Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY Quan Zhuang, Central South University, China

REVIEWED BY John Mark R. Asio, Gordon College, Philippines Naresh Poondla, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, United States Joanna Baj-Korpak, John Paul II University of Applied Sciences in Biala Podlaska, Poland

*CORRESPONDENCE Xiaoqian Tuo ⊠ island19940331@stu.xjtu.edu.cn

RECEIVED 22 December 2022 ACCEPTED 19 April 2023 PUBLISHED 12 May 2023

CITATION

Hu B, Yang X and Tuo X (2023) The prevalence of post-traumatic stress disorder in college students by continents and national income during the COVID-19 pandemic: a meta-analysis. *Front. Psychol.* 14:1129782. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1129782

COPYRIGHT

© 2023 Hu, Yang and Tuo. This is an openaccess article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

The prevalence of post-traumatic stress disorder in college students by continents and national income during the COVID-19 pandemic: a meta-analysis

Biao Hu¹, Xiling Yang² and Xiaoqian Tuo³*

¹School of Marxism, Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an, Shaanxi, China, ²Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, The First Affiliated Hospital of Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an, Shaanxi, China, ³Department of Gynecology, Shaanxi Provincial People's Hospital, Xi'an, Shaanxi, China

Introduction: The present study aimed to provide a more accurate representation of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) in college students during COVID-19 by performing meta-analyses by continents, national income, and study majors, and comparing the results with estimated pooled prevalence.

Methods: Based on the guideline of PRISMA, literature was searched in PubMed, Web of Science, and Embase. The prevalence of PTSD was estimated through a random model based on the different continents and levels of national income, as well as study majors, and compared with the pooled prevalence of PTSD among college students.

Results: Totally 381 articles were retrieved from electronic databases and 38 articles were included in the present meta-analysis. The results showed that the pooled prevalence of college students' PTSD was 25% (95% CI: 21–28%). Prevalence estimates of PTSD among college students were statistically significant (*p*<0.00001) when stratified with geographical regions, income levels, and study majors. In comparison with the pooled prevalence of PTSD (25%), subgroups of Africa and Europe, lower-middle-income countries, and medical college students possessed higher prevalence estimates.

Discussion: The findings of the study showed that the prevalence of PTSD in college students worldwide during COVID-19 was relatively high and varied in different continents and countries with different income levels. Therefore, healthcare providers should pay attention to the psychologically healthy condition of college students during COVID-19.

KEYWORDS

PTSD, college students, mental health, COVID-19, meta-analysis

1. Introduction

Around 16 years after the severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), another pathogenic coronavirus, the coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19) emerged in Wuhan City (Hubei Province, China) in 2019. Due to the serious situation, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic on March 11, 2020 (Si et al., 2021). Since the declaration of the outbreak, many countries adopted strict policies to control the spread of COVID-19, such as lockdowns, home isolation, and social distancing. Reports suggested that stressful events such

as natural disasters and man-made traumas exerted significant mental health impacts and could result in conditions such as posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and depression (Kopala-Sibley et al., 2016; Plexousakis et al., 2019; Schwartz et al., 2019). However, public health authorities and healthcare researchers had paid more attention to the biological and physical effects rather than to the mental health implications of COVID-19.

Post-traumatic stress disorder is a chronic impairment disorder that often occurs after exposure to severe stressors, like combat, nature disaster, or other events (White et al., 2015). It is characterized by re-experience and avoidance symptoms as well as negative alterations in cognition and arousal (Miao et al., 2018). PTSD was first noticed by public during and after the military of the United States in Afghanistan and Iraq, and then a large number of relevant studies occurred in this field. However, underlying mechanisms of PTSD and specific treatment for it remain unclear. Therefore, due to the significant medical, social and even financial problems, PTSD is remarkable both for individuals and society, people suffering from PTSD or under traumatic exposure need to know about the risk and effects of PTSD.

Previous studies based on the SARS outbreak indicated that mental health problems were common among SARS survivors and authors referred to SARS as a "mental health catastrophe" (Maunder, 2009). Mak et al. (2009) reported that among 90 residents of Hong Kong who were infected with SARS and survived, 25.6% had PTSD and 15.6% had depressive disorders 30 months after infection. Another study by Leung et al. showed the trend of the population's anxiety followed the trend of the number of daily new cases (Leung et al., 2005). One prospective cohort study on college students indicated that the prevalence of anxiety increased markedly in the early phase of the SARS but gradually reduced over time (Cheng and Cheung, 2005). And for now, the COVID-19 pandemic has brought into focus the mental health of affected populations, such as patients, medical staff, children, and older adults (Fu et al., 2021). Mental health of college students during COVID-19 pandemic were gradually of particular interest, as they experienced nationwide school closures, sudden change in students' learning environment, loss of internships, on-campus jobs, and other opportunities (J. Lee et al., 2021). Chi et.al conducted a study among college students in mainland China during the beginning of COVID-19 and indicated that 30.8% (95% CI: 28.8-32.8%) of the participants presented relevant PTSD symptoms (Chi et al., 2020). Another survey conducted in the US found that among 2031 participants, 48.14% showed a moderate-to-severe level of depression, 38.48% showed a moderate-to-severe level of anxiety, and 18.04% had suicidal thoughts, the majority of participants (71.26%) indicated that their stress/anxiety levels had increased during the COVID-19 pandemic (Wang et al., 2020).

A growing number of researchers investigated the prevalence of PTSD among college students, and the reported prevalence ranged from 2.7 to 66.7% (Tang et al., 2020; Abdel-Aziz et al., 2022). But the overall prevalence of college students worldwide was deficient for raising awareness and providing appropriate interventions. In addition, the findings of these researches converged on the uptick of mental health issues among college students, but the contributing factors might not be generalizable to populations worldwide. As we observed the prevalence of PTSD varied among college students from different countries, and the most significant difference existed between students in Egypt (Africa, 66.7%) and China (Asia,2.7%; Tang et al., 2022). Thus, we inferred that factor like continents and

national income participated in the different outcome of studies. In addition, previous studies had reported several mental health problems were high prevalent among medical students (Pacheco et al., 2017). Therefore, there was an urgent need to comprehensively assess the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on mental health especially the prevalence of PTSD among college students.

Collectively, the present study aimed to provide a more accurate representation of PTSD in college students during the COVID-19 pandemic by performing meta-analyses by continents, national income, and study majors and comparing the results with estimated pooled prevalence, to assist policymakers to develop relative policies and help clinical practitioners to provide services to the affected populations in time.

2. Materials and methods

The present study was conducted following the Preferred Reporting Item for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) statement. And the study protocol was registered in the PROSPERO (CRD42022382828) before data extraction.

2.1. Search strategy

Electronic databases including PubMed, Embase, and Web of Science databases were used for systematically searching for related literature that was published in English from March 2020 to September 2022. The keywords used for search strategies were as follows: "COVID-19" OR "SARS-CoV-2" AND "college students" or "university students" or "undergraduate students" or "bachelor students" or "graduate students" or "doctorate students" or "higher education students" AND "post-traumatic stress disorder" OR "PTSD." Combinations of the above keywords were modified to optimize the search results in the databases. All of the included literature were screened manually to identify potential articles.

2.2. Inclusion and exclusion criteria

The EndNote X7 program (Clarivate Analytics, Philadelphia) was used to import and document articles, and duplications were first excluded. The preliminary screening was conducted by reading the titles and abstracts of the articles. After that, the articles were further screened by two independent reviewers (BH and XY) according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria. A third researcher (XT) was consulted to assist in the judgment in case of disagreement.

The inclusion criteria were as follows: (a) studies related to COVID-19; (b) studies published in English; (c) the study design included cross-sectional studies; (d) the study population consisted of college or university students; (e) the presence of PTSD was measured with clinical interviews or questionnaires according to DSM diagnostic criteria; and (f) studies containing a clear description of the prevalence of PTSD. The exclusion criteria were as follows: (a) the college or university students with mental illness already; (b) articles that were inconsistent with the study aim, re-published, books, editorials, conference abstracts, letters to the editors, viewpoints, case

presentations, and brief communications; and (c) lacking sufficient data required to conduct the basic analysis.

