu) independently selected literature and extracted data and cross-checked the repetition. If two or more papers came from the same research, the most complete paper with the most detailed reports were selected. Any disagreement would be settled through adjudication based on discussion or consultation with a third member of the research group. First, the titles and abstracts of the literature were read. Then the full texts were read to determine whether they could be included in the research. If the important information involved in the research was missing or unclear, we would contact the author of the original study through emails and telephone. Data extraction table included: 1) first author, research subject, date of publication; 2) research characteristics: population category, country, research location, number of participants; 3) key factors of assessing bias and risks: response rate, research method, sampling method, survey scale, survey method, the number of effective questionnaires, survey time, survey node; 4) result indicators and result measurement data: the number of reports of anxiety, depression, stress disorder, insomnia, etc., and relevant grouping data and risk factors were also included.

2.4. Methodology quality assessment

The two authors assessed the quality of the methodology and independently cross-checked the results. In terms of the methodology quality of the cross-sectional or longitudinal studies included in the research, it was evaluated using the list of 11 items recommended by Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality(AHRQ) (Rostom et al., 2004). An item would be scored '0' if its answer was "NO" or "UNCLEAR"; otherwise, it would be '1'. The quality assessment of the studies were as follows: Low quality = 0-3; Medium quality = 4-7; High quality = 8-11.
2.5. Data analysis

The prevalence rate was defined as the number of cases detected divided by sample size and standard error. To incorporate a study into the meta-analyses, two conditions have to be met: 1) it should determine the results using a recognized scale rather than self-designed questionnaires; 2) the number of result indicators or the scores of specific items in the scale should be accurately reported. The inverse variance method of DerSimonian and Laird (adjustment) (DerSimonian and Laird, 2015) was adopted to calculate the prevalence rate and the integrated prevalence of estimates and 95% confidence interval (CI). Heterogeneity between studies was expressed in $I^2$, and the results of the meta-analyses were represented by forest plot. We considered using the subgroup analysis for the different stages and degrees of patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection, and divided the patients into overall patients with no distinguishing feature, patients with mild symptoms or clinically stable patients, severe patients (patients admitted to an intensive care unit diagnosed according to the COVID-19 diagnostic and treatment protocol), discharged patients, patients with suspected infection based on their characteristics; sensitivity analysis was conducted to test the abnormal values that may occur, excluding the research that failed to clearly report the investigation time or survey time point; according to the investigation time, the studies were divided into the first stage (from January to the beginning of February 2020), the second stage (from mid-February to mid-March 2020), the third stage (after late March 2020); or according to the time point of the investigation, the studies were divided into the studies during hospitalization or just completed the definite diagnosis, and the follow-up investigation conducted when or after the patients left the hospital. Due to the existence of publication bias, Begg’s test and Egger’s test were used for analysis. $P < 0.05$ was considered to be statistically significant. Meta-analyses were performed using Stata v16.0 (StataCorp LLC). Because of the heterogeneity of the studies on patients from different countries, we used the narrative analysis to summarize the outstanding findings of the studies included in the systematic review, and presented the results with tables.

Fig. 1. Flow diagram of the selection of studies for the systematic review and meta-analyses.
3. Results

3.1. Study selection

Through the preliminary screening of COVID-19 mental health database, 26,590 literature were selected. After the repetition was excluded, there were 15,503 left. After reviewing the titles and abstracts, we finally established the COVID-19 mental health database (dynamic version, Date 19/02/2021), including 5,185 papers. In this database, through browsing the titles and the abstracts, papers without obvious relations with the theme of this systematic review were excluded, then 77 articles were reviewed and classified, and 44 of them were finally included in this review. (see Fig. 1)

3.2. Study characteristics

The systematic review included 44 studies. Table 1 provides the literature characteristics included in this review. One research (Zhang et al., 2020) conducted a longitudinal study and the other studies conducted cross-sectional studies. Forty-four studies included 8,587 completed questionnaires, and 33 (75.0%) reported response rates. Of the 44 papers, 23 (Bo et al., 2020; Cai et al., 2020; Chang and Park, 2020; Chen et al., 2020; Dai et al., 2020; Guo et al., 2020; Hu et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2020; Ma et al., 2020; Mazza et al., 2020; Nie et al., 2020; Paz et al., 2020; Qi et al., 2020; Ramezani et al., 2020; Sahoo et al., 2020; Speth et al., 2020; Tomasoni et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020; Wesemann et al., 2020; Wu et al., 2020; Zarghami et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020; Zeng et al., 2020; Zeng et al., 2020; Cheng et al., 2020; Cheng et al., 2020; Gong et al., 2020; He et al., 2020; Hu et al., 2020; Li, W. et al., 2020; Li,X. et al., 2020; Lv et al., 2020; Miao et al., 2020; Qin et al., 2020; Qiu et al., 2020; Shao et al., 2020; Sun et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020; Wu and Peng, 2020; Yuan et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2020) were published in English and 21 (Cao et al., 2020; Cao et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2020; Cheng et al., 2020; Cheng et al., 2020; Gong et al., 2020; He et al., 2020; Hu et al., 2020; Li, W. et al., 2020; Li,X. et al., 2020; Lv et al., 2020; Miao et al., 2020; Qin et al., 2020; Qiu et al., 2020; Shao et al., 2020; Sun et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020; Wu and Peng, 2020; Yuan et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2020) were published in English and 21 (Cao et al., 2020; Cao et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2020; Cheng et al., 2020; Cheng et al., 2020; Gong et al., 2020; He et al., 2020; Hu et al., 2020; Li, W. et al., 2020; Li,X. et al., 2020; Lv et al., 2020; Miao et al., 2020; Qin et al., 2020; Qiu et al., 2020; Shao et al., 2020; Sun et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020; Wu and Peng, 2020; Yuan et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2020) in Chinese. Two studies (Mazza et al., 2020; Tomasoni et al., 2020) came from Italy, two (Ramezani et al., 2020; Zarghami et al., 2020) from Iran, one (Sahoo et al., 2020) from India, one (Paz et al., 2020) from Ecuador, one (Chang and Park, 2020) from Korea, one (Speth et al., 2020) from Switzerland, one (Wesemann et al., 2020) from Germany, and the other studies (35,79.5%) from China. 20 (45.4%) of Chinese studies were from Hubei Province. Three studies (6.8%) did not report survey time; all the other studies were conducted from the end of January to the beginning of June 2020, and 30 studies (68.2%) were conducted from the end of January 2020 to March 2020. Twenty-five studies (56.8%) investigated COVID-19 patients with no distinguishing feature; two (4.5%) included discharged COVID-19 patients; two (4.5%) included severe COVID-19 patients; six (13.6%) studies included mild or clinically stable COVID-19 patients; nine (20.5%) included suspected COVID-19 patients. Twenty-three studies (52.3%) were investigated by online questionnaires issued through online applications; 17 (38.6%) were completed by researchers through face-to-face interviews with patients; two (4.5%) were conducted by researchers through telephone interview questionnaires, and five studies (11.4%) did not use the form of questionnaires. Twenty-three studies (52.3%) did not clearly state the sampling methods; nine (20.5%) used cluster sampling; nine (20.5%) used convenience sampling method; two (4.5%) used sequential sampling method, and one (2.3%) used non-probability sampling method (without defining a specific sampling method).

