



Since January 2020 Elsevier has created a COVID-19 resource centre with free information in English and Mandarin on the novel coronavirus COVID-19. The COVID-19 resource centre is hosted on Elsevier Connect, the company's public news and information website.

Elsevier hereby grants permission to make all its COVID-19-related research that is available on the COVID-19 resource centre - including this research content - immediately available in PubMed Central and other publicly funded repositories, such as the WHO COVID database with rights for unrestricted research re-use and analyses in any form or by any means with acknowledgement of the original source. These permissions are granted for free by Elsevier for as long as the COVID-19 resource centre remains active.



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

## Sleep Medicine Reviews

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/smrv](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/smrv)

## CLINICAL REVIEW

## Sleep disturbances during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review, meta-analysis, and meta-regression



Haitham A. Jahrami <sup>a, b, \*</sup>, Omar A. Alhaj <sup>c</sup>, Ali M. Humood <sup>b</sup>, Ahmad F. Alenezi <sup>b</sup>, Feten Fekih-Romdhane <sup>d, e</sup>, Maha M. AlRasheed <sup>f</sup>, Zahra Q. Saif <sup>a</sup>, Nicola Luigi Bragazzi <sup>g</sup>, Seithikurippu R. Pandi-Perumal <sup>h, i</sup>, Ahmed S. BaHammam <sup>j, k</sup>, Michael V. Vitiello <sup>l</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Ministry of Health, Bahrain<sup>b</sup> College of Medicine and Medical Sciences, Arabian Gulf University, Bahrain<sup>c</sup> Department of Nutrition, Faculty of Pharmacy and Medical Science, University of Petra, Amman, Jordan<sup>d</sup> The Tunisian Center of Early Intervention in Psychosis, Psychiatry Department "Ibn Omrane", Tunisia<sup>e</sup> Tunis El Manar University, Faculty of Medicine of Tunis, Tunisia<sup>f</sup> Clinical Pharmacy Department, College of Pharmacy, King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia<sup>g</sup> Laboratory for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, York University, Toronto, Canada<sup>h</sup> Somnogen Canada Inc., College Street, Toronto, Canada<sup>i</sup> Saveetha Medical College and Hospitals, Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences, Saveetha University, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India<sup>j</sup> Department of Medicine, College of Medicine, University Sleep Disorders Center, King Saud University, Saudi Arabia<sup>k</sup> The Strategic Technologies Program of the National Plan for Sciences and Technology and Innovation in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia<sup>l</sup> Psychiatry & Behavioral Sciences, Gerontology & Geriatric Medicine, and Biobehavioral Nursing, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195-6560, United States

## ARTICLE INFO

## Article history:

Received 24 August 2021

Received in revised form

15 November 2021

Accepted 11 January 2022

Available online 22 January 2022

## Keywords:

Sleep disorder  
Sleep disturbance  
Pandemic  
Insomnia  
Sleep hygiene  
Circadian rhythm

## SUMMARY

This systematic review and meta-analysis evaluated the extent of sleep disturbances during the COVID-19 pandemic. Eleven databases and six preprint repositories were searched for the period from November 1, 2019, to July 15, 2021. The DerSimonian and Laird method was used to develop random-effect meta-analyses. Two hundred and fifty studies comprising 493,475 participants from 49 countries were included. During COVID-19, the estimated global prevalence of sleep disturbances was 40.49% [37.56; 43.48%]. Bayesian meta-analysis revealed an odds of 0.68 [0.59; 0.77] which translates to a rate of approximately 41%. This provides reassurance that the estimated rate using classical meta-analysis is robust. Six major populations were identified; the estimated prevalence of sleep problem was 52.39% [41.69; 62.88%] among patients infected with COVID-19, 45.96% [36.90; 55.30%] among children and adolescents, 42.47% [37.95; 47.12%] among healthcare workers, 41.50% [32.98; 50.56%] among special populations with healthcare needs, 41.16% [28.76; 54.79%] among university students, and 36.73% [32.32; 41.38%] among the general population. Sleep disturbances were higher during lockdown compared to no lockdown, 42.49% versus 37.97%. Four in every ten individuals reported a sleep problem during the COVID-19 pandemic. Patients infected with the disease, children, and adolescents appeared to be the most affected groups.

© 2022 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

**Abbreviations:** AIS, Athens insomnia scale; Decimal, data extraction for complicated meta-analysis; DOI, digital object identification; GOSH, Graphic display of study heterogeneity; IPD, individual patient data; ISI, Insomnia severity index; MeSH, Medical Subjects Headings; NOS, Newcastle–Ottawa Scale; Prisma, Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses; PSQI, Pittsburgh sleep quality index.

\* Corresponding author. College of Medicine and Medical Sciences, Arabian Gulf University, P.O. Box: 26671, Manama, Bahrain.

E-mail address: [HJahrami@health.gov.bh](mailto:HJahrami@health.gov.bh) (H.A. Jahrami).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2022.101591>

1087-0792/© 2022 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

## Introduction

Because sufficient sleep is necessary for humans to sustain everyday functioning [1], numerous research studies of sleep disturbances were conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic, most using self-report data [2]. These studies have reported a range of results on the prevalence and associated factors of sleep disturbances during COVID-19 in various populations.

Several systematic reviews and meta-analyses examining the impact of COVID-19 on sleep disturbances have been conducted. The first review reported a systematic review and meta-analysis of the pooled prevalence rate of sleep disturbances during the COVID-19 pandemic [2]. The review concluded that the global prevalence of sleep disturbances was approximately 36%; the least affected group was the general population with a rate of 32%, followed by healthcare workers with a rate of 36%, and patients with COVID-19 were the most affected with a rate of 75% [2]. A more recent systematic review and meta-analysis estimated a similar prevalence of sleep disturbances among the general population, 31% [3] to the 32% initially reported by Jahrami and colleagues (2). Similar findings of healthcare workers were confirmed by two independent meta-analyses that reported a pool rate of 35% [4] and 38% [5]. Nurses appeared to have a slightly higher rate of sleep disturbances with a reported rate of 43% [6]. According to the same review, the adjusted pooled estimated prevalence of sleep disturbances was 24% for females and 27%, for males [3]. A review focused on children and adolescents reported a combined prevalence of any sleep disruption in children was 54% [7]. Furthermore, a high rate of sleep disturbances was reported among Chinese healthcare workers, with a reported rate of 45% [8]. Reviews of sleep disturbances in patients infected with COVID-19 produced heterogenous findings as follows 34% [9], 57% [10], and 75% [2].

In all previous systematic reviews and meta-analyses, heterogeneity or variation in study outcomes between studies was high despite efforts to control moderators using subgroup analysis or a meta-regression analysis. While results of moderator analyses resulted in better fit indices of heterogeneity; nonetheless, it remained high. Previous reviews typically controlled for one moderator at the time, and no review has attempted a multiple meta-regression analysis to correct for interaction between variables at the metadata level. Risk of bias assessment was examined coarsely as part of some of the previous systematic reviews and meta-analyses with findings presented as aggregate scores and not utilized to influence the synthesis of the studies' conclusions or to factor into the overall reliability evaluation of the evidence.

Ten previous systematic reviews and meta-analyses were performed and published before our review [2–11]; and were critically appraised as a preparatory step. While there is some value in independent replications of meta-analyses by different teams, the specific purpose of this review was not to perform an updated systematic review and meta-analysis but to fill identified gaps in previous multiple overlapping meta-analyses covering the topic of sleep disturbances during COVID-19. Several important information gaps were identified in evaluating the previously published reviews. First, seven out of ten were narrowly focused on a single population, mainly healthcare workers [4–6,8,11], children and adolescents [7], or patients with COVID-19 [9]. Therefore, several significant populations were missed, for example, university students or those with medical comorbidities. Second, previous studies that focused on healthcare workers did not control for the line of work, i.e., frontline healthcare workers vs. non-frontline healthcare workers. Thus, it remained unknown if the proportion of frontline healthcare workers in the analyzed study or nursing staff (as the primary direct care providers) during the pandemic will affect the reported estimated rate. Third, previous work

examined the role of lockdown during the COVID-19 pandemic and reported an association between lockdown status, per se, and prevalence of sleep disturbances [10] but did not explicitly quantify or report the magnitudes of sleep disturbances during lockdown compared to no lockdown. Accordingly, neither lockdown status nor the year of publication as a proxy for the longitudinal effect were analyzed or reported in previously published studies. Finally, all previously published reviews relied exclusively on classical meta-analytic techniques. Consequently, statistical approaches (e.g., Bayesian analysis) guided by combining prior information about what is already known with data in a new sample were not previously utilized to ensure the stability of results.

Given the now large number of published studies on the topic, the current systematic review was designed and conducted to estimate the raw and weighted prevalence rates of sleep disturbances during the pandemic taking into account the effect of a single moderator and simultaneous interaction of several moderators on the prevalence of sleep disorders in diverse populations. The findings provide a more precise prevalence estimate of sleep disturbances during COVID-19 across multiple at-risk populations and may aid in the development of customized screening and intervention techniques to reduce the harmful consequences of these sleep disturbances.

## Methodology

### Registration and protocol

The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (Prisma) criteria were used to design and perform this systematic review and meta-analysis [12]. The protocol was registered into the PROSPERO International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (Prospero) database (Registration number: CRD42021268440). Before registering our protocol, a careful review of the Prospero and the COVID-19 evidence network to support decision-making (COVID-END) resources was performed to verify if a similar systematic review already existed to avoid duplication.

### Search strategy

Eleven electronic academic databases (American Psychological Association PsycINFO; Cochrane Library; Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL); EBSCOhost Research Platform; Embase; Google Scholar; MEDLINE; ProQuest Medical; ScienceDirect; Scopus; and Web of Science) were searched systematically between November 1, 2019 and July 15, 2021. Additionally, the COVID-19 Global literature on coronavirus disease database by World Health Organization was also searched to cover six preprint repositories ([arXiv.org](https://arxiv.org); [biorxiv.org](https://biorxiv.org); [medRxiv.org](https://medRxiv.org); [Preprints.org](https://Preprints.org); [psyarxiv.com](https://psyarxiv.com); and [SSRN.com](https://SSRN.com)) for publications that have been peer-reviewed and accepted but not yet indexed. There was no limit on the language used.

The search strategy involved crossmatching keywords selected based on key terms and the PubMed Medical Subjects Headings (MeSH). The Boolean logic operators of (OR, AND, NOT) were used to develop the search in an [All Fields] search. Each database's advanced search characteristics were used to change the search syntax. In the search, the following keywords were used: "COVID-19" OR "2019-nCoV" OR "2019 coronavirus" OR "Wuhan coronavirus" OR "2019 novel coronavirus" OR "SARS-CoV-2" AND "sleep" OR "sleep medicine" OR "sleep disturbances" OR "sleep disorders" OR "sleep problems" OR "polysomnography" OR "sleep quality" OR "PSQI" OR "Pittsburg Sleep Quality Index" OR "insomnia" OR "circadian rhythm" OR "restless leg syndrome" OR "sleep apnea" OR "narcolepsy" OR "daytime dysfunction" OR "daytime sleepiness"

OR “ESS” or “Epworth Sleepiness Scale” AND “prevalence” OR “incidence” OR “epidemiology” OR “rate” OR “frequency” OR “risk factors” OR “interventions” OR “treatment” OR “therapy” OR “management”.

To enhance the chance of obtaining relevant original studies, the reference lists of included studies and previous systematic reviews and meta-analyses of published articles were manually searched.

Finally, the final search results were converted into a Microsoft Excels spreadsheet 2019 to filter and eliminate duplicates. Research Information Systems, incorporated files were saved to manage the citations using EndNote X9.3.3.

*Inclusion and exclusion criteria*

The magnitude of sleep disturbances during the COVID-19 pandemic was the primary outcome of the current meta-analysis. As a result, we included: First, all observational studies that looked at the impact of COVID-19 on sleep quantity and quality in a variety of groups, including the general population, healthcare workers, COVID-19-infected patients, children and adolescents, university students, and people with special healthcare needs (e.g., pregnant women or people with chronic medical conditions). Second, studies that reported numerical values of the prevalence of sleep disturbances expressed in event counts and total sample size. We used an artificial intelligence application - WebPlotDigitizer [13] - to obtain the underlying numerical data, reverse plots of data visualizations if they were not reported in the text of the original

studies. Third, only English language, peer-reviewed studies published between November 1, 2019, and July 15, 2021, were included.

There were no restrictions on the characteristics of the participants. Abstracts, case reports, editorials, infographics, letters, narrative reviews, opinions, position statements, and systematic reviews and meta-analyses were excluded from the retrieved articles. Fig. 1 shows the Prisma flow diagram for study selection.

*Outcomes*

The primary outcome was the estimated prevalence of sleep disturbances during the COVID-19 pandemic. Sleep disturbances refer to a group of disturbances characterized by trouble falling or staying asleep, which can result in excessive drowsiness throughout the day as a result of sleep deprivation or change in terms of quantity, quality, or timing [10]. Sleep disturbances as an outcome had to be measured with valid and reliable psychometric instruments or validated with established cut-off points before being labeled as such. For example, on the Pittsburgh sleep quality index [14], a global score of five or above indicates poor sleep quality indicative of a “sleep problem”.

*Study screening and selection*

In the first phase, two reviewers independently evaluated the title and abstract of all retrieved publications based on the inclusion criteria (HJ, AH, AFA, FFR). Based on the aforementioned criteria, the




Fig. 1. PRISMA flow diagram of study inclusion.

complete texts of possibly relevant papers were studied further. Relevant studies were chosen during this procedure. Disagreements between reviewers were addressed by a third member of the study team (AB) through discussion and consensus.

#### Data extraction

The recommendations for data extraction for complicated meta-analysis (Decimal) [15] were used to design data extraction for this review. To extract data from the studies that were included, a pre-designed electronic form was created in a Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet. To facilitate the work of geographically dispersed researchers, the form was available live online within a secure, shared workspace for the extraction team members.

Study information, epidemiological findings, and the article's reference were all part of the data extraction process. The research information included the last author, year of publication, country of origin, kind of study, study goals, sample size, recruitment strategy, and basic sample characteristics such as mean age and proportion of females. The prevalence rate for sleep quality (count of events and sample size) and other noteworthy findings were the epidemiological findings. The complete citation information of the publication, including the digital object identification (DOI), was provided in the citation. We contacted the corresponding authors for clarifications and to seek more information when necessary. Each entry was extracted by two reviewers independently (OH, AH, AFA, FFR) and was matched by (ZS); discrepancies/disagreements between reviewers were settled through discussion and consensus with a third author (HJ).

#### Quality assessment and risk of bias

The Newcastle–Ottawa Scale (NOS) was used to evaluate the methodological quality and assess the risk of bias of the studies included in the current review. The NOS checklist was used to look at three aspects (participants selection, comparability, and outcome and statistics). There are three variants of the checklist: for cross-sectional studies (seven items), for case–control studies (eight items), and for cohort or longitudinal studies (eight items). NOS is based on a star rating system, with each study receiving a maximum of nine stars (cross-sectional and cohort studies) or ten stars (case–control studies). A study with a score  $\geq 8$  has good quality and low risk of bias, a score of 5–7 has moderate quality and moderate risk of bias, and a score of 0–4 has low quality and high risk of bias [16]. Based on this quality ranking, no studies were eliminated. On the other hand, subgroup analysis was used to examine the impact of quality on the pooled effect size. Quality evaluation was done in parallel with data extraction by the same researchers, and the quality score for each study was determined using a consensus method.

Quality assessment results are presented visually using the traffic light plot, which tabulates the judgment for each study in each area of the NOS. A summary plot (weighted) was also created to depict the proportion of information within each judgment for each domain for all studies.

#### Data analysis

Because the studies included were of diverse populations, a random effect model was used to account for both within-study and between-study variations. Our meta-analysis utilized the general inverse variance approach [17], the logit transformed proportions, and corresponding standard errors with the DerSimonian and Laird estimates of effect size [18]. Clopper–Pearson interval was used for the 95% confidence interval calculation [19]. The  $I^2$  statistic

was used to quantify the variability of sample size impact estimates across these investigations [20]. The  $I^2$  statistic indicates how much variance between research is attributable to heterogeneity rather than chance [21]. Heterogeneity is classified as 1) mild when the  $I^2$  is less than 25%, 2) moderate when the  $I^2$  is 25–50%, 3) severe when the  $I^2$  is 50–75%, and 4) extremely severe when the  $I^2$  is higher than 75% [21].

Cochran's Q test [22] and  $\tau^2$  [23] statistics were used to determine the degree of heterogeneity between the studies. The weighted sum of squared differences between individual study effects and the pooled effect across studies was computed as Cochran's Q, with the weights being those used in the pooling technique [22]. The chi-square statistic with k (number of studies) minus 1 degree of freedom was used to distribute Q [22]. The  $\tau^2$  statistic is the variation of effect size parameters across all studies in a population, and it represents the variance of real effect sizes;  $\tau$  refers to the square root of this integer. To further examine heterogeneity, the H statistic was defined as the ratio of the standard deviation of a random-effects meta-analysis' estimated overall effect size to the standard deviation of a fixed-effects meta-analysis [20].

In our meta-analysis, the Baujat plot was employed to investigate heterogeneity [24]. Each study's contribution to the total heterogeneity statistic is displayed on the x-axis. The standardized difference of the total prevalence of sleep disturbances with and without each study is displayed on the y-axis; this amount represents the impact of each study on the overall treatment effect.

The findings of meta-analyses are plotted as a point estimate with 95% confidence intervals in a forest plot [25]. A jackknife approach was used to establish that no single study drove our findings by doing a leave-one-out sensitivity analysis [26]. The inclusion of outliers and influential studies may compromise the validity and robustness of the meta-analysis results. Thus, outliers were identified and removed. An outlier is labeled if the study's confidence interval does not coincide with the pooled effect's confidence interval [27]. Funnel plots were used as a visual approach to examine publication bias [28]. A funnel plot is a basic scatter plot of individual study intervention effect estimates versus some metric of study size or precision. The impact estimates are plotted on the horizontal scale, with the study size measured on the vertical axis, as with forest plots. This is the polar opposite of traditional scatter plot graphical presentations, which exhibit the result (e.g., effect size) on the vertical axis and the covariate (e.g., study size) on the horizontal axis [28]. Kendall's  $\tau$  rank-order correlations [29] and Egger's regression [30] were used to analyze publication bias in a formal way. The use of Duval and Tweedie's trim and fill technique [31] to produce modified point estimates to account for funnel plot asymmetry due to possible publication bias was planned a priori. Because the most extreme findings on one side of the funnel plot are suppressed, the technique may be used to estimate the number of studies missing from a meta-analysis [31]. The technique then adds data to the funnel plot to make it more symmetric. The approach should not be thought of as a way to get a more valid assessment of the overall effect or outcome, but rather as a tool to see how sensitive the results are to one specific selection process [31]. The adjusted prevalence rate was reported if both Kendall's  $\tau$  rank order correlation and Egger's regression were significant.

The p-curve approach, which focuses on p-values as the major driver of publication bias, was used to determine whether there is a real impact behind our meta-analysis data and to estimate its size [32,33]. Importantly, unlike small-study impact approaches, it accounts for dubious research procedures such as p-hacking. Graphic display of study heterogeneity (GOSH) plots was also utilized as a diagnostic plot to examine effect size heterogeneity [34]. Within



the modeled data, GOSH charts make it easier to find outliers as well as clear homogenous groupings [34].

To explain the dispersion of effect sizes or heterogeneity, a moderator analysis was done. Because estimates of the prevalence of sleep disturbances differ depending on the types of populations studied, subgroup meta-analyses were performed to see if sleep disorders in each of the groups had an impact on the overall pooled estimate. Subgroup analysis was used to look at variations between groups based on categorical factors, such as the study population and the research measure. When three or more studies were available for analysis, subgroup analysis was conducted, and results were presented. We reported subgroup analysis based on country, population, used sleep measure, lockdown status, year of publication (time effect), research design, and quality assessment. The different aspects of sleep disturbances described, such as insomnia or sleep quality, were analyzed and presented separately according to the sleep measurement tool utilized in the included studies. The primary two disturbances reported were poor sleep quality measured using the Pittsburgh sleep quality index (PSQI); and insomnia measured using the insomnia severity index (ISI), the Athens insomnia scale (AIS).

For countries, we reported results if  $\geq 10$  studies were available for a given country. Special populations were defined as pregnant women, the elderly, and individuals with chronic diseases. Healthcare workers include physicians, nurses, emergency medical personnel, dental professionals, diagnostics professionals, pharmacists, and administrative staff. Those personnel in organizations committed to the assessment, quarantine, isolation, and treatment of established COVID-19 cases are designated as frontline healthcare workers in our analysis.

We utilized meta-regression approaches to look for continuous variables of sleep difficulties; we used four covariates, mean age, female sex proportion, front-line staff proportion (for studies involving healthcare workers) and proportion of nurses (for studies involving healthcare workers), and the interaction term of the proportion of nurses working on the front-line (for studies involving healthcare workers).

To further strengthen the results of the classical meta-analysis, Bayesian meta-analysis was also conducted. Meta-analysis using Bayesian methods has some advantages over many classical methods [35]. First, the analysis naturally considers the imprecision of the estimated between-study variance estimates [35]. Second, the analysis includes the impact of data on people's beliefs [20]. Finally, the analysis includes external evidence, such as information about the effects of interventions or likely differences between studies. Bayesian meta-analysis uses the Bayesian hierarchical model [36]. As with the conventional random-effects model, this model relies on the same basic assumptions [36]. There is a difference, however, in that prior distribution (informative, weakly informative, or uninformative) is assumed for  $\mu$  and  $\tau^2$ . The prior distribution describes the uncertainty surrounding a particular effect measure within a meta-analysis, such as the odds ratio or the mean difference [36]. There may be subjective beliefs about the size of the effect, or it may be based on sources of evidence excluded from the meta-analysis, such as non-randomized studies. Quantity uncertainty is reflected by the width of the prior distribution [37]. It is possible to use a 'non-informative prior when there is little or no available information, in which all values are equally likely [37]. Meta-analysis likelihood summarizes both the data from included studies and the model of the meta-analysis (assuming random effects) [35,37].

All data analyses and visualizations were performed using R for statistical computing version 4.1.0 [38]. The packages 'meta' [39] and 'metafor' [40] were used to perform all meta-analytics. The package 'bayesmeta' [41] was used to perform Bayesian meta-

analysis. Quality assessment plots were produced using risk-of-bias visualization 'robvis' [42].

#### Role of the funding source

No governmental, commercial, or non-profit sector has provided support for this systematic review and meta-analysis.

## Results

### Features of the studies included

The search was performed for the period between November 1, 2019, and July 15, 2021. Through electronic database searches and other sources, a total of 8715 records were identified. There were 6771 records left after duplicates were removed. A total of 734 prospective articles were evaluated in their entirety. Narrative and systematic reviews, editorials, comments, letters to the editor, position statements, irrelevant literature, duplicates, and incorrectly categorized publications were among the 485 papers eliminated. The search procedure is depicted in Fig. 1 using the PRISMA flowchart.