2.3. Data extraction

The extracted data were as follows: (1) the first author of the study; (2) publication year; (3) the country surveyed; (4) study design; (5) sample size; (6) the assessment tools; (7) prevalence and standard error (SE); (8) relevant subgroup data. SE could be calculated using the formula $SE = \sqrt{P} \times (1 - P) \div N$ when SE value was not presented in the article, and *P* was the proportions of cases reported in the article, *N* was the sample size of the prevalence estimate. For a longitudinal study in our meta-analysis, we chose the prevalence surveyed during the COVID-19 pandemic.

2.4. Data analysis

Review Manager 5.4 (RevMan 5.4, The Cochrane Collaboration, London) was used to conduct the meta-analytic calculations. The pooled prevalence of PTSD, 95% confidence intervals (CI), *Z*-value, and heterogeneity test values were calculated, respectively. Heterogeneity was estimated by Cochran's Q-test (Chi-square) and I^2 statistics, a *value of p* of Chi-square < 0.10 indicated heterogeneity of the estimates of the prevalence rates, and I^2 of 25, 50 and 75% indicated low, moderate and high heterogeneity, respectively. The random effect mode was used to account for expected heterogeneity between studies. For the source of heterogeneity, we conducted the subgroup analysis divided by the economic level of countries, majors of college students, and the continents. Finally, we used funnel plots to explore whether publication bias existed.

2.5. Quality assessment

The Joanna Briggs Inventory (JBI) Checklist was used to evaluate study quality by two researchers (BH and XY) independently. The quality was evaluated based on the following items: (a) sample frame; (b) sampling; (c) sample size; (d) description of subjects and setting; (e) sample coverage of the data analysis; (f) validity of the methods to identify the condition; (g) standardization and reliability of the methods to measure the con by the edition of all participants; (h) statistical analysis; and (i) response rate (Table 1). An item was scored '0' when it was rated 'no', 'unclear', or 'not applicable', and was scored '1' when it was rated 'yes'. The overall scores ranged from 0 to 9, and the quality of the included eligible studies was assessed as follows: 0–3, 4–6, and 7–9 indicated a high, moderate, and low risk of bias, respectively. And when disagreements occurred in the assessments, they were resolved by another author (XT).

3. Results

3.1. Search results

In total, 381 articles were retrieved from three electronic databases and then imported into the Endnote X7. After the removal of 146 duplications, 235 articles were next screened by two reviewers. By reading titles and abstracts, 137 articles were eliminated since they did not meet the inclusion criteria listed previously. Then 98 potential original articles were further screened by reading the full context and 60 articles were excluded because of the lack of detailed data mentioned in the inclusion criteria. Finally, 38 articles were included in the present meta-analysis (Figure 1).

3.2. Study characteristics

The descriptive characteristics of the 38 included studies were presented in Table 2. Totally 95,375 college students were included in the present meta-analysis, and all of the included studies were crosssectional studies. Included studies from 16 countries, that belonged to four continents (See Table 2). We extracted the information about mean age and standard deviation from all of the included studies if possible, and college students surveyed were at a similar age. For the assessment of PTSD, 14 studies used IES-R (Impact of Event Scale-Revised), six studies used PCL-C (Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Checklist-Civilian Version), four studies used PCL-5 (PTSD Checklist for the DSM-5), two studies used PCL (The Abbreviated PTSD Checklist), PC-PTSD (the Primary Care PTSD Screen), IES-6 (6-item Impact of Event Scale-Revised), PCL-S (17-item PTSD check list-specific version), and IES (Impact of Event scale) separately to assess PTSD. In addition, one study used GPS-PTSS (Global Psychotrauma Screen), The COVID Stress Scale, PC-PTSD-5 (Primary Care PTSD Screen DSM-5), IES-R-K (Impact of Event Scale-Revised), respectively, to assess PTSD (See Table 2).

3.3. The pooled prevalence of PTSD

Figure 2 showed the forest plot for the complete dataset. Across the 38 studies with 95,375 college students, the pooled prevalence for all the students was 25% (N=38, n=95,375, 95% confidence interval: 21–28%) with high heterogeneity (I²=99.9%, p<0.001).

3.4. Subgroup analysis

Prevalence estimates of PTSD among college students were statistically significant (p < 0.00001) when stratified by geographical regions (Figure 3), with Africa having the highest prevalence (48, 95% CI: 20-75%), followed by Europe (30, 95% CI: 16-45%), Asia (21, 95% CI: 17-26%) and North America which was 20% (95% CI: 10-30%). Figure 4 represented the prevalence estimates of PTSD among college students were statistically significant (p < 0.00001) that were stratified by national income level, with lower-middle-income level having the highest prevalence (39, 95% CI:30-48%), followed by high-income level (25, 95% CI:18-32%) and upper-middle-income level which was 17% (95% CI:13-21%). Finally, in terms of study majors of college students, the prevalence estimates of PTSD among medical college students (28, 95% CI:21-35%) was higher than that of non-medical college students (23, 95% CI,19-28%; Figure 5). Collectively, in comparison with the pooled prevalence of PTSD (25%), subgroups of Africa and Europe, lower-middle-income countries and medical college students possessed higher prevalence estimates.

TABLE 1 Risk of bias assessment for included studies.

Author (year)	а	b	с	d		f	g	h		Scores
Abdel-Aziz et al. (2022)	*	*	/	*	*	*	*	*	*	8
Cam et al. (2022)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9
Camilleri et al. (2022)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9
Chi et al. (2020)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9
Dixit et al. (2022)	*	*	/	*	*	*	*	*	*	8
El Maouch et al. (2022)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9
Elbarazi (2022)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	NA	8
Feng et al. (2022)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9
Fila-Witecka et al. (2022)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9
Gao et al. (2021)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9
Giusti et al. (2020)	*	*	/	*	*	*	*	*	*	8
Ifthikar et al. (2021)	*	*	/	*	*	*	*	*	*	8
Jardon and Choi (2022)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	/	8
Joseph et al. (2022)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	/	8
Kim et al. (2022)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	/	8
Kim et al. (2022)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9
Kumar et al. (2020)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9
Kumar et al. (2021)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9
C. M. Lee et al. (2021)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	/	8
Lee et al. (2022)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9
Li et al. (2021)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9
Li et al. (2021)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9
Lin et al. (2021)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9
López-Castro et al. (2021)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9
Ochnik et al. (2021)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9
Rogowska et al. (2022)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9
Saali et al. (2022)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9
Wang et al. (2022)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	NA	8
Soltan et al. (2021)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	NA	8
Bijia et al. (2020)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9
Sultana et al. (2021)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9
Sun et al. (2021)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	NA	8
Tang et al. (2020)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9
Udgiri et al. (2021)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	NA	8
Wathelet et al. (2021)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	NA	8
Xie et al. (2021)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9
Xu et al. (2021)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9
Zhang et al. (2021)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9

"*" means that item was scored '1' because it was rated 'yes'.

3.5. Quality assessment and publication bias

Assessment for the risk of bias ascertained for each article was listed in Table 1. Overall, the overall score ranged from 8 to 9 which indicated a low risk of bias. Publication bias was not observed among the analyses where it was possible to systematically assess publication bias using funnel plots (Supplementary Figure S1).

4. Discussion

To our knowledge, the present study is the first meta-analysis to investigate the prevalence of PTSD symptoms among college students worldwide during the COVID-19 pandemic. The pooled prevalence of PTSD during the COVID-19 pandemic is 25% (95%CI: 21–28%) in this study, compared with the prevalence in the general population ranging from 1 to 10%, and in college students ranging from 6 to 17%



before the COVID-19 pandemic (Read et al., 2011). Higher prevalence can be explained by the decrease in face-to-face social interaction, long-time online learning, fear associated with the pandemic, and fewer opportunities to exercise for students during the COVID-19 pandemic (Feng et al., 2014; Nicola et al., 2020; Rogers et al., 2020). In all, the present study can be a great warning about the mental health of college students during the COVID-19 pandemic. Mental health care should not be, therefore, underestimated at present, especially for college students.