3.3. Methodology quality assessment

The methodology quality scores of all studies included are shown in Table 2. Among these studies, one (2.3%) was rated as high-quality; 33 (75.0%) as medium-quality, and 10 (22.7%) as low-quality.

3.4. Meta-analyses

Thirty-eight studies were included in the meta-analyses, and integrated analysis was made on the prevalence rates of abnormal psychological problems, such as anxiety, depression, PTSD, insomnia, somatization, and fear.

3.4.1. Prevalence of different psychological problems

3.4.1.1. Anxiety. Twenty-seven studies reported the prevalence of anxiety in 5,144 patients, and the scales used to measure anxiety states included self-rating depression scale (SAS, n = 8, 29.6%), generalized anxiety scale-7 (GAD-7, n = 7, 25.9%), hospital anxiety and depression scale (HADS, n = 4, 14.8%), symptom checklist-90 (SCL-90, n = 4, 14.8%), Hamilton anxiety scale (HAMA, n = 2, 7.4%), and generalized anxiety scale-2 (GAD-2, n = 2, 7.4%). The meta-analyses showed that the combined prevalence was 80.5% (80.5%-100.0%). Among them, studies reported the prevalence of anxiety was 25.6% (23.0%-28.1%), and that of above moderate anxiety was 16.6% (10.1%-23.1%).

According to the subgroup analysis of the degree of patients’ condition, the combined prevalence of overall patients with no distinguishing feature was 25.6% (23.0%-41.4%), the combined prevalence of severe patients was 56.7% (92.8%-83.7%), that of patients with mild symptoms or clinically stable patients was 30.9% (16.3%-25.6%), that of discharged patients was 32.7% (12.7%-52.7%), and that of patients with suspected infection was 58.8% (42.6%-74.9%).

3.4.1.2. Depression. Twenty-seven studies reported the prevalence of depression in 6,002 patients. The scales used to measure depression states were patient health questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9, n = 9, 33.3%), self-rating depression scale (SDS, n = 6,22.2%), HADS (n = 4, 14.8%), SCL-90 (n = 4,14.8%), Hamilton depression scale (HAMD, n = 2, 7.4%), and patient health questionnaire-2 (PHQ-2, n = 2, 7.4%). The meta-analyses showed that the combined prevalence was 37.7% (29.3%-46.2%, see Fig. 3). Among them, 11 studies reported the degree of depression, and the meta-analyses showed that the combined prevalence of mild depression was 30.3% (23.8%-36.8%), and that of above moderate depression was 23.1% (18.0%-28.1%). According to the subgroup analysis of the degree of patients’ condition, the combined prevalence of overall patients with no distinguishing feature was 30.5% (23.0%-38.0%), the combined prevalence of severe patients was 66.3% (15.7%-116.9%), that of patients with mild symptoms or clinically stable patients was 30.9% (6.8%-54.9%), that of discharged patients was 52.1% (25.2%-79.1%), and that of patients with suspected infection was 43.4% (24.6%-62.2%).

3.4.1.3. PTSD. Ten studies reported the prevalence of PTSD in 1,982 patients. The scales used to measure depression states were PTSD checklist-civilian version (PCL-C, n = 3, 30.0%), impact of events scale-revised (IES-R, n = 1, 10.0%), post-traumatic stress disorder self-rating scale (PTSD-SS, n = 1, 10.0%), and Stanford’s acute stress response questionnaire (SASQ, n = 1, 10.0%). The meta-analyses showed that the combined prevalence of PTSD was 41.5% (9.3%-73.7%, see Fig. 4). According to the subgroup analysis of the degree of patients’ condition, the combined prevalence of overall patients with no distinguishing feature was 44.6% (14.4%-74.9%), that of patients with mild symptoms or clinically stable patients was 96.2% (94.8%-97.6%), that of discharged patients was 21.3% (3.2%-39.4%), and that of patients with suspected infection was 25.6% (1.8%-49.5%).