A total of 250 studies [285 subgroups, i.e., multiple populations, multiple tools, or multiple data points] comprising 493,475 participants from 49 countries were included in the analyses [43–292]. The countries included Argentina (K = 3), Australia (K = 3), Austria (K = 1), Bahrain (K = 1), Bangladesh (K = 4), Belgium (K = 1), Brazil (K = 7), Canada (K = 5), China (K = 84), Colombia (K = 2), Cyprus (K = 1), Egypt (K = 6), Ethiopia (K = 2), Finland (K = 1), France (K = 4), Germany (K = 2), Greece (K = 5), India (K = 16), Indonesia (K = 2), Iran (K = 3), Iraq (K = 2), Israel (K = 2), Italy (K = 34), Jordan (K = 2), Kuwait (K = 1), Libya (K = 1), Mali (K = 1), Morocco (K = 2), Multicountry (K = 17), México (K = 1), Nepal (K = 2), Netherlands (K = 1), Nigeria (K = 1), Oman (K = 3), Pakistan (K = 1), Poland (K = 2), Qatar (K = 2), Russia (K = 1), Saudi Arabia (K = 10), Slovenia (K = 1), Spain (K = 10), Sweden (K = 1), Taiwan (K = 1), Thailand (K = 1), Tunis (K = 2), Turkey (K = 12), UK (K = 2), USA (K = 15), and Vietnam (K = 1). A total of 249 (99.60%) of the studies collected data online; only one study used a telephone survey and aimed to include the elderly [123]. In 139 (55.60%) studies the data were obtained during the specific countries' national lockdown periods. In terms of included studies, the top three countries were China, Italy, India with (84, 33.60%), (34, 13.60%), and (16, 6.40%), respectively.

The mean sample size was 1804 [95%CI 1237; 2376 participants]. Participants were mainly females 64% [95%CI 62%; 66%], and the mean age of participants was 35 years [95%CI 33; 37 years]. A total of six participants grouping clusters were identified: general population 98 (39%), healthcare workers 84 (34%), special population 22 (9%), university students 18 (7%), COVID-19 patients 15 (6%), and children and adolescents 13 (5%). Participants from the healthcare workers included: 37% [95%CI 28%; 45%] from the frontline workforce, and 40% [95%CI 32%; 47%] were from nursing staff only. Cross-sectional design 229 (91%) was the most common, followed by longitudinal 12 (5%) or case-control 9 (4%) designs. Sleep disturbances were assessed using a variety of measures; the most common were: the PSQI, 95 (38%) of the studies, the ISI 94 (37.60%) of the studies, the AIS 12 (4.80%) of the studies, and other sleep measures 49 (19.60%) of the remaining studies. A prevalence rate was calculated as the number of people with sleep disturbances divided by all the individuals in a sample. All studies were published after March 2020, and 93 (37%) were released in 2021. Studies published in 2020 and 2021 did not differ significantly in terms of populations,  $P = 0.32$ , or used research design,  $P = 0.90$ . However, studies published in 2021 compared to those published

in 2020 were mostly during lockdown periods  $P = 0.001$  and relied mainly on the PSQI as a research measure  $P = 0.001$ . Furthermore, more studies in 2021 came from the countries that did not publish in 2020,  $P = 0.002$ . The mean NOS quality score was  $7.10 \pm 1.12$  and ranged from 4.0 to 8.0. Detailed examination of quality assessment for each study included in the meta-analysis is presented in Fig. S1. Summary results indicate that 95% of the studies were of high or moderate quality. According to Fig. 2, most of the risk bias is observed in the selection dimension, specifically regarding the sample size and representativeness of the sample. The summary features of all included studies are listed in Table 1.

*Sleep disturbances: a meta-analysis*

*Global assessment of sleep disturbances*

Using all available studies, a random-effects meta-analysis evaluated the prevalence of sleep disturbances in all populations ( $K = 285$ ,  $N = 493,475$ ) generated a pooled prevalence rate of 40.49% [37.56; 43.48%], heterogeneity ( $Q = 87,213$  (284),  $P = 0.001$ ),  $\tau^2 = 1.09$  [0.86; 1.30],  $\tau = 1.04$  [0.93; 1.14],  $I^2 = 99.7\%$ ;  $H = 17.52$  [17.28; 17.78]. Using any sleep measure in all populations, the raw prevalence estimates for sleep disturbances varied from 2% to 95%. The forest plot of the meta-analysis of sleep disturbances in all populations using all measures is shown in Fig. S2.

A (leave-one-out) sensitivity analysis found that no study had a greater than 1% impact on the global prevalence estimate, Fig. S3. Influence analysis was used to identify and eliminate outliers in our meta-analyses. Results of influence meta-analysis yielded a pooled prevalence rate of 40.70% [39.81; 41.59%], heterogeneity ( $Q = 270$  (76),  $P = 0.001$ ),  $\tau^2 = 0.02$  [0.01; 0.04],  $\tau = 0.12$  [0.10; 0.19],  $I^2 = 72.20\%$  [65.10%; 77.90%],  $H = 1.90$  [1.69; 2.13]. The influence on pooled result and overall heterogeneity contribution from the analysis is shown in a Baujat plot in Figure S4.

After using the leave-one-out method and influence analyses to test the robustness of our meta-analysis, the GOSH plot in Fig. S5 revealed several distinct clusters, indicating that there may be more than one effect size population in our data, necessitating a subgroup analysis and the preservation of outliers. GOSH diagnostics indicated that the number of K-means clusters detected  $\geq 3$  is shown in Fig. S6.

Visual inspection to funnel plot indicated a slight publication bias (Fig. 3), Egger's regression  $P = 0.001$  confirmed the publication bias; however, this was not evident in the radial plot (Fig. 4) and rank correlation by Kendall's  $\tau$  without continuity correction,  $P = 0.06$ . The trim-and-fill technique was used to estimate and compensate for the quantity and findings of missing studies, and results showed that adjusted prevalence of sleep disturbances with  $K = 353$  (68 added studies) is 30.50% [27.93; 33.19%], heterogeneity ( $Q = 124,771$  (352),  $P = 0.001$ ),  $\tau^2 = 1.39$  [1.27; 1.84],  $\tau = 1.18$  [1.12; 1.35],  $I^2 = 99.70\%$ ;  $H = 18.83$  [18.60; 19.06].

Meta-regression analysis revealed that neither age nor sex moderates the global prevalence rate of sleep disturbances during

the COVID-19 pandemic  $P = 0.15$  and  $P = 0.92$ , respectively. Detailed results are presented in Table 2.

Bayesian meta-analysis of the global assessment of sleep disturbances revealed that the mean odds of quotes estimate was 0.68 [0.59; 0.77],  $\tau = 1.09$  [1.00; 1.18]. Thus, converting the odds obtained by Bayesian meta-analysis translates to an overall proportion of approximately 41%; detailed results are shown in Figure S7.

*Assessment of sleep disturbances during COVID-19 by country*

Seven countries had 10 or more studies and showed a statistically significant difference between the groups  $Q = 4808$  (48),  $P = 0.001$ . Prevalence rate of sleep disturbances were as follow: China 30.32% [26.26; 34.72%],  $\tau^2 = 0.87$ ,  $I_t = 99.70\%$ ; Italy 38.64% [28.86; 49.44%],  $\tau^2 = 1.67$ ,  $I^2 = 99.80\%$ ; India 27.25% [19.00; 37.43%],  $\tau^2 = 0.89$ ,  $I_t = 98.20\%$ ; USA 50.21% [41.06; 59.35%],  $\tau^2 = 0.52$ ,  $I^2 = 98.80\%$ ; Turkey 44.18% [33.41; 55.53%],  $\tau^2 = 0.62$ ,  $I^2 = 98.0\%$ ; Spain 58.59% [47.64; 68.76%],  $\tau^2 = 0.45$ ,  $I^2 = 92.80\%$ ; and Saudi Arabia 51.10% [36.67; 65.35%],  $\tau^2 = 0.89$ ,  $I^2 = 99.20\%$ .

Age (older age) was a statistically significant moderator in China and Spain,  $P = 0.02$  and  $P = 0.04$ , respectively. Detailed results are presented in Table 2 and Figure S8.

*Assessment of sleep disturbances during COVID-19 by population*

Subgroup analysis by population revealed that: patients infected with COVID-19 are the most affected population group by sleep disturbances with an overall pooled rate of 52.39% [41.69; 62.88%],  $K = 16$ ,  $N = 6821$ ,  $I^2 = 98.10\%$ ,  $H = 7.31$ ,  $\tau^2 = 0.70$ , and  $\tau = 0.84$ . Children and adolescents appeared the second most affected population group by sleep disturbances with an overall pooled rate of 45.96% [36.90; 55.30%],  $K = 13$ ,  $N = 29,006$ ,  $I^2 = 99.30\%$ ,  $H = 12.29$ ,  $\tau^2 = 0.45$ , and  $\tau = 0.67$ . Healthcare workers, special populations, and university students had a similar pooled prevalence rate of sleep disturbances during COVID-19. Specifically, data for healthcare workers  $K = 90$ ,  $N = 63,685$  showed an overall rate of sleep disturbances during COVID-19 pandemic of 42.47% [37.95; 47.12%],  $I^2 = 99.1\%$ ,  $H = 0.47$ ,  $\tau^2 = 0.82$ , and  $\tau = 0.90$ . Special populations  $K = 23$ ,  $N = 8023$ , showed an overall rate of sleep disturbances during COVID-19 pandemic of 41.50% [32.98; 50.56%],  $I^2 = 98.1\%$ ,  $H = 7.19$ ,  $\tau^2 = 0.77$ , and  $\tau = 0.88$ . University students  $K = 22$ ,  $N = 21,880$ , showed an overall rate of sleep disturbances during COVID-19 pandemic of 41.16% [28.76; 54.79%],  $I^2 = 99.6\%$ ,  $H = 16.08$ ,  $\tau^2 = 1.69$ , and  $\tau = 1.30$ . Finally, the general population  $K = 121$ ,  $N = 364,060$  had the lowest rate of sleep disturbances during COVID-19 pandemic with an overall rate of 36.73% [32.32; 41.38%],  $I^2 = 99.8\%$ ,  $H = 23.17$ ,  $\tau^2 = 1.18$ , and  $\tau = 1.09$ . Forest plots of the results are shown in Fig. S9. Assessment of publication bias using funnel plots revealed no significant publication bias within each group, results was confirmed by Kendall's and Egger's tests. Detailed results are presented in Table 2.

Moderator analysis revealed that age (older age) was associated with a higher risk of sleep disturbances in healthcare workers  $P = 0.03$ ; and sex (larger proportion of female) was associated with




Fig. 2. The summary risk of bias plot of included studies.

**Table 1**  
Key features, methodologies, and measures of studies that were included in this review about sleep disturbances during COVID-19.

| ID | Authors, year (Ref.)         | Country      | Lockdown Period | Population   | Methodology   | Measures <sup>a</sup> | Quality score <sup>b</sup> |
|----|------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|--|---|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| 1  | Abbas et al., 2021 [43]      | Kuwait       | Yes             | Healthcare workers                                       | Cross-sectional design, N = 217, Female = 43.8%, Age = 35.8 years.  | PSQI                  | 5                          |
| 2  | Abdellah et al., 2021 [44]   | Multi        | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 0%]         | Cross-sectional design, N = 344, Female = 71.5%, Age = 35.6 years.  | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 3  | Abdulah et al., 2020 [45]    | Iraq         | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 0%]         | Cross-sectional design, N = 268, Female = 29.9%, Age = 35.1 years.  | AIS                   | 8                          |
| 4  | Agberotimi et al., 2020 [46] | Nigeria      | Yes             | General Population                                       | Cross-sectional design, N = 884, Female = 45.5%, Age = 28.8 years.  | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 5  | Ahmad et al., 2020 [47]      | India        | Yes             | General Population                                       | Cross-sectional design, N = 393, Female = 47.2%, Age = 30.3 years.  | SD                    | 6                          |
| 6  | Akinci et al., 2021 [48]     | Turkey       | No              | COVID-19 patients  | Cross-sectional design, N = 189, Female = 41%, Age = 46.3 years.    | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 7  | Al Ammari et al., 2021 [49]  | Saudi Arabia | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 27.78%, Nurses = 36.39%] | Cross-sectional design, N = 720, Female = 64.2%, Age = 18–40 years. | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 8  | Al Maqbali et al., 2021 [50] | Oman         | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 81.4%, Nurses = 100%]    | Cross-sectional design, N = 1130, Female = 91.2%, Age = 36.9 years. | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 9  | Al-Ajlouni et al., 2020 [51] | Jordan       | Yes             | General Population                                       | Cross-sectional design, N = 1240, Female = 47.1%, Age = 37.4 years. | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 10 | Alamrawy et al., 2021 [52]   | Egypt        | No              | General Population                                       | Cross-sectional design, N = 447, Female = 70.2%, Age = 20.7 years.  | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 11 | AlAteeq et al., 2021 [53]    | Saudi Arabia | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 0%]         | Cross-sectional design, N = 1313, Female = 44.2%, Age = 34.8 years. | ISI                   | 7                          |
| 12 | Alessi et al., 2020 [54]     | Brazil       | No              | Special Population                                       | Cross-sectional design, N = 120, Female = 55.8%, Age = 54.8 years.  | MSQ                   | 6                          |
| 13 | Alfonsi et al., 2021 [55]    | Italy        | Yes             | General Population                                       | Longitudinal design, N = 217, Female = 72%, Age = 35.7 years.       | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 14 | Alharbi et al., 2021 [56]    | Saudi Arabia | Yes             | General Population                                       | Cross-sectional design, N = 790, Female = 53.1%, Age = 40–60 years. | PSQI, AIS             | 7                          |
| 15 | Ali et al., 2021 [57]        | Bangladesh   | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 4.1%, Nurses = 9.5%]     | Cross-sectional design, N = 294, Female = 43.5%, Age = 28.9 years.  | ISI                   | 5                          |
| 16 | Almater et al., 2020 [58]    | Saudi Arabia | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 64.5%, Nurses = 0%]      | Cross-sectional design, N = 107, Female = 43.9%, Age = 32.9 years.  | ISI                   | 6                          |
| 17 | Alnofaiey et al., 2020 [59]  | Saudi Arabia | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 0%]         | Cross-sectional design, N = 462, Female = 49.1%, Age = 20–60 years. | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 18 | Alomayri et al., 2020 [60]   | Saudi Arabia | No              | Special Population                                       | Cross-sectional design, N = 400, Female = 86%, Age = 18–55 years.   | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 19 | Alqahtani et al., 2021 [61]  | Saudi Arabia | Yes             | General Population                                       | Cross-sectional design, N = 593, Female = 42.3%, Age = 36.5 years.  | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 20 | AlRasheed et al., 2021 [62]  | Saudi Arabia | Yes             | General Population                                       | Cross-sectional design, N = 344, Female = 63%, Age = 27.5 years.    | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 21 | Alshekaili et al., 2020 [63] | Oman         | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 50.4%, Nurses = 39.5%]   | Cross-sectional design, N = 1139, Female = 80%, Age = 36.3 years.   | ISI                   | 7                          |
| 22 | Ammar et al., 2020 [64]      | Multi        | No              | General Population                                       | Longitudinal design, N = 1047, Female = 53.8%, Age = 18–55 years.   | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 23 | Amra et al., 2021 [65]       | Iran         | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 65.1%]      | Cross-sectional design, N = 372, Female = 65.8%, Age = 34.5 years.  | PSQI, ISI             | 7                          |
| 24 | Assenza et al., 2020 [66]    | Italy        | No              | General Population                                       | Cross-sectional design, N = 928, Female = 74.5%, Age = 18–86 years. | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 25 | Atas et al., 2021 [67]       | Turkey       | Yes             | Special Population                                       | Cross-sectional design, N = 106, Female = 38.7%, Age = 44.2 years.  | PSQI, ISI             | 5                          |
| 26 | Bacaro et al., 2020 [68]     | Italy        | Yes             | General Population                                       | Cross-sectional design, N = 1989, Female = 76.2%, Age = 38.4 years. | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 27 | Badellino et al., 2020 [69]  | Argentina    | No              | General Population                                       | Cross-sectional design, N = 1985, Female = 75.9%, Age = 36.8 years. | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 28 | Bai et al., 2020 [70]        | China        | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 74.6%]      | Cross-sectional design, N = 118, Female = 63.6%, Age = 33.1 years.  | PSQI                  | 5                          |
| 29 | Bajaj et al., 2020 [71]      | India        | Yes             | General Population                                       | Cross-sectional design, N = 391, Female = 53.5%, Age = 19–41 years. | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 30 | Barrea et al., 2020 [72]     | Italy        | Yes             | General Population                                       | Longitudinal design, N = 121, Female = 64.5%, Age = 44.9 years.     | PSQI                  | 6                          |
| 31 | Barua et al., 2021 [73]      | Bangladesh   | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 100%, Nurses = 0%]       | Cross-sectional design, N = 370, Female = 39.7%, Age = 30.5 years.  | SCI-02                | 8                          |
| 32 | Baskan et al., 2021 [74]     | Turkey       | Yes             | General Population                                       | Cross-sectional design, N = 1909, Female = 69%, Age = 31.9 years.   | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 33 | Beck et al., 2020 [75]       | France       | Yes             | General Population                                       | Cross-sectional design, N = 1005, Female = 52%, Age = NR years.     | SD                    | 6                          |
| 34 | Benham et al., 2020 [76]     | USA          | Yes             | University Students                                      | Longitudinal, N = 1222, Female = 69%, Age = 21.3 years.             | PSQI, ISI             | 7                          |
| 35 | Bezerra et al., 2020 [77]    | Brazil       | Yes             | General Population                                       | Cross-sectional design, N = 3836, Female = 73.5%, Age = 18-7 years. | SD                    | 6                          |

(continued on next page)



Table 1 (continued)

| ID | Authors, year (Ref.)                  | Country    | Lockdown Period | Population  | Methodology  | Measures <sup>a</sup> | Quality score <sup>b</sup> |
|----|---------------------------------------|------------|-----------------|---|--|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| 36 | Bhat et al., 2020 [78]                | India      | No              | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 264, Female = 27.7%, Age = 18–60 years.  | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 37 | Bigalke et al., 2020 [79]             | USA        | Yes             | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 103, Female = 59%, Age = 38 years.   | PSQI                  | 6                          |
| 38 | Blekas et al., 2020 [80]              | Greece     | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 50%]                       | Cross-sectional design, N = 270, Female = 73.7%, Age = 18–75 years.  | AI5                   | 8                          |
| 39 | Bohlken et al., 2020 [81]             | Germany    | Yes             | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 396, Female = NR%, Age = 23.9 years.   | SD                    | 6                          |
| 40 | Brito-Marques et al., 2021 [82]       | Brazil     | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 0%]                        | Cross-sectional design, N = 332, Female = 68.4%, Age = 36 years.   | PSQI                  | 6                          |
| 41 | Caballero-Domínguez et al., 2020 [83] | Colombia   | Yes             | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 700, Female = 68%, Age = 37.1 years.   | AI5                   | 8                          |
| 42 | Cai et al., 2020 [84]                 | China      | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 50%, Nurses = 50%]                      | Case-Control design, N = 2346, Female = 70%, Age = 30.6 years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 43 | Cai et al., 2020 [85]                 | China      | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 45.9%, Nurses = 100%]                   | Cross-sectional design, N = 1330, Female = 97%, Age = 18–40 years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 44 | Casagrande et al., 2020 [86]          | Italy      | No              | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 2291, Female = 74.6%, Age = 18–50 years.   | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 45 | Cellini et al., 2021 [87]             | Italy      | No              | General Population<br>Children and Adolescents                          | Cross-sectional design, N = 299, Female = 100%, Age = 40.1 years.<br>Cross-sectional design, N = 299, Female = 46.5%, Age = 8.0 years. | PSQI<br>SDSC          | 8                          |
| 46 | Cellini et al., 2020 [88]             | Italy      | Yes             | COVID-19 patients   | Cross-sectional design, N = 1310, Female = 67.2%, Age = 23.9 years.  | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 47 | Cellini et al., 2021 [89]             | Multi      | No              | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 2272, Female = 73.9%, Age = 38.6 years.  | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 48 | Chatterjee et al., 2021 [90]          | India      | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 32.9%]                     | Cross-sectional design, N = 140, Female = 56.7%, Age = 37.7 years.   | ISI                   | 7                          |
| 49 | Chen et al., 2021 [91]                | China      | No              | Special Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 834, Female = 100%, Age = NR years.  | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 50 | Cheng et al., 2020 [92]               | China      | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 45.88%]                    | Cross-sectional design, N = 534, Female = 82.4%, Age = 20–50 years.  | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 51 | Cheng et al., 2021b [93]              | Multi      | No              | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 2278, Female = 53.5%, Age = NR years.  | PROMIS                | 8                          |
| 52 | Chi et al., 2021 [94]                 | China      | No              | Children and Adolescents  | Cross-sectional design, N = 1794, Female = 43.9%, Age = 15.3 years.  | YSIS                  | 8                          |
| 53 | Chouchou et al., 2021 [95]            | France     | No              | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 400, Female = 58.3%, Age = 29.8 years.   | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 54 | Coiro et al., 2021 [96]               | Multi      | Yes             | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 2541, Female = 50.2%, Age = 38.7 years.  | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 55 | Cui et al., 2020 [97]                 | China      | No              | COVID-19 patients   | Cross-sectional design, N = 891, Female = 100%, Age = 18–40 years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 56 | Czeisler et al., 2021 [98]            | Australia  | No              | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 1531, Female = 48.3%, Age = 38.7 years.  | SD                    | 5                          |
| 57 | Dai et al., 2020 [99]                 | China      | No              | COVID-19 patients   | Cross-sectional design, N = 307, Female = 43.3%, Age = 44–60 years.  | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 58 | Das et al., 2021 [100]                | Bangladesh | Yes             | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 672, Female = 43%, Age = 34.4 years.   | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 59 | Dasdemir et al., 2021 [101]           | Turkey     | Yes             | Special Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 44, Female = 70.5%, Age = 34.3 years.  | PSQI                  | 5                          |
| 60 | de Medeiros et al., 2021 [102]        | Brazil     | Yes             | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 5, Female = 60%, Age = 40 years.   | PSQI                  | 4                          |
| 61 | Demartini et al., 2020 [103]          | Italy      | No              | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 432, Female = 72%, Age = 35.9 years.   | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 62 | Du et al., 2021 [104]                 | Multi      | Yes             | University Students   | Cross-sectional design, N = 2254, Female = 66.6%, Age = 22.5 years.  | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 63 | Duran et al., 2021 [105]              | Turkey     | No              | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 405, Female = 70.9%, Age = NR years.   | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 64 | Elhadi et al., 2021 [106]             | Libya      | Yes             | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 10,296, Female = 77.6%, Age = 28.9 years.  | ISI                   | 6                          |
| 65 | ElHafeez et al., 2021 [107]           | Egypt      | Yes             | General Population<br>Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 50%] | Cross-sectional design, N = 538, Female = 66.2%, Age = 35 years.<br>Cross-sectional design, N = 462, Female = 66.2%, Age = 35 years.   | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 66 | Elkholy et al., 2021 [108]            | Egypt      | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 100%, Nurses = 40%]                     | Cross-sectional design, N = 502, Female = 50%, Age = 20–40 years.  | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 67 | Essangri et al., 2021 [109]           | Morocco    | No              | University Students   | Cross-sectional design, N = 549, Female = 74%, Age = 22 years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 68 | Falkingham et al., 2020 [110]         | UK         | Yes             | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 15,360, Female = 53.9%, Age = 36.5 years.  | SD                    | 6                          |
| 69 | Fekih-Romdhane et al., 2020 [111]     | Tunis      | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 48.3%, Nurses = 0.65%]                  | Cross-sectional design, N = 210, Female = 70.5%, Age = 28.6 years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |

Table 1 (continued)

| ID  | Authors, year (Ref.)                  | Country   | Lockdown Period | Population   | Methodology   | Measures <sup>a</sup> | Quality score <sup>b</sup> |
|-----|---------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|--|---|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| 70  | Fidanci et al., 2020 [112]            | Turkey    | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 1%]   | Cross-sectional design, N = 153, Female = 67.3%, Age = 33.4 years.  | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 71  | Filippo et al., 2021 [113]            | Italy     | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 8.57%]  | Cross-sectional design, N = 175, Female = 76.6%, Age = 37 years.  | PSQI                  | 5                          |
| 72  | Florin et al., 2020 [114]             | France    | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 0%]   | Cross-sectional design, N = 1515, Female = 44.3%, Age = 45.2 years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 73  | Franceschini et al., 2020 [115]       | Italy     | Yes             | General Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 6439, Female = 73.1%, Age = 33.9 years.   | MOS-SS                | 8                          |
| 74  | Fu et al., 2020 [116]                 | China     | No              | General Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 1242, Female = 69.7%, Age = 18–64 years.  | AIIS                  | 8                          |
| 75  | Garcia-Priego et al., 2020 [117]      | México    | Yes             | General Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 561, Female = 71%, Age = 30.7 years.  | SD                    | 6                          |
| 76  | Garriga-Baraut et al., 2021 [118]     | Multi     | Yes             | Children and Adolescents   | Longitudinal design, N = 25, Female = 64%, Age = 14 years.  | SDSC                  | 4                          |
| 77  | Gas et al., 2021 [119]                | Turkey    | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 0%]   | Cross-sectional design, N = 699, Female = 64.7%, Age = 21.3 years.  | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 78  | Ge et al., 2020 [120]                 | China     | No              | University Students  | Cross-sectional design, N = 2009, Female = 51%, Age = NR years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 79  | Genta et al., 2021 [121]              | Brazil    | Yes             | Children and Adolescents   | Longitudinal design, N = 94, Female = 64%, Age = 15 years.  | PSQI                  | 6                          |
| 80  | Giardino et al., 2020 [122]           | Argentina | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 7.5%]   | Cross-sectional design, N = 1059, Female = 72.7%, Age = 41.7 years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 81  | Goodman-Casanova et al., 2020 [123]   | Spain     | Yes             | Special Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 93, Female = 65%, Age = 73.3 years.   | SD                    | 4                          |
| 82  | Goularte et al., 2021 [124]           | Brazil    | Yes             | General Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 1996, Female = 84.5%, Age = 34.2 years.   | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 83  | Gu et al., 2020 [125]                 | China     | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 77.9%]  | Cross-sectional design, N = 522, Female = 77.6%, Age = 18–40 years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 84  | Gualano et al., 2020 [126]            | Italy     | Yes             | General Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 1515, Female = 65.6%, Age = 42 years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 85  | Guo et al., 2020 [127]                | China     | No              | General Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 2441, Female = 52.4%, Age = 18–50 years.  | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 86  | Gupta et al., 2020 [128]              | India     | Yes             | General Population<br>Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 50%]                        | Cross-sectional design, N = 579, Female = 37.7%, Age = 38.8 years.<br>Cross-sectional design, N = 379, Female = 46.2%, Age = 35.7 years.  | ISI                   | 7                          |
| 87  | Hao et al., 2020 [129]                | China     | Yes             | Special Population   | Case-Control design, N = 185, Female = 49.8%, Age = 33 years.   | ISI                   | 7                          |
| 88  | Haravuori et al., 2020 [130]          | Finland   | No              | General Population   | Longitudinal design, N = 4804, Female = 87.5%, Age = 45 years.  | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 89  | He et al., 2020 [131]                 | China     | No              | COVID-19 patients<br>General Population<br>Healthcare workers [Frontline = NR %, Nurses = NR%] | Cross-sectional design, N = 1912, Female = 70.1%, Age = 56.8 years.<br>Cross-sectional design, N = 374, Female = 77.4%, Age = 56.8 years.<br>Cross-sectional design, N = 403, Female = 49.6%, Age = 56.8 years. | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 90  | Hendrickson et al., 2020 [132]        | USA       | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 44%, Nurses = 34.59%]  | Cross-sectional design, N = 118, Female = NR%, Age = 41 years.  | ISI                   | 5                          |
| 91  | Herrero San Martin et al., 2020 [133] | Spain     | No              | General Population<br>Healthcare workers [Frontline = 58.82%, Nurses = 15.29%]                 | Cross-sectional design, N = 70, Female = 58.8%, Age = 36.4 years.<br>Cross-sectional design, N = 100, Female = 59%, Age = 36.4 years.   | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 92  | Huang et al., 2020 [134]              | China     | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 100%, Nurses = 100%]   | Cross-sectional design, N = 966, Female = 91.2%, Age = 31.9 years.  | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 93  | Huang et al., 2020 [135]              | China     | No              | General Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 1172, Female = 69.3%, Age = 18–40 years.  | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 94  | Huang et al., 2020 [136]              | China     | No              | General Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 7236, Female = 54.6%, Age = 36.6 years.   | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 95  | Hussen et al., 2021 [137]             | Iraq      | Yes             | General Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 320, Female = NR%, Age = NR years.  | SD                    | 6                          |
| 96  | Idrissi et al., 2020 [138]            | Morocco   | Yes             | General Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 827, Female = 52.2%, Age = 35.9 years.  | AIIS                  | 8                          |
| 97  | Innocenti et al., 2020 [139]          | Italy     | Yes             | General Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 1035, Female = 82.9%, Age = NR years.   | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 98  | Iqbal et al., 2020 [140]              | Qatar     | Yes             | COVID-19 patients  | Cross-sectional design, N = 50, Female = 52%, Age = 39.5 years.   | SD                    | 4                          |
| 99  | Jahrami et al., 2020 [141]            | Bahrain   | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 50%, Nurses = 50%]   | Cross-sectional design, N = 257, Female = 70%, Age = 40.2 years.  | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 100 | Jain et al., 2020 [142]               | India     | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 0%]   | Cross-sectional design, N = 512, Female = 44.3%, Age = 18–60 years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 101 | Jiang et al., 2021 [143]              | China     | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 35.2%, Nurses = 50.2%]   | Cross-sectional design, N = 4245, Female = 77.5%, Age = 38 years.   | SRSS                  | 8                          |

(continued on next page)

**Table 1** (continued)

| ID  | Authors, year (Ref.)              | Country     | Lockdown Period | Population  | Methodology  | Measures <sup>a</sup> | Quality score <sup>b</sup> |
|-----|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|---|--|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| 102 | Jin et al., 2021 [144]            | China       | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 50%]                           | Cross-sectional design, N = 404, Female = NR%, Age = 30–50 years.    | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 103 | Juanjuan et al., 2020 [145]       | China       | No              | Special Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 658, Female = 100%, Age = 40–65 years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 104 | Jung et al., 2020 [146]           | Germany     | Yes             | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 3545, Female = 83.1%, Age = 41.4 years.  | SD                    | 6                          |
| 105 | Kaparounaki et al., 2020 [147]    | Greece      | Yes             | University Students   | Cross-sectional design, N = 1000, Female = 68.1%, Age = 22.1 years.  | SRSS                  | 7                          |
| 106 | Khaled et al., 2021 [148]         | Qatar       | No              | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 1161, Female = 53.2%, Age = NR years.    | SCI                   | 8                          |
| 107 | Khalil et al., 2020 [149]         | Egypt       | No              | Children and Adolescents  | Cross-sectional design, N = 83, Female = 74.7%, Age = 12.8 years.    | PSQI                  | 4                          |
| 108 | Khamis et al., 2020 [150]         | Oman        | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 27.9%, Nurses = 71.6%]                      | Cross-sectional design, N = 402, Female = 100%, Age = 36.4 years.    | SQS                   | 8                          |
| 109 | Khanal et al., 2020 [151]         | Nepal       | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 45.3%, Nurses = 35.2%]                      | Cross-sectional design, N = 475, Female = 52.6%, Age = 28.2 years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 110 | Houry et al., 2021 [152]          | Canada      | No              | Special Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 303, Female = 100%, Age = 32.1 years.    | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 111 | Kilani et al., 2020 [153]         | Multi       | No              | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 1723, Female = 46.8%, Age = 34.9 years.  | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 112 | Killgore et al., 2020 [154]       | USA         | Yes             | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 1013, Female = 56%, Age = 18–35 years.   | ISI                   | 7                          |
| 113 | Kocevska et al., 2020 [155]       | Netherlands | Yes             | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 667, Female = NR%, Age = NR years.       | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 114 | Kokou-Kpolou et al., 2020 [156]   | France      | Yes             | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 556, Female = 75.5%, Age = 30.1 years.   | ISI                   | 7                          |
| 115 | Kolokotroni et al., 2021 [157]    | Cyprus      | Yes             | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 745, Female = 73.8%, Age = 39 years.     | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 116 | Lahiri et al., 2021 [158]         | India       | Yes             | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 1081, Female = 41.7%, Age = 32 years.    | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 117 | Lai et al., 2020 [159]            | China       | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 41.5%, Nurses = 60.8%]                      | Cross-sectional design, N = 1257, Female = 76.7%, Age = 18–40 years. | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 118 | Lai et al., 2020 [160]            | UK          | No              | University Students   | Cross-sectional design, N = 124, Female = 63.7%, Age = NR years.     | ISI                   | 6                          |
| 119 | Lavigne-Cerván et al., 2021 [161] | Spain       | Yes             | Children and Adolescents  | Cross-sectional design, N = 1028, Female = 46.5%, Age = 10.5 years.  | BEARS                 | 7                          |
| 120 | Li et al., 2021 [162]             | Australia   | Yes             | Children and Adolescents  | Cross-sectional design, N = 760, Female = 72%, Age = 14.8 years.     | ISI                   | 7                          |
| 121 | Li et al., 2020 [163]             | Taiwan      | Yes             | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 1970, Female = 66.2%, Age = 37.8 years.  | SD                    | 6                          |
| 122 | Li et al., 2021 [164]             | China       | Yes             | COVID-19 patients   | Cross-sectional design, N = 51, Female = 58%, Age = 46.1 years.      | PSQI                  | 5                          |
| 123 | Li et al., 2020 [165]             | China       | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 23.3%, Nurses = 55.1%]                      | Cross-sectional design, N = 606, Female = 81.2%, Age = 35.8 years.   | ISI                   | 7                          |
| 124 | Li et al., 2021 [166]             | China       | No              | Special Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 1063, Female = 67.4%, Age = 62.8 years.  | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 125 | Liang et al., 2020 [167]          | China       | No              | General Population<br>Healthcare workers [Frontline = 100%, Nurses = 50.0%] | Cross-sectional design, N = 1104, Female = 69.5%, Age = 20–60 years. | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 126 | Liguori et al., 2020 [168]        | Italy       | Yes             | COVID-19 patients   | Cross-sectional design, N = 889, Female = 74.8%, Age = 20–60 years.  | SNS                   | 5                          |
| 127 | Lin et al., 2021 [169]            | China       | Yes             | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 103, Female = 42.7%, Age = 55 years.     | ISI                   | 7                          |
| 128 | Liu et al., 2020 [170]            | China       | Yes             | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 5461, Female = 70.1%, Age = 37.6 years.  | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 129 | Liu et al., 2021 [171]            | China       | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 63.8%]                         | Cross-sectional design, N = 285, Female = 54.5%, Age = NR years.     | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 130 | Liu et al., 2021 [172]            | China       | No              | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 2126, Female = 97.7%, Age = NR years.    | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 131 | Liu et al., 2020 [173]            | China       | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 63.8%]                         | Cross-sectional design, N = 2858, Female = 53.6%, Age = NR years.    | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 132 | Liu et al., 2020 [174]            | USA         | No              | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 606, Female = 81.2%, Age = 35.8 years.   | MOS-SS                | 8                          |
| 133 | Lu et al., 2020 [175]             | China       | No              | Children and Adolescents  | Cross-sectional design, N = 898, Female = 81.3%, Age = 24.5 years.   | YSRIS                 | 8                          |
| 134 | Machón et al., 2021 [176]         | Spain       | Yes             | Special Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 965, Female = 42.4%, Age = 15.3 years.   | EQ-5D-5L              | 5                          |
| 135 | Magnavita et al., 2020 [177]      | Italy       | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 0%]                            | Cross-sectional design, N = 38, Female = 71%, Age = 83 years.        | SCI                   | 6                          |
| 136 | Majumdar et al., 2021 [178]       | India       | Yes             | General Population<br>University Students                                   | Cross-sectional design, N = 90, Female = 52.2%, Age = NR years.      | ESS                   | 6                          |
|     |                                   |             |                 |   | Cross-sectional design, N = 203, Female = 18.2%, Age = 33.1 years.   |                       |                            |
|     |                                   |             |                 |   | Cross-sectional design, N = 325, Female = 60.9%, Age = 22.1 years.   |                       |                            |

**Table 1** (continued)

| ID  | Authors, year (Ref.)                    | Country      | Lockdown Period | Population   | Methodology   | Measures <sup>a</sup> | Quality score <sup>b</sup> |
|-----|---|--------------|-----------------|--|---|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| 137 | Mandelkorn et al., 2021 [179]           | Multi USA    | Yes             | General Population<br>General Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 2562, Female = 68%, Age = 45.2 years.<br>Cross-sectional design, N = 971, Female = 52.8%, Age = 40.4 years. | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 138 | Marelli et al., 2020 [180]              | Italy        | No              | University Students  | Longitudinal design, N = 400, Female = 75.8%, Age = 29.9 years.   | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 139 | Marroquín et al., 2020 [181]            | USA          | No              | General Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 435, Female = 46.4%, Age = 39.2 years.  | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 140 | Martínez-de-Quel et al., 2021 [182]     | Spain        | No              | General Population   | Longitudinal design, N = 161, Female = 37%, Age = 35 years.   | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 141 | Martínez-Lezaun et al., 2020 [183]      | Spain        | Yes             | University Students  | Cross-sectional design, N = 75, Female = 80.4%, Age = 21.8 years.   | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 142 | Massicotte et al., 2021 [184]           | Canada       | No              | Special Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 36, Female = 100%, Age = 53.6 years.  | ISI                   | 6                          |
| 143 | Mazza et al., 2020 [185]                | Italy        | No              | COVID-19 patients  | Cross-sectional design, N = 402, Female = 34.4%, Age = 57.8 years.  | MOS-SS                | 8                          |
| 144 | McCall et al., 2020 [186]               | USA          | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 55.5%]<br>General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 573, Female = 72%, Age = 43.4 years.  | SD                    | 6                          |
| 145 | McCracken et al., 2020 [187]            | Sweden       | No              | General Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 1212, Female = 73.8%, Age = 36.1 years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 146 | Meo et al., 2021 [188]                  | Saudi Arabia | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 71.5%, Nurses = 15.4%]<br>Special Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 1678, Female = 51.2%, Age = 34.1 years.   | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 147 | Miaskowski et al., 2020 [189]           | USA          | Yes             | Special Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 187, Female = 97.9%, Age = 63.3 years.  | SD                    | 4                          |
| 148 | Mongkhon et al., 2021 [190]             | Thailand     | Yes             | General Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 4004, Female = 65.4%, Age = 29.1 years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 149 | Murata et al., 2020 [191]               | USA          | Yes             | Children and Adolescents<br>General Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 583, Female = 80%, Age = 15.8 years.<br>Cross-sectional design, N = 4326, Female = 80%, Age = 43.6 years.   | SD                    | 5                          |
| 150 | Necho et al., 2020 [192]                | Ethiopia     | No              | Special Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 423, Female = 40.7%, Age = 36.7 years.  | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 151 | Osiogo et al., 2021 [193]               | Canada       | Yes             | General Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 6041, Female = 86.8%, Age = 20–60 years.  | SD                    | 6                          |
| 152 | Ozluk et al., 2021 [194]                | Turkey       | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 0%]<br>Special Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 347, Female = 24.2%, Age = 20–65 years.   | ISI                   | 7                          |
| 153 | Parlapani et al., 2020 [195]            | Greece       | No              | Special Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 103, Female = 61.2%, Age = 69.9 years.  | AIS                   | 6                          |
| 154 | Pedrozo-Pupo et al., 2020 [196]         | Colombia     | No              | Special Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 292, Female = 64.7%, Age = 60.4 years.  | AIS                   | 8                          |
| 155 | Petrov et al., 2021 [197]               | Multi        | Yes             | General Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 991, Female = 72.5%, Age = 37.9 years.  | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 156 | Pieh et al., 2020 [198]                 | Austria      | Yes             | General Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 1005, Female = 52.7%, Age = 18–65 years.  | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 157 | Poyraz et al., 2020 [199]               | Turkey       | No              | COVID-19 patients  | Cross-sectional design, N = 284, Female = 49.8%, Age = 39.7 years.  | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 158 | Qi et al., 2020 [200]                   | China        | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 61.33%, Nurses = 0%]<br>Special Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 1306, Female = 80.4%, Age = 33.1 years.   | PSQI, ISI             | 8                          |
| 159 | Que et al., 2020 [201]                  | China        | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 9.1%]<br>General Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 2285, Female = 69.1%, Age = 31.1 years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 160 | Ren et al., 2020 [202]                  | China        | No              | General Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 1172, Female = 69.3%, Age = 22 years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 161 | Repon et al., 2021 [203]                | Bangladesh   | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 26%]<br>General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 355, Female = 43%, Age = 20–60 years.   | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 162 | Robillard et al., 2020 [204]            | Canada       | Yes             | General Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 5525, Female = 67.1%, Age = 55.6 years.   | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 163 | Rossi et al., 2020 [205]                | Italy        | No              | General Population<br>Healthcare workers [Frontline = 52.1%, Nurses = 36%]<br>Case-control design, N = 2706, Female = 79.5%, Age = 42 years. | Case-control design, N = 21,342, Female = 80.4%, Age = 38.95 years.   | ISI<br>ISI            | 8                          |
| 164 | Rossi et al., 2020 [206]                | Italy        | No              | General Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 18,147, Female = 79.5%, Age = 38 years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 165 | Roy et al., 2020 [207]                  | India        | Yes             | General Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 662, Female = 51.2%, Age = 29 years.  | SD                    | 6                          |
| 166 | Saaddeh et al., 2021 [208]              | Jordan       | Yes             | University Students  | Cross-sectional design, N = 6157, Female = 71.3%, Age = 19.8 years.   | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 167 | Sadeghniaat-Haghighi et al., 2021 [209] | Iran         | No              | General Population   | Cross-sectional design, N = 1223, Female = 67.6%, Age = 39.8 years.   | ISI                   | 7                          |
| 168 | Sagaon-Teyssier et al., 2020 [210]      | Mali         | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 14.8%]<br>Healthcare workers [Frontline = 63.2%, Nurses = 100%]                                 | Cross-sectional design, N = 135, Female = 39.3%, Age = 40 years.  | ISI                   | 5                          |
| 169 | Sagherian et al., 2020 [211]            | USA          | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 63.2%, Nurses = 100%]  | Cross-sectional design, N = 564, Female = 94.1%, Age = 18–40 years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |

(continued on next page)