In this study, we observed that the prevalence of PTSD among college students on different continents varies from each other. The prevalence of PTSD among African college students is the highest (48%), while the prevalence among North American college students is the lowest (20%). With the rapidly increasing number of newly confirmed cases, three major factors are impacting the population and might lead to mental health problems: firstly, the direct impact of the disease, particularly near-death experiences during illness, and isolation from loved ones; secondly, restriction limits the social support and supply of food and medication; thirdly, uncertainty and stress resulting from loss of jobs and livelihoods (Semo and Frissa, 2020). Previous studies have reported significant differences in risk of acquiring COVID-19 between the continents, in which Asia and North America showed lower risks, and that lead to less direct or indirect impact of COVID-19 in North America and Asia (Sunjaya et al., 2022). Different social cultures, lifestyles, and political values in different continents might lead to the discrepant prevalence of PTSD among college students across continents. In addition, poor recognition of other outbreak-related epidemiologic terms might lead to passive attitudes to intervention strategies and measures (Zhang and Ba-Thein, 2022). It is also known that North America and Europe possess better medical condition than African, which partially interpret the difference of prevalence of PTSD among continents. Moreover, population density varies across continents, which also caused heterogeneity in the outcome. As Shuwiekh et al. (2022) have reported more densely populated countries like Egypt had a greater mental health impact than the countries with lower population density like Algeria and Saudi Arabia.

Factors like economic and income level also affect the spread of COVID-19 and its subsequent mental health impact like PTSD. Subgroup analyses based on the income levels (lower-middle income/upper-middle income/high-income) among countries indicate that the income levels of countries correlate with the prevalence of PTSD among college students. Lower-middle-income countries possess the highest prevalence since the reduction in household income is significantly associated with an increased risk of incident mental disorders (Sareen et al., 2011; Pieh et al., 2020). For example, it has been shown that lower socioeconomic status is linked to increased levels of PTSD and depression among people who have been exposed to trauma (Ochnik et al., 2021). Similarly, material assets are significantly related to mental health outcome, as the economic crises brought about by COVID-19 have markedly increased vulnerabilities to psychiatric symptomatology (Rudenstine

TABLE 2 Descriptive characteristics of studies (Table view).

Author (year) Ref No.	Study continent	Income level	Sample size (N)	Number of PTSD cases (prevalence rate)	Majors of students	Assessment tools	Research time
Abdel-Aziz et al. (2022)	Africa	Lower-middle	81	54 (66.7%)	Medical	GPS-PTSS	July–September 2020
Cam et al. (2022)	Asia	Upper-middle	1,095	378 (34.5%)	Non-medical	IES-R	May 11-15 2020
Camilleri et al. (2022)	North America	High	608	93 (15.3%)	Non-medical	IES-R	August-September 2020
Chi et al. (2020)	Asia	Upper-middle	2038	628 (30.8%)	Non-medical	PCL	February 12–17 2020
Dixit et al. (2022)	Asia	High	24	7 (29.2%)	Medical	IES-R	December 2020
El Maouch et al. (2022)	Asia	Upper-middle	852	203 (23.8%)	Non-medical	IES-R	November 2021–March 2022
Elbarazi (2022)	Africa	Lower-middle	1,195	273 (22.8)	Non-medical	PCL	December 2021– February 2022
Feng et al. (2022)	Asia	Upper-middle	2070	147 (7.1%)	Non-medical	PCL-C	December 2020–January 2021
Fila-Witecka et al. (2022)	Europe	High	1,053	689 (65.4%)	Non-medical	IES-R	May–June 2020
Gao et al. (2021)	Asia	Upper-middle	1,532	46 (3.0%)	Medical	IES-R	April 12–23 2020
Giusti et al. (2020)	Europe	High	103	14 (13.6%)	Non-medical	IES-R	March 16–May 4 2020
Ifthikar et al. (2021)	Asia	High	309	114 (36.9%)	Medical	IES-R	June 16-August 18 2020
Jardon and Choi (2022)	North America	High	174	57 (32.8%)	Medical	The COVID Stress Scales	March–Apr 2021
Joseph et al. (2022)	North America	High	207	56 (27.1%)	Medical	IES-R	May–September 2020
Kim et al. (2022)	North America	High	4,524	1,306 (28.9%)	Non-medical	PC-PTSD	March 2–May 9 2020
Kim et al. (2022)	Asia	High	400	129 (32.3%)	Non-medical	IES-6	June–July 2021
Kumar et al. (2020)	Asia	Lower-middle	331	75 (22.7%)	Medical	IES-R	April 4–16 2020
Kumar et al. (2021)	Asia	Lower-middle	420	161 (38.3%)	Medical	IES-R	July–December 2020
C. M. Lee et al. (2021)	North America	High	741	188 (25.4%)	Medical	PC-PTSD-5	April–May 2020
Lee et al. (2022)	Asia	High	270	28 (10.4%)	Medical	IES-R-K	2021
Li et al. (2021)	Asia	Upper-middle	6,348	950 (15.0%)	Medical	PCL-C	March 8–24 2020
Li et al. (2021)	Asia	Upper-middle	4,355	708 (16.3%)	Non-medical	IES-R	April 26–29 2020
Lin et al. (2021)	Asia	Upper-middle	1,022	163 (15.9%)	Non-medical	PCL-C	June 27–30 2021
López-Castro et al. (2021)	North America	High	909	43 (4.7%)	Non-medical	PC-PTSD-5	May 1–31 2020
Ochnik et al. (2021)	Not available	Not available	1741	570 (32.7%)	Non-medical	PCL-S	October–December 2020
Rogowska et al. (2022)	Not available	Not available	3,230	741 (22.9%)	Non-medical	PCL-S	November 2020
Saali et al. (2022)	North America	High	108	8 (7.4%)	Medical	PCL-5	June–July 2020
Wang et al. (2022)	Asia	Upper-middle	3,641	1,245 (34.2%)	Non-medical	IES-6	February 23–May 5 2020
Soltan et al. (2021)	Africa	Lower-middle	282	153(54.3%)	Medical	IES-R	May 1–June 2020
Bijia et al. (2020)	North America	High	261	98 (37.5%)	Non-medical	PCL-C	Not available
Sultana et al. (2021)	Asia	Lower-middle	3,997	1,635 (40.9%)	Non-medical	IES	May 29–July 22 2020
Sun et al. (2021)	Asia	Upper-middle	1912	338 (17.7%)	Non-medical	IES	March 20–April 10 2020
Tang et al. (2020)	Asia	Upper-middle	2,485	67 (2.7%)	Non-medical	PCL-C	February 20–27 2020

(Continued)

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Author (year) Ref No.	Study continent	Income level	Sample size (N)	Number of PTSD cases (prevalence rate)	Majors of students	Assessment tools	Research time
Udgiri et al. (2021)	Asia	Lower-middle	80	25 (31.3%)	Medical	IES-R	Not available
Wathelet et al. (2021)	Europe	High	22,883	4,456 (19.5)	Non-medical	PCL-5	June 15–July 15 2020
Xie et al. (2021)	Asia	Upper-middle	8,879	615 (6.9%)	Non-medical	PCL-5	April 20–26 2020
Xu et al. (2021)	Asia	Upper-middle	11,254	952 (8.5%)	Non-medical	PCL-5	June 29–July 18 2020
Zhang et al. (2021)	Asia	Upper-middle	3,961	870 (22.0%)	Non-medical	PCL-C	April 4–24 2020

Global Psycho-trauma Screen (GPS-PTSS); Impact of Event Scale-Revised (IES-R); The Abbreviated PTSD Checklist (PCL); Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Checklist–Civilian Version (PCL-C); the Primary Care PTSD Screen (PC-PTSD); Impact of Event Scale-6 (IES-6); Primary Care PTSD Screen DSM-5 (PC-PTSD-5); Impact of Event Scale-Revised (IES-R-K); 17-item PTSD checklist—specific version (PCL-S); PTSD Checklist for the DSM-5(PCL-5); 6-item Impact of Event Scale-Revised (IES-6); Impact of Event scale (IES).