3.4.1.4. Insomnia. Five studies reported the prevalence of insomnia in 1,130 patients. The scales used to measure depression states were...
| No. | First author       | Year   | Population                      | Study location          | Research type | Number of participants (n) | Response rate(%) | Sampling method | Survey form | Survey tools                         | Completed questionnaire (n) | Gender (n, male/female) | Survey time | Survey point                        |
|-----|-------------------|--------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|------------------------------------|
| 1   | Yu Wu             | 2020   | severe COVID-19 patients        | Wuhan, Hubei, China     | CSS           | 60                         | 100.0           | convenience sampling | FIQS        | HADS                                | 60                       | 34/26                     | 10/02/2020-13/02/2020 | DHQ                   |
| 2   | Sha Miao          | 2020   | severe COVID-19 patients        | Wuhan, Hubei, China     | CSS           | 40                         | 100.0           | NR              | FIQS        | HADS, AIS                            | 40                       | 19/21                     | 05/02/2020-05/03/2020 | DHQ                   |
| 3   | Yao-Zhi Zhang     | 2020   | suspected COVID-19 patients     | southwest China region  | CSS           | 93                         | 100.0           | sequential sampling | OQS         | PCL-5, PSS-10                       | 93                       | 51/42                     | 16/02/2020-28/02/2020 | DHQ                   |
| 4   | Jing Yuan         | 2020   | suspected COVID-19 patients     | Shanghai, China         | CSS           | 145                        | 90.6            | NR              | OQS         | SAS, SDS, SSRS                       | 145                      | 64/81                     | 27/01/2020-24/02/2020 |                       |
| 5   | Jing Cao          | 2020   | COVID-19 patients               | Shenzhen, China         | CSS           | 148                        | 94.9            | convenience sampling | FIQS        | SAS, SDS                            | 148                      | 70/78                     | 02/2020                 |                       |
| 6   | Yan-Xia Shao      | 2020   | COVID-19 patients               | Shenzhen, China         | CSS           | 62                         | 100.0           | convenience sampling | FIQS        | SASRQ                               | 62                       | 28/34                     | 19/02/2020              |                       |
| 7   | Lan Cheng         | 2020   | suspected and mild COVID-19 patients | Shanghai, China | CSS | 139 | 88.5 | NR | FIQS | HAMA, HAMD, FoP-Q-SF | 139 | 81/58 | 26/01/2020-15/03/2020 |                       |
| 8   | Qian Zhao         | 2020   | COVID-19 patients               | Wuhan, Hubei, China     | CSS           | 106                        | 100.0           | NR              | OQS         | PHQ-9, GAD-7, PHQ-15                 | 106                      | 46/60                     | 02/02/2020-16/02/2020 | DHQ                   |
| 9   | Xin Cai           | 2020   | discharged COVID-19 patients    | Shenzhen, China         | CSS           | 126                        | 100.0           | NR              | OQS         | SAS, SDS, PTSD-SS                   | 126                      | 60/66                     | 01/03/2020-14/03/2020 |                       |
| 10  | Shuang-Tao Sun    | 2020   | COVID-19 patients               | Wuhan, Hubei, China     | CSS           | 82                         | 60.7            | cluster sampling | OQS         | PCL-C                               | 82                       | 34/48                     | 21/02/2020-21/03/2020 | post-discharge        |
| 11  | Dong Liu          | 2020   | discharged COVID-19 patients    | Wuhan, Hubei, China     | CSS           | 675                        | 100.0           | cluster sampling | FIQS and OQS | PHQ-9, GAD-7, PCL-C                  | 675                      | 371/358                   | 11/04/2020-22/04/2020 |                       |
| 12  | Yu-Fen Ma         | 2020   | stable COVID-19 patients        | Hubei, China            | CSS           | 770                        | 98.2            | cluster sampling | OQS         | PHQ-9, WHOQOL-BREF                | 770                      | 370/400                   | 24/02/2020-08/03/2020 | DHQ                   |
| 13  | Xue-Dan Nie       | 2020   | COVID-19 patients               | Hubei, China            | CSS           | 78                         | 95.1            | cluster sampling | FIQS        | SAS, SDS                            | 78                       | 33/45                     | 14/02/2020-18/02/2020 | DHQ                   |
| 14  | Xin Li            | 2020   | suspected COVID-19 patients     | Gansu, China            | CSS           | 76                         | 100             | sequential sampling | FIQS        | HAMA, HAMD                         | 76                       | 41/35                     | 31/01/2020              |                       |