**Table 1** (continued)

| ID  | Authors, year (Ref.)           | Country   | Lockdown Period | Population   | Methodology   | Measures <sup>a</sup> | Quality score <sup>b</sup> |
|-----|--------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|--|---|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| 170 | Saguem et al., 2021 [212]      | Tunis     | Yes             | University Students                                    | Cross-sectional design, N = 251, Female = 82.5%, Age = 21 years.      | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 171 | Şahin et al., 2020 [213]       | Turkey    | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 60.6%, Nurses = 27.1%] | Cross-sectional design, N = 939, Female = 66%, Age = 18–40 years.     | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 172 | Salfi et al., 2021 [214]       | Italy     | Yes             | General Population                                     | Cross-sectional design, N = 13,989, Female = 77.6%, Age = 34.8 years. | PSQI, ISI             | 8                          |
| 173 | Sañudo et al., 2020 [215]      | Spain     | No              | General Population                                     | Cross-sectional design, N = 20, Female = 47%, Age = 22.6 years.       | PSQI                  | 5                          |
| 174 | Saracoglu et al., 2020 [216]   | Turkey    | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 67.3%]    | Cross-sectional design, N = 208, Female = 27.9%, Age = 29 years.      | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 175 | Saraswathi et al., 2020 [217]  | India     | No              | University Students                                    | Longitudinal design, N = 217, Female = 64%, Age = 20 years.           | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 176 | Scotta et al., 2020 [218]      | Argentina | Yes             | University Students                                    | Cross-sectional design, N = 584, Female = 81%, Age = 22.5 years.      | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 177 | Sekartaji et al., 2021 [219]   | Indonesia | Yes             | University Students                                    | Cross-sectional design, N = 101, Female = 58.4%, Age = 21–26 years.   | ISI                   | 4                          |
| 178 | Sharma et al., 2020 [220]      | Nepal     | Yes             | General Population                                     | Cross-sectional design, N = 204, Female = 32.8%, Age = 32 years.      | SD                    | 5                          |
| 179 | Sharma et al., 2020 [221]      | India     | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 60.9%, Nurses = 41.8%] | Cross-sectional design, N = 184, Female = 58.7%, Age = 20–50 years.   | ISI                   | 7                          |
| 180 | Sharma et al., 2021 [222]      | India     | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 0%]       | Cross-sectional design, N = 100, Female = 0%, Age = 30–60 years.      | SQS                   | 4                          |
| 181 | Shi et al., 2020 [223]         | China     | No              | General Population                                     | Cross-sectional design, N = 56,679, Female = 52.1%, Age = 36 years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 182 | Shillington et al., 2021 [224] | Canada    | Yes             | General Population                                     | Cross-sectional design, N = 2192, Female = 89.6%, Age = 43 years.     | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 183 | Simonetti et al., 2021 [225]   | Italy     | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 80.8%, Nurses = 100%]  | Cross-sectional design, N = 1005, Female = 65.9%, Age = 40.2 years.   | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 184 | Song et al., 2020 [226]        | China     | No              | General Population                                     | Cross-sectional design, N = 709, Female = 74.2%, Age = 35.4 years.    | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 185 | Stanton et al., 2020 [227]     | Australia | Yes             | General Population                                     | Cross-sectional design, N = 1491, Female = NR%, Age = NR years.       | SD                    | 6                          |
| 186 | Stewart et al., 2021 [228]     | USA       | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 100%, Nurses = 0%]     | Cross-sectional design, N = 963, Female = 73.4%, Age = 18–50 years.   | PSQI, ISI             | 7                          |
| 187 | Sun et al., 2020 [229]         | China     | Yes             | General Population                                     | Cross-sectional design, N = 2091, Female = 60.8%, Age = 16–60 years.  | SD                    | 6                          |
| 188 | Sunil et al., 2021 [230]       | India     | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 47.6%]    | Cross-sectional design, N = 313, Female = 35.5%, Age = 21–61 years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 189 | Tan Wanqiu et al., 2020 [231]  | China     | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = NR %, Nurses = NR%]    | Cross-sectional design, N = 673, Female = 25.6%, Age = 30.8 years.    | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 190 | Tang et al., 2020 [232]        | China     | Yes             | University Students                                    | Cross-sectional design, N = 2485, Female = 60.8%, Age = 19.8 years.   | SD                    | 6                          |
| 191 | Than et al., 2020 [233]        | Vietnam   | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 100%, Nurses = 63%]    | Cross-sectional design, N = 173, Female = 68.2%, Age = 31 years.      | ISI                   | 7                          |
| 192 | Tiete et al., 2020 [234]       | Belgium   | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 50.4%, Nurses = 72.3%] | Cross-sectional design, N = 647, Female = 78.4%, Age = 20–50 years.   | ISI                   | 7                          |
| 193 | Totskiy et al., 2021 [235]     | Russia    | Yes             | University Students                                    | Cross-sectional design, N = 39, Female = 64.1%, Age = 20.6 years.     | ISI                   | 5                          |
| 194 | Trabelsi et al., 2021a [236]   | Multi     | Yes             | General Population                                     | Longitudinal design, N = 517, Female = 52.2%, Age = 63.2 years.       | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 195 | Trabelsi et al., 2021b [237]   | Multi     | No              | General Population                                     | Longitudinal design, N = 5056, Female = 59.4%, Age = 18–55 years.     | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 196 | Tselebis et al., 2020 [238]    | Greece    | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 100%]     | Cross-sectional design, N = 150, Female = 80%, Age = 42.3 years.      | AIS                   | 7                          |
| 197 | Tu et al., 2020 [239]          | China     | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 100%, Nurses = 100%]   | Cross-sectional design, N = 100, Female = 100%, Age = 34.4 years.     | PSQI                  | 6                          |
| 198 | Varma et al., 2021 [240]       | Multi     | Yes             | General Population                                     | Cross-sectional design, N = 1653, Female = 67.7%, Age = 42.9 years.   | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 199 | Vitale et al., 2020 [241]      | Italy     | Yes             | COVID-19 patients                                      | Cross-sectional design, N = 4, Female = 25%, Age = 54 years.          | PSQI                  | 4                          |
| 200 | Voitaidis et al., 2020 [242]   | Greece    | Yes             | General Population                                     | Cross-sectional design, N = 2427, Female = 76.2%, Age = 18–30 years.  | AIS                   | 7                          |
| 201 | Wang et al., 2021a [243]       | China     | Yes             | General Population COVID-19 patients                   | Case-control design, N = 1743, Female = 47.8%, Age = 32.7 years.      | ISI                   | 7                          |
| 202 | Wang et al., 2020 [244]        | China     | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 50%, Nurses = 59.2%]   | Case-control design, N = 1674, Female = 49.8%, Age = 32.6 years.      | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 203 | Wang et al., 2021 [245]        | China     | Yes             | Children and Adolescents                               | Cross-sectional design, N = 274, Female = 77.4%, Age = 37 years.      | SD                    | 6                          |
| 204 | Wang et al., 2020 [246]        | China     | No              | General Population                                     | Cross-sectional design, N = 11,072, Female = 47.9%, Age = 11.5 years. | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 205 | Wang et al., 2021 [247]        | China     | No              | General Population                                     | Cross-sectional design, N = 19,372, Female = 52%, Age = 11–87 years.  | ISI                   | 8                          |
|     |                                |           |                 |  | Cross-sectional design, N = 5676, Female = 71.4%, Age = NR years.     |                       |                            |



Table 1 (continued)

| ID  | Authors, year (Ref.)         | Country   | Lockdown Period | Population  | Methodology   | Measures <sup>a</sup> | Quality score <sup>b</sup> |
|-----|------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|---|---|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| 206 | Wang et al., 2020 [248]      | China     | No              | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 4191, Female = 62%, Age = 36.2 years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 207 | Wang et al., 2020 [249]      | China     | No              | University Students   | Cross-sectional design, N = 3092, Female = 66.4%, Age = NR years.   | SRSS                  | 8                          |
| 208 | Wang et al., 2020 [250]      | China     | No              | COVID-19 patients   | Cross-sectional design, N = 484, Female = 50.2%, Age = 52.5 years.  | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 209 | Wang et al., 2020 [251]      | China     | No              | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 6437, Female = 56.1%, Age = 31.5 years.   | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 210 | Wang et al., 2020 [252]      | China     | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 33%, Nurses = 0%]                           | Cross-sectional design, N = 2001, Female = 64.5%, Age = 33 years.   | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 211 | Wang et al., 2020 [253]      | China     | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 61%]                           | Cross-sectional design, N = 123, Female = 90%, Age = 33.8 years.  | PSQI                  | 6                          |
| 212 | Wańkowitz et al., 2020 [254] | Poland    | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 46.7%, Nurses = 0%]                         | Cross-sectional design, N = 441, Female = 52.2%, Age = 40 years.  | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 213 | Wańkowitz et al., 2020 [255] | Poland    | No              | Special Population  | Case-control design, N = 723, Female = 54.4%, Age = 39.1 years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 214 | Wasim et al., 2020 [256]     | Pakistan  | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 20.8%]                         | Cross-sectional design, N = 356, Female = 52%, Age = NR years.  | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 215 | Windiani et al., 2021 [257]  | Indonesia | No              | Children and Adolescents  | Cross-sectional design, N = 204, Female = 48.5%, Age = 16 years.  | PSQI                  | 4                          |
| 216 | Wu et al., 2020 [258]        | China     | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 100%, Nurses = 0%]                          | Case-control design, N = 120, Female = 74.2%, Age = 33.7 years.   | PSQI                  | 6                          |
| 217 | Xia et al., 2021 [259]       | China     | No              | Special Population  | Case-control design, N = 288, Female = 54.8%, Age = 60.5 years.   | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 218 | Xu et al., 2021 [260]        | China     | Yes             | Special Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 274, Female = 100%, Age = 30.4 years.   | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 219 | Yadav et al., 2021 [261]     | India     | Yes             | COVID-19 patients   | Cross-sectional design, N = 100, Female = 27%, Age = 42.9 years.  | PSQI                  | 5                          |
| 220 | Yang et al., 2020 [262]      | China     | Yes             | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 2410, Female = 49.2%, Age = 36.3 years.   | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 221 | Yang et al., 2020 [263]      | China     | No              | General Population<br>Healthcare workers [Frontline = 100%, Nurses = 84.4%] | Case-control design, N = 15,000, Female = 57.1%, Age = NR years.<br>Case-control design, N = 1036, Female = 72.9%, Age = 20–50 years. | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 222 | Yang et al., 2021 [264]      | China     | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 100%, Nurses = 84.4%]                       | Cross-sectional design, N = 1036, Female = 72.9%, Age = 20–50 years.  | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 223 | Yifan et al., 2020 [265]     | China     | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 100%, Nurses = 100%]                        | Cross-sectional design, N = 140, Female = 84.3%, Age = 29.4 years.  | SD                    | 5                          |
| 224 | Yitayih et al., 2020 [266]   | Ethiopia  | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 52.2%]                         | Cross-sectional design, N = 249, Female = 52.6%, Age = 27.4 years.  | ISI                   | 7                          |
| 225 | Youssef et al., 2020 [267]   | Egypt     | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 10.2%, Nurses = 9.1%]                       | Cross-sectional design, N = 540, Female = 45.6%, Age = 37.3 years.  | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 226 | Yu et al., 2020 [268]        | China     | Yes             | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 1138, Female = 65.6%, Age = NR years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 227 | Yuksel et al., 2021 [269]    | Multi     | Yes             | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 6882, Female = 78.8%, Age = 42.3 years.   | SD                    | 6                          |
| 228 | Zanghì et al., 2020 [270]    | Italy     | No              | Special Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 432, Female = 64.1%, Age = 40.4 years.  | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 229 | Zhan et al., 2020 [271]      | China     | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 100%, Nurses = 100%]                        | Cross-sectional design, N = 1794, Female = 97%, Age = 25–65 years.  | AI5                   | 8                          |
| 230 | Zhang et al., 2020 [272]     | China     | Yes             | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 2027, Female = 61.2%, Age = 35.5 years.   | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 231 | Zhang et al., 2021 [273]     | China     | Yes             | COVID-19 patients   | Cross-sectional design, N = 205, Female = 48.3%, Age = 58 years.  | PSQI                  | 5                          |
| 232 | Zhang et al., 2020 [274]     | China     | Yes             | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 0%, Nurses = 11.3%]                         | Cross-sectional design, N = 2182, Female = 64.2%, Age = NR years.   | ISI                   | 7                          |
| 233 | Zhang et al., 2020 [275]     | China     | No              | COVID-19 patients   | Cross-sectional design, N = 135, Female = 42.2%, Age = 63 years.  | PSQI                  | 6                          |
| 234 | Zhang et al., 2021 [276]     | China     | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 100%, Nurses = 46.7%]                       | Cross-sectional design, N = 319, Female = 62.1%, Age = 30.4 years.  | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 235 | Zhang et al., 2021 [277]     | China     | No              | Special Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 456, Female = 100%, Age = NR years.   | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 236 | Zhang et al., 2020 [278]     | China     | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 28.6%, Nurses = 55.7%]                      | Cross-sectional design, N = 524, Female = 74.4%, Age = 34.9 years.  | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 237 | Zhang et al., 2020 [279]     | China     | No              | COVID-19 patients   | Cross-sectional design, N = 30, Female = 50%, Age = 42.5 years.   | ISI                   | 6                          |
| 238 | Zhang et al., 2020 [280]     | China     | No              | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 3237, Female = 47.1%, Age = NR years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 239 | Zhang et al., 2020 [281]     | China     | No              | Healthcare workers [Frontline = 50%, Nurses = 62.9%]                        | Cross-sectional design, N = 1563, Female = 82.7%, Age = 18–60 years.  | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 240 | Zhang et al., 2020 [282]     | China     | No              | University Students   | Longitudinal design, N = 66, Female = 62.1%, Age = 20.7 years.  | PSQI                  | 6                          |

(continued on next page)

**Table 1** (continued)

| ID  | Authors, year (Ref.)        | Country  | Lockdown Period | Population  | Methodology  | Measures <sup>a</sup> | Quality score <sup>b</sup> |
|-----|-----------------------------|----------|-----------------|---|--|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| 241 | Zhao et al., 2020 [283]     | China    | Yes             | Healthcare workers<br>[Frontline = 100%, Nurses = 46%]                        | Cross-sectional design, N = 215,<br>Female = 76.2%, Age = 35.9 years.  | PSQI                  | 5                          |
| 242 | Zheng et al., 2020 [284]    | China    | Yes             | Healthcare workers<br>[Frontline = 63.77%,<br>Nurses = 74.88%]                | Cross-sectional design, N = 207,<br>Female = 84.5%, Age = 37 years.  | PSQI                  | 5                          |
| 243 | Zheng et al., 2021 [285]    | China    | Yes             | General Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 631,<br>Female = 61.2%, Age = 21.1 years.  | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 244 | Zhou et al., 2020 [286]     | China    | Yes             | Children and Adolescents  | Cross-sectional design, N = 11,835,<br>Female = 57.7%, Age = 17.4 years.   | PSQI                  | 7                          |
| 245 | Zhou et al., 2020 [287]     | China    | No              | General population<br>Healthcare workers<br>[Frontline = 100%, Nurses = NR %] | Case-control design, N = 1099,<br>Female = 69.4%, Age = 28.3 years.<br>Case-control design, N = 606,<br>Female = 81.2%, Age = 35.8 years.  | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 246 | Zhou et al., 2020 [288]     | China    | No              | Healthcare workers<br>[Frontline = 100%, Nurses = 83.6%]                      | Cross-sectional design, N = 1931,<br>Female = 95.4%, Age = 35.1 years.   | PSQI                  | 8                          |
| 247 | Zhou et al., 2020 [289]     | China    | No              | Special Population  | Cross-sectional design, N = 859,<br>Female = 100%, Age = 33.3 years.   | ISI                   | 8                          |
| 248 | Zhuo et al., 2020 [290]     | China    | No              | Healthcare workers<br>[Frontline = 100%, Nurses = NR %]                       | Cross-sectional design, N = 26,<br>Female = 46.2%, Age = 41.9 years.   | ISI                   | 5                          |
| 249 | Zreik et al., 2021 [291]    | Israel   | Yes             | General Population<br>Children and Adolescents                                | Cross-sectional design, N = 264,<br>Female = 100%, Age = 34 years.<br>Cross-sectional design, N = 264,<br>Female = 54.4%, Age = 0.5 years. | ISI<br>BICQ           | 7                          |
| 250 | Zupancic et al., 2021 [292] | Slovenia | Yes             | Healthcare workers<br>[Frontline = 27.03%, Nurses = NR%]                      | Cross-sectional design, N = 1019,<br>Female = 73.3%, Age = NR years.   | ESS                   | 8                          |

<sup>a</sup> Measures: AIS = Athens insomnia scale. BEARS = Bedtime issues, excessive daytime sleepiness, night awakenings, regularity and duration of sleep, and snoring. ISI = Insomnia severity index. MOS-SS = Medical outcomes study sleep scale. MSQ = Mini sleep questionnaire. PROMIS = Patient-reported outcomes measurement information system-sleep disturbance. PSQI = Pittsburgh sleep quality index. SCI = Sleep condition indicator. SCI-02 = Sleep condition indicator-02. SD = Self-developed. SDSC = Bruni scale/sleep disturbance scale for children. SNS = Subjective neurological symptoms. SQS = Sleep quality scale. SRSS = Self-rating scale of sleep. YSIS = Youth self-rating insomnia scale.


<sup>b</sup> The Newcastle–Ottawa Scale (NOS) was used to evaluate the methodological quality and assess the risk of bias of the studies included in the current review. The look at three aspects (participants selection, comparability, and outcome and statistics).

a higher risk of sleep disturbances in university students and special populations  $P = 0.04$  and  $P = 0.05$ , respectively. Detailed results are presented in Table 2.


For the healthcare workers population, being a nurse or frontline or a nurse working in frontline (interaction term) was not a moderator of the size of sleep disturbances during the pandemic COVID-19  $P = 0.15$ ,  $P = 0.78$ , and  $P = 0.98$ , respectively.

*Assessment of sleep disturbances during COVID-19 by used measure*

Random-effects subgroup meta-analysis of sleep disturbances doing the COVID-19 pandemic by research measure used showed statistically different results between the groups  $Q = 51.81$  (3),  $P = 0.001$ . The largest magnitude of sleep disturbances (poor sleep quality) was obtained by studies that have used the PSQI,  $K = 114$  studies and yielded a prevalence rate of 51.87% [47.87; 55.84%],



**Fig. 3.** Funnel plot of sleep disturbances (all populations, all countries, all measures).



**Fig. 4.** Radial plot of sleep disturbances (all populations, all countries, all measures).

$\tau^2 = 0.73$ ,  $I^2 = 99.40\%$ . ISI (moderate to severe insomnia) was used in  $K = 110$  studies and yielded a prevalence rate of 30.98% [26.77; 35.54%],  $\tau^2 = 1.19$ ,  $I^2 = 99.7\%$ . AIS (insomnia) was used in  $K = 12$  studies and yielded a prevalence rate of 47.22% [41.37; 53.15%],  $\tau^2 = 0.16$ ,  $I^2 = 96.9\%$ . Finally, other measures were used in  $K = 49$  studies and yielded a prevalence rate 35.70% [30.38; 41.39%],  $\tau^2 = 0.72$ ,  $I^2 = 99.6\%$ .

Moderator analysis revealed that neither age (older age) nor sex (larger proportion of female) was associated with higher rates of sleep disturbances using any research measure.

Publication bias was detected in the studies that have used ISI and adjusted prevalence rate of sleep disturbances with  $K = 147$  (with 37 added studies) is 18.38% [15.36; 21.85%],  $\tau^2 = 1.76$  [1.58; 2.75],  $\tau = 1.32$  [1.25; 1.66],  $I^2 = 99.8\%$ ;  $H = 21.36$  [20.99; 21.73],  $Q = 66,590$  (146),  $P = 0.001$ . Detailed results are presented in [Table 2](#), and [Fig. S10](#).

*Assessment of sleep disturbances during COVID-19 by lockdown status*

About half the studies 123 (49.2%) collected data during no lockdown period and about 162 (64.8%) collected data during a local lockdown. Results for subgroups based on lockdown status using random-effects modelling showed that the prevalence rate of sleep disturbances during lockdown periods was higher 42.49% [38.21; 46.89%],  $\tau^2 = 1.31$ ,  $I^2 = 99.8\%$  compared to periods of non-lockdown 37.97% [34.42; 41.66%],  $\tau^2 = 0.74$ ,  $I^2 = 99.4\%$ . Test for subgroup differences showed that between groups differences did not reach statistical significance  $Q = 2.45$  (1),  $P = 0.11$ . Detailed results are presented in [Table 2](#), and [Fig. S11](#).

*Assessment of sleep disturbances during COVID-19 by year of publication*

Papers published in 2021 reported a higher prevalence rate of sleep disturbances compared to papers published in 2020. The overall rate of sleep disturbances during COVID-19 pandemic in 2021 was 47.14% [43.01; 51.30%],  $\tau^2 = 0.80$ ,  $I^2 = 99.6\%$ . In 2020 the rate was lower with an overall prevalence of 36.20% [32.52; 40.04%],

$\tau^2 = 1.16$ ,  $I^2 = 99.7\%$ . Test for subgroup differences between groups indicated that the difference is statistically significant  $Q = 14.42$  (1),  $P = 0.001$ . Detailed results are presented in [Table 2](#) and [Fig. S12](#).

*Assessment of sleep disturbances during COVID-19 by research design*

Most 249 (87.4%) of the data were collected using a cross-sectional design; on the other hand, 25 (8.8) were collected using longitudinal designs, and only 11 (3.8%) were collected using case-control studies. The overall pooled prevalence rate obtained by longitudinal studies was the highest, 48.36% [43.14; 53.61%],  $\tau^2 = 0.25$  [0.28; 1.26],  $\tau = 0.51$  [0.50; 1.12],  $I^2 = 98.0\%$  [97.5%; 98.3%],  $H = 6.98$  [6.37; 7.66],  $Q = 1171$  (24),  $P = 0.001$ . Results obtained by cross-sectional studies followed, 40.26% [37.10; 43.49%],  $\tau^2 = 1.12$  [0.86; 1.34],  $\tau = 1.06$  [0.92; 1.15],  $I^2 = 99.7\%$ ;  $H = 17.93$  [17.66; 18.20],  $Q = 79,698$  (248),  $P = 0.001$ . Case-control studies produced the lowest overall prevalence rate of sleep disturbances during the COVID-19 pandemic with an overall rate of 31.57% [18.23; 48.85%],  $\tau^2 = 1.50$  [0.58; 4.33],  $\tau = 1.22$  [0.76; 2.08],  $I^2 = 99.7\%$  [99.7%; 99.8%],  $H = 18.99$  [17.68; 20.40],  $Q = 3606$  (10),  $P = 0.001$ . Sex (larger proportion of female sex) was a statistically significant moderator in longitudinal studies  $P = 0.001$ . Detailed results are presented in [Table 2](#), and [Fig. S13](#).