Audu an Culture	Diele Difference	07	Mainter	Risk Difference	Risk Difference
tudy or Subgroup	Risk Difference		Weight	IV. Random, 95% C	
bdel-Aziz et al 2022		0.05237828	2.2%	0.67 [0.56, 0.77]	
am et al 2022	0.345205	0.0143676	2.7%	0.35 [0.32, 0.37]	
amilleri et al 2022		0.01459788	2.7%	0.15 [0.12, 0.18]	
hi et al 2020		0.01022782	2.7%	0.31 [0.29, 0.33]	
ixit et al 2022		0.09278048	1.6%	0.29 [0.11, 0.47]	
IBarazi et al 2022		0.01214493	2.7%	0.23 [0.20, 0.25]	
eng et al 2022		0.00564537	2.7%	0.07 [0.06, 0.08]	
ila-Witecka et al 2022		0.01465608	2.7%	0.65 [0.63, 0.68]	
ao et al 2021		0.00436014	2.7%	0.03 [0.02, 0.04]	
iusti et al 2020		0.03376783	2.5%	0.14 [0.07, 0.20]	
thikar et al 2021		0.02744935	2.6%	0.37 [0.32, 0.42]	
ardon et al 2022		0.03558004	2.5%	0.33 [0.26, 0.40]	
oseph et al 2022		0.03087642	2.5%	0.27 [0.21, 0.33]	
im et al 2022	0.288683	0.00673722	2.7%	0.29 [0.28, 0.30]	•
im H.J et al 2022		0.02337166	2.6%	0.32 [0.28, 0.37]	
umar et al 2020	0.226586	0.02300958	2.6%	0.23 [0.18, 0.27]	-
umar et al 2021	0.383333	0.02372405	2.6%	0.38 [0.34, 0.43]	-
ee et al 2021	0.253711	0.01598506	2.7%	0.25 [0.22, 0.29]	-
ee et al 2022	0.103704	0.01855415	2.7%	0.10 [0.07, 0.14]	-
et al 2021	0.149653	0.00447737	2.7%	0.15 [0.14, 0.16]	
in et al 2021	0.159491	0.01145286	2.7%	0.16 [0.14, 0.18]	-
i X et al 2021	0.162572	0.00559116	2.7%	0.16 [0.15, 0.17]	
opez-Castro et al 2021	0.047305	0.00704121	2.7%	0.05 [0.03, 0.06]	
laouch et al 2022	0.238263	0.01459523	2.7%	0.24 [0.21, 0.27]	-
chnik et al 2021	0.327398	0.01124651	2.7%	0.33 [0.31, 0.35]	-
ogowska et al 2022	0.229412	0.00739806	2.7%	0.23 [0.21, 0.24]	•
aali et al 2022	0.074074	0.02520051	2.6%	0.07 [0.02, 0.12]	-
oltan et al 2021	0.542553	0.02966654	2.6%	0.54 [0.48, 0.60]	-
ong et al 2021	0.375479	0.02997409	2.6%	0.38 [0.32, 0.43]	-
ultana et al 2021	0.409057	0.00777674	2.7%	0.41 [0.39, 0.42]	•
un et al 2021	0.176778	0.00872427	2.7%	0.18 [0.16, 0.19]	· ·
ang et al 2020	0.026962	0.0032492	2.8%	0.03 [0.02, 0.03]	•
dgiri et al 2021	0.3125	0.05182226	2.2%	0.31 [0.21, 0.41]	
/ang et al 2022	0.341939	0.00786135	2.7%	0.34 [0.33, 0.36]	· · ·
/athelet et al 2021	0.19473	0.00261776	2.8%	0.19 [0.19, 0.20]	•
ie et al 2021		0.00269455	2.8%	0.07 [0.06, 0.07]	•
u et al 2021		0.00262312	2.8%	0.08 [0.08, 0.09]	•
hang et al 2021	0.219642	0.00657812	2.7%	0.22 [0.21, 0.23]	•
otal (95% CI)			100.0%	0.25 [0.21, 0.28]	•
eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0	01; Chi² = 9204.52, c	if = 37 (P < 0.	00001); l²	= 100%	
est for overall effect: Z =	13.96 (P < 0.00001)			-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
2					
					pandemic. CI, confidence intervals.

et al., 2022). Moreover, the lower economic income can cause additional frustration due to incapable to cover the adequate need for supplies, medical attention and maintaining previous lifestyles, as indicated in previous studies on the consequences of quarantine (Alejandro-Salinas et al., 2022). A study based on family factors also has verified the relationship between the prevalence of PTSD and family background, which has shown university students from extremely poor families had the highest prevalence of PTSD, in contrast to the lowest level among students from wealthy families (Zhang et al., 2021). During the COVID-19 pandemic, some college

1.3.1 Africa Abdel-Aziz et al 2022 ElBarazi et al 2022 Soltan et al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Fest for overall effect: Z = 1.3.2 Europe Fila-Witecka et al 2022	0.228452 0.542553 6; Chi² = 149.86, df	0.05237828 0.01214493 0.02966654	2.3% 2.9% 2.7%	IV, Random, 95% Cl 0.67 [0.56, 0.77] 0.23 [0.20, 0.25]		om, 95% Cl
ElBarazi et al 2022 Soltan et al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Fest for overall effect: Z = 1.3.2 Europe	0.228452 0.542553 6; Chi² = 149.86, df	0.01214493 0.02966654	2.9%			· · ·
Soltan et al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Fest for overall effect: Z = 1.3.2 Europe	0.228452 0.542553 6; Chi² = 149.86, df	0.01214493 0.02966654	2.9%			1
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.06 Fest for overall effect: Z = 1.3.2 Europe	6; Chi² = 149.86, df					-
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.06 Fest for overall effect: Z = 1.3.2 Europe	6; Chi² = 149.86, df			0.54 [0.48, 0.60]		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.06 Fest for overall effect: Z = 1.3.2 Europe		= 2 (P < 0.00	7.9%	0.48 [0.20, 0.75]		
			001); I² =	99%		
	0 654321	0.01465608	2.9%	0.65 [0.63, 0.68]		-
Giusti et al 2020		0.03376783	2.6%	0.14 [0.07, 0.20]		
Rogowska et al 2022		0.00739806	2.9%	0.23 [0.21, 0.24]		-
Nathelet et al 2021		0.00261776	2.9%	0.19 [0.19, 0.20]		•
Subtotal (95% CI)	0.13475	0.00201110	11.3%	0.30 [0.16, 0.45]		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.02 Test for overall effect: Z =		= 3 (P < 0.00				
I.3.3 Asia						
Cam et al 2022	0.345205	0.0143676	2.9%	0.35 [0.32, 0.37]		-
Chi et al 2020		0.01022782	2.9%	0.31 [0.29, 0.33]		÷
Dixit et al 2022		0.09278048	1.6%	0.29 [0.11, 0.47]		·
Feng et al 2022		0.00564537	2.9%	0.07 [0.06, 0.08]		•
Gao et al 2021		0.00436014	2.9%	0.03 [0.02, 0.04]		•
Ifthikar et al 2021		0.02744935	2.7%	0.37 [0.32, 0.42]		-
Kim H.J et al 2022		0.02337166	2.8%	0.32 [0.28, 0.37]		-
Kumar et al 2020	0.226586	0.02300958	2.8%	0.23 [0.18, 0.27]		-
Kumar et al 2021	0.383333	0.02372405	2.8%	0.38 [0.34, 0.43]		-
Lee et al 2022		0.01855415	2.8%	0.10 [0.07, 0.14]		-
Li et al 2021		0.00447737	2.9%	0.15 [0.14, 0.16]		•
Lin et al 2021		0.01145286	2.9%	0.16 [0.14, 0.18]		-
Li X et al 2021		0.00559116	2.9%	0.16 [0.15, 0.17]		•
Maouch et al 2022	0.238263	0.01459523	2.9%	0.24 [0.21, 0.27]		-
Sultana et al 2021		0.00777674	2.9%	0.41 [0.39, 0.42]		•
Sun et al 2021	0.176778	0.00872427	2.9%	0.18 [0.16, 0.19]		*
Tang et al 2020	0.026962	0.0032492	2.9%	0.03 [0.02, 0.03]		•
Udgiri et al 2021	0.3125	0.05182226	2.3%	0.31 [0.21, 0.41]		·
Wang et al 2022		0.00786135	2.9%	0.34 [0.33, 0.36]		*
Xie et al 2021	0.069265	0.00269455	2.9%	0.07 [0.06, 0.07]		•
Xu et al 2021	0.084592	0.00262312	2.9%	0.08 [0.08, 0.09]		•
Zhang et al 2021	0.219642	0.00657812	2.9%	0.22 [0.21, 0.23]		
Subtotal (95% CI)			61.3%	0.21 [0.17, 0.26]		◆
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z =			00001); l²	= 100%		
1.3.4 North America						
Camilleri et al 2022		0.01459788	2.9%	0.15 [0.12, 0.18]		-
Jardon et al 2022	0.327586	0.03558004	2.6%	0.33 [0.26, 0.40]		-
Joseph et al 2022	0.270531	0.03087642	2.7%	0.27 [0.21, 0.33]		
Kim et al 2022	0.288683	0.00673722	2.9%	0.29 [0.28, 0.30]		•
Lee et al 2021	0.253711	0.01598506	2.8%	0.25 [0.22, 0.29]		-
Lopez-Castro et al 2021		0.00704121	2.9%	0.05 [0.03, 0.06]		*
Saali et al 2022	0.074074	0.02520051	2.8%	0.07 [0.02, 0.12]		-
Subtotal (95% CI)			19.5%	0.20 [0.10, 0.30]		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z =		= 6 (P < 0.00	001); l² =	99%		
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	0.24 [0.21, 0.28]		•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = Test for subaroup differen	13.44 (P < 0.00001)	00001); l²	= 100%	-1 -0.5 Favours [experimental]	0 0.5 1 Favours [control]
E 3 roup analysis based on c						