(continued on next page)
| No | First author | Year | Population | Study location | Research type | Number of participants (n) | Response rate(%) | Sampling method | Survey form | Survey tools | Completed questionnaire (n) | Gender (n, male/female) | Survey time | Survey point |
|----|--------------|------|------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| 15 | Yu Wang      | 2020 | COVID-19 patients | Wuhan, Hubei, China | CSS | 484 | 99 | NR | OQS | ISI-7,GHQ-12, PHQ-9,GAD-7, PHQ-4 | 484 | 241/243 | 22/02/2020 | before their discharge |
| 16 | Swapnajeet Sahoo | 2020 | COVID-19 patients | Chandigarh, India | CSS | 50 | 51.5 | cluster sampling | FIQS | 50 | 33/17 | 23/03/2020 | the day of the admission procedure |
| 17 | U. Wesemann  | 2020 | suspected and confirmed COVID-19 patients | Essen, Germany | CSS | 60 | NR | cluster sampling | QS | PCL-5,PHQ stress module | 60 | 33/27 | 08/03/2020 | after hospital admission |
| 18 | Clara Paz    | 2020 | suspected and confirmed COVID-19 patients | Ecuador | CSS | 759 | NR | NR | OQS | PHQ-9,GAD-7 | 759 | 386/373 | 22/03/2020 | during persons under the epidemiological surveillance program |
| 19 | Arman Zarghami | 2020 | COVID-19 patients | Fasa, Iran | CSS | 82 | 72.6 | cluster sampling | FIQS and OQS | PHQ-9,GAD-7, PSS-14 | 82 | 32/50 | 06/04/2020 | at one month follow-up after hospital treatment |
| 20 | Mario Gennaro Mazza | 2020 | COVID-19 patients | Milan, Italy | CSS | 402 | NR | cluster sampling | FIQS and OQS | IES-R,PCL-5, SDS,BDI-13, STAI-Y,BDI-13, STAI-Y,MOS-SS, WHIRLS,OCI HADS | 402 | 265/137 | 03/03/2020 | one to three months after hospitalization |
| 21 | Daniele Tomasoni | 2020 | COVID-19 patients | Milan, Italy | CSS | 105 | NR | NR | FIQS | 105 | 77/28 | 04/2020 | over a 6-week period |
| 22 | Min Cheol Chang | 2020 | COVID-19 patients | Daegu, Korea | CSS | 64 | 58.9 | NR | TI | PCL-5 | 64 | 13/51 | 02/2020 | two or three days after admission |
| 23 | Mahtab Ramezani | 2020 | COVID-19 patients | Tehran, Iran | CSS | 30 | NR | NR | QS | HADS | 30 | 17/13 | 03/03/2020 | |
| 24 | Marlene M. Speth | 2020 | COVID-19 patients | Aarau, Switzerland | CSS | 114 | NR | NR | TI | PHQ-2,GAD-2 | 114 | 52/62 | 26/01/2020 | |
| 25 | Jing-Long Lv | 2020 | mild COVID-19 patients | Chongqing, China | CSS | 106 | NR | NR | FIQS | SAS,SSRS | 106 | 61/45 | 26/01/2020 | |
| 26 | Hao-Bin Zhang | 2020 | COVID-19 patients | Wuhan, Hubei, China | LS | 30 | 100.0 | NR | FIQS | PHQ-9,GAD-7, ISI | 30 | 15/15 | 05/02/2020 | |
| 27 | Ling-Ling Dai | 2020 | COVID-19 patients | Wuhan, Hubei, China | CSS | 307 | NR | NR | OQS | SAS,SDS,PSQI | 307 | 174/133 | 23/02/2020 | |
| 28 | Yan-Yu Hu | 2020 | COVID-19 patients | Wuhan, Hubei, China | CSS | 85 | NR | NR | FIQS and OQS | PHQ-9,GAD-7, ISI | 85 | 43/42 | 03/03/2020 | |

