Iran J Psychiatry 2023; 18: 4: 429-442

Original Article

Two Years after the Beginning of COVID-19: Comparing Families Who Had or Did not Have Patients with COVID-19 on Health Beliefs and Obsessive-Compulsive Symptoms

Behzad Salmani[1*], Jafar Hasani[1], Zahra Zanjani[2], Mohammad Gholami-Fesharaki[3]

Abstract

Objective: This study aimed to compare health beliefs and obsessive-compulsive symptoms (OCS) in families with (FIM+) or without an infected member (FIM–) two years after the beginning of COVID-19. Additionally, this research intended to predict a decrease in OCS from baseline (T1) to 40 days later (T2) based on health beliefs.
Method: In a longitudinal survey, 227 participants in two groups, including FIM+ (n = 98; M = 30.44; SD = 5.39) and FIM– (n = 129; M = 29.24; SD = 4.93), were selected through purposive sampling. They responded to measurements consisting of demographic characteristics, the Obsessive-Compulsive Inventory-Revised (OCI-R), Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9), Impact of Event Scale-Revised (IES-R), and COVID-19 Health Belief Questionnaire (COVID-19-HBQ) at the final assessment phase (T2). To investigate differences between the two groups and predict OCS changes from T1 to T2, data were analyzed using Chi-squared, t-tests, U-Mann-Whitney, Kruskal-Wallis, Pearson correlations, and linear regression analyses.
Results: At T1, FIM+ demonstrated significantly greater OCS, health beliefs, posttraumatic stress symptoms (PTS), and depressive symptoms than FIM–. Furthermore, FIM+ showed a decrease in OCS from T1 to T2 after its infected member recovered from COVID-19 ($P < 0.001$). A decrease in OCS was correlated with a decrease in perceived susceptibility, severity, and barriers. Lack of a vulnerable family member, lower educational attainment, and being a primary caregiver were associated with a greater decrease in OCS. Changes in perceived severity and self-efficacy accounted for 17% of variation in OCS.
Conclusion: Even two years after the onset of the pandemic, COVID-19 not only impacts the life of patients with COVID-19 but family members who care for such patients respond to the disease by engaging in excessive health behaviors in the form of OCS.
Key words: *COVID-19; Demographic Factors; Family; Health Belief Model; Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder*

1. Department of Clinical Psychology, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran.
2. Department of Clinical Psychology, Faculty of Medicine, Kashan University of Medical Sciences, Kashan, Iran.
3. Department of Biostatistics, Faculty of Medicine, Tarbiat Moddares University, Tehran, Iran.

***Corresponding Author:**
Address: Department of Clinical Psychology, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Kharazmi University, Khaqani Street, South Mofatteh Street, Tehran, Iran, Postal Code: 15719-14911.
Tel: 98-21 88329220, Fax: 98-21 88830893, Email: std_b.salmani@alumni.khu.ac.ir

Article Information:
Received Date: 2022/07/02, Revised Date: 2022/11/15, Accepted Date: 2023/01/30

As the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) spreads throughout the world, people are experiencing both physical and psychological consequences of the pandemic due to pandemic-related lifestyle changes (1, 2). These consequences have influenced individuals with or without a history of psychiatric disorders (3, 4). To control the spread of COVID-19, the World Health Organization (WHO) offers some advice, including frequent hand washing and the use of disinfectants (5). Despite their critical role in slowing the spread of COVID-19, research indicates that these behaviors have led to an increase in obsessive-compulsive symptoms (OCS) in clinical and nonclinical samples (6-8).

With the goal of elucidating the reason why some individuals experienced increased OCS during the pandemic, some research (9) suggests that OCS may be an adjustable response to a fear of contamination. Research has consistently documented an increase in OCS (10, 11). Furthermore, during the pandemic, studies confirmed a significant relationship between health beliefs and OCS in people with or without psychiatric disorders (12-15). Although the literature has indicated that factors other than COVID-19 infection such as receiving treatment and sociodemographic factors could alter OCS in specific or mental health in general (10, 13), given the abovementioned findings, it is assumed that health beliefs play a significant role in explaining why some people had higher OCS during the pandemic. One example of such health beliefs is the perception of the likelihood of contacting COVID-19 for a person compared to someone of the same age, sex, residency, and health status. Nevertheless, these results were obtained when some COVID-19-related demographic characteristics such as having vulnerable conditions (e.g., hypertension) were not considered, given the association between perceived vulnerability to COVID-19 and OCS (16).