students in developing countries like Pakistan, are unable to afford laptops because of electricity shortages and connectivity issues and may have apprehensions about their practical capabilities as a professional as they are unable to learn in hospitals through clinical rotations and internships (Gonzalo et al., 2009; Arima et al., 2020; Gallagher and Schleyer, 2020). Finally, subgroup analysis that based on medical and non-medical students has shown, the prevalence of PTSD among medical college students during the COVID-19 pandemic is significantly higher than among non-medical college students. Related reasons are inferred as follows: first of all, medical students need to complete some on-site operation and internship courses in hospitals, but hospitals are key

	Dial Diff	-		Risk Difference	Risk Dif	
Study or Subgroup	Risk Difference	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Rando	m, 95% Cl
.2.1 Lower-middle incom		0.05007000	0.40/	0.07 (0.50, 0.77)		
bdel-Aziz et al 2022		0.05237828	2.4%	0.67 [0.56, 0.77]		-
Barazi et al 2022		0.01214493	3.0%	0.23 [0.20, 0.25]		
Cumar et al 2020		0.02300958	2.9%	0.23 [0.18, 0.27]		-
Kumar et al 2021		0.02372405	2.9%	0.38 [0.34, 0.43]		
Soltan et al 2021		0.02966654	2.8%	0.54 [0.48, 0.60]		
Sultana et al 2021		0.00777674	3.0%	0.41 [0.39, 0.42]		
Idgiri et al 2021	0.3125	0.05182226	2.4%	0.31 [0.21, 0.41]		
Subtotal (95% CI)			19.3%	0.39 [0.30, 0.48]		
leterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.01 est for overall effect: Z = 3			001); I ² = 9	98%		
.2.2 Upper-middle incon	20					
		0.0440676	2.00/	0.05 (0.00, 0.07)		-
cam et al 2022	0.345205	0.0143676	2.9%	0.35 [0.32, 0.37]		.
Chi et al 2020		0.01022782	3.0%	0.31 [0.29, 0.33]		
eng et al 2022		0.00564537	3.0%	0.07 [0.06, 0.08]		•
Sao et al 2021		0.00436014	3.0%	0.03 [0.02, 0.04]		
i et al 2021		0.00447737	3.0%	0.15 [0.14, 0.16]		-
in et al 2021		0.01145286	3.0%	0.16 [0.14, 0.18]		
i X et al 2021		0.00559116	3.0%	0.16 [0.15, 0.17]		_
Maouch et al 2022		0.01459523	2.9%	0.24 [0.21, 0.27]		
Sun et al 2021		0.00872427	3.0%	0.18 [0.16, 0.19]		•
ang et al 2020	0.026962		3.0%	0.03 [0.02, 0.03]		•
Vang et al 2022		0.00786135	3.0%	0.34 [0.33, 0.36]		*
Kie et al 2021		0.00269455	3.0%	0.07 [0.06, 0.07]		•
Ku et al 2021	0.084592	0.00262312	3.0%	0.08 [0.08, 0.09]		•
Zhang et al 2021	0.219642	0.00657812	3.0%	0.22 [0.21, 0.23]		•
Subtotal (95% CI)			41.7%	0.17 [0.13, 0.21]		•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0 ⁻ Fest for overall effect: Z =			.00001); l²	= 100%		
1.2.3 High income						
Camilleri et al 2022	0.152961	0.01459788	2.9%	0.15 [0.12, 0.18]		-
Dixit et al 2022		0.09278048	1.7%	0.29 [0.11, 0.47]		
Fila-Witecka et al 2022		0.01465608	2.9%	0.65 [0.63, 0.68]		-
Giusti et al 2020		0.03376783	2.7%	0.14 [0.07, 0.20]		
fthikar et al 2021		0.02744935	2.8%	0.37 [0.32, 0.42]		-
lardon et al 2022		0.03558004	2.7%	0.33 [0.26, 0.40]		
loseph et al 2022		0.03087642	2.8%	0.27 [0.21, 0.33]		-
Kim et al 2022		0.00673722	3.0%	0.29 [0.28, 0.30]		•
Kim H.J et al 2022		0.02337166	2.9%	0.32 [0.28, 0.37]		-
ee et al 2021		0.01598506	2.9%	0.25 [0.22, 0.29]		+
_ee et al 2022		0.01855415		0.10 [0.07, 0.14]		-
_opez-Castro et al 2021		0.00704121	3.0%	0.05 [0.03, 0.06]		*
Saali et al 2022		0.02520051	2.8%	0.07 [0.02, 0.12]		-
Wathelet et al 2021		0.00261776		0.19 [0.19, 0.20]		•
Subtotal (95% CI)	0.10470	5.00201770	39.0%	0.25 [0.18, 0.32]		•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z =			.00001); I²	= 99%		
			100.0%	0.24 [0.21, 0.28]		▲
Total (95% Cl)	1. Chi2 - 9676 50	df = 24 /D = 0		. , .	⊢ −−−−	▼
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0			.00001); 12	= 100%	-1 -0.5 (0.5 1
Test for overall effect: Z =			004) 12	00 50/	Favours [experimental]	Favours [control]
Test for subaroup differen	ces: Chi* = 19.11.	at = 2 (P < 0.0	1001). I ² =	89.3%		
4						

areas for epidemic control, which has caused more pressure on medical students. Then, in the process of fighting against COVID-19, the medical staff's hard work and lack of corresponding supply guarantee in the early stage have made them go through a difficult period, which may have an impact on the medical students' practice choice (Wang et al., 2022). Finally, during the period of isolation, separation from loved ones, loss of freedom, boredom and uncertainty about disease conditions may also bring psychological distress and disorder symptoms to medical staff.

The COVID-19 pandemic is one of the risk factors leading to college students' psychological problems, which should be solved as an urgent matter of public health. Isolation and treatment of infected persons and possible expansion of the vaccination population are effective measures to control the COVID-19 pandemic (Frederiksen et al., 2020). Given that medical college students are more likely to suffer mental problems, we should give more attention to medical students and provide psychological support and material services to reduce their risk of developing PTSD and other mental problems. And for those who have suffered from PTSD, online and telephone support can be provided for help, since that has already been verified as an effective emergency measure in many countries. Popularizing medical knowledge about COVID-19 can also help reduce panic and the risk of mental problems among college students (Wang et al., 2020).