(continued on next page)
| No | First author       | Year | Population                  | Study location | Research type | Number of participants (n) | Response rate(%) | Sampling method             | Survey form | Survey tools                  | Completed questionnaire (n) | Gender (n, male/female) | Survey time                  | Survey point          |
|----|--------------------|------|-----------------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| 29 | Qian Guo           | 2020 | mild COVID-19 patients      | Shanghai, China | CSS           | 103                       | 100.0           | convenience sampling         | OQS         | PHQ-9,GAD-7, PSS-14,PCL-5   | 103                       | 59/44                     | 10/02/2020-28/02/2020   | NR                     |
| 30 | Fang Chen          | 2020 | suspected COVID-19 patients | Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China | CSS           | 31                        | NR              | convenience sampling         | OQS         | PHQ-9,GAD-7, SRQ-20          | 31                       | 12/19                     | 28/01/2020-09/02/2020   | NR                     |
| 31 | Hai-Xin Bo         | 2020 | stable COVID-19 patients    | Wuhan, Hubei, China | CSS           | 714                       | 97.8            | cluster sampling             | OQS         | PCL-5                         | 714                       | 350/364                   | 03/2020                     | NR                     |
| 32 | Rong-Feng Qi       | 2020 | COVID-19 patients           | Wuhan, Hubei, China | CSS           | 41                        | 52.4            | cluster sampling             | OQS         | GHQ-12,PCL-C, SAS,SDS,FS-14, SRRS,SCSQ | 41                       | 45/37                     | 02/2020                     | NR                     |
| 33 | Jie Zhang          | 2020 | mild COVID-19 patients      | Wuhan, Hubei, China | CSS           | 296                       | 99.0            | convenience sampling         | OQS         | CD-RISC,HADS                 | 296                       | 173/123                   | 03/03/2020-05/03/2020   | NR                     |
| 34 | Hui Wang           | 2020 | COVID-19 patients           | Wuhan, Hubei, China | CSS           | 652                       | 99.2            | convenience sampling         | OQS         | SCL-90,CFQ, MCMQ              | 652                       | 346/306                   | 17/02/2020-25/02/2020   | NR                     |
| 35 | Xue-Mei Qin        | 2020 | COVID-19 patients           | Changsha, Hunan, China | CSS           | 112                       | 100.0           | convenience sampling         | OQS         | SCL-90                        | 112                       | 59/53                     | 10/02/2020               | NR                     |
| 36 | Xue-Qian Hu        | 2020 | COVID-19 patients           | Wuhan, Hubei, China | CSS           | 356                       | 100.0           | NR                           | QS          | SCL-90                        | 356                       | 188/168                   | 11/02/2020-08/03/2020   | seven days after admission |
| 37 | Wen-Hao Li#        | 2020 | mild COVID-19 patients      | Wuhan, Hubei, China | CSS           | 118                       | 100.0           | convenience sampling         | OQS         | SAS                           | 118                       | 65/53                     | 23/02/2020-27/02/2020   | NR                     |
| 38 | Xi-Fei He          | 2020 | COVID-19 patients           | Wuhan, Hubei, China | CSS           | 214                       | 100.0           | nonprobability sampling      | OQS         | PSQI,FoP-Q-SF, PHQ-9,DDI     | 214                       | 99/115                    | 17/02/2020-29/02/2020   | NR                     |
| 39 | Shu-Yao Chou#      | 2020 | suspected COVID-19 patients | Shenzhen, China   | CSS           | 46                        | 100.0           | convenience sampling         | QS          | PSQI,SAS                      | 46                        | 20/26                     | 18/02/2020-25/02/2020   | NR                     |
| 40 | Lin Chen           | 2020 | COVID-19 patients           | Hanzhou, Anhui, China | CSS           | 50                        | 100.0           | NR                           | OQS         | SAS,SIS                       | 50                        | 28/22                     | 28/01/2020-15/02/2020   | NR the day after the admission procedure |
| 41 | Xin-Yu Cao         | 2020 | suspected COVID-19 patients | Chengdu, Sichuan, China | CSS           | 65                        | 100.0           | NR                           | OQS         | SAS                           | 65                        | 28/27                     | 28/01/2020-15/02/2020   | NR                     |
| 42 | Li Cheng           | 2020 | COVID-19 patients           | Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China | CSS           | 76                        | 100.0           | NR                           | OQS         | SAS                           | 76                        | 31/45                     | 01/02/2020-16/02/2020   | NR                     |
| 43 | Dao-Ming Gong      | 2020 | COVID-19 patients           | Wuhan, Hubei, China | CSS           | 65                        | 81.3            | NR                           | QS          | IES-R,SRRS,SES, HADS         | 65                        | 33/32                     | 01/02/2020-15/03/2020   | NR during post-discharge follow-up |
| 44 | Chao-Min Wu        | 2020 | COVID-19 patients           | Wuhan, Hubei, China | CSS           | 370                       | NR              | NR                           | OQS         | PHQ-9,GAD-7                 | 370                       | 203/167                   | 20/02/2020-15/03/2020   | NR                     |
3.4.1.5. Somatization. Five studies reported the prevalence of somatization in 1,291 patients. The scales used to measure depression states included SCL-90 (n=1, 25.0%) and patient health questionnaire (PHQ-9, n=1, 20.0%). The meta-analyses showed that the combined somatization prevalence was 36.5% (20.2%-52.8%, see Fig. 6). According to the subgroup analysis of the degree of patients’ condition, the combined prevalence of overall patients with no distinguishing feature was 39.7% (20.7%-58.8%), and that of patients with suspected infection was 23.1% (12.8%-33.3%).

3.4.1.6. Fear. Four studies reported the prevalence of fear in 672 patients. The scales used to measure depression states included SCL-90 (n=1, 25.0%) and fear of progression questionnaire-short form (FoP-Q-SF, n=1, 25.0%). The meta-analyses showed that the combined fear prevalence was 47.6% (9.4%-85.7%, see Fig. 7). According to the subgroup analysis of the degree of patients’ condition, the combined prevalence of overall patients with no distinguishing feature was 46.3% (21.6%-65.1%), and that of patients with suspected infection was 48.8% (13.5%-111.2%).

3.4.2. Sensitivity analysis

After excluding studies with no reported investigation time, the first stage (from January to early February 2021): the combined prevalence of anxiety was 45.4% (29.4%-61.4%), that of depression was 42.6% (28.5%-56.7%), that of PTSD was 13.4% (7.6%-19.2%), that of insomnia was 82.7% (79.4%-86.0%), and that of somatization was 36.9% (12.0%-61.7%). The second stage (from mid-February to mid-March 2021): the combined prevalence of anxiety was 33.6% (14.2%-53.0%), that of depression was 29.5% (17.9%-41.0%), that of PTSD was 50.1% (11.8%-88.4%), that of insomnia was 47.4% (36.5%-58.3%), and that of somatization was 48.3% (43.1%-53.5%). The third stage (late March 2021): the combined prevalence of anxiety was 39.6% (29.3%-50.0%), that of depression was 39.8% (22.3%-57.4%), and that of PTSD was 24.7% (-0.7%-50.0%).

After excluding the studies with no reported investigation time point, as for patients who had just a definite diagnosis or completed the survey during their hospital stay, their combined prevalence of anxiety was 45.3% (29.5%-61.0%), that of depression was 42.2% (29.3%-55.1%), that of PTSD was 37.0% (16.4%-57.6%), and that of insomnia was 73.2% (54.2%-92.2%). As for the patients who received the follow-up investigation conducted when or after they left the hospital, their combined prevalence of anxiety was 44.9% (33.6%-56.3%), that of depression was 33.7% (11.9%-55.4%), that of PTSD was 24.0% (0.3%-47.6%), and that of insomnia was 42.8% (38.4%-47.2%).