*Assessment of sleep disturbances during COVID-19 by methodological quality/risk of bias*

Studies of moderate and low quality produced similar results, while studies of high quality produced a lower overall rate of sleep disturbances. Specifically, low quality studies  $K = 10$ ,  $N = 852$  showed an overall rate of sleep disturbances of 42.60% [29.20; 57.19%],  $\tau^2 = 0.7182$  [0.34; 3.56],  $\tau = 0.84$  [0.58; 1.88],  $I^2 = 91.8\%$  [87.1%; 94.8%],  $H = 3.50$  [2.79; 4.40],  $Q = 110$  (9),  $P = 0.001$ . Medium quality studies  $K = 138$ ,  $N = 144,345$  showed an overall rate of sleep disturbances of 46.49% [42.64; 50.39%],  $\tau^2 = 0.84$  [0.74; 1.36],  $\tau = 0.92$  [0.86; 1.16],  $I^2 = 99.4\%$ ;  $H = 13.01$  [12.68; 13.34],  $Q = 23,172$  (137),  $P = 0.001$ . Finally, high quality studies  $K = 137$ ,  $N = 348,278$  showed an overall rate of sleep disturbances of 34.59% [30.58;

**Table 2**

Sleep disturbances during COVID-19: a meta-analysis, a moderator analysis and assessment of heterogeneity.

| Component   | K   | N       | Random-effects meta-analysis |             | Heterogeneity  |       |                |              |                  | Moderators |               | Publication Bias                       | Adjusted results [95%CI] |
|---|-----|---------|------------------------------|-------------|----------------|-------|----------------|--------------|------------------|------------|---------------|--|--------------------------|
|   |     |         | Pooled results [95%CI]       | Forest Plot | I <sup>2</sup> | H     | τ <sup>2</sup> | Q (Within)   | Q (Between)      | Age        | Sex (%Female) |  |                          |
| Global assessment of sleep disturbances during COVID-19                         |     |         |                              |             |                |       |                |              |                  |            |               |  |                          |
| Sleep disturbances (all populations, all countries, all measures <sup>a</sup> ) | 285 | 493,475 | 40.49% [37.56; 43.48%]       | Fig. S2.    | 99.7%          | 17.52 | 1.09           | 87,213 (284) | NA               | 0.15       | 0.92          | Egger's P = 0.001                      | 30.50% [27.93; 33.19%]   |
| Assessment of sleep disturbances during COVID-19 by country                     |     |         |                              |             |                |       |                |              |                  |            |               |  |                          |
| Sleep disturbances (all populations, all measures) China                        | 84  | 223,196 | 30.32% [26.26; 34.72%]       | Fig. S8.    | 99.7%          | 17.45 | 0.86           | 25,281 (83)  | 54 (7) P = 0.001 | 0.02       | 0.14          | Egger's P = 0.003                      | 20.14% [17.02; 23.65%]   |
| Sleep disturbances (all populations, all measures) Italy                        | 34  | 91,878  | 38.64% [28.86; 49.44%]       |             | 99.8%          | 23.99 | 1.67           | 18,997 (33)  |                  | 0.66       | 0.19          | NS                                     | NI                       |
| Sleep disturbances (all populations, all measures) India                        | 16  | 5842    | 27.25% [19.00; 37.43%]       |             | 98.2%          | 7.39  | 0.89           | 819 (15)     |                  | 0.89       | 0.78          | NS                                     | NI                       |
| Sleep disturbances (all populations, all measures) USA                          | 15  | 13,022  | 50.21% [41.06; 59.35%]       |             | 98.8%          | 9.18  | 0.52           | 1181 (14)    |                  | 0.35       | 0.83          | NS                                     | NI                       |
| Sleep disturbances (all populations, all measures) Turkey                       | 12  | 5389    | 44.18% [33.41; 55.53%]       |             | 98.0%          | 7.03  | 0.62           | 543 (11)     |                  | 0.10       | 0.83          | Egger's P = 0.03                       | 60.67% [49.31; 70.98%]   |
| Sleep disturbances (all populations, all measures) Spain                        | 10  | 1848    | 58.59% [47.64; 68.76%]       |             | 92.8%          | 3.72  | 0.45           | 124 (9)      |                  | 0.04       | 0.66          | NS                                     | NI                       |
| Sleep disturbances (all populations, all measures) Saudi Arabia                 | 10  | 7197    | 51.10% [36.67; 65.35%]       |             | 99.2%          | 11.17 | 0.90           | 1122 (9)     |                  | 0.19       | 0.39          | NS                                     | NI                       |
| Sleep disturbances (all populations, all measures) all other countries          | 104 | 145,103 | 47.69% [43.67; 51.75%]       |             | 99.5%          | 14.04 | 0.69           | 20,316 (103) |                  | 0.85       | 0.78          | NS                                     | NI                       |
| Assessment of sleep disturbances during COVID-19 by population                  |     |         |                              |             |                |       |                |              |                  |            |               |  |                          |
| Sleep disturbances (general population, all measures)                           | 121 | 364,060 | 36.73% [32.32; 41.38%]       | Fig. S9.    | 99.8%          | 23.17 | 1.18           | 64,436 (120) | 9 (5) P = 0.10   | 0.12       | 0.34          | NS                                     | NI                       |
| Sleep disturbances (healthcare workers, all measures)                           | 90  | 63,685  | 42.47% [37.95; 47.12%]       |             | 99.1%          | 0.47  | 0.81           | 9749 (89)    |                  | 0.03       | 0.74          | NS                                     | NI                       |
| Sleep disturbances (COVID-19 patients, all measures)                            | 16  | 6821    | 52.39% [41.69; 62.88%]       |             | 98.1%          | 7.31  | 0.70           | 802 (15)     |                  | 0.60       | 0.34          | Egger's P = 0.006                      | 33.20% [24.17; 43.66%]   |
| Sleep disturbances (university students, all measures)                          | 22  | 21,880  | 41.16% [28.76; 54.79%]       |             | 99.6%          | 16.08 | 1.69           | 5432 (21)    |                  | 0.52       | 0.04          | NS                                     | NI                       |
| Sleep disturbances (special populations, all measures)                          | 23  | 8023    | 41.50% [32.98; 50.56%]       |             | 98.1%          | 7.19  | 0.77           | 1136 (22)    |                  | 0.10       | 0.05          | NS                                     | NI                       |
| Sleep disturbances (children and adolescents, all measures)                     | 13  | 29,006  | 45.96% [36.90; 55.30%]       |             | 99.3%          | 12.29 | 0.45           | 1812 (12)    |                  | 0.64       | 0.15          | NS                                     | NI                       |
| Assessment of sleep disturbances during COVID-19 by used measure                |     |         |                              |             |                |       |                |              |                  |            |               |  |                          |
| Sleep disturbances (all populations, PSQI only)                                 | 114 | 134,177 | 51.87% [47.87; 55.84%]       | Fig. S10.   | 99.4%          | 13.11 | 0.73           | 19,414 (113) | 52 (3) P = 0.001 | 0.76       | 0.78          | NS                                     | NI                       |
| Sleep disturbances (all populations, ISI only)                                  | 110 | 256,673 | 30.98% [26.77; 35.54%]       |             | 99.7%          | 18.39 | 1.19           | 36,874 (109) |                  | 0.69       | 0.56          | Kendall's P = 0.04<br>Egger's P = 0.01 | 18.38% [15.36; 21.85%]   |
| Sleep disturbances (all populations, AIS only)                                  | 12  | 10,169  | 47.22% [41.37; 53.15%]       |             | 96.9%          | 5.69  | 0.17           | 356 (11)     |                  | 0.45       | 0.09          | NS                                     | NI                       |
| Sleep disturbances (all populations, other measures)                            | 49  | 92,456  | 35.70% [30.38; 41.39%]       |             | 96.9%          | 16.00 | 0.72           | 12,294 (48)  |                  | 0.054      | 0.055         | NS                                     | NI                       |

|  |     |         |                        |           |       |       |      |              |                     |       |       |   |                           |
|--|-----|---------|------------------------|-----------|-------|-------|------|--------------|---------------------|-------|-------|---|---------------------------|
| Assessment of sleep disturbances during COVID-19 by lockdown status        |     |         |                        |           |       |       |      |              |                     |       |       |   |                           |
| Sleep disturbances (all populations, all measures, no lockdown)            | 123 | 325,653 | 37.97% [34.42; 41.66%] | Fig. S11. | 99.4% | 13.13 | 0.74 | 21,033 (122) | 3 (1)<br>P = 0.1    | 0.008 | 0.51  | Egger's<br>P = 0.001                          | 26.68%<br>[23.59; 30.01%] |
| Sleep disturbances (all populations, all measures, during lockdown)        | 162 | 166,275 | 42.49% [38.21; 46.89%] |           | 99.8% | 20.33 | 1.31 | 65,459 (161) |                     | 0.78  | 0.39  | Kendall's<br>P = 0.03<br>Egger's<br>P = 0.03  | 33.01%<br>[29.20; 37.06%] |
| Assessment of sleep disturbances during COVID-19 by year of publication    |     |         |                        |           |       |       |      |              |                     |       |       |   |                           |
| Sleep disturbances (all populations, all measures, 2020)                   | 171 | 321,988 | 36.20% [32.52; 40.04%] | Fig. S12. | 99.7% | 17.55 | 1.16 | 52,374 (170) | 15 (1)<br>P = 0.001 | 0.04  | 0.99  | Kendall's<br>P = 0.01<br>Egger's<br>P = 0.001 | 23.54%<br>[20.68; 26.66%] |
| Sleep disturbances (all populations, all measures, 2021)                   | 114 | 171,487 | 47.14% [43.01; 51.30%] |           | 99.6% | 15.34 | 0.80 | 26,601 (113) |                     | 0.90  | 0.56  | NS  | NI                        |
| Assessment of sleep disturbances during COVID-19 by research design        |     |         |                        |           |       |       |      |              |                     |       |       |   |                           |
| Sleep disturbances assessed using cross-sectional design                   | 249 | 445,950 | 40.26% [37.10; 43.49%] | Fig. S13. | 99.7% | 17.93 | 1.12 | 79,699 (248) | 8 (2)<br>P = 0.01   | 0.15  | 0.66  | Egger's<br>P = 0.002                          | 29.65%<br>[26.91; 32.54%] |
| Sleep disturbances assessed using case-control design                      | 11  | 24,820  | 31.57% [18.23; 48.85%] |           | 99.7% | 18.99 | 1.50 | 3607 (10)    |                     | 0.15  | 0.39  | NS  | NI                        |
| Sleep disturbances assessed using longitudinal design                      | 25  | 22,705  | 48.36% [43.14; 53.61%] |           | 98.0% | 6.98  | 0.26 | 1171 (24)    |                     | 0.37  | 0.001 | NS  | NI                        |
| Assessment of sleep disturbances during COVID-19 by methodological quality |     |         |                        |           |       |       |      |              |                     |       |       |   |                           |
| High quality (low risk of bias)  | 137 | 348,278 | 34.59% [30.58; 38.83%] | Fig. S14. | 99.8% | 21.01 | 1.18 | 60,013 (136) | 16 (2)<br>P = 0.001 | 0.59  | 0.94  | Egger's<br>P = 0.049                          | 21.80%<br>[18.56; 25.43%] |
| Moderate quality (moderate risk of bias)                                   | 138 | 144,345 | 46.49% [42.64; 50.39%] |           | 99.4% | 13.01 | 0.85 | 23,172 (137) |                     | 0.06  | 0.27  | Egger's<br>P = 0.04                           | 30.50%<br>[27.93; 33.19%] |
| Low quality (high risk of bias)  | 10  | 852     | 42.60% [29.20; 57.19%] |           | 91.8% | 3.50  | 0.72 | 110 (9)      |                     | 0.93  | 0.58  | NS  | NI                        |

17 Abbreviations: CI, Confidence interval. K = denotes the number of studies. N = denotes the number of participants. NA = Not applicable. NI = Not indicated. NS = Not Significant. Methodological details.

$I^2$  statistic describes the percentage of variation across studies due to heterogeneity rather than chance.

In a random-effects meta-analysis, the extent of variation among the effects observed in different studies (between-study variance) is referred to as  $\tau$ -squared.

Cochran's Q, which is calculated as the weighted sum of squared differences between individual study effects and the pooled effect across studies, with the weights being those used in the pooling method.

Meta-regression was performed using Method of Moments Estimator for Random Effect Multivariate Meta-Analysis.

Publication bias was not observed in the Funnel plot.

Adjusted results were calculated using trill-and-fill.

<sup>a</sup> Measures: AIS = Athens insomnia scale. BEARS = Bedtime issues, excessive daytime sleepiness, night awakenings, regularity and duration of sleep, and snoring. ISI = Insomnia severity index. MOS-SS = Medical outcomes study sleep scale. MSQ = Mini sleep questionnaire. PROMIS = Patient-reported outcomes measurement information system-sleep disturbance. PSQI = Pittsburgh sleep quality index. SCI = Sleep condition indicator. SCI-02 = Sleep condition indicator-02. SD = Self-developed. SDSC = Bruni scale/sleep disturbance scale for children. SNS = Subjective neurological symptoms. SQS = Sleep quality scale. SRSS = Self-rating scale of sleep. YSIS = Youth self-rating insomnia scale.



38.83%],  $\tau^2 = 1.17$  [0.78; 1.37],  $\tau = 1.08$  [0.88; 1.17],  $I^2 = 99.8\%$ ;  $H = 21.01$  [20.63; 21.39],  $Q = 60,013$  (136),  $P = 0.001$ . Detailed results are presented in Table 2, and Fig. S14.

## Discussion

The current systematic review and meta-analysis of 250 studies comprising about half-million participants revealed that during the COVID-19 pandemic, the pooled estimated prevalence of sleep disturbances (including poor sleep quality and insomnia), independent of any covariate, was 40%. Bayesian meta-analysis revealed the same overall estimate of sleep disturbances, providing reassurance that this is likely a reasonable estimate of COVID-19 related sleep disturbance. Publication bias was minimal, and neither age nor gender moderated the overall pooled prevalence rate. A statistically significant variation was observed between countries, and overall results ranged from approximately 30% in China and India to 60% in Spain. Patients infected with COVID-19 appeared the most affected by sleep disturbances, with an overall pooled rate of 52%. Children and adolescents were the second most affected group, with an overall rate of sleep disturbances of approximately 46%. Healthcare workers, university students, and special populations had a similar magnitude of the problem, with an overall rate of approximately 41%. The general population appeared the least affected by the pandemic, with an overall prevalence of sleep disturbances of about 36%. Poor sleep quality appeared as the main problem and explained 52% of the variance in the data.

Meeting clinical diagnostic scores for insomnia was observed in 30%–40% of the overall participants; therefore, accounting for approximately 80% of the variance of total sleep disturbances. Sleep disturbances were more prevalent during lockdown periods than non-lockdown periods, 38% and 43%, respectively. The difference according to lockdown status did not reach statistical significance. Finally, a statistically significant increase was observed in studies published in 2021 compared to studies published in 2020, 36% and 47%, respectively.

Our global finding on the pooled prevalence rate of sleep disturbances during COVID-19 (40%) is consistent with two previous meta-analyses [2,10]. In the review, meta-regression revealed that age and sex had no bearing on the estimated prevalence of sleep disturbances. This finding was also reported in previous reviews [2,3,10].

Statistically significant differences were observed between countries, implying that the emergence of COVID-19, the local community transmission rate of the disease, measures taken to control the virus, and the pattern of media use [293] contributed to the magnitude of sleep disturbances. Recent data from COVID-STRESS Global Survey showed that stress and stress-related symptoms are positively associated with living in a nation or region where COVID-19 is more severe [294]. Additionally, cross-country discrepancies in public perception of stress have been reported [295]. The overlapping prevalence between psychological distress symptoms [296] and our findings on sleep disturbances suggests that there is a two-way relationship between sleep disturbances and psychiatric comorbidities, which indicates sleep experts should consider treating comorbidities in sleep disturbances and vice versa.

COVID-19 patients can be expected to have the highest frequency of sleep disturbances (about 52%) because of the core symptoms of the disease, including cough, fever, inflammation, and shortness of breath, all of which are related to sleep disturbances [2]. The increased risk of sleep disturbances in COVID-19 patients is likely also the result of body pain and the side effects of used medications.

Before the pandemic, a meta-analysis documented that 25% of normally developing children had sleep disturbances [297].

Therefore, the high prevalence of sleep disturbances among children (46%) observed during the pandemic is alarming. The most significant negative effect of the lockdown (schools closures), according to several studies, was a delay in the start of sleep and wake-up time [7]. Increased anxiety, inability to do outdoor activities, remote learning, and lack of in-person social connections all led to more time spent using technology, especially during the pre-sleep period [298]. Limited exposure to sunshine and extended exposure to screen blue and bright light from phones and computer screens (for school or play) may lead to disturbed circadian rhythms [299].

Previous reviews concluded that healthcare workers are among the populations most affected by sleep disturbances during the pandemic [2,4,5,10]. In addition, recent data demonstrated that during the pandemic, healthcare workers have a high prevalence of perceived stress, anxiety, and depression [53,300]. The present review documented that healthcare workers, university students, and special populations had a similar magnitude of sleep disturbances, with an overall rate of approximately 41%.

A key component in understanding sleep disturbances during the pandemic was shown to be lockdown. Current evidence suggests that social isolation and loneliness can harm mental health [301], and affect sleep quality [302,303].

Another interesting finding is that the reported prevalence of sleep disturbances in publications in 2021 appeared to be higher than in 2020, suggesting that the COVID-19 pandemic is continuing to have a negative impact on sleep. Since 2020, multiple epidemic waves with increasing infected cases [304], and the identification, spread, and impact of new COVID variants have led to “pandemic fatigue” [305]. Despite the availability of COVID-19 vaccines at the end of 2020, new waves could not be avoided across the globe, and the expected return to normal life now appears to be delayed or even uncertain. Moreover, several populations have experienced successive lockdowns since, which the current meta-analysis demonstrates is one of the major factors associated with COVID-19-related sleep disturbances. Hence, as the pandemic persists, more people are likely to develop sleep disturbances [193]. Findings that emerged from longitudinal follow-up studies revealed a significant worsening of sleep parameters over observational waves [306].

The findings of this review have several practical and research implications. First, screening programs and countermeasures for sleep disturbances must be developed and executed to help various groups detect and overcome sleep-related impairment. Specific programs need to be tailored for different populations, e.g., healthcare workers, children and adolescents, university students, and special populations, such as pregnant women, etc. Evidence-based strategies, e.g., cognitive behavioral therapy for insomnia [307], meditation [308], sports interventions [309], and wellness interventions [310], can be included in self-help applications, and healthcare staff can be trained to detect and treat sleep issues in various populations [311]. Second, special attention needs to be paid to insomnia as a formal disorder accounting for approximately 80% of the variance of sleep disturbances. Future primary and secondary research need to identify the magnitude of insomnia by severity; longitudinal studies are required to determine if insomnia is short-term or long-term. Third, our review showed that data saturation is achieved in certain populations, e.g., healthcare workers and the general populations; therefore, at least some research focus needs to be shifted to novel populations, e.g., post-COVID-19 populations, homeless individuals, those rough sleeping, and others. Fourthly, formal sleep assessment needs to be part of the comprehensive psychiatric evaluation for individuals seeking psychiatric services. Empirical results of a recent review documented the strong association between psychological distress

and sleep disturbances [10], implying that both issues are best assessed and treated simultaneously.

The current review has several strengths. First, the rate of sleep disturbances has been assessed across several new populations that never received attention in previous reviews, e.g., special populations, university students, and children and adolescents. Second, robust statistical tests were used to handle bias, detect outliers, and examine heterogeneity. Third, because the pooled sample size was very large and the participants were recruited from many countries, the generalizability of the current review's conclusions is likely to be strong.

There are a few drawbacks to this review. First, the magnitude of heterogeneity in this meta-analysis was large. This is to be expected in a large epidemiological meta-analysis. The use of random-effects modeling was anticipated to deal with issues related to the effects of evaluating many studies that do not all follow the same pattern, but instead follow a distribution. Future reviews need finetuned aggregate data, and individual patient data (IPD) meta-analyses are desirable and should be encouraged to work out, analyze and present different aspects of sleep disturbances. Second, we included only limited moderators. When correcting for moderators, future reviews should expand this exploration using other lifestyle variables, including physical activity, smoking, and substance use, focusing on adjusting for stress-related illnesses such as post-traumatic stress disorder, adjustment disorders, anxiety, and depression. Besides sleep disturbances, there are many types of wakefulness disturbances that all have to do with staying awake at a time that is desirable or socially appropriate. These were beyond the scope of our analyses and discussion. Further reviewers are encouraged to address this under-investigated topic.

## Conclusion

During the COVID-19 pandemic, sleep disturbances are common. Four in every ten individuals reported a sleep problem, and the main complaint is insomnia. Patients infected with COVID-19 and children and adolescents appeared to be the most affected groups. Healthcare workers, special populations, and university students had a similar but somewhat lower rate of sleep disturbances, while the general population appears to be the least affected. Lockdown is associated with a larger magnitude of sleep disturbances. More research is needed, particularly longitudinal studies, to establish the courses of sleep disturbances over time in these and populations, and such studies should pay particular attention to moderators, which may exacerbate sleep problem prevalence.

### Practice points

- Sleep disturbances are common during the COVID-19 pandemic. The most affected groups were patients infected with the disease, children and adolescents, and university students. It is essential to develop and implement screening programs and countermeasures to help various groups detect and overcome sleep disturbances.
- There is a need to pay special attention to insomnia as a formal sleep disorder that accounts for 80% of sleep loss.
- During the pandemic, individuals seeking psychiatric treatment need a formal sleep assessment as part of their comprehensive evaluation.

### Research agenda

- It is necessary to conduct future primary and secondary research to identify the severity of insomnia; longitudinal studies are needed to determine if insomnia is short-term or long-term.
- Meta-analyses of individual patient data (IPD) should be encouraged in future reviews and fine-tuned aggregate parameters should be included.
- The process of adjusting for moderators should expand the analysis by adding physical activity, smoking, and substance use, focusing on the prevalence of stress-related disorders.

### Author agreement

All authors were involved in writing the paper and have seen and approved the manuscript.

### Ethical statement

This article does not contain any studies with human participants performed by any of the authors.

### Informed consent

For this type of study (meta-analysis) formal consent is not required.

### Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

### Conflicts of interest

The authors do not have any conflicts of interest to disclose.

### Acknowledgments

None.

### Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2022.101591>.

### References

- [1] Ramar K, Malhotra RK, Carden KA, Martin JL, Abbasi-Feinberg F, Aurora RN, et al. Sleep is essential to health: an American Academy of Sleep Medicine position statement. *J Clin Sleep Med* 2021 Oct 1;17(10): 2115–9. <https://doi.org/10.5664/jcsm.9476>. PMID: 34170250; PMCID: PMC8494094.
- \*[2] Jahrami H, BaHammam AS, Bragazzi NL, Saif Z, Faris M, Vitiello MV. Sleep problems during the COVID-19 pandemic by population: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Clin Sleep Med* 2021;17:299–313.
- \*[3] Alimoradi Z, Gozal D, Tsang HWH, Lin CY, Broström A, Ohayon MM, et al. Gender-specific estimates of sleep problems during the COVID-19 pandemic: systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Sleep Res* 2021:e13432.
- \*[4] Salari N, Khazaie H, Hosseinian-Far A, Ghasemi H, Mohammadi M, Shohaimi S, et al. The prevalence of sleep disturbances among physicians and nurses facing the COVID-19 patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Glob Health* 2020;16:92.