				Risk Difference	Risk Difference
Study or Subgroup	Risk Difference	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
1.4.1 Medical students					
Abdel-Aziz et al 2022		0.05237828	2.2%	0.67 [0.56, 0.77]	
Dixit et al 2022		0.09278048	1.6%	0.29 [0.11, 0.47]	
Gao et al 2021		0.00436014	2.7%	0.03 [0.02, 0.04]	·
Ifthikar et al 2021		0.02744935	2.6%	0.37 [0.32, 0.42]	
Jardon et al 2022		0.03558004	2.5%	0.33 [0.26, 0.40]	
Joseph et al 2022		0.03087642	2.5%	0.27 [0.21, 0.33]	
Kumar et al 2020		0.02300958	2.6%	0.23 [0.18, 0.27]	
Kumar et al 2021		0.02372405	2.6%	0.38 [0.34, 0.43]	
Lee et al 2021		0.01598506	2.7%	0.25 [0.22, 0.29]	_ *
Lee et al 2022		0.01855415	2.7%	0.10 [0.07, 0.14]	
Li et al 2021		0.00447737	2.7%	0.15 [0.14, 0.16]	_
Saali et al 2022		0.02520051	2.6%	0.07 [0.02, 0.12]	
Soltan et al 2021		0.02966654	2.6%	0.54 [0.48, 0.60]	
Udgiri et al 2021	0.3125	0.05182226	2.2%	0.31 [0.21, 0.41]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			34.9%	0.28 [0.21, 0.35]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.02 Test for overall effect: Z =		f = 13 (P < 0.	00001); l²	= 99%	
1.4.2 Non-medical stude	. ,				
Cam et al 2022	0.345205	0.0142676	2 70/	0.35 [0.32, 0.37]	
Camilleri et al 2022		0.0143676 0.01459788	2.7%		-
			2.7%	0.15 [0.12, 0.18]	
Chi et al 2020 ElBorozi et al 2022		0.01022782	2.7%	0.31 [0.29, 0.33]	
ElBarazi et al 2022		0.01214493	2.7%	0.23 [0.20, 0.25]	
Feng et al 2022		0.00564537	2.7%	0.07 [0.06, 0.08]	-
Fila-Witecka et al 2022		0.01465608	2.7%	0.65 [0.63, 0.68]	—
Giusti et al 2020		0.03376783	2.5%	0.14 [0.07, 0.20]	
Kim et al 2022		0.00673722	2.7%	0.29 [0.28, 0.30]	-
Kim H.J et al 2022 Lin et al 2021		0.02337166 0.01145286	2.6%	0.32 [0.28, 0.37]	-
Li X et al 2021		0.00559116	2.7% 2.7%	0.16 [0.14, 0.18]	
		0.00559110	2.7%	0.16 [0.15, 0.17]	
Lopez-Castro et al 2021 Maouch et al 2022		0.00704121	2.7%	0.05 [0.03, 0.06]	-
				0.24 [0.21, 0.27]	
Ochnik et al 2021		0.01124651	2.7%	0.33 [0.31, 0.35]	
Rogowska et al 2022		0.00739806	2.7%	0.23 [0.21, 0.24]	
Song et al 2021		0.02997409	2.6%	0.38 [0.32, 0.43]	
Sultana et al 2021		0.00777674	2.7%	0.41 [0.39, 0.42]	-
Sun et al 2021		0.00872427	2.7%	0.18 [0.16, 0.19]	•
Tang et al 2020	0.026962	0.0032492	2.8%	0.03 [0.02, 0.03]	•
Nang et al 2022		0.00786135	2.7%	0.34 [0.33, 0.36]	
Wathelet et al 2021		0.00261776 0.00269455	2.8%	0.19 [0.19, 0.20]	
Xie et al 2021			2.8%	0.07 [0.06, 0.07]	
Xu et al 2021 Zhang et al 2021		0.00262312	2.8%	0.08 [0.08, 0.09]	
Zhang et al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI)	0.219042	0.00657812	2.7% 65.1%	0.22 [0.21, 0.23] 0.23 [0.19, 0.28]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0	1: Chi ² = 7083 75	If = 23 /D < 0			•
Test for overall effect: Z =			0000 r <i>)</i> , I [_]	- 100 /0	
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	0.25 [0.21, 0.28]	▲
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$	1: Chi ² = 9204 52	f = 37 (P < ∩			
Test for overall effect: Z =			,, 1		-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1
Test for subaroup differen		,). I² = 29.7	%	Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
E 5					

5. Conclusion

The objective of the meta-analysis was to assess the prevalence of PTSD in college students worldwide by continent and national income levels during the COVID-19 pandemic. The findings of our meta-analysis suggested that 25% of college students experienced PTSD during COVID-19, and the prevalence varied among different continents, different national income levels, and different study majors of college students. The highlighting of the high prevalence of college students' PTSD, and comprehensive analysis of potential risk factors could help to raise caution among college students during COVID-19. To better understand the prevalence of PTSD among college students

worldwide, future studies can use standard and reliable questionnaires to conduct surveys reasonably sampled from the world. Meanwhile, we should take measures to reduce the impact of the pandemic on people's mental health urgently.

6. Limitation of the study and future direction

Limitations of our study must be noted to provide a better interpretation of the present study. Firstly, all of the included studies were cross-sectional studies, which might not provide sufficient evidence for the association between the COVID-19 pandemic and the increased prevalence of PTSD among college students. In addition, the heterogeneity of the studies included in our meta-analysis was relatively high, and heterogeneities of subgroup analysis based on the continents, national income and study major were also relatively high. However, the present study included 95,375 college students, which was quite a large sample for meta-analysis to assess the pooled prevalence of PTSD among college students worldwide, and might not affect the overall prevalence of PTSD among college students.

The results of the study highlighted the need for future research to pay attention to mental health of vulnerable population (such as patients, children, pregnant women and college students) after exposure to emergent events of public health. Additionally, further study is needed to determine the effects of the COVID-19 on college students' mental health and well-being in its later phases rather than the peak period. Based on relative studies during the SARS outbreak, the effects of the COVID-19 on students might linger for a time beyond the peak of the COVID-19 itself (McAlonan et al., 2007).

Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/Supplementary material, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

Author contributions

XT designed the methodology of the study, supervised and performed article screening, data extraction, statistical analyses, critically reviewed and revised the manuscript, and accepted

References

Abdel-Aziz, S. B., Emadeldin, M., Al Hanafy, S. H., and Amin, T. T. (2022). Mental health outcomes and psychological support among university students during the COVID-19 pandemic in Egypt. *Open Access Maced. J. Med. Sci.* 10, 1248–1254. doi: 10.3889/oamjms.2022.6930

Alejandro-Salinas, R., Rojas-Cueva, A. C., Visconti-Lopez, F. J., Osorio-Martinez, M. L., and Toro-Huamanchumo, C. J. (2022). Factors associated with post-traumatic stress disorder symptoms in the post-quarantine context of the COVID-19 pandemic in Peruvian medical students. *Heliyon* 8:e09446. doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e09446

Arima, M., Takamiya, Y., Furuta, A., Siriratsivawong, K., Tsuchiya, S., and Izumi, M. (2020). Factors associated with the mental health status of medical students during the COVID-19 pandemic: a cross-sectional study in Japan. *BMJ Open* 10:e043728. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-043728

Bijia, S., Yilin, Z., and Junchao, Z. (2020). COVID-19-related traumatic effects and psychological reactions among international students. *J. Epidemiol. Global Health* 11, 117–123. doi: 10.2991/jegh.k.201016.001

Cam, H. H., Ustuner Top, F., and Kuzlu Ayyildiz, T. (2022). Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on mental health and health-related quality of life among university students in Turkey. *Curr. Psychol.* 41, 1033–1042. doi: 10.1007/s12144-021-01674-y

Camilleri, C., Fogle, C. S., O'Brien, K. G., and Sammut, S. (2022). The impact of COVID-19 and associated interventions on mental health: a cross-sectional study in a sample of university students. *Front. Psychol.* 12:801859. doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2021.801859

Cheng, C., and Cheung, M. W. (2005). Psychological responses to outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome: a prospective, multiple time-point study. J. Pers. 73, 261–285. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2004.00310.x

Chi, X., Becker, B., Yu, Q., Willeit, P., Jiao, C., Huang, L., et al. (2020). Prevalence and psychosocial correlates of mental health outcomes among Chinese college students during the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic. *Front. Psychol.* 11:803. doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2020.00803

responsibility for the integrity of the data analyzed. XY and BH performed article screening, data extraction, and statistical analyses and drafted the manuscript. All authors had read and approved the final version of the manuscript to be submitted.