3.4.3. Publication bias

Begg’s Test was performed on the 27 anxiety-related studies included, and the results were z = 0.63, P = 0.532, and Egger’s Test result was P = 0.000; Begg’s Test was performed on the 27 depression-related studies included, and the results were z = 1.25, P = 0.210, and Egger’s Test result P = 0.015; Begg’s Test was performed on the 10 depression-related studies included, and the results were z = 1.07, P = 0.283, and Egger’s Test result P = 0.010. The results showed that the funnel plot including data on prevalence was asymmetric and may not have publication bias, but other reasons for the funnel plot asymmetry may include small survey sample size, varied scales used, and varied characteristics of study subjects.
4. Discussion

4.1. COVID-19 patients were experiencing various psychological problems

The results show that the COVID-19 patients with different infection degrees and stages were experiencing different degrees of anxiety, depression, PTSD, insomnia, somatization and fear. The prevalence of anxiety and depression in severe patients was significantly higher than that of other types of patients. The prevalence of anxiety and depression in patients with suspected infection was also higher than other types of patients, possibly because the time of investigation was mainly in the early stage of medical quarantine. The ambiguous diagnosis results may have publication bias. However, due to the small number of studies included, a more cautious attitude should be taken to the results of the study.

3.5. Qualitative synthesis of influencing factors of adverse psychological problems in COVID-19 patients

Through text analysis and integration of 44 studies, the influencing factors of adverse psychological problems of COVID-19 patients were summarized, as shown in Table 3.
The research showed that the proportion of severe patients suffering from insomnia reached 80%, and there were obvious respiratory system and multiple organ symptoms caused by SARS-CoV-2 infection (Miao et al., 2020; Wu and Peng, 2020). Thus, it is necessary to provide drugs to improve sleep conditions for patients with severe insomnia. Patients may suffer from fatigue and chest distress due to SARS-CoV-2 infection. Therefore, the report on somatization symptoms was found in the study. The explanation of these somatization symptoms should be carried out based on physical and psychological aspects, especially after the detection of SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid turned negative, the somatization still lasted for a long time, which can be considered to be closely related to psychological factors (Huang et al., 2021). The research showed that nearly half of the patients had strong fear, which may be related to the unclear understanding of the disease among the public, especially the SARS-CoV-2 patients, and too much negative media information could also affect the patients’ cognition of COVID-19 (Garfin et al., 2020; Iqbal et al., 2020; Sahoo et al., 2020).

A systematic review of the mental health of the general population in 8 countries suggests significant differences in the prevalence of different mental disorders, such as anxiety (6.3%–50.9%), depression (14.6%–48.3%), PTSD (7%–53.8%), psychological disturbance (34.43%–38%), and stress (8.1%–81.9%) (Xiong et al., 2020). A meta-analyses on the mental conditions of the general population from communities suggests a 25% (18%–33%) complicated prevalence of anxiety (Bueno-Notivol et al., 2020). A comparison between the meta-analyses results and the survey data on the mental conditions of the general population during COVID-19 leads to the conclusion that the COVID-19 patients suffer from severer mental diseases. A meta-analyses of the prevalence of mental diseases among different population groups during the COVID-19 pandemic indicates that the complicated prevalence of depression, anxiety and sleep disorder among COVID-19 patients (42%, 37%, 82%) was much higher than that of the healthcare workers (25%, 24%, 43%) and the general population (24%, 37%, 34%) (Krishnamoorthy et al., 2020).

At the same time, some studies have shown that COVID-19 patients may also have delirium and other mental symptoms (Garcez et al., 2020; Parra et al., 2020), which may be related to the neurophysiological changes caused by the SARS-CoV-2 virus (Varatharaj et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020). This suggested that when patients’ psychological states were assessed, we cannot ignore the neuropathological states caused by the infection virus itself. The symptoms of patients should be comprehensively evaluated and more active clinical intervention should be given if necessary (Kim and Su, 2020; Raomy et al., 2020).

With the control of COVID-19 pandemic and the in-depth understanding of the SARS-CoV-2 virus, the long-term psychological impacts on COVID-19 patients should be evaluated for a longer follow-up period.
4.2. Conceptual framework and clinical implications for influencing factors of psychological problems in COVID-19 patients

Through the analysis of different psychological problems of COVID-19 patients, the study divided the influencing factors of psychological problems into the individual level, surrounding level, and social support level.

**Individual level:** it included physical and psychological parts, and the two exerted a mutual effect. If the COVID-19 patients had previous high burden basic diseases, or have physiological diseases in the past, they were more likely to have psychological problems. If COVID-19 patients had somatization, especially those who had been discharged from hospital or entered the recovery period, they were prone to psychological problems (Chen et al., 2020; Mazza et al., 2020; Speth et al., 2020; Tomasoni et al., 2020). A survey among the cancer patients shows that 86.5% of patients report fear of disease progression, while 67.5% suffer from anxiety, and 74.5% depression (Chen et al., 2020). A survey on the breast cancer patients in Hubei suggests that 46.2% of the patients have to adjust their therapy during the pandemic, with 56.2% reporting anxiety, 47.3% depression, 53.1% insomnia and 83.0% distress (Li et al., 2020). Medical conditions and culture affect how patients with underlying disease cope with the mental impact of COVID-19 on them. A survey on the psychosocial impact of COVID-19 on HIV-infected youngsters in western Kenya shows that about 10% of youngsters suffer from depression, with the conditions of those aged between 20 and 24 were much worse (Dyer et al., 2020). Another survey among HIV patients in Turkey suggest that 25% of the respondents suffer from anxiety (Kuman et al., 2020). Suffering from sudden infectious diseases is a major stress event for patients. If patients have more negative emotions or are in a high-stress state before they get sick, infection with SARS-CoV-2 will become “the last straw”, which will stimulate patients’ strong reaction to early trauma events (Cheng et al., 2020; Gong et al., 2020; Mazza et al., 2020; Shao et al., 2020). A pilot study on the mental health of the Iraqi refugees suggested that the outbreak of COVID-19 caused the prevalence of PTSD among women to rise from 43.3% to 57.9%, and from 36.7% to 47.4% among men (Kizilhan and Noll-Hussong, 2020). This revealed that those who have suffered from grave trauma before the pandemic tend to have their conditions aggravated due to fear of being affected with SARS-CoV-2. There were great differences in the understanding of COVID-19 among patients with different cognitive levels. Research showed that the education levels of patients prone to psychological problems were polarized, which was related to the social roles of these two groups. COVID-19 has a multidimensional effect on the world. COVID-19 patients with fixed occupation and in the taking-off stage may be more likely to face uncertain factors of future life (Cai et al., 2020; Cheng et al., 2020). For such patients, attention should be focused on their personal life history and their understanding of themselves or the disease after SARS-CoV-2.
Fig. 4. Forest plot of post-traumatic stress disorder prevalence rate in patients infected with SARS-CoV-2.