- [5] Serrano-Ripoll MJ, Zamanillo-Campos R, Castro A, Fiol-de Roque MA, Ricci-Cabello I. Insomnia and sleep quality in healthcare workers fighting against COVID-19: a systematic review of the literature and meta-analysis. *Actas Esp Psiquiatr* 2021;49:155–79.
- [6] Al Maqbali M, Al Sinani M, Al-Lenjawi B. Prevalence of stress, depression, anxiety and sleep disturbance among nurses during the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Psychosom Res* 2021;141:110343.
- [7] Sharma M, Aggarwal S, Madaan P, Saini L, Bhutani M. Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on sleep in children and adolescents: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sleep Med* 2021;84:259–67.
- [8] Xia L, Chen C, Liu Z, Luo X, Guo C, Liu Z, et al. Prevalence of sleep disturbances and sleep quality in Chinese healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front Psychiatr* 2021;12:646342.
- [9] Deng J, Zhou F, Hou W, Silver Z, Wong CY, Chang O, et al. The prevalence of depression, anxiety, and sleep disturbances in COVID-19 patients: a meta-analysis. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 2021;1486:90–111.
- [10] Alimoradi Z, Broström A, Tsang HWH, Griffiths MD, Haghayegh S, Ohayon MM, et al. Sleep problems during COVID-19 pandemic and its' association to psychological distress: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eclin Med* 2021:36.
- [11] Pappa S, Ntella V, Giannakas T, Giannakoulis VG, Papoutsis E, Katsaounou P. Prevalence of depression, anxiety, and insomnia among healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Brain Behav Immun* 2020;88:901–7.
- [12] Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Ann Intern Med* 2009;151:264–9.
- [13] PLOTCON. WebPlotDigitizer. 2017. <https://automeris.io/WebPlotDigitizer/>. Accessed September 2021.
- [14] Buysse DJ, Reynolds 3rd CF, Monk TH, Berman SR, Kupfer DJ. The Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index: a new instrument for psychiatric practice and research. *Psychiatr Res* 1989;28:193–213.
- [15] Pedder H, Sarri G, Keeney E, Nunes V, Dias S. Data extraction for complex meta-analysis (DECIMAL) guide. *Syst Rev* 2016;5:212.
- [16] Luchini C, Stubbs B, Solmi M, Veronese N. Assessing the quality of studies in meta-analyses: advantages and limitations of the Newcastle Ottawa scale. *World J Meta-Anal* 2017;5:80–4.
- [17] Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JP, Rothstein HR. A basic introduction to fixed-effect and random-effects models for meta-analysis. *Res Synth Methods* 2010;1:97–111.
- [18] DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials revisited. *Contemp Clin Trials* 2015;45:139–45.
- [19] Clopper CJ, Pearson ES. The use of confidence or fiducial limits illustrated in the case of the binomial. *Biometrika* 1934;26:404–13.
- [20] Higgins JP, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Stat Med* 2002;21:1539–58.
- [21] Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ* 2003;327:557–60.
- [22] Cochran WG. The combination of estimates from different experiments. *Biometrics* 1954;10:101–29.
- [23] Higgins JP, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, et al. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*. John Wiley & Sons; 2019.
- [24] Baujat B, Mahé C, Pignon J-P, Hill C. A graphical method for exploring heterogeneity in meta-analyses: application to a meta-analysis of 65 trials. *Stat Med* 2002;21:2641–52.
- [25] Lewis S, Clarke M. Forest plots: trying to see the wood and the trees. *BMJ* 2001;322:1479–80.
- [26] Hedges LV, Olkin I. *Statistical methods for meta-analysis*. Academic Press; 2014.
- [27] Viechtbauer W, Cheung MW. Outlier and influence diagnostics for meta-analysis. *Res Synth Methods* 2010;1:112–25.
- [28] Sterne JAC, Sutton AJ, Ioannidis JPA, Terrin N, Jones DR, Lau J, et al. Recommendations for examining and interpreting funnel plot asymmetry in meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ* 2011;343:d4002.
- [29] Kendall M, Gibbons JD. Rank correlation methods edward arnold. A division of Hodder & Stoughton. London: A Charles Griffin Title; 1990. p. 29–50.
- [30] Egger M, Smith GD, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ* 1997;315:629–34.
- [31] Duval S, Tweedie R. A nonparametric "trim and fill" method of accounting for publication bias in meta-analysis. *J Am Stat Assoc* 2000;95:89–98.
- [32] Simonsohn U, Nelson LD, Simmons JP. P-curve: a key to the file-drawer. *J Exp Psychol Gen* 2014;143:534–47.
- [33] Simonsohn U, Nelson LD, Simmons JP. p-Curve and effect size: correcting for publication bias using only significant results. *Perspect Psychol Sci* 2014;9:666–81.
- [34] Olkin I, Dahabreh IJ, Trikalinos TA. GOSH - a graphical display of study heterogeneity. *Res Synth Methods* 2012;3:214–23.
- [35] Sutton AJ, Abrams KR. Bayesian methods in meta-analysis and evidence synthesis. *Stat Methods Med Res* 2001;10:277–303.
- [36] Spiegelhalter DJ. Incorporating Bayesian ideas into health-care evaluation. *Stat Sci* 2004;19:156–74.
- [37] Lunn D, Barrett J, Sweeting M, Thompson S. Fully Bayesian hierarchical modelling in two stages, with application to meta-analysis. *J Roy Stat Soc: C Appl Stat* 2013;62:551–72.
- [38] R. 4.1.0. In: Team RC, editor. R foundation for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria A: Language and Environment Forstatistical Computing; 2021.
- [39] Balduzzi S, Rucker G, Schwarzer G. How to perform a meta-analysis with R: a practical tutorial. *Evid Base Ment Health* 2019;22:153–60.
- [40] Viechtbauer W. Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor package. *J Stat Software* 2010;36:1–48.
- [41] Röver C. Bayesian random-effects meta-analysis using the bayesmeta R package. 2017. arXiv preprint arXiv:171108683.
- [42] McGuinness LA, Higgins JP. Risk-of-bias VISualization (robvis): an R package and shiny web app for visualizing risk-of-bias assessments. *Res Synth Methods* 2021;12:55–61.
- [43] Abbas A, Al-Otaibi T, Gheith OA, Nagib AM, Farid MM, Walaa M. Sleep quality among healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on medical errors: Kuwait experience. *Turk Thorax J* 2021;22:142.
- [44] Abdellah MM, Khalil MF, Alhafiz A. Prevalence of poor sleep quality among physicians during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Cureus* 2021;13.
- [45] Abdulah DM, Musa DH. Insomnia and stress of physicians during COVID-19 outbreak. *Sleep Med X* 2020;2:100017.
- [46] Agberotimi SF, Akinsola OS, Oguntayo R, Olasen AO. Interactions between socioeconomic status and mental health outcomes in the nigerian context amid covid-19 pandemic: a comparative study. *Front Psychol* 2020;11:2655.
- [47] Ahmad A, Rahman I, Agarwal M. Early psychosocial predictors of mental health among Indians during coronavirus disease 2019 outbreak. *J Health Sci* 2020;10(2):147–56. <https://doi.org/10.17532/jhsci.2020.950>.
- [48] Akıncı T, Başar HM. Relationship between sleep quality and the psychological status of patients hospitalised with COVID-19. *Sleep Med* 2021;80:167–70.
- [49] Al Ammari M, Sultana K, Thomas A, Al Swaidan L, Al Harthi N. Mental health outcomes amongst health care workers during COVID 19 pandemic in Saudi Arabia. *Front Psychiatr* 2020;11.
- [50] Al Maqbali M, Al Khadhuri J. Psychological impact of the coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic on nurses. *Jpn J Nurs Sci* 2021:e12417.
- [51] Al-Ajlouni YA, Park SH, Alawa J, Shamaileh G, Bawab A, El-Sadr WM, et al. Anxiety and depressive symptoms are associated with poor sleep health during a period of COVID-19-induced nationwide lockdown: a cross-sectional analysis of adults in Jordan. *BMJ Open* 2020;10:e041995.
- [52] Alamrawy RG, Fadl N, Khaled A. Psychiatric morbidity and dietary habits during COVID-19 pandemic: a cross-sectional study among Egyptian Youth (14–24 years). *Middle East Curr Psychiatr* 2021;28:1–10.
- [53] AlAtaeeq D, Almohtib A, Mohideen M, AlBlowi N, Fayed A, Alshahrani SM. Stress, sleep, and use of sleep aids among physicians during the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Nat Sci Med* 2021;4:197.
- [54] Alessi J, De Oliveira GB, Franco DW, Do Amaral BB, Becker AS, Knijnik CP, et al. Mental health in the era of COVID-19: prevalence of psychiatric disorders in a cohort of patients with type 1 and type 2 diabetes during the social distancing. *Diabetol Metab Syndrome* 2020;12:1–10.
- [55] Alfonsi V, Gorgoni M, Scarpelli S, Zivi P, Soia S, Mari E, et al. COVID-19 lockdown and poor sleep quality: not the whole story. *J Sleep Res* 2021:e13368.
- [56] Alharbi AS, Alshahrani SM, Alsaadi MM, Al-Jahdali HH, Wali SO, BaHammam AS. Sleep quality and insomnia during the COVID-19 lockdown among the Saudi public. *Saudi Med J* 2021;42:384–90.
- [57] Ali M, Uddin Z, Ahsan NF, Haque MZ, Bairagee M, Khan SA, et al. Prevalence of mental health symptoms and its effect on insomnia among healthcare workers who attended hospitals during COVID-19 pandemic: a survey in Dhaka city. *Heliyon* 2021;7:e06985.
- [58] Almater AI, Tobaigy MF, Younis AS, Alaqeel MK, Abouammoh MA. Effect of 2019 coronavirus pandemic on ophthalmologists practicing in Saudi Arabia: a psychological health assessment. *Middle East Afr J Ophthalmol* 2020;27:79.
- [59] Alnofaiey YH, Alshehri HA, Alosaimi MM, Alswat SH, Alswat RH, Alhulayfi RM, et al. Sleep disturbances among physicians during COVID-19 pandemic. *BMC Res Notes* 2020;13:1–7.
- [60] Alomayri W, Alanazi N, Faraj F. Correlation between atopic dermatitis and sleep quality among adults in Saudi Arabia. *Cureus* 2020;12.
- [61] Alqahtani SS, Banji D, Banji OJ. A survey assessing sleep efficiency among Saudis during COVID-19 home confinement using the Pittsburgh sleep quality index: a call for health education. *Saudi Pharmaceutical Journal*; 2021.
- [62] AlRasheed MM, Alkadir AM, Shuqiran KIB, Al-Aqeel S, Jahrami HA, BaHammam AS. The impact of quarantine on sleep quality and psychological distress during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nat Sci Sleep* 2021;13:1037.
- [63] Alshekaili M, Hassan W, Al-Said N, Alsulimani F, Kumar Jayapal S, Al-Mawali A, et al. Factors associated with mental health outcomes in Oman during COVID-19: frontline vs non-frontline healthcare workers. 2020. Available at: SSRN 3624265.
- [64] Ammar A, Trabelsi K, Brach M, Chtourou H, Boukhris O, Masmoudi L, et al. Effects of home confinement on mental health and lifestyle behaviours during the COVID-19 outbreak: insights from the ECLB-COVID19 multicentre study. *Biol Sport* 2021;38:9.



- [65] Amra B, Salmasi M, Soltaninejad F, Sami R, Nickpour M, Mansourian M, et al. Healthcare workers' sleep and mood disturbances during COVID-19 outbreak in an Iranian referral center. *Sleep Breath* 2021;1–8.
- [66] Assenza G, Lanzzone J, Brigo F, Coppola A, Di Gennaro G, Di Lazzaro V, et al. Epilepsy care in the time of COVID-19 pandemic in Italy: risk factors for seizure worsening. *Front Neurol* 2020;11:737.
- [67] Barutcu Atas D, Aydin Sunbul E, Velioglu A, Tuglular S. The association between perceived stress with sleep quality, insomnia, anxiety and depression in kidney transplant recipients during Covid-19 pandemic. *PLoS One* 2021;16:e0248117.
- [68] Bacaro V, Chiabudini M, Buonanno C, De Bartolo P, Riemann D, Mancini F, et al. Insomnia in the Italian population during Covid-19 Outbreak: a snapshot on one major risk factor for Depression and Anxiety. *Front Psychiatr* 2020;11.
- [69] Badellino H, Gobbo ME, Torres E, Aschieri ME. Early indicators and risk factors associated with mental health problems during COVID-19 quarantine: is there a relationship with the number of confirmed cases and deaths? *Int J Soc Psychiatr* 2020;67(5):567–75. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020764020966020>.
- [70] Wang X, Jiang X, Huang Q, Wang H, Gurarie D, Ndeffo-Mbah M, et al. Risk factors of SARS-CoV-2 infection in healthcare workers: a retrospective study of a nosocomial outbreak. *Sleep Med X* 2020;2:100028.
- [71] Bajaj S, Blair KS, Schwartz A, Dobbertin M, Blair RJR. Worry and insomnia as risk factors for depression during initial stages of COVID-19 pandemic in India. *PLoS One* 2020;15:e0243527.
- [72] Barrea L, Pugliese G, Framondi L, Di Matteo R, Laudisio D, Savastano S, et al. Does Sars-Cov-2 threaten our dreams? Effect of quarantine on sleep quality and body mass index. *J Transl Med* 2020;18:1–11.
- [73] Barua L, Zaman MS, Omi FR, Faruque M. Psychological burden of the COVID-19 pandemic and its associated factors among frontline doctors of Bangladesh: a cross-sectional study. *F1000Research* 2020;9.
- [74] Başkan SA, Güneş D. The effect of stress perceived by adults due to the COVID-19 pandemic on their sleep quality. *J Turk Sleep Med* 2021;1:57–66.
- [75] Beck F, Léger D, Fressard L, Peretti-Watel P, Verger P, Group C. Covid-19 health crisis and lockdown associated with high level of sleep complaints and hypnotic uptake at the population level. *J Sleep Res* 2021;30:e13119.
- [76] Benham G. Stress and sleep in college students prior to and during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Stress Health* 2021 Aug;37(3):504–15. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.3016>. Epub 2020 Dec 19. PMID: 33315301.
- [77] Bezerra CB, Saintrain MVdL, Braga DRA, Santos FdS, Lima AOP, Brito EHSd, et al. Psychosocial impact of COVID-19 self-isolation on the Brazilian population: a preliminary cross-sectional analysis. *Saúde Soc* 2020;29:e200412.
- [78] Bhat BA, Mir RA, Hussain A, Shah IR. Depressive and anxiety symptoms, quality of sleep, and coping during the 2019 coronavirus disease pandemic in general population in Kashmir. *Middle East Curr Psychiatr* 2020;27:1–10.
- [79] Bigalke JA, Greenlund IM, Carter JR. Sex differences in self-report anxiety and sleep quality during COVID-19 stay-at-home orders. *Biol Sex Differ* 2020;11:1–11.
- [80] Blekas A, Voitsidis P, Athanasiadou M, Parlapani E, Chatzigeorgiou AF, Skoupra M, et al. COVID-19: PTSD symptoms in Greek health care professionals. *Psychol Trauma: Theor, Res, Pract, Pol* 2020;12:812.
- [81] Bohlken J, Schömig F, Seehagen T, Köhler S, Gehring K, Roth-Sackenheim C, et al. Experience of practice-based psychiatrists and neurologists during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Psychiatr Prax* 2020;47:214–7.
- [82] Brito-Marques JMdAM, Franco CMR, Brito-Marques PRd, Martinez SCG, Prado Gfd. Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on the sleep quality of medical professionals in Brazil. *Arq Neuro Psiquiatr* 2021;79:149–55.
- [83] Caballero-Domínguez CC, De Luque-Salcedo JG, Campo-Arias A. Social capital and psychological distress during Colombian coronavirus disease lockdown. *J Community Psychol* 2021;49:691–702.
- [84] Cai Q, Feng H, Huang J, Wang M, Wang Q, Lu X, et al. The mental health of frontline and non-frontline medical workers during the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak in China: a case-control study. *J Affect Disord* 2020;275:210–5.
- [85] Cai Z, Cui Q, Liu Z, Li J, Gong X, Liu J, et al. Nurses endured high risks of psychological problems under the epidemic of COVID-19 in a longitudinal study in Wuhan China. *J Psychiatr Res* 2020;131:132–7.
- [86] Casagrande M, Favieri F, Tambelli R, Forte G. The enemy who sealed the world: effects quarantine due to the COVID-19 on sleep quality, anxiety, and psychological distress in the Italian population. *Sleep Med* 2020;75:12–20.
- [87] Cellini N, Di Giorgio E, Mioni G, Di Riso D. Sleep and psychological difficulties in Italian school-age children during COVID-19 lockdown. *J Pediatr Psychol* 2021;46:153–67.
- [88] Cellini N, Canale N, Mioni G, Costa S. Changes in sleep pattern, sense of time and digital media use during COVID-19 lockdown in Italy. *J Sleep Res* 2020;29:e13074.
- [89] Cellini N, Conte F, De Rosa O, Giganti F, Malloggi S, Reynt M, et al. Changes in sleep timing and subjective sleep quality during the COVID-19 lockdown in Italy and Belgium: age, gender and working status as modulating factors. *Sleep Med* 2021;77:112–9.
- [90] Chatterjee SS, Chakrabarty M, Banerjee D, Grover S, Chatterjee SS, Dan U. Stress, sleep and psychological impact in healthcare workers during the early phase of COVID-19 in India: a factor analysis. *Front Psychol* 2021;12:473.
- [91] Chen X, Wang L, Liu L, Jiang M, Wang W, Zhou X, et al. Factors associated with psychological distress among patients with breast cancer during the COVID-19 pandemic: a cross-sectional study in Wuhan, China. *Support Care Cancer* 2021:1–10.
- [92] Cheng F-F, Zhan S-H, Xie A-W, Cai S-Z, Hui L, Kong X-X, et al. Anxiety in Chinese pediatric medical staff during the outbreak of Coronavirus Disease 2019: a cross-sectional study. *Transl Pediatr* 2020;9:231.
- [93] Cheng C, Ebrahimi OV, Lau Yc. Maladaptive coping with the infodemic and sleep disturbance in the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Sleep Res* 2020:e13235.
- [94] Chi X, Liang K, Chen S-T, Huang Q, Huang L, Yu Q, et al. Mental health problems among Chinese adolescents during the COVID-19: the importance of nutrition and physical activity. *Int J Clin Health Psychol* 2021;21:100218.
- [95] Chouchou F, Augustini M, Caderby T, Caron N, Turpin NA, Dalleau G. The importance of sleep and physical activity on well-being during COVID-19 lockdown: reunion island as a case study. *Sleep Med* 2021;77:297–301.
- [96] Coiro MJ, Asraf K, Tzischinsky O, Hadar-Shoval D, Tannous-Haddad L, Wolfson AR. Sleep quality and COVID-19-related stress in relation to mental health symptoms among Israeli and US adults. *Sleep Health* 2021;7:127–33.
- [97] Cui Q, Cai Z, Li J, Liu Z, Sun S, Chen C, et al. The psychological pressures of breast cancer patients during the COVID-19 outbreak in China—a comparison with frontline female nurses. *Front Psychiatr* 2020;11:1462.
- [98] Czeisler ME, Wiley JF, Facer-Childs ER, Robbins R, Weaver MD, Barger LK, et al. Mental health, substance use, and suicidal ideation during a prolonged COVID-19-related lockdown in a region with low SARS-CoV-2 prevalence. *J Psychiatr Res* 2021 Aug;140:533–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2021.05.080>. PMID: PMC8177437.
- [99] Dai L-L, Wang X, Jiang T-C, Li P-F, Wang Y, Wu S-J, et al. Anxiety and depressive symptoms among COVID-19 patients in Jiangnan Fangcang shelter hospital in Wuhan, China. *PLoS One* 2020;15:e0238416.
- [100] Das R, Hasan MR, Daria S, Islam MR. Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on mental health among general Bangladeshi population: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open* 2021;11:e045727.
- [101] Daşdemir KA, Suner Keklik S. Physical activity, sleep and quality of life of patients with asthma during the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Asthma* 2021:1–11.
- [102] de Medeiros G, Artismo RS, Coelho P, da Silveira B, Souza Filho VPP, Branco JHL, et al. Did social isolation due to COVID-19 interfere with the quality of sleep and excessive daytime sleepiness in individuals with grade III obesity about to enter a surgical prehabilitation program? An observational study. *Metabol Open* 2021:100104.
- [103] Demartini B, Nisticò V, D'Agostino A, Priori A, Gambini O. Early psychiatric impact of COVID-19 pandemic on the general population and healthcare workers in Italy: a preliminary study. *Front Psychiatr* 2020;11.
- [104] Du C, Zan MCH, Cho MJ, Fenton JI, Hsiao PY, Hsiao R, et al. Health behaviors of higher education students from 7 countries: poorer sleep quality during the COVID-19 pandemic predicts higher dietary risk. *Clock Sleep* 2021;3:12–30.
- [105] Duran S, Ö Erkin. Psychologic distress and sleep quality among adults in Turkey during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Prog Neuro Psychopharmacol Biol Psychiatr* 2021;107:110254.
- [106] Elhadi M, Alsoufi A, Msherghi A, Alsharea E, Ashini A, Nagib T, et al. Psychological health, sleep quality, behavior, and internet use among people during the COVID-19 pandemic: a cross-sectional study. *Front Psychiatr* 2021;12.
- [107] Abd-ElHafeez S, Meira e Cruz M, Gouda S, Nofal M, Fayed A, Ghazy R, et al. Sleep quality and anxiety among Egyptian population during COVID-19 pandemic. *Sleep Sci* 2021. <https://doi.org/10.5935/1984-0063.20210020>.
- [108] Elkholy H, Tawfik F, Ibrahim I, Salah El-din W, Sabry M, Mohammed S, et al. Mental health of frontline healthcare workers exposed to COVID-19 in Egypt: a call for action. *Int J Soc Psychiatr* 2020;0020764020960192.
- [109] Essangri H, Sabir M, Benkabbou A, Majbar MA, Amrani L, Ghannam A, et al. Predictive factors for impaired mental health among medical students during the early stage of the COVID-19 pandemic in Morocco. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* 2021;104:95.
- [110] Falkingham J, Evandrou M, Qin M, Vlachantoni A. Sleepless in lockdown: unpacking differences in sleep loss during the coronavirus pandemic in the UK. 2020.
- [111] Fekih-Romdhane F, Snene H, Jebri A, Rhouma MB, Cheour M. Psychological impact of the pandemic COVID-19 outbreak among medical residents in Tunisia. *Asian J Psychiatr* 2020;53:102349.
- [112] Fidanci I, derinöz Güleriyüz O, Fidanci I. An analysis on sleep quality of the healthcare professionals during the covid-19 pandemic. *Acta Med* 2020;36:3797.
- [113] Di Filippo P, Attanasi M, Dodi G, Porreca A, Raso M, Di Pillo S, et al. Evaluation of sleep quality and anxiety in Italian pediatric healthcare workers during the first wave of COVID-19 pandemic. *BMC Res Notes* 2021;14:1–8.
- [114] Florin M, Pinar U, Chavigny E, Bouaboula M, Jarbouli L, Coulibaly A, et al. Socio-economic and psychological impact of the COVID-19 outbreak on