On the other hand, research indicates that psychiatric symptoms may stem in part from fear of transmitting infection (17). For example, healthcare workers and members of the general population who came into contact with COVID-19-infected patients demonstrated increased distress, anxiety, and depressive symptoms (18-21). In addition, previous research has established the association between health beliefs and preventive behaviors in healthcare workers who routinely confront infected patients (22). Similarly, Wong *et al*. (23) demonstrated a relationship between certain health beliefs, such as perceived severity or perceived benefits, and the intention to obtain the COVID-19 vaccine. Thus, in addition to health beliefs, confronting COVID-19 infected patients may increase psychopathology. However, it is unknown whether exposing COVID-19-infected patients increased OCS in a nonclinical sample.

OCS may be better explained as an excessive type of preventive behavior in the nonclinical sample during the pandemic (6, 8). Given the relationship between preventive behaviors and health beliefs on the one hand, and the association between the fear of transmitting COVID-19 to relatives and psychiatric symptoms on the other, there is an unexpectedly small number of studies focusing on the effects of encountering infected people in changing health beliefs and OCS in relatives, and tracking these changes until infected people recover. Additionally, prior research overlooked some critical COVID-19-related factors, such as the percentage of lung infections. As a reliable indicator of the severity of COVID-19, the percentage of infection in the lung affects psychological outcomes, particularly OCS (24).

The aim of the study is twofold. Firstly, this study examines the impact of infection with COVID-19, as well as recovery from the disease in a family member, in changing OCS, health beliefs, posttraumatic stress symptoms (PTS), and depressive symptoms in other family members. Depressive symptoms and PTS are regarded as general psychopathology, and prior research indicated that recent pandemics were associated with elevated PTS and depressive symptoms (4, 25). Even two years after the beginning of the pandemic, authors assumed that the impact of COVID-19 infection on a family's mental health is noticeable. In connection with the first aim, the authors are interested in the effect of demographic characteristics on changes in OCS, specifically the decrease in OCS from immediately after the confirmation of COVID-19 (T1) to 40 days later (T2). Following the first aim, the authors tried to compare families with (FIM+) and without COVID-19 infected members (FIM–) on OCS, health beliefs, PTS, and depressive symptoms. After forty days, when both patients and family members of FIM+ were confident that the disease had been adequately treated, the authors conducted a T2 assessment (26, 27). Based on previous studies (e.g., 28), the authors hypothesized that when a family member is confirmed to have COVID-19, other family members respond by engaging in excessive COVID-19 preventive behaviors (e.g., hand washing), which reinforces and strengthens their health beliefs and OCS. Recent studies (e.g., 10, 14) postulate that COVID-19 infection will result in higher health belief scores (e.g., perceived susceptibility and perceived severity) and OCS in the FIM+ group compared to the FIM– group.

Second, concerning essential associations between demographic characteristics (e.g., working from home, and having a vulnerable family member) and COVID-19-related health behaviors (29), the current study attempted to predict OCS changes using these demographic characteristics and health beliefs, while controlling for PTS and depressive symptoms. After reviewing several studies, the authors selected the most important demographic characteristics in the recent pandemic (19, 30) (see demographic characteristics in Table 1). The authors anticipate that COVID-19-related demographic characteristics (e.g., having a vulnerable family member) (16) and certain health beliefs (e.g., perceived susceptibility and perceived severity) (14) will predict

OCS changes more accurately than other variables. In other words, the present research pursues two goals: (a) examining the impact of having or not having COVID-19 patients in the family on OCS and health beliefs, and (b) predicting changes in outcomes through the health belief model.

Materials and Methods

Participants

By purposive sampling, 253 individuals (aged 18–49 years) were recruited from an online survey via social media platforms (e.g., LinkedIn and Instagram; for FIM–) and two healthcare centers (for FIM+). For FIM–, the file of measurements was sent to individuals who agreed to cooperate, and for FIM+, measurements were completed in person. There are no significant differences between FIM+ and FIM– in terms of age at T1 (n = 104, M = 30.57, SD = 5.70; FIM–: n = 149, M = 29.21, SD = 5.03; t = 2.00; df = 251; P = 0.46). The following criteria were used to determine eligibility: 1) being over 18 years old, 2) having educational background equal to or greater than 12 years, 3) signing the written form of informed consent, 4) agreeing to participate in both assessment phases (i.e., T1 and T2), and 5) having a family member who contracted COVID-19 during the sampling period (for the FIM+ group). Three participants did not complete all measures at T1; additionally, 23 participants did not participate at T2, resulting in a final sample size of 227 participants at T2 (response rate at T2 = 89.7%). At T1, 104 participants (41.6%) reported having a family member infected with COVID-19. The FIM+ group reported not being infected with COVID-19 during the sampling period. The study was approved by Kharazmi University's ethical committee (IR.KHU.REC.1400.034). Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study. Table 1 contains detailed demographic information.