Fig. 5. Forest plot of insomnia prevalence rate in patients infected with SARS-CoV-2.
Fig. 6. Forest plot of somatization prevalence rate in patients infected with SARS-CoV-2.

Fig. 7. Forest plot of fear prevalence rate in patients infected with SARS-CoV-2.
and colleagues, which had an important impact on the intimacy of each infection, isolation, and even death of their family members, friends, likely to cause the infection in clusters. COVID-19 patients may face the incorrect understanding of the disease by patients (Azim et al., 2020; Hui Wang et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020; Jing Cao et al., 2020; Lan Cheng et al., 2020; Cheng et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2020; Lv et al., 2020; Ma et al., 2020; Mazza et al., 2020; Miao et al., 2020; Nie et al., 2020; Qi et al., 2020; Speth et al., 2020; Tomasoni et al., 2020; Wu et al., 2020; Li et al., 2020; Hu et al., 2020; Yuan et al., 2020; Zarghami et al., 2020)

Patients may be discriminated against when they returned to the community after treatment. If there was any positive virus detection in the recovery period, they may worry that they could infect the disease to others, which may cause intimate relationship alienation (Bagcchi, 2020; Sotgiu and Dobler, 2020; Villa et al., 2020). If the patients experienced the loss of relatives or other important things, attention should be paid to their grief response and the occurrence of abnormal grief response for more than 6 months (Goveas and Shear, 2020; Morris et al., 2020; Pirnia et al., 2020; Walsh, 2020; Zhai and Du X, 2020).

Table 3
Influencing Factors of Adverse Psychological States of COVID-19 Patients

| Psychological state | Influencing Factors | Reference |
|---------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| Anxiety             | Persistent physical symptoms: such as fatigue, palpitation, chest tightness, severe loss of taste or smell, poor sleep quality | (Cai et al., 2020; Chang and Park, 2020; Chen et al., 2020; Dai et al., 2020; Hui Wang et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020; Jing Cao et al., 2020; Lan Cheng et al., 2020; Cheng et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2020; Lv et al., 2020; Ma et al., 2020; Mazza et al., 2020; Miao et al., 2020; Nie et al., 2020; Qi et al., 2020; Speth et al., 2020; Tomasoni et al., 2020; Wu et al., 2020; Li et al., 2020; Hu et al., 2020; Yuan et al., 2020; Zarghami et al., 2020) |
|                     | Physiological indexes: high cortisol level, high interleukin (IL)-1β level |           |
|                     | Combined basic diseases: such as non-communicable diseases with high burden for many years |           |
|                     | Gender: female |           |
|                     | Marital status: divorced |           |
|                     | Age: early recovery of patients under 60 years old had more serious infection |           |
|                     | Educational level polarization: ① lower, junior high school and below; ② bachelor’s degree and above, with fixed occupation |           |
|                     | Cognition of disease: the degree of cognitive fusion is high, and the degree of self-perceived disease severity of COVID-19 is high |           |
|                     | Subjective feelings: such as the sense of isolation from the outside world, feeling discriminated against, feeling ashamed of high disease, worrying about the infection by family members, worrying about whether they can be cured, worrying about the recurrence of symptoms or infecting other people |           |
|                     | Social support: low perceived social support or utilization of support, family members or colleagues diagnosed with COVID-19, family members died due to COVID-19, family members need to be taken care of |           |
|                     | Low mental resilience |           |
| Depression          | Persistent physical symptoms: such as fatigue, palpitation, chest tightness, severe loss of taste or smell, poor sleep quality | (Cai et al., 2020; Dai et al., 2020; Guo et al., 2020; Hui Wang et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020; Jing Cao et al., 2020; Lan Cheng et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2020; Ma et al., 2020; Mazza et al., 2020; Miao et al., 2020; Nie et al., 2020; Qi et al., 2020; Ramezani et al., 2020; Sahoo et al., 2020; Speth et al., 2020; Tomasoni et al., 2020; Wu et al., 2020; Li et al., 2020; Hu et al., 2020; Yuan et al., 2020; Zarghami et al., 2020) |
|                     | Physiological indexes: high cortisol level, high interleukin (IL)-1β level, high C-reactive protein level |           |
|                     | Combined basic diseases: such as non-communicable diseases with high burden for many years |           |
|                     | Marital status: divorced or widowed |           |
|                     | Age: early recovery of patients under 60 years old had more serious infection |           |
|                     | Educational level polarization: ① lower, junior high school and below; ② bachelor’s degree and above, with fixed occupation |           |
|                     | Cognition of disease: the degree of cognitive fusion is high, and the degree of self-perceived disease severity of COVID-19 is high |           |
|                     | Subjective feelings: such as the sense of isolation from the outside world, feeling discriminated against, feeling ashamed of high disease, worrying about the infection by family members, worrying about whether they can be cured, worrying about the recurrence of symptoms or infecting other people |           |
|                     | Social support: low perceived social support or utilization of support, family members or colleagues diagnosed with COVID-19, family members died due to COVID-19, family members need to be taken care of |           |
|                     | Low mental resilience |           |
|                     | Daily behavior: frequent use of social media to obtain COVID-19-related information, home isolation lifestyle after discharge |           |
| Stress              | Combined basic diseases: such as non-communicable diseases with high burden for many years | (Cai et al., 2020; Gong et al., 2020; Li et al., 2020; Mazza et al., 2020; Qi et al., 2020; Shao et al., 2020) |
|                     | Age: advanced age |           |
|                     | Combine with anxiety or depression |           |
|                     | Social support: low perceived social support or utilization of support, family members or colleagues diagnosed with COVID-19, family members died due to COVID-19 |           |
|                     | Negative coping |           |
| Insomnia            | Persistent physical symptoms: such as fatigue | (Jie et al., 2020; Miao et al., 2020; (Hu et al., 2020); (Wang et al., 2020)) |
|                     | Gender: female |           |
|                     | Combine with anxiety or depression |           |
|                     | Cognition of disease: the degree of self-perceived disease severity of COVID-19 is high |           |
|                     | Physiological indexes: high interleukin (IL)-1β level |           |