Acknowledgments

We thank all authors of the eligible articles.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Supplementary material

The Supplementary material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1129782/full#supplementary-material

Dixit, S., Musa, A., Sillva, A. B., Reddy, R. S., Abohashrh, M., Kakaraparthi, V. N., et al. (2022). The impact of post-traumatic stress of SARS-CoV-2 affliction on psychological and mental health of student survivors: cross sectional study. *Front. Public Health* 10:845741. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2022.845741

El Maouch, M., Wang, Y., Jin, Z., Tamunang Tamutana, T., Zhao, K., and Liu, Y. (2022). Activity system, schizotypal personality, and mentalization: a study between halted activity and COVID-19 conducted in Henan, China. *Front. Public Health* 10:930842. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2022.930842

Elbarazi, A. S. (2022). Post-traumatic stress disorder and difficulties in emotion regulation among university students under the COVID-19 condition. *J. Evid.-Based Psychother.* 22, 87–102. doi: 10.24193/jebp.2022.1.5

Feng, J., Lau, P. W. C., Shi, L., and Huang, W. Y. (2022). Movement behaviors and posttraumatic stress disorder during the COVID-19 pandemic: a retrospective study of Chinese university students. *J. Exerc. Sci. Fit.* 20, 263–268. doi: 10.1016/j.jesf.2022.05.002

Feng, Q., Zhang, Q. L., Du, Y., Ye, Y. L., and He, Q. Q. (2014). Associations of physical activity, screen time with depression, anxiety and sleep quality among Chinese college freshmen. *PLoS One* 9:e100914. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0100914

Fila-Witecka, K., Malecka, M., Senczyszyn, A., Wieczorek, T., Wieckiewicz, M., Szczesniak, D., et al. (2022). Sleepless in solitude-insomnia symptoms severity and psychopathological symptoms among university students during the COVID-19 pandemic in Poland. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 19:2551. doi: 10.3390/jerph19052551

Frederiksen, L. S. F., Zhang, Y., Foged, C., and Thakur, A. (2020). The long road toward COVID-19 herd immunity: vaccine platform technologies and mass immunization strategies. *Front. Immunol.* 11:1817. doi: 10.3389/fimmu.2020.01817

Fu, W., Yan, S., Zong, Q., Anderson-Luxford, D., Song, X., Lv, Z., et al. (2021). Mental health of college students during the COVID-19 epidemic in China. *J. Affect. Disord.* 280, 7–10. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2020.11.032

Gallagher, T. H., and Schleyer, A. M. (2020). "we signed up for this!"-student and trainee responses to the Covid-19 pandemic. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 382:e96. doi: 10.1056/ NEJMp2005234

Gao, J., Wang, F., Guo, S., and Hu, F. (2021). Mental health of nursing students amid coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic. *Front. Psychol.* 12:699558. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.699558

Giusti, L., Salza, A., Mammarella, S., Bianco, D., Ussorio, D., Casacchia, M., et al. (2020). #everything will be fine. Duration of home confinement and "all-or-nothing" cognitive thinking style as predictors of traumatic distress in young university students on a digital platform during the COVID-19 Italian lockdown. *Front. Psychol.* 11. doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2020.574812

Gonzalo, J. D., Masters, P. A., Simons, R. J., and Chuang, C. H. (2009). Attending rounds and bedside case presentations: medical student and medicine resident experiences and attitudes. *Teach. Learn. Med.* 21, 105–110. doi: 10.1080/10401330902791156

Ifthikar, Z., Fakih, S. S., Johnson, S., and Alex, J. (2021). Post-traumatic stress disorder following COVID-19 pandemic among medical students in Riyadh: a cross-sectional study. *Middle East Curr. Psychiatr.* 28:44. doi: 10.1186/s43045-021-00127-3

Jardon, C., and Choi, K. R. (2022). COVID-19 experiences and mental health among graduate and undergraduate nursing students in Los Angeles. J. Am. Psychiatr. Nurses Assoc.:107839032110722. doi: 10.1177/10783903211072222

Joseph, R. A., Turner, T., Lee, C., Akers, S. W., Whorley, E., and Goodrich, C. (2022). Impact of COVID-19 on nursing students: factors associated with PTSD risk. *J. Christ. Nurs.* 39, 250–257. doi: 10.1097/cnj.000000000000951

Kim, H., Rackoff, G. N., Fitzsimmons-Craft, E. E., Shin, K. E., Zainal, N. H., Schwob, J. T., et al. (2022). College mental health before and during the COVID-19 pandemic: results from a Nationwide survey. *Cognit Ther. Res.* 46, 1–10. doi: 10.1007/s10608-021-10241-5

Kopala-Sibley, D. C., Danzig, A. P., Kotov, R., Bromet, E. J., Carlson, G. A., Olino, T. M., et al. (2016). Negative emotionality and its facets moderate the effects of exposure to hurricane Sandy on children's postdisaster depression and anxiety symptoms. *J. Abnorm. Psychol.* 125, 471–481. doi: 10.1037/abn0000152

Kumar, R., Kumar, H., Kumari, R., Dars, J., Qureshi, S., Hamza, M. A., et al. (2021). The impact of covid-19 on medical students: a cross sectional survey. *Pak. J. Med. Health Sci.* 15, 2905–2909. doi: 10.53350/pjmhs2115112905

Kumar, A., Kumar, A., Shrama, D., Sharma, S., Bansal, R., Shukla, A., et al. (2020). The psychological impact of the Covid-19 lockdown on medical students of a College in North India. *Indian J. Public Health Res. Dev.* 11, 82–87. doi: 10.37506/ijphrd. v11i10.11118

Lee, C. M., Juarez, M., Rae, G., Jones, L., Rodriguez, R. M., Davis, J. A., et al. (2021). Anxiety, PTSD, and stressors in medical students during the initial peak of the COVID-19 pandemic. *PLoS One* 16:e0255013. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0255013

Lee, J., Lee, S. J., Chang, S. M., Won, S., Woo, J., and Kim, B. S. (2022). Association of Sociodemographic and Psychosocial Factors with COVID-19-related post-traumatic stress disorder risk group among medical students. *Psychiatry Investig.* 19, 676–686. doi: 10.30773/pi.2022.0080

Lee, J., Solomon, M., Stead, T., Kwon, B., and Ganti, L. (2021). Impact of COVID-19 on the mental health of US college students. *BMC Psychol.* 9:95. doi: 10.1186/ s40359-021-00598-3

Leung, G. M., Ho, L. M., Chan, S. K., Ho, S. Y., Bacon-Shone, J., Choy, R. Y., et al. (2005). Longitudinal assessment of community psychobehavioral responses during and after the 2003 outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome in Hong Kong. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* 40, 1713–1720. doi: 10.1086/429923

Li, X., Fu, P., Fan, C., Zhu, M., and Li, M. (2021). COVID-19 stress and mental health of students in locked-down colleges. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 18, 1–12. doi: 10.3390/ijerph18020771

Li, D., Zou, L., Zhang, Z., Zhang, P., Zhang, J., Fu, W., et al. (2021). The psychological effect of COVID-19 on home-quarantined nursing students in China. *Front. Psychol.* 12:652296. doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2021.652296

Lin, Z., Zhang, X., Chen, L., Feng, D., Liu, N., and Chen, Z. (2021). Impact of middleand long-distance running on mental health in college students in Guangzhou during COVID-19 outbreak. *Nan Fang Yi Ke Da Xue Xue Bao* 41, 1864–1869. doi: 10.12122/j. issn.1673-4254.2021.12.16

López-Castro, T., Brandt, L., Anthonipillai, N. J., Espinosa, A., and Melara, R. (2021). Experiences, impacts and mental health functioning during a COVID-19 outbreak and lockdown: data from a diverse New York City sample of college students. *PLoS One* 16:e0249768. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0249768

Mak, I. W., Chu, C. M., Pan, P. C., Yiu, M. G., and Chan, V. L. (2009). Long-term psychiatric morbidities among SARS survivors. *Gen. Hosp. Psychiatry* 31, 318–326. doi: 10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2009.03.001

Maunder, R. G. (2009). Was SARS a mental health catastrophe? Gen. Hosp. Psychiatry 31, 316–317. doi: 10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2009.04.004

McAlonan, G. M., Lee, A. M., Cheung, V., Cheung, C., Tsang, K. W., Sham, P. C., et al. (2007). Immediate and sustained psychological impact of an emerging infectious disease outbreak on health care workers. *Can. J. Psychiatr.* 52, 241–247. doi: 10.1177/070674370705200406

Miao, X. R., Chen, Q. B., Wei, K., Tao, K. M., and Lu, Z. J. (2018). Posttraumatic stress disorder: from diagnosis to prevention. *Mil. Med. Res.* 5:32. doi: 10.1186/ s40779-018-0179-0

Nicola, M., Alsafi, Z., Sohrabi, C., Kerwan, A., Al-Jabir, A., Iosifidis, C., et al. (2020). The socio-economic implications of the coronavirus pandemic (COVID-19): a review. *Int. J. Surg.* 78, 185–193. doi: 10.1016/j.ijsu.2020.04.018

Ochnik, D., Rogowska, A. M., Kuśnierz, C., Jakubiak, M., Wierzbik-Strońska, M., Schütz, A., et al. (2021). Exposure to COVID-19 during the first and the second wave of the pandemic and coronavirus-related PTSD risk among university students from six countries-a repeated cross-sectional study. *J. Clin. Med.* 10. doi: 10.3390/jcm10235564