Measurements

1. Demographic Characteristics Questionnaire

A 13-item questionnaire was developed to assess the demographic characteristics. Gender, educational attainment, age, marital status, having/not having an infected family member, being/not being the primary caregiver of the infected person (only in the FIM+), lung infection percentage (only in the FIM+), and having/not having a history of psychiatric disorders were all considered in the questions (see Table 1). Given that healthcare workers reported more psychological symptoms (e.g., 18), the questionnaire also inquired about whether participants' occupations were related to COVID-19 (e.g., healthcare workers) or not. Additionally, three questions assessed vulnerable conditions associated with COVID-19 in FIM+ (e.g., above 65-year-old, pregnancy, history of underlying conditions such as hypertension). Finally, one question assessed participants' ability to continue working from home. The final question was included in the questionnaire because research confirmed the psychological impact of working from home during the pandemic (31).

2. Obsessive-Compulsive Inventory-Revised (OCI-R)

Foa *et al*. (32) developed OCI-R, a six-subscale measure of OCS over a 30-day period that includes washing, checking, ordering, neutralizing, obsessing, and hoarding. This 18-item inventory is scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0 ("not at all") to 4 ("extremely"). Earlier research established that the OCI-R has a high degree of convergent validity (e.g., 33). Spearman's rank correlation coefficients between the OCI-R and Yale-Brown Obsessive-Compulsive Scale (Y-BOCS) and Maudsley Obsessive-Compulsive Inventory (MOCI) were 0.53 and 0.85, respectively. Moreover, Cronbach's alphas for six subscales were reported to be higher than 0.65 except for neutralizing subscales in the control group which was 0.35 (32). Other research also has emphasized the OCI-R's psychometric properties (34). The six-factor structure of the OCI-R in the original study was confirmed in the Persian version of the OCI-R (35). Furthermore, Cronbach's alphas of six subscales were 0.50 to 0.72 for the Persian version of the OCI-R and 0.52 to 0.70 for the present study.

3. COVID-19-Related Health Beliefs Questionnaire (COVID-19-HBQ)

Shahnazi *et al*. (36) developed a COVID-19-related health beliefs questionnaire based on the Health Belief Model (HBM) (37) to assess health beliefs. These beliefs contain perceived susceptibility, severity, benefits, barriers, self-efficacy, and cues to action. All items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 ("completely disagree") to 5 ("completely agree"). According to Shahnaz *et al*. (36), the validity of the questionnaire was established by experts using confirmatory factor analysis, and all Comparative Fit Indexes (CFIs) ranged from 0.91 to 0.94. Cronbach's alphas for six beliefs were 0.53 to 0.65 in the present study.

4. Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9)

The PHQ-9 is a nine-item questionnaire designed to assess depressive symptoms in accordance with the criteria for major depression disorder (MDD). The items were scored on a scale of 0 ("not at all") to 3 ("almost every day"), yielding a total score of 0-27. The questionnaire's construct validity was determined using a brief general health survey, self-reported illness days, and symptoms-related problems (38). The test-retest reliability and internal consistency of the questionnaire were acceptable. Cronbach's alphas were 0.86 and 0.89 for two studies (38). This scale was also used to diagnose and quantify MDD and depressive symptoms (39). Moreover, Farrahi *et al*. (40) confirmed the test-retest reliability (interclass correlation coefficient = 0.86) and internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = 0.85) of the Persian version of the PHQ-9. One-factor structure of the questionnaire was established in the Iranian sample (40).

Furthermore, the Persian form demonstrated good convergent validity, as it has a significant relationship with other depression scales (correlation coefficients extended from 0.50 to 0.76). Finally, Cronbach's alpha of the PHQ-9 in the current research was equal to 0.79.