- private practice and public hospital radiologists. *Eur J Radiol* 2020;132:109285.
- [115] Franceschini C, Musetti A, Zenesini C, Palagini L, Scarpelli S, Quattropiani MC, et al. Poor sleep quality and its consequences on mental health during the COVID-19 lockdown in Italy. *Front Psychol* 2020;11:3072.
- [116] Fu W, Wang C, Zou L, Guo Y, Lu Z, Yan S, et al. Psychological health, sleep quality, and coping styles to stress facing the COVID-19 in Wuhan, China. *Transl Psychiatry* 2020;10:1–9.
- [117] Garcia-Priego BA, Triana-Romero A, Pinto-Galvez SM, Duran-Ramos C, Salas-Nolasco O, Reyes MM, et al. Anxiety, depression, attitudes, and internet addiction during the initial phase of the 2019 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) epidemic: a cross-sectional study in México. *medRxiv* 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.10.20095844>.
- [118] Garriga-Baraut T. COVID-19 pandemic and sleep disorders among pediatric and adolescent asthmatic patients. TP73 TP073 *Pediatr Sleep: Am Thorac Soc* 2021:A3344 [A].
- [119] Gaş S, Ekşi Özsoy H, Cesur Aydın K. The association between sleep quality, depression, anxiety and stress levels, and temporomandibular joint disorders among Turkish dental students during the COVID-19 pandemic. *CRANIO®* 2021:1–6.
- [120] Ge F, Di Zhang LW, Mu H. Predicting psychological state among Chinese Undergraduate Students in the COVID-19 Epidemic: a longitudinal study using a machine learning. *Neuropsychiatric Dis Treat* 2020;16:2111.
- [121] Genta FD, Neto GBR, Sunfeld JPV, Porto JF, Xavier AD, Moreno CRC, et al. COVID-19 pandemic impact on sleep habits, chronotype, and health-related quality of life among high school students: a longitudinal study. *J Clin Sleep Med* 2021;17:1371–7.
- [122] Giardino DL, Huck-Iriart C, Riddick M, Garay A. The endless quarantine: the impact of the COVID-19 outbreak on healthcare workers after three months of mandatory social isolation in Argentina. *Sleep Med* 2020;76:16–25.
- [123] Goodman-Casanova JM, Dura-Perez E, Guzman-Parra J, Cuesta-Vargas A, Mayoral-Cleries F. Telehealth home support during COVID-19 confinement for community-dwelling older adults with mild cognitive impairment or mild dementia: survey study. *J Med Internet Res* 2020;22:e19434.
- [124] Goularte JF, Serafim SD, Colombo R, Hogg B, Caldieraro MA, Rosa AR. COVID-19 and mental health in Brazil: psychiatric symptoms in the general population. *J Psychiatr Res* 2021;132:32–7.
- [125] Gu Y, Zhu Y, Xu G. Factors associated with mental health outcomes among health care workers in the Fangcang shelter hospital in China. *Int J Soc Psychiatr* 2020:0020764020975805.
- [126] Gualano MR, Lo Moro G, Voglino G, Bert F, Siliquini R. Effects of Covid-19 lockdown on mental health and sleep disturbances in Italy. *Int J Environ Res Publ Health* 2020;17:4779.
- [127] Guo J, Feng XL, Wang XH, van IJzendoorn MH. Coping with COVID-19: exposure to COVID-19 and negative impact on livelihood predict elevated mental health problems in Chinese adults. *Int J Environ Res Publ Health* 2020;17:3857.
- [128] Gupta R, Grover S, Basu A, Krishnan V, Tripathi A, Subramanyam A, et al. Changes in sleep pattern and sleep quality during COVID-19 lockdown. *Indian J Psychiatr* 2020;62:370.
- [129] Hao F, Tan W, Jiang L, Zhang L, Zhao X, Zou Y, et al. Do psychiatric patients experience more psychiatric symptoms during COVID-19 pandemic and lockdown? A case-control study with service and research implications for immunopsychiatry. *Brain Behav Immun* 2020;87:100–6.
- [130] Haravuori H, Junttila K, Haapa T, Tuisku K, Kujala A, Rosenström T, et al. Personnel well-being in the Helsinki university hospital during the COVID-19 pandemic—a prospective cohort study. *Int J Environ Res Publ Health* 2020;17:7905.
- [131] He Q, Fan B, Xie B, Liao Y, Han X, Chen Y, et al. Mental health conditions among the general population, healthcare workers and quarantined population during the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic. *Psychol Health Med* 2021:1–13.
- [132] Hendrickson RC, Slevin RA, Chang BP, Sano E, McCall CA, Raskind MA. The impact of working during the Covid-19 pandemic on health care workers and first responders: mental health, function, and professional retention. *medRxiv* 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248325>.
- [133] San Martin AH, Serrano JP, Cambriles TD, Arias EMA, Méndez JM, del Yerro Álvarez MJ, et al. Sleep characteristics in health workers exposed to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Sleep Med* 2020;75:388–94.
- [134] Huang L, Lei W, Liu H, Hang R, Tao X, Zhan Y. Nurses' sleep quality of "Fangcang" hospital in China during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Int J Ment Health Addiction* 2020:1–11.
- [135] Huang Y, Wang Y, Zeng L, Yang J, Song X, Rao W, et al. Prevalence and correlation of anxiety, insomnia and somatic symptoms in a Chinese population during the COVID-19 epidemic. *Front Psychiatr* 2020;11:894.
- [136] Huang Y, Zhao N. Generalized anxiety disorder, depressive symptoms and sleep quality during COVID-19 outbreak in China: a web-based cross-sectional survey. *Psychiatr Res* 2020;288:112954.
- [137] Hussien B, Qader S, Aziz K, Hazha J, Qader A, Jamal A. The assessment of lifestyle change due to COVID-19 pandemic in northern Iraq. 2021.
- [138] Idrissi AJ, Lamkaddem A, Benouajit A, El Bouazzaoui MB, El Houari F, Alami M, et al. Sleep quality and mental health in the context of COVID-19 pandemic and lockdown in Morocco. *Sleep Med* 2020;74:248–53.
- [139] Innocenti P, Puzella A, Mogavero MP, Bruni O, Ferri R. Letter to editor: CoVID-19 pandemic and sleep disorders—a web survey in Italy. *Neurol Sci* 2020;41:2021–2.
- [140] Iqbal Y, Al Abdulla MA, Albrahim S, Latoo J, Kumar R, Haddad PM. Psychiatric presentation of patients with acute SARS-CoV-2 infection: a retrospective review of 50 consecutive patients seen by a consultation-liaison psychiatry team. *BJPsych Open* 2020;6.
- [141] Jahrami H, BaHammam AS, AlGahtani H, Ebrahim A, Faris M, AlEid K, et al. The examination of sleep quality for frontline healthcare workers during the outbreak of COVID-19. *Sleep Breath* 2021;25:503–11.
- [142] Jain A, Singariya G, Kamal M, Kumar M, Jain A, Solanki RK. COVID-19 pandemic: psychological impact on anaesthesiologists. *Indian J Anaesth* 2020;64:774.
- [143] Jiang F, Xiao Y, Dong H, Liu S, Guo F, Gong Z, et al. Sleep quality in medical staffs during the outbreak of coronavirus disease 2019 in China: a web-based cross-sectional study. *Front Psychiatr* 2021;12:630330.
- [144] Jin L-R, Zhou S, Yuan H. Investigation on sleep quality in Chinese medical staff during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Psychol Health Med* 2021:1–7.
- [145] Juanjuan L, Santa-Maria CA, Hongfang F, Lingcheng W, Pengcheng Z, Yuanbing X, et al. Patient-reported outcomes of patients with breast cancer during the COVID-19 outbreak in the epicenter of China: a cross-sectional survey study. *Clin Breast Cancer* 2020;20:e651–62.
- [146] Jung S, Kneer J, Kruger TH. The German COVID-19 survey on mental health: primary results. *medRxiv* 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.06.20090340>.
- [147] Kaparounaki CK, Patsali ME, Mousa D-PV, Papadopoulou EV, Papadopoulou KK, Fountoulakis KN. University students' mental health amidst the COVID-19 quarantine in Greece. *Psychiatr Res* 2020;290:113111.
- [148] Khaled SM, Petcu C, Al-Thani MA, Al-Hamadi AMH, Daher-Nashif S, Zolezzi M, et al. Prevalence and associated factors of DSM-5 insomnia disorder in the general population of Qatar. *BMC Psychiatr* 2021;21:1–10.
- [149] Khalil11 AMS, Elsayed ZEH. Children dietary habits and quality of sleep during COVID-19 pandemic. *Int J Nurs* 2020;7:80–6.
- [150] Khamis F, Al Mahyijari N, Al Lawati F, Badahdah AM. The mental health of female physicians and nurses in Oman during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Oman Med J* 2020;35:e203.
- [151] Khanal P, Devkota N, Dahal M, Paudel K, Joshi D. Mental health impacts among health workers during COVID-19 in a low resource setting: a cross-sectional survey from Nepal. *Glob Health* 2020;16:1–12.
- [152] Khoury JE, Atkinson L, Bennett T, Jack SM, Gonzalez A. COVID-19 and mental health during pregnancy: the importance of cognitive appraisal and social support. *J Affect Disord* 2021;282:1161–9.
- [153] Kilani HA, Bataineh MaF, Al-Nawayseh A, Atiyat K, Obeid O, Abu-Hilal MM, et al. Healthy lifestyle behaviors are major predictors of mental wellbeing during COVID-19 pandemic confinement: a study on adult Arabs in higher educational institutions. *PLoS One* 2020;15:e0243524.
- [154] Killgore WD, Cloonan SA, Taylor EC, Fernandez F, Grandner MA, Dailey NS. Suicidal ideation during the COVID-19 pandemic: the role of insomnia. *Psychiatr Res* 2020;290:113134.
- [155] Kocovska D, Blanken TF, Van Someren EJ, Rösler L. Sleep quality during the COVID-19 pandemic: not one size fits all. *Sleep Med* 2020;76:86–8.
- [156] Kokou-Kpolou CK, Megalakaki O, Laimou D, Kousouri M. Insomnia during COVID-19 pandemic and lockdown: prevalence, severity, and associated risk factors in French population. *Psychiatr Res* 2020;290:113128.
- [157] Kolokotroni O, Mosquera MC, Quattrocchi A, Heraclides A, Demetriou C, Philippou E. Lifestyle habits of adults during the COVID-19 pandemic lockdown in Cyprus: evidence from a cross-sectional study. *BMC Publ Health* 2021;21:1–11.
- [158] Lahiri A, Jha SS, Acharya R, Dey A, Chakraborty A. Correlates of insomnia among the adults during COVID19 pandemic: evidence from an online survey in India. *Sleep Med* 2021;77:66–73.
- [159] Lai J, Ma S, Wang Y, Cai Z, Hu J, Wei N, et al. Factors associated with mental health outcomes among health care workers exposed to coronavirus disease 2019. *JAMA Netw Open* 2020;3:e203976–.
- [160] Lai AY-k, Lee L, Wang M-p, Feng Y, Lai TT-k, Ho L-m, et al. Mental health impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on international university students, related stressors, and coping strategies. *Front Psychiatr* 2020;11.
- [161] Lavigne-Cerván R, Costa-López B, Juárez-Ruiz de Mier R, Real-Fernández M, Sánchez-Muñoz de León M, Navarro-Soria I. Consequences of COVID-19 confinement on anxiety, sleep and executive functions of children and adolescents in Spain. *Front Psychol* 2021;12:334.
- [162] Li SH, Beames JR, Newby JM, Maston K, Christensen H, Werner-Seidler A. The impact of COVID-19 on the lives and mental health of Australian adolescents. *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatr* 2021:1–13.
- [163] Li D-J, Ko N-Y, Chen Y-L, Wang P-W, Chang Y-P, Yen C-F, et al. COVID-19-related factors associated with sleep disturbance and suicidal thoughts among the Taiwanese public: a Facebook survey. *Int J Environ Res Publ Health* 2020;17:4479.
- [164] Li X, Cai Q, Jia Z, Zhou Y, Liu L, Zhou Y, et al. The correlation between mental health status, sleep quality, and inflammatory markers, virus negative conversion time among patients confirmed with 2019-nCoV during the COVID-19 outbreak in China: an observational study. *Medicine* 2021;100.



- [165] Li H, Zhang Y, Wang H, Liang J, Zhou Y, Huang Y, et al. The relationship between symptoms of anxiety and somatic symptoms in health professionals during the coronavirus disease 2019 Pandemic. *Neuropsychiatric Dis Treat* 2020;16:3153.
- [166] Li W, Zhao N, Yan X, Zou S, Wang H, Li Y, et al. The prevalence of depressive and anxiety symptoms and their associations with quality of life among clinically stable older patients with psychiatric disorders during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Transl Psychiatry* 2021;11:1–8.
- [167] Liang Y, Wu K, Zhou Y, Huang X, Zhou Y, Liu Z. Mental health in frontline medical workers during the 2019 novel coronavirus disease epidemic in China: a comparison with the general population. *Int J Environ Res Publ Health* 2020;17:6550.
- [168] Liguori C, Pierantozzi M, Spanetta M, Sarmati L, Cesta N, Iannetta M, et al. The emerging neurological symptoms frequently occur in patients with SARS-CoV2 infection. *Brain Behav Immun* 2020;88:11–6.
- [169] Lin L-y, Wang J, Ou-Yang X-Y, Miao Q, Chen R, Liang F-x, et al. The immediate impact of the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak on subjective sleep status. *Sleep Med* 2021;77:348–54.
- [170] Liu N, Zhang F, Wei C, Jia Y, Shang Z, Sun L, et al. Prevalence and predictors of PTSD during COVID-19 outbreak in China hardest-hit areas: gender differences matter. *Psychiatr Res* 2020;287:112921.
- [171] Liu T, Zheng Z, Sha X, Liu H, Zheng W, Su H, et al. Psychological impact in non-infectious disease specialists who had direct contact with patients with COVID-19. *BJPsych Open* 2021;7.
- [172] Liu C, Liu D, Huang N, Fu M, Ahmed JF, Zhang Y, et al. The combined impact of gender and age on post-traumatic stress symptoms, depression, and insomnia during COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Front Public Health* 2020;8.
- [173] Liu D, Liu S, Zhu L, Li D, Huang D, Deng H, et al. Prevalence and related factors of insomnia among Chinese medical staff in the middle and late stage of COVID-19. *Front Psychiatr* 2020;11.
- [174] Liu C, Stevens C, Conrad R, Hahm H. Evidence for elevated psychiatric distress, poor sleep, and quality of life concerns during the COVID-19 pandemic among US young adults with suspected and reported psychiatric diagnoses. *Psychiatr Res* 2020;292:113345.
- [175] Lu C, Chi X, Liang K, Chen S-T, Huang L, Guo T, et al. Moving more and sitting less as healthy lifestyle behaviors are protective factors for insomnia, depression, and anxiety among adolescents during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Psychol Res Behav Manag* 2020;13:1223.
- [176] Sobrado MM, Mateo-Abad M, Vrotsou K, Vergara I. Health status and lifestyle habits of vulnerable, community-dwelling older people during the COVID-19 lockdown. *J Frailty Aging* 2021;1–4.
- [177] Magnavita N, Soave PM, Ricciardi W, Antonelli M. Occupational stress and mental health among anesthetists during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Int J Environ Res Publ Health* 2020;17:8245.
- [178] Majumdar P, Biswas A, Sahu S. COVID-19 pandemic and lockdown: cause of sleep disruption, depression, somatic pain, and increased screen exposure of office workers and students of India. *Chronobiol Int* 2020;37:1191–200.
- [179] Mandelkorn U, Genzer S, Choshen-Hillel S, Reiter J, Meira e Cruz M, Hochner H, et al. Escalation of sleep disturbances amid the COVID-19 pandemic: a cross-sectional international study. *J Clin Sleep Med* 2021;17:45–53.
- [180] Marelli S, Castelnuovo A, Somma A, Castronovo V, Mombelli S, Bottoni D, et al. Impact of COVID-19 lockdown on sleep quality in university students and administration staff. *J Neurol* 2021;268:8–15.
- [181] Marroquín B, Vine V, Morgan R. Mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic: effects of stay-at-home policies, social distancing behavior, and social resources. *Psychiatr Res* 2020;293:113419.
- [182] Martínez-de-Quel Ó, Suárez-Iglesias D, López-Flores M, Pérez CA. Physical activity, dietary habits and sleep quality before and during COVID-19 lockdown: a longitudinal study. *Appetite* 2021;158:105019.
- [183] Martínez-Lezaun I, Santamaría-Vázquez M, Del Líbano M. Influence of confinement by COVID-19 on the quality of sleep and the interests of university students. *Nat Sci Sleep* 2020;12:1075.
- [184] Massicotte V, Ivers H, Savard J. COVID-19 pandemic stressors and psychological symptoms in breast cancer patients. *Curr Oncol* 2021;28:294–300.
- [185] Mazza MG, De Lorenzo R, Conte C, Poletti S, Vai B, Bollettini I, et al. Anxiety and depression in COVID-19 survivors: role of inflammatory and clinical predictors. *Brain Behav Immun* 2020;89:594–600.
- [186] McCall WV, Mensah-Bonsu D, Withers AE, Gibson RW. Short-term insomnia disorder in health care workers in an academic medical center before and during COVID-19: rates and predictive factors. *J Clin Sleep Med* 2021;17:749–55.
- [187] McCracken LM, Badinlou F, Bührman M, Brocki KC. Psychological impact of COVID-19 in the Swedish population: depression, anxiety, and insomnia and their associations to risk and vulnerability factors. *Eur Psychiatr* 2020;63.
- [188] Meo SA, Alkhalifah JM, Alshammari NF, Alnufaei WS. Comparison of generalized anxiety and sleep disturbance among frontline and second-line healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Int J Environ Res Publ Health* 2021;18:5727.
- [189] Miaskowski C, Paul SM, Snowberg K, Abbott M, Borno H, Chang S, et al. Stress and symptom burden in oncology patients during the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Pain Symptom Manag* 2020;60:e25–34.
- [190] Mongkhon P, Ruengorn C, Awiphan R, Thavorn K, Hutton B, Wongpakaran N, et al. Exposure to COVID-19-related information and its association with mental health problems in Thailand: Nationwide, cross-sectional survey study. *J Med Internet Res* 2021 Feb 12;23(2):e25363. <https://doi.org/10.2196/25363>. PMID: 33523828; PMCID: PMC7886375.
- [191] Murata S, Rezeppa T, Thoma B, Marengo L, Krancevich K, Chiyka E, et al. The psychiatric sequelae of the COVID-19 pandemic in adolescents, adults, and health care workers. *Depress Anxiety* 2021;38:233–46.
- [192] Necho M, Birkie M, Gelaye H, Beyene A, Belete A, Tsehay M. Depression, anxiety symptoms, insomnia, and coping during the COVID-19 pandemic period among individuals living with disabilities in Ethiopia, 2020. *PLoS One* 2020;15:e0244530.
- [193] Osigo F, Shalaby R, Adegboyega S, Hrabok M, Gusnowski A, Vuong W, et al. COVID-19 pandemic: demographic and clinical correlates of disturbed sleep among 6,041 Canadians. *Int J Psychiatr Clin Pract* 2021: 1–8.
- [194] Ozluk O, Kicici B, Zoghi M, Yuce E, Ozmen C, Yenercag M, et al. An assessment of the anxiety, depression, and sleep disorders experienced by cardiologists during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Int J Clin Exp Med* 2021: 1936–42.
- [195] Parlapani E, Holeva V, Nikopoulou VA, Sereslis K, Athanasiadou M, Godosidis A, et al. Intolerance of uncertainty and loneliness in older adults during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Front Psychiatr* 2020;11:842.
- [196] Pedrozo-Pupo JC, Campo-Arias A. Depression, perceived stress related to COVID, post-traumatic stress, and insomnia among asthma and COPD patients during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Chron Respir Dis* 2020;17. 1479973120962800.
- [197] Petrov ME, Pituch KA, Kasraeian K, Jiao N, Mattingly J, Hasanaj K, et al. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on change in sleep patterns in an exploratory, cross-sectional online sample of 79 countries. *Sleep Health* 2021 Aug;7(4):451–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sleh.2021.05.007>. Epub 2021 Jun 27. PMID: 34193394.
- [198] Pih C, Budimir S, Probst T. The effect of age, gender, income, work, and physical activity on mental health during coronavirus disease (COVID-19) lockdown in Austria. *J Psychosom Res* 2020;136:110186.
- [199] Poyraz BÇ, Poyraz CA, Olgun Y, Gürel Ö, Alkan S, Özdemir YE, et al. Psychiatric morbidity and protracted symptoms after COVID-19. *Psychiatr Res* 2021;295:113604.
- [200] Qi J, Xu J, Li B-Z, Huang J-S, Yang Y, Zhang Z-T, et al. The evaluation of sleep disturbances for Chinese frontline medical workers under the outbreak of COVID-19. *Sleep Med* 2020;72:1–4.
- [201] Que J, Le Shi JD, Liu J, Zhang L, Wu S, Gong Y, et al. Psychological impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on healthcare workers: a cross-sectional study in China. *Gen Psychiatr* 2020;33.
- [202] Ren Y, Qian W, Li Z, Liu Z, Zhou Y, Wang R, et al. Public mental health under the long-term influence of COVID-19 in China: geographical and temporal distribution. *J Affect Disord* 2020;277:893–900.
- [203] Repon MAU, Pakhe SA, Quaiyum S, Das R, Daria S, Islam MR. Effect of COVID-19 pandemic on mental health among Bangladeshi healthcare professionals: a cross-sectional study. *Sci Prog* 2021;104. 00368504211026409.
- [204] Robillard R, Dion K, Pennestri MH, Solomonova E, Lee E, Saad M, et al. Profiles of sleep changes during the COVID-19 pandemic: demographic, behavioural and psychological factors. *J Sleep Res* 2021;30:e13231.
- [205] Rossi R, Socci V, Pacitti F, Mensi S, Di Marco A, Siracusano A, et al. Mental health outcomes among healthcare workers and the general population during the COVID-19 in Italy. *Front Psychol* 2020;11.
- [206] Rossi R, Socci V, Talevi D, Mensi S, Niuolu C, Pacitti F, et al. COVID-19 pandemic and lockdown measures impact on mental health among the general population in Italy. *Front Psychiatr* 2020;11:790.
- [207] Roy D, Tripathy S, Kar SK, Sharma N, Verma SK, Kaushal V. Study of knowledge, attitude, anxiety & perceived mental healthcare need in Indian population during COVID-19 pandemic. *Asian J Psychiatr* 2020;51: 102083.
- [208] Saadeh H, Saadeh M, Almobaideen W, Al Refaei A, Shewaikani N, Al Fayed RQ, et al. Effect of COVID-19 quarantine on the sleep quality and the depressive symptom levels of university students in Jordan during the spring of 2020. *Front Psychiatr* 2021;12:131.
- [209] Sadeghniaat-Haghighi KM M, Najafi A, Shabani M, Akbarpour S. Cluster analysis of insomnia symptoms during COVID-19 pandemic: a general population web-based survey in Iran. *Sleep Sci* 2021:1–6. 0.
- [210] Sagaon-Teyssier L, Kamissoko A, Yattassaye A, Diallo F, Castro DR, Delabre R, et al. Assessment of mental health outcomes and associated factors among workers in community-based HIV care centers in the early stage of the COVID-19 outbreak in Mali. *Health Pol Open* 2020;1:100017.
- [211] Sagherian K, Steege LM, Cobb SJ, Cho H. Insomnia, fatigue and psychosocial well-being during COVID-19 pandemic: a cross-sectional survey of hospital nursing staff in the United States. *J Clin Nurs* 2020 Nov 20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.15566>. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 33219569; PMCID: PMC7753687.
- [212] Saguem BN, Nakhli J, Romdhane I, Nasr SB. Predictors of sleep quality in medical students during COVID-19 confinement. *L'encephale*; 2021.
- [213] Şahin MK, Aker S, Şahin G, Karabekiroğlu A. Prevalence of depression, anxiety, distress and insomnia and related factors in healthcare workers