Pacheco, J. P., Giacomin, H. T., Tam, W. W., Ribeiro, T. B., Arab, C., Bezerra, I. M., et al. (2017). Mental health problems among medical students in Brazil: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Braz. J. Psychiatr.* 39, 369–378. doi: 10.1590/1516-4446-2017-2223

Pieh, C., Budimir, S., and Probst, T. (2020). The effect of age, gender, income, work, and physical activity on mental health during coronavirus disease (COVID-19) lockdown in Austria. *J. Psychosom. Res.* 136:110186. doi: 10.1016/j. jpsychores.2020.110186

Plexousakis, S. S., Kourkoutas, E., Giovazolias, T., Chatira, K., and Nikolopoulos, D. (2019). School bullying and post-traumatic stress disorder symptoms: the role of parental bonding. *Front. Public Health* 7:75. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2019.00075

Read, J. P., Ouimette, P., White, J., Colder, C., and Farrow, S. (2011). Rates of DSM-IV-TR trauma exposure and posttraumatic stress disorder among newly matriculated college students. *Psychol. Trauma* 3, 148–156. doi: 10.1037/a0021260

Rogers, J. P., Chesney, E., Oliver, D., Pollak, T. A., McGuire, P., Fusar-Poli, P., et al. (2020). Psychiatric and neuropsychiatric presentations associated with severe coronavirus infections: a systematic review and meta-analysis with comparison to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Lancet Psychiatry* 7, 611–627. doi: 10.1016/s2215-0366(20)30203-0

Rogowska, A. M., Kuśnierz, C., Pavlova, I., and Chilicka, K. (2022). A path model for subjective well-being during the second wave of the COVID-19 pandemic: a comparative study among polish and Ukrainian university students. *J. Clin. Med.* 11. doi: 10.3390/jcm11164726

Rudenstine, S., Bhatt, K., Schulder, T., McNeal, K., Ettman, C. K., and Galea, S. (2022). Examining the role of material and social assets on mental health in the context of COVID-19 among an urban public university sample. *Psychol. Trauma* 15, 483–492. doi: 10.1037/tra0001307

Saali, A., Stanislawski, E. R., Kumar, V., Chan, C., Hurtado, A., Pietrzak, R. H., et al. (2022). The psychiatric burden on medical students in New York City entering clinical clerkships during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Psychiatr. Q.* 93, 419–434. doi: 10.1007/ s11126-021-09955-2

Sareen, J., Afifi, T. O., McMillan, K. A., and Asmundson, G. J. (2011). Relationship between household income and mental disorders: findings from a population-based longitudinal study. *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry* 68, 419–427. doi: 10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2011.15

Schwartz, R. M., Rasul, R., Gargano, L. M., Lieberman-Cribbin, W., Brackbill, R. M., and Taioli, E. (2019). Examining associations between hurricane Sandy exposure and posttraumatic stress disorder by Community of Residence. *J. Trauma. Stress.* 32, 677–687. doi: 10.1002/jts.22445

Semo, B. W., and Frissa, S. M. (2020). The mental health impact of the COVID-19 pandemic: implications for sub-Saharan Africa. *Psychol. Res. Behav. Manag.* 13, 713–720. doi: 10.2147/prbm.s264286

Shuwiekh, H. A. M., Kira, I. A., Sous, M. S. F., Ashby, J. S., Alhuwailah, A., Baali, S. B. A., et al. (2022). The differential mental health impact of COVID-19 in Arab countries. *Curr. Psychol.* 41, 5678–5692. doi: 10.1007/s12144-020-01148-7

Si, M. Y., Su, X. Y., Jiang, Y., Wang, W. J., Gu, X. F., Ma, L., et al. (2021). Prevalence and predictors of PTSD during the initial stage of COVID-19 epidemic among female college students in China. *Inquiry* 58:469580211059953. doi: 10.1177/00469580211059953

Soltan, M. R., Soliman, S. S., and Dawoud, M. E. (2021). A study of anxiety, depression and stress symptoms among Fayoum medical students during COVID-19 lockdown, Egypt. *Egypt J. Neurol. Psychiatr. Neurosurg.* 57:123. doi: 10.1186/s41983-021-00377-2

Sultana, M. S., Khan, A. H., Hossain, S., Ansar, A., Sikder, M. T., and Hasan, M. T. (2021). Prevalence and predictors of post-traumatic stress symptoms and depressive symptoms among Bangladeshi students during COVID-19 mandatory home confinement: a nationwide cross-sectional survey. *Child Youth Serv. Rev.* 122:105880. doi: 10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105880

Sun, S., Goldberg, S. B., Lin, D., Qiao, S., and Operario, D. (2021). Psychiatric symptoms, risk, and protective factors among university students in quarantine during the COVID-19 pandemic in China. *Glob. Health* 17:15. doi: 10.1186/s12992-021-00663-x

Sunjaya, A. P., Allida, S. M., Di Tanna, G. L., and Jenkins, C. R. (2022). Asthma and COVID-19 risk: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur. Respir. J.* 59:2101209. doi: 10.1183/13993003.01209-2021

Tang, W., Hu, T., Hu, B., Jin, C., Wang, G., Xie, C., et al. (2020). Prevalence and correlates of PTSD and depressive symptoms one month after the outbreak of the COVID-19 epidemic in a sample of home-quarantined Chinese university students. *J. Affect. Disord.* 274, 1–7. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2020.05.009

Udgiri, R. S., Biradar, S. G., and Shannawaz, M. (2021). Assessing impact event scale of post-traumatic stress disorder of covid-19 pandemic among postgraduates working at tertiary care hospital — a cross-sectional study. *Journal of the Indian Medical Association*, 119, 19–23.

Wang, X., Hegde, S., Son, C., Keller, B., Smith, A., and Sasangohar, F. (2020). Investigating mental health of US College students during the COVID-19 pandemic: cross-sectional survey study. *J. Med. Internet Res.* 22:e22817. doi: 10.2196/22817

Wang, H., Si, M. Y., Su, X. Y., Huang, Y. M., Xiao, W. J., Wang, W. J., et al. (2022). Mental health status and its influencing factors among college students during the epidemic of coronavirus disease 2019:a multi-center cross-sectional study. *Zhongguo Yi Xue Ke Xue Yuan Xue Bao* 44, 30–39. doi: 10.3881/j. issn.1000-503X.14144

Wang, Z. H., Yang, H. L., Yang, Y. Q., Liu, D., Li, Z. H., Zhang, X. R., et al. (2020). Prevalence of anxiety and depression symptom, and the demands for psychological knowledge and interventions in college students during COVID-19 epidemic: a large cross-sectional study. *J. Affect. Disord.* 275, 188–193. doi: 10.1016/j. jad.2020.06.034

Wathelet, M., Fovet, T., Jousset, A., Duhem, S., Habran, E., Horn, M., et al. (2021). Prevalence of and factors associated with post-traumatic stress disorder among French university students 1 month after the COVID-19 lockdown. *Transl. Psychiatry* 11:327. doi: 10.1038/s41398-021-01438-z

White, J., Pearce, J., Morrison, S., Dunstan, F., Bisson, J. I., and Fone, D. L. (2015). Risk of post-traumatic stress disorder following traumatic events in a community sample. *Epidemiol. Psychiatr. Sci.* 24, 249–257. doi: 10.1017/s2045796014000110

Xie, X., Zhu, K., Xue, Q., Zhou, Y., Liu, Q., Wu, H., et al. (2021). Problematic internet use was associated with psychological problems among university students during COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Front. Public Health* 9:675380. doi: 10.3389/ fpubh.2021.675380

Xu, Y., Su, S., Jiang, Z., Guo, S., Lu, Q., Liu, L., et al. (2021). Prevalence and risk factors of mental health symptoms and suicidal behavior among university students in Wuhan, China during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Front. Psychol.* 12:695017. doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2021.695017

Zhang, D., and Ba-Thein, W. (2022). COVID-19 epidemic and Chinese medical students: perception, emotions, attitudes, and conformity during domicile quarantine. *J. Infect. Dev. Ctries.* 16, 41–48. doi: 10.3855/jidc.14328

Zhang, Y., Zhao, J., Xi, J., Fan, B., Wang, Q., Yao, Z., et al. (2021). The prevalence and determinant of PTSD symptoms among home-quarantined Chinese university students during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Healthcare (Basel)* 9. doi: 10.3390/healthcare9101383