5. Impact of Events Scale-Revised (IES-R)

Weiss and Marmar (41) developed a 22-item scale to assess post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) symptoms within the preceding week (42). The IES-R total score ranges from 0-88 when all items are rated on a five-point Likert scale from 0 ("not at all") to 4 ("significantly"). This scale has three subscales including intrusion, avoidance, and hyperarousal (42). Bienvenu *et al*. (43) demonstrated that the instrument is a valid and reliable scale. The IES-R showed suitable test-retest reliability (0.89-0.94 for a six-month interval) and internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha ranged from 0.79-0.94 for all subscales). The concurrent validity of the IES-R and related constructs was reported as acceptable as all correlation coefficients were above 0.48 (42). According to Panaghi *et al*. (44), the Persian version of the IES-R had acceptable internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = 0.67-0.87) and could thus be considered a reliable instrument for assessing PTSD symptoms. In the present study, Cronbach's alpha for IES-R was 0.75 for the total scale.

Procedure

Data were collected from December 5, 2021, to February 15, 2022. To collect information on FIM–, notices were distributed via social media platforms (LinkedIn and Instagram). The notices requested participation in "research into the relationship between COVID-19 and hygiene behaviors*."* The authors used a broad term such as *"*hygiene behaviors" rather than a more specific term such as "OCS" because research has demonstrated that OCS may be interpreted negatively (45). Further, participants underwent a five-minute interview to verify and remove fake social media accounts. Then, those who met the eligibility criteria were provided with measurements. FIM+ data were gathered by connecting to two healthcare centers in Tehran and Kashan, Iran. These facilities are primarily used to diagnose COVID-19. All FIM+ participants reported having only one family member with this condition. All participants from both groups were asked to respond as honestly as possible.

Considering the 19-day interval between the onset of COVID-19 symptoms and the negative test result (27) and a prescribed 14-day interval for isolating after the last exposure to infected people (26), the authors carefully conducted a second assessment 40 days later (T2). At this time the likelihood of a significant reduction in the fear of COVID-19 in FIM+ was high. If the COVID-19 infection was prolonged, no T2 assessment was performed. Afterward, participants in both groups (FIM+ and FIM–) were notified via telephone 40 days later (T2) to complete the instruments for the second time. If a member of the FIM– contracted COVID-19 during the sampling period, they were classified as a member of the FIM+. Between T1 and T2, only one participant reported that his family member contracted COVID-19. Moreover, if a family member who cared for an infected member contracted the infection while caring (as indicated and verified by health centers), their responses were omitted to account for confounding variables (n = 1).

Statistical Analysis

IBM SPSS software (version 26.0) was used to analyze the data. Prior to analyses, all assumptions were obtained. The primary dependent variable was the change in OCS from T1 to T2 for the two groups. The authors used the chi-squared test to compare the two groups' demographic characteristics. Furthermore, we used a t-test to compare the two groups on the PHQ-9, IES-R, health beliefs, and OCS at T1 and T2. Following that, the U-Mann-Whitney and Kruskal-Wallis tests were used to determine differences in OCS changes in terms of demographic characteristics between the two groups. It should be noted that age was considered a categorical variable. The analyses were done on participants in both groups (FIM+ and FIM–) who had completed measurements at T1 and T2. Mixed-design MANOVAs were used to compare T1 vs. T2 in both groups. T1 and T2 were considered the within-subject factor; group (FIM+ and FIM–) was considered the between-subjects factor; and the PHQ-9, IES-R, health beliefs, and, OCS were considered the dependent variables in all mixed-design MANOVAs. Moreover, Pearson correlations were used to examine the relationship between study variables and changes in OCS. Finally, linear regression analyses were used to forecast changes in OCS. COVID-19 has been shown to increase depressive symptoms and PTS in several studies (e.g., 4); thus, the PHQ-9 and IES-R were planned as covariates. To predict OCS only based on health beliefs, the authors intended to include demographic characteristics that were significantly associated with OCS changes as covariates. Then, we performed linear multiple regression analyses to examine the predictive validity of health beliefs for OCS. Before conducting these analyses, we examined the assumptions of linear regression. Examination of scatter plots showed that study variables were linearly related and were normally distributed. In addition, other assumptions such as multicollinearity and homoscedasticity were obtained. For all analyses, P-values less than 5% were considered statistically significant.