- during COVID-19 pandemic in Turkey. *J Community Health* 2020;45:1168–77.
- [214] Salfi F, Lauriola M, D'Atri A, Amicucci G, Viselli L, Tempesta D, et al. Demographic, psychological, chronobiological, and work-related predictors of sleep disturbances during the COVID-19 lockdown in Italy. *Sci Rep* 2021;11:1–12.
- [215] Sañudo B, Fennell C, Sánchez-Oliver AJ. Objectively-assessed physical activity, sedentary behavior, smartphone use, and sleep patterns pre-and during-COVID-19 quarantine in young adults from Spain. *Sustainability* 2020;12:5890.
- [216] Saracoglu KT, Simsek T, Kahraman S, Bombaci E, Sezen Ö, Saracoglu A, et al. The psychological impact of Covid-19 disease is more severe on Intensive Care Unit healthcare providers: a cross-sectional study. *Clin Psychopharmacol Neurosci* 2020;18:607.
- [217] Saraswathi I, Saikarthik J, Kumar KS, Srinivasan KM, Ardhanari M, Gunapriya R. Impact of COVID-19 outbreak on the mental health status of undergraduate medical students in a COVID-19 treating medical college: a prospective longitudinal study. *PeerJ* 2020;8:e10164.
- [218] Scotta AV, Cortez MV, Miranda AR. Insomnia is associated with worry, cognitive avoidance and low academic engagement in Argentinian university students during the COVID-19 social isolation. *Psychol Health Med* 2021;1–16.
- [219] Sekartaji M, Sari RP, Irsan M, Adnan M, Aquaira LP, Farahiya SR, et al. Relationship between anxiety and insomnia in clinical clerkship students during COVID-19 pandemic. *J Commun Empower Health* 2021;4:21–8.
- [220] Sharma R, Sharma SC, Sharma P, Pradhan SN, Chalise P, Regmee J, et al. Effect of lockdown on mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic among individuals attending services at a tertiary care center. *Indian J Psychiatr* 2020;62:5431.
- [221] Sharma R, Seth S, Solanki HK, Mishra N, Srivastava A, Jakhar K. COVID-19 and obstetrical care: coping with new stress. *Cureus* 2020;12.
- [222] Sharma V, Kumar N, Gupta B, Mahajan A. Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on orthopaedic surgeons in terms of anxiety, sleep outcomes and change in management practices: a cross-sectional study from India. *J Orthop Surg* 2021;29. 23094990211001621.
- [223] Shi L, Lu Z-A, Que J-Y, Huang X-L, Liu L, Ran M-S, et al. Prevalence of and risk factors associated with mental health symptoms among the general population in China during the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic. *JAMA Netw Open* 2020;3:e2014053. e.
- [224] Shillington KJ, Vanderloo LM, Burke SM, Ng V, Tucker P, Irwin JD. Not so sweet dreams: adults' quantity, quality, and disruptions of sleep during the initial stages of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Sleep Med* 2021 Feb 19; S1389-9457(21)00127-1. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sleep.2021.02.028>. Epub ahead of print.
- [225] Simonetti V, Durante A, Ambrosca R, Arcadi P, Graziano G, Pucciarelli G, et al. Anxiety, sleep disorders and self-efficacy among nurses during COVID-19 pandemic: a large cross-sectional study. *J Clin Nurs* 2021;30:1360–71.
- [226] Song L, Wang Y, Li Z, Yang Y, Li H. Mental health and work attitudes among people resuming work during the COVID-19 pandemic: a cross-sectional study in China. *Int J Environ Res Publ Health* 2020;17:5059.
- [227] Stanton R, To QG, Khalesi S, Williams SL, Alley SJ, Thwaite TL, et al. Depression, anxiety and stress during COVID-19: associations with changes in physical activity, sleep, tobacco and alcohol use in Australian adults. *Int J Environ Res Publ Health* 2020;17:4065.
- [228] Stewart NH, Koza A, Dhaon S, Shoushtari C, Martinez M, Arora VM. Sleep disturbances in frontline health care workers during the COVID-19 pandemic: social media survey study. *J Med Internet Res* 2021;23:e27331.
- [229] Sun L, Sun Z, Wu L, Zhu Z, Zhang F, Shang Z, et al. Prevalence and risk factors of acute posttraumatic stress symptoms during the COVID-19 outbreak in Wuhan, China. *medRxiv* 2020:1–17.
- [230] Sunil R, Bhatt MT, Bhumika TV, Thomas N, Puranik A, Chaudhuri S, et al. Weathering the storm: psychological impact of COVID-19 pandemic on clinical and nonclinical healthcare workers in India. *Indian J Crit Care Med: Peer-Reviewed, Off Publ Ind Soc Crit Care Med* 2021;25:16.
- [231] Tan W, Hao F, McIntyre RS, Jiang L, Jiang X, Zhang L, et al. Is returning to work during the COVID-19 pandemic stressful? A study on immediate mental health status and psychoneuroimmunity prevention measures of Chinese workforce. *Brain Behav Immun* 2020;87:84–92.
- [232] Tang W, Hu T, Hu B, Jin C, Wang G, Xie C, et al. 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* 2020;274:1–7.
- [233] Than HM, Nong VM, Nguyen CT, Dong KP, Ngo HT, Doan TT, et al. Mental health and health-related quality-of-life outcomes among frontline health workers during the peak of COVID-19 outbreak in Vietnam: a cross-sectional study. *Risk Manag Healthc Pol* 2020;13:2927.
- [234] Tiete J, Guatteri M, Lachaux A, Matossian A, Hougardy J-M, Loas G, et al. Mental health outcomes in healthcare workers in COVID-19 and non-COVID-19 care units: a cross-sectional survey in Belgium. *Front Psychol* 2020;11.
- [235] Totskiy D, Alekhin A, Leonenko N, Pultcina C, Belyaeva S, Guzi L. The psychological hardness of students with a high insomnia index during the covid-19 pandemic. In: E3S web of conferences. EDP Sciences; 2021. p. 7092.
- [236] Trabelsi K, Ammar A, Masmoudi L, Boukhris O, Chtourou H, Bouaziz B, et al. Sleep quality and physical activity as predictors of mental wellbeing variance in older adults during COVID-19 lockdown: ECLB COVID-19 international online survey. *Int J Environ Res Publ Health* 2021;18:4329.
- [237] Trabelsi K, Ammar A, Masmoudi L, Boukhris O, Chtourou H, Bouaziz B, et al. Globally altered sleep patterns and physical activity levels by confinement in 5056 individuals: ECLB COVID-19 international online survey. 2021.
- [238] Tselebis A, Lekka D, Sikaras C, Tsomaka E, Tassopoulos A, Ilias I, et al. Insomnia, perceived stress, and family support among nursing staff during the pandemic crisis. *Healthcare: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute*; 2020. p. 434.
- [239] Tu Z-h, He J-w, Zhou N. Sleep quality and mood symptoms in conscripted frontline nurse in Wuhan, China during COVID-19 outbreak: a cross-sectional study. *Medicine* 2020;99.
- [240] Varma P, Junge M, Meaklim H, Jackson ML. Younger people are more vulnerable to stress, anxiety and depression during COVID-19 pandemic: a global cross-sectional survey. *Prog Neuro Psychopharmacol Biol Psychiatr* 2021;109:110236.
- [241] Vitale JA, Perazzo P, Silingardi M, Biffi M, Banfi G, Negrini F. Is disruption of sleep quality a consequence of severe Covid-19 infection? A case-series examination. *Chronobiol Int* 2020;37:1110–4.
- [242] Voitsidis P, Gliatas I, Bairachtari V, Papadopoulou K, Papageorgiou G, Parlapani E, et al. Insomnia during the COVID-19 pandemic in a Greek population. *Psychiatr Res* 2020;289:113076.
- [243] Wang C, Song W, Hu X, Yan S, Zhang X, Wang X, et al. Depressive, anxiety, and insomnia symptoms between population in quarantine and general population during the COVID-19 pandemic: a case-controlled study. *BMC Psychiatr* 2021;21:1–9.
- [244] Wang L-Q, Zhang M, Liu G-M, Nan S-Y, Li T, Xu L, et al. Psychological impact of coronavirus disease (2019)(COVID-19) epidemic on medical staff in different posts in China: a multicenter study. *J Psychiatr Res* 2020;129:198–205.
- [245] Wang L, Zhang Y, Chen L, Wang J, Jia F, Li F, et al. Psychosocial and behavioral problems of children and adolescents in the early stage of reopening schools after the COVID-19 pandemic: a national cross-sectional study in China. *Transl Psychiatry* 2021;11:1–12.
- [246] Wang S, Zhang Y, Ding W, Meng Y, Hu H, Liu Z, et al. Psychological distress and sleep problems when people are under interpersonal isolation during an epidemic: a nationwide multicenter cross-sectional study. *Eur Psychiatr* 2020;63.
- [247] Wang M, Zhao Q, Hu C, Wang Y, Cao J, Huang S, et al. Prevalence of psychological disorders in the COVID-19 epidemic in China: a real world cross-sectional study. *J Affect Disord* 2021;281:312–20.
- [248] Wang Q, Feng H, Wang M, Xie Y, Hou B, Lu X, et al. Mental health and psychological responses during the coronavirus disease 2019 epidemic: a comparison between Wuhan and other areas in China. *Psychosom Med* 2021;83:322–7.
- [249] Wang X, Chen H, Liu L, Liu Y, Zhang N, Sun Z, et al. Anxiety and sleep problems of college students during the outbreak of COVID-19. *Front Psychiatr* 2020;11.
- [250] Wang Y, Zhu L-Y, Ma Y-F, Bo H-X, Deng H-B, Cao J, et al. Association of insomnia disorder with sociodemographic factors and poor mental health in COVID-19 inpatients in China. *Sleep Med* 2020;75:282–6.
- [251] Wang J, Gong Y, Chen Z, Wu J, Feng J, Yan S, et al. Sleep disturbances among Chinese residents during the Coronavirus Disease 2019 outbreak and associated factors. *Sleep Med* 2020;74:199–203.
- [252] Wang W, Song W, Xia Z, He Y, Tang L, Hou J, et al. Sleep disturbance and psychological profiles of medical staff and non-medical staff during the early outbreak of COVID-19 in Hubei Province, China. *Front Psychiatr* 2020;11:733.
- [253] Wang S, Xie L, Xu Y, Yu S, Yao B, Xiang D. Sleep disturbances among medical workers during the outbreak of COVID-2019. *Occup Med* 2020;70:364–9.
- [254] Wańkiewicz P, Szylińska A, Rotter I. Assessment of mental health factors among health professionals depending on their contact with COVID-19 patients. *Int J Environ Res Publ Health* 2020;17:5849.
- [255] Wańkiewicz P, Szylińska A, Rotter I. Evaluation of mental health factors among people with systemic lupus erythematosus during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. *J Clin Med* 2020;9:2872.
- [256] Wasim T, e Raana G, Bushra N, Riaz A. Effect of COVID-19 pandemic on mental wellbeing of healthcare workers in tertiary care hospital, vol. 26. *Annals of King Edward Medical University*; 2020. p. 140–4.
- [257] Windiani IGAT, Noviyani NMR, Adnyana IGANS, Murti NLS, Soetjiningih S. Prevalence of sleep disorders in adolescents and its relation with screen time during the COVID-19 pandemic era. *Open Access Macedonian J Med Sci* 2021;9:297–300.
- [258] Wu K, Wei X. Analysis of psychological and sleep status and exercise rehabilitation of front-line clinical staff in the fight against COVID-19 in China. *Med Sci Mon Basic Res* 2020;26:e924085. 1.
- [259] Xia Y, Kou L, Zhang G, Han C, Hu J, Wan F, et al. Investigation on sleep and mental health of patients with Parkinson's disease during the Coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic. *Sleep Med* 2020;75:428–33.
- [260] Xu K, Zhang Y, Zhang Y, Xu Q, Lv L, Zhang J. Mental health among pregnant women under public health interventions during COVID-19 outbreak in Wuhan, China. *Psychiatr Res* 2021;301:113977.
- [261] Yadav R, Yadav P, Kumar SS, Kumar R. Assessment of depression, anxiety, and sleep disturbance in COVID-19 patients at tertiary care center of north India. *J Neurosci Rural Pract* 2021;12:316–22.

- [262] Yang Y, Zhu J-f, Yang S-y, Lin H-j, Chen Y, Zhao Q, et al. Prevalence and associated factors of poor sleep quality among Chinese returning workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Sleep Med* 2020;73:47–52.
- [263] Yang BX, Xia L, Huang R, Chen P, Luo D, Liu Q, et al. Relationship between eHealth literacy and psychological status during COVID-19 pandemic: a survey of Chinese residents. *J Nurs Manag* 2021;29:805–12.
- [264] Yang G, Li C, Zhu X, Yan J, Liu J. Prevalence of and risk factors associated with sleep disturbances among HPCD exposed to COVID-19 in China. *Sleep Med* 2021;80:16–22.
- [265] Yifan T, Ying L, Chunhong G, Jing S, Rong W, Zhenyu L, et al. Symptom cluster of ICU nurses treating COVID-19 pneumonia patients in Wuhan, China. *J Pain Symptom Manag* 2020;60:e48–53.
- [266] Yitayih Y, Mekonen S, Zeynudin A, Mengistie E, Ambelu A. Mental health of healthcare professionals during the early stage of the COVID-19 pandemic in Ethiopia. *BJPsych Open* 2021;7.
- [267] Youssef N, Mostafa A, Ezzat R, Yosef M, El Kassas M. Mental health status of health-care professionals working in quarantine and non-quarantine Egyptian hospitals during the COVID-19 pandemic. *East Mediterr Health J* 2020:1155–64.
- [268] Yu BY-M, Yeung W-F, Lam JC-S, Yuen SC-S, Lam SC, Chung VC-H, et al. Prevalence of sleep disturbances during COVID-19 outbreak in an urban Chinese population: a cross-sectional study. *Sleep Med* 2020;74:18–24.
- [269] Yukselel D, McKee GB, Perrin PB, Alzueta E, Caffarra S, Ramos-Usuga D, et al. Sleeping when the world locks down: correlates of sleep health during the COVID-19 pandemic across 59 countries. *Sleep Health* 2021;7:134–42.
- [270] Zanghì A, D'Amico E, Luca M, Ciaorella M, Basile L, Patti F. Mental health status of relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis Italian patients returning to work soon after the easing of lockdown during COVID-19 pandemic: a monocentric experience. *Mult Scler Relat Disord* 2020;46:102561.
- [271] Zhan Y, Liu Y, Liu H, Li M, Shen Y, Gui L, et al. Factors associated with insomnia among Chinese front-line nurses fighting against COVID-19 in Wuhan: a cross-sectional survey. *J Nurs Manag* 2020;28:1525–35.
- [272] Zhang F, Shang Z, Ma H, Jia Y, Sun L, Guo X, et al. Epidemic area contact history and sleep quality associated with posttraumatic stress symptoms in the first phase of COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Sci Rep* 2020;10:1–10.
- [273] Zhang L, Li T, Chen L, Wu F, Xia W, Huang M, et al. Association of sleep quality before and after SARS-CoV-2 infection with clinical outcomes in hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in China. *EXCLI J* 2021;20:894.
- [274] Zhang W-r, Wang K, Yin L, Zhao W-f, Xue Q, Peng M, et al. Mental health and psychosocial problems of medical health workers during the COVID-19 epidemic in China. *Psychother Psychosom* 2020;89:242–50.
- [275] Zhang J, Xu D, Xie B, Zhang Y, Huang H, Liu H, et al. Poor-sleep is associated with slow recovery from lymphopenia and an increased need for ICU care in hospitalized patients with COVID-19: a retrospective cohort study. *Brain Behav Immun* 2020;88:50–8.
- [276] Zhang X, Zou R, Liao X, Bernardo AB, Du H, Wang Z, et al. Perceived stress, hope, and health outcomes among medical staff in China during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Front Psychiatr* 2021;11:1646.
- [277] Zhang X, Liu J, Han N, Yin J. Social media use, unhealthy lifestyles, and the risk of miscarriage among pregnant women during the COVID-19 pandemic: prospective observational study. *JMIR Publ Health Surveill* 2021;7:e25241.
- [278] Zhang X, Zhao K, Zhang G, Feng R, Chen J, Xu D, et al. Occupational stress and mental health: a comparison between frontline medical staff and non-frontline medical staff during the 2019 novel coronavirus disease outbreak. *Front Psychiatr* 2020;11:1543.
- [279] Zhang H, Qin S, Zhang L, Feng Z, Fan C. A psychological investigation of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) patients in mobile cabin hospitals in Wuhan. *Ann Transl Med* 2020;8.
- [280] Zhang Y, Wang S, Ding W, Meng Y, Hu H, Liu Z, et al. Status and influential factors of anxiety depression and insomnia symptoms in the work resumption period of COVID-19 epidemic: a multicenter cross-sectional study. *J Psychosom Res* 2020;138:110253.
- [281] Zhang C, Yang L, Liu S, Ma S, Wang Y, Cai Z, et al. Survey of insomnia and related social psychological factors among medical staff involved in the 2019 novel coronavirus disease outbreak. *Front Psychiatr* 2020;11:306.
- [282] Zhang Y, Zhang H, Ma X, Di Q. Mental health problems during the COVID-19 pandemics and the mitigation effects of exercise: a longitudinal study of college students in China. *Int J Environ Res Publ Health* 2020;17:3722.
- [283] Zhao X, Zhang T, Li B, Yu X, Ma Z, Cao L, et al. Job-related factors associated with changes in sleep quality among healthcare workers screening for 2019 novel coronavirus infection: a longitudinal study. *Sleep Med* 2020;75:21–6.
- [284] Zheng C, Huang W, Sheridan S, Sit C, Chen X, Wong S. COVID-19 pandemic brings a sedentary lifestyle: a cross-sectional and longitudinal study. *medRxiv May*. 2020;24. Preprint posted online.
- [285] Zheng Y, Wang L, Feng L, Ye L, Zhang A, Fan R. Sleep quality and mental health of medical workers during the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic. *Sleep Biol Rhythm* 2021;19:173–80.
- [286] Zhou S-j, Wang L-l, Yang R, Yang X-j, Zhang L-g, Guo Z-c, et al. Sleep problems among Chinese adolescents and young adults during the coronavirus-2019 pandemic. *Sleep Med* 2020;74:39–47.
- [287] Zhou Y, Wang W, Sun Y, Qian W, Liu Z, Wang R, et al. The prevalence and risk factors of psychological disturbances of frontline medical staff in China under the COVID-19 epidemic: workload should be concerned. *J Affect Disord* 2020;277:510–4.
- [288] Zhou Y, Yang Y, Shi T, Song Y, Zhou Y, Zhang Z, et al. Prevalence and demographic correlates of poor sleep quality among frontline health professionals in Liaoning Province, China during the COVID-19 outbreak. *Front Psychiatr* 2020;11:520.
- [289] Zhou Y, Shi H, Liu Z, Peng S, Wang R, Qi L, et al. The prevalence of psychiatric symptoms of pregnant and non-pregnant women during the COVID-19 epidemic. *Transl Psychiatry* 2020;10:1–7.
- [290] Zhuo K, Gao C, Wang X, Zhang C, Wang Z. Stress and sleep: a survey based on wearable sleep trackers among medical and nursing staff in Wuhan during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Gen Psychiatr* 2020;33.
- [291] Zreik G, Asraf K, Haimov I, Tikotzky L. Maternal perceptions of sleep problems among children and mothers during the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic in Israel. *J Sleep Res* 2021;30:e13201.
- [292] Zupancic N, Bucik V, Ihan A, Dolenc-Groselj L. Sleep and safety improve physicians' psychological functioning at work during covid-19 epidemic. *Front Psychol* 2020;11.
- [293] Pahayahay A, Khalili-Mahani N. What media helps, what media hurts: a mixed methods survey study of coping with COVID-19 using the media repertoire framework and the appraisal theory of stress. *J Med Internet Res* 2020;22:e20186.
- [294] Kowal M, Coll-Martin T, Ikizer G, Rasmussen J, Eichel K, Studzińska A, et al. Who is the most stressed during the COVID-19 pandemic? Data from 26 countries and areas. *Appl Psychol: Health Well-Being* 2020;12:946–66.
- [295] Souza-Talarico JN, Wan N, Santos S, Fialho PPA, Chaves EC, Caramelli P, et al. Cross-country discrepancies on public understanding of stress concepts: evidence for stress-management psychoeducational programs. *BMC Psychiatr* 2016;16:181.
- [296] Liu X, Zhu M, Zhang R, Zhang J, Zhang C, Liu P, et al. Public mental health problems during COVID-19 pandemic: a large-scale meta-analysis of the evidence. *Transl Psychiatry* 2021;11:384.
- [297] Horwood L, Li P, Mok E, Shevell M, Constantin E. A systematic review and meta-analysis of the prevalence of sleep problems in children with cerebral palsy: how do children with cerebral palsy differ from each other and from typically developing children? *Sleep Health* 2019;5:555–71.
- [298] Becker SP, Gregory AM. Editorial Perspective: perils and promise for child and adolescent sleep and associated psychopathology during the COVID-19 pandemic. *JCPP (J Child Psychol Psychiatry)* 2020;61:757–9.
- [299] Lissak G. Adverse physiological and psychological effects of screen time on children and adolescents: literature review and case study. *Environ Res* 2018;164:149–57.
- [300] Aly HM, Nemr NA, Kishk RM, Elsaid N. Stress, anxiety and depression among healthcare workers facing COVID-19 pandemic in Egypt: a cross-sectional online-based study. *BMJ Open* 2021;11:e045281.
- [301] Leigh-Hunt N, Bagguley D, Bash K, Turner V, Turnbull S, Valtorta N, et al. An overview of systematic reviews on the public health consequences of social isolation and loneliness. *Publ Health* 2017;152:157–71.
- [302] Smith SS, Kozak N, Sullivan KA. An investigation of the relationship between subjective sleep quality, loneliness and mood in an Australian sample: can daily routine explain the links? *Int J Soc Psychiatr* 2012;58:166–71.
- [303] Kurina LM, Knutson KL, Hawkey LC, Cacioppo JT, Lauderdale DS, Ober C. Loneliness is associated with sleep fragmentation in a communal society. *Sleep* 2011;34:1519–26.
- [304] Hassan EM, Mahmoud HN. Impact of multiple waves of COVID-19 on healthcare networks in the United States. *PLoS One* 2021;16:e0247463.
- [305] Reicher S, Drury J. Pandemic fatigue? How adherence to covid-19 regulations has been misrepresented and why it matters. *BMJ* 2021;372:n137.
- [306] Lam CS, Yu BY-M, Cheung DST, Cheung T, Lam SC, Chung K-F, et al. Sleep and mood disturbances during the COVID-19 outbreak in an urban Chinese population in Hong Kong: a longitudinal study of the second and third waves of the outbreak. *Int J Environ Res Publ Health* 2021;18:8444.
- [307] Balesio A, Aquino M, Feige B, Johann AF, Kyle SD, Spiegelhalter K, et al. The effectiveness of behavioural and cognitive behavioural therapies for insomnia on depressive and fatigue symptoms: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Sleep Med Rev* 2018;37:114–29.
- [308] Rusch HL, Rosario M, Levison LM, Olivera A, Livingston WS, Wu T, et al. The effect of mindfulness meditation on sleep quality: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 2019;1445:5–16.
- [309] Jahrami H, BaHammam AS, Stubbs B, Sabah A, Saif Z, Bragazzi NL, et al. Eight-week high-intensity interval training is associated with improved sleep quality and cardiorespiratory fitness in patients with depressive disorders. *Sleep Breath* 2021 May 27. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11325-021-02388-y>. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 34046817.
- [310] Magnavita N, Garbarino S. Sleep, health and wellness at work: a scoping review. *Int J Environ Res Publ Health* 2017;14:1347.
- [311] Choi YK, Demiris G, Lin S-Y, Iribarren SJ, Landis CA, Thompson HJ, et al. Smartphone applications to support sleep self-management: review and evaluation. *J Clin Sleep Med : JCSM: Off Publ Am Acad Sleep Med* 2018;14:1783–90.