Infection. For the psychological problems of patients with lower education level or obvious stigma, more familiar and easy-to-understand words should be used to fully explain the disease.

**Surrounding level**: SARS-CoV-2 is so highly infectious that it is likely to cause the infection in clusters. COVID-19 patients may face the infection, isolation, and even death of their family members, friends, and colleagues, which had an important impact on the intimacy of each patient (Cai et al., 2020; Cao et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2020; Nie et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020). Family and pets that needed to be taken care of by COVID-19 patients were outside the medical quarantine space. Patients may be discriminated against when they returned to the community after treatment. If there was any positive virus detection in the recovery period, they may worry that they could infect the disease to others, which may cause intimate relationship alienation (Bagcchi, 2020; Sotgiu and Dobler, 2020; Villa et al., 2020). If the patients experienced the loss of relatives or other important things, attention should be paid to their grief response and the occurrence of abnormal grief response for more than 6 months (Goveas and Shear, 2020; Morris et al., 2020; Pirnia et al., 2020; Walsh, 2020; Zhai and Du X, 2020).

**Social support level**: media plays an important role in social psychology in the information age. Excessive negative information or unconfirmed information was released through We Media, which affected the correct understanding of the disease by patients (Azim et al., 2020; Looi et al., 2020; Schroyer, 2020; Yoshiooka and Maeda, 2020). We should pay attention to the effective access of psychological assistance, track the patients’ psychological state, and give corresponding medical...
help. Basic living security and necessary medical assistance should be given to patients under financial difficulties. The organization of patient mutual assistance should be established through social media, and the adaptation of COVID-19 patients in different countries or regions should be considered in combination with the localization characteristics of social psychology (Araujo et al., 2020; Krishnamoorthi et al., 2020; Lao et al., 2020; Schwartz et al., 2020). The psychological states of the patients were related to many factors. When the solution strategies are put forward for each patient’s psychological problems, the relevant factors should be fully considered, such as social support and economic conditions.

4.3. Strength of this living systematic review

This research systematically reviewed the differences of psychological state among COVID-19 patients with different disease degrees for the first time, the differences of anxiety, depression, PTSD, insomnia, somatization and fear psychological problems in different investigation periods and different investigation time points, and demonstrated the psychological problems and its changes of COVID-19 patients in a multidimensional way.

This paper summarized this living systematic review for the first time, which will be updated continuously in the next two years. With the increasing number of related studies, it may be possible to answer the following questions, such as how different the distribution of psychological questions is in different countries or regions. This living systematic review aimed to guide the development of corresponding public health interventions and better prevent and control the mental diseases caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

4.4. Limitations

According to the investigation time included in the study, the studies included were conducted within half a year after the outbreak of COVID-19, especially before March 2020. As this paper is the first known living systematic review, the updated version will be released as more bibliographic search results appear. Deeper analysis on the medical records (physical or mental diseases) of the SARS-CoV-2 patients will be made to explore the profound impacts of SARS-CoV-2 on patients with chronic disease or those who have suffered from previous trauma in long term. According to the severity of patients, different psychological scales were used to evaluate. For patients with a mild infection, online information collection tools could be used (Bo et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020). For severe patients, face-to-face interviews were used when their condition was stable (Miao et al., 2020; Wu and Peng, 2020). However, due to the lack of research into severe patients, the study on psychological problems of severe patients may have some deficiencies. Although the review has adopted more strict inclusion and exclusion criteria, the original studies included have found significant heterogeneity because of the characteristics of observational studies in epidemic situations. The source of heterogeneity was related to the following reasons: the small sample sizes of some studies were small, non-random sampling method, and different survey scales. This research only included one longitudinal study. It was found that the psychological state changes of COVID-19 patients needed long-term follow-up observation. If possible, more longitudinal studies should be carried out in the future.

5. Conclusion

There existed high proportions of COVID-19 patients with psychological problems such as anxiety, depression, PTSD, insomnia, somatization, fear. The psychological problems of the patients varied in different investigation periods and different course stages, which was closely related to the patients themselves, their surroundings and social support. Thus, it is imperative to actively carry out psychological assistance for COVID-19 patients and to observe them based on follow-up visits for a longer time.
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