Results

1.Differences between the Two Groups in Demographic Characteristics

Generally, the demographic characteristics of individuals who participated in both assessments (n = 227) did not differ from those who only participated at T1. On average, however, participants who completed both assessments were younger than participants who completed the T1 assessment only (M = 29.76; SD = 5.17).

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Families with an Infected Member and Families without an Infected Member

Demographic	Level	FIM+ (n = 98)		FIM– (n = 129)		χ^2 (df)	P
		N	%	N	%		
Gender	Male	26	26.5	46	35.7	2.14 (1)	0.153
	Female	72	73.5	83	64.3		
Age	≤ 25	19	19.4	14	10.9	17.61 (3)	0.001
	26-30	31	31.6	77	59.7		
	31-35	34	34.7	27	20.9		
	> 36	14	14.3	11	8.5		
Marital Status	Married	50	51.0	57	44.2	1.04 (1)	0.348
	Single	48	49.0	72	55.8		
Educational Levels	Diploma	20	20.4	51	39.5	12.90 (2)	0.002
	Bachelor's degree	53	54.1	63	48.8		
	High-level education	25	25.5	15	11.6		
Is your job related to COVID-19?	Yes	15	15.3	26	20.2	0.88 (1)	0.387
	No	83	84.7	103	79.8		
Do you work from home?	Yes	15	15.3	40	31.0	7.48 (1)	0.006
	No	83	84.7	89	69.0		
Having a vulnerable family member in your home?	Yes	66	67.3	46	35.7	22.37 (1)	< 0.001
	No	32	32.7	83	64.3		
Having history of psychiatric disorders?	Yes	3	3.1	2	1.6	0.59 (1)	0.654
	No	95	96.9	127	98.4		
Form of Caring of COVID-19 infected member	Primary	22	22.4				
	Secondary	76	77.6				
Percentage of lung infection at T1	0-10%	0	0.0				
	10-30%	53	54.1				
	30-50%	36	36.7				
	50-70%	9	9.2				
	Over 70%	0	0.0				
Percentage of lung infection at T2	0-10%	92	93.9				
	10-30%	6	6.1				
	30-50%	0	0.0				
	50-70%	0	0.0				
	Over 70%	0	0.0				

Note: FIM+ = Families with an Infected Member; FIM– = Families without an Infected Member; T1 = Immediately after contracting COVID-19 in FIM+; T2 = 40 days after T1.

According to Table 1, participants in the FIM+ group were significantly older, more educated, less likely to work from home, and had more vulnerable family members in their homes than participants in the FIM– group. Out of all the participants, five individuals reported a history of psychiatric disorders (three participants in FIM+: two participants had MDD, and one participant had panic disorder; two participants in FIM–: both had MDD).

2. Differences between Groups in PHQ-9, IES-R, Health Beliefs, and, OCS at T1 and T2

As mentioned above, the mixed-design MANOVAs were applied to investigate total differences in the PHQ-9, IES-R, health beliefs, and, OCS. The results indicated the overall significant main effects of Time and Time*Group interactions in all variables. These results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. The Results of Mixed-Design MANOVAs for Patient Health Questionnaire-9, Impact of Events Scale-Revised, Health Beliefs, and Obsessive-Compulsive Symptoms

		Wilks λ	F(1, 225)	P-value	η^2
PHQ-9	Time	0.18	78.18	< 0.001	0.85
	Time*Group	0.44	63.50	< 0.001	0.69
IES-R	Time	0.14	305.02	< 0.001	0.94
	Time*Group	0.30	84.11	< 0.001	0.78
Health beliefs	Time	0.09	48.42	< 0.001	0.77
	Time*Group	0.46	62.53	< 0.001	0.74
OCS	Time	0.09	65.45	< 0.001	0.79
	Time*Group	0.43	74.50	< 0.001	0.78

Note: PHQ-9 = Patient Health Questionnaire-9; IES-R = Impact of Events Scale-Revised; OCS = Obsessive-Compulsive Symptoms.

These differences need further examination as they did not specify which group differed from the other group in terms of the PHQ-9, IES-R, health beliefs, and OCS changes. The results are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. The Means, SD, T, Cohen d, and P-Values for Patient Health Questionnaire-9, Impact of Events Scale-Revised, Health Beliefs, and Obsessive-Compulsive Symptoms Changes of the Families with an Infected Member and Families without an Infected Member Immediately after Contracting COVID-19 in Families with an Infected Member and 40-Days Later

	Variables	FIM+ (n = 98)		FIM– (n = 129)		T	Cohen's d	P
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
T1	PHQ-9	10.94	4.45	7.33	3.02	7.27	0.97	< 0.001
	IES-R	39.56	13.27	19.82	1.65	16.73	2.24	< 0.001
	Perceived Susceptibility	11.92	2.17	9.74	0.83	10.44	1.40	< 0.001
	Perceived Severity	11.63	1.48	9.64	0.76	13.15	1.76	< 0.001
	Perceived Barriers	25.56	4.21	24.62	1.87	2.26	0.30	0.025
	Perceived Benefits	5.43	1.38	4.73	0.70	4.96	0.67	< 0.001
	Self-Efficacy	3.92	0.80	3.94	0.60	0.212	- 0.03	0.832
	Cues	5.84	1.92	4.52	0.93	6.82	0.91	< 0.001
	Hoarding	4.83	2.84	2.77	0.62	7.98	1.07	< 0.001
	Checking	3.12	1.82	2.82	0.54	1.77	0.24	0.117
	Ordering	5.28	2.16	4.67	0.86	2.93	0.39	0.004
	Neutralizing	1.06	0.94	0.89	0.82	1.45	0.19	0.149
	Washing	6.87	2.16	2.05	0.30	25.08	3.36	< 0.001
	Obsessing	5.56	2.88	2.61	0.50	11.42	1.53	< 0.001
	OCS Total	25.50	9.41	15.81	1.33	11.54	1.55	< 0.001
	Variables	FIM+ (n = 98)		FIM– (n = 129)		T	Cohen d	**P**
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
T2	PHQ-9	6.67	4.24	7.22	2.95	1.14	- 0.15	0.250
	IES-R	21.37	10.66	20.07	1.23	1.37	0.18	0.171
	Perceived Susceptibility	10.10	2.13	10.03	0.66	1.46	0.30	0.162
	Perceived Severity	9.97	2.39	9.59	0.59	1.82	0.31	0.069
	Perceived Barriers	24.98	3.13	24.60	1.64	1.48	0.59	0.155

Perceived Benefits	5.32	1.53	5.21	0.68	1.09	0.59	0.208
Self-Efficacy	3.71	0.98	3.78	0.47	0.616	-0.10	0.538
Cues	5.57	1.82	5.01	0.86	1.87	0.36	0.079
Hoarding	2.54	1.47	2.75	0.43	1.54	- 0.21	0.124
Checking	3.09	1.62	2.77	1.64	1.48	0.20	0.139
Ordering	4.25	1.42	4.16	0.84	1.11	0.45	0.254
Neutralizing	1.01	0.89	0.88	0.79	1.90	0.28	0.059
Washing	3.09	1.64	2.88	0.95	1.47	0.32	0.140
Obsessing	2.71	1.78	2.69	0.50	0.148	0.02	0.882
OCS Total	16.10	4.67	15.81	2.14	0.620	0.08	0.536

Note: FIM+ = Families with an Infected Member; FIM– = Families without an Infected Member; PHQ-9 = Patient Health Questionnaire-9; IES-R = Impact of Events Scale-Revised; OCS = Obsessive-Compulsive Symptoms.

As outlined in Table 3, the groups differ in all components except for self-efficacy, checking, and neutralizing at T1. Although there are no differences in outcomes between the two groups at T2, the results indicate that the FIM+ group's mean OCS changes are significantly greater than the FIM– group's (-9.40 ± 2.2 vs. 0.01 ± 2.17, P < 0.001).

3. Differences between Groups in Demographic Characteristics According to OCS Changes

The means, standard deviations, and P-values for OCS changes in terms of demographical variables for the two groups are represented in Table 4. The table shows that levels of factors such as having a vulnerable family member, educational background, and forms of caring for a COVID-19-infected member significantly differ when OCS changes are considered as outcomes only in the FIM+ group. There are no significant differences in OCS changes between the levels of demographic characteristics in FIM–.

Table 4. The Demographic Characteristics of the Families with an Infected Member and Families without an Infected Member According to Obsessive-Compulsive Symptoms Changes

Demographic	Level	FIM+ (n = 98)		FIM– (n = 129)	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Gender	Female	- 9.35	4.84	0.28	2.86
	Male	- 9.42	10.37	- 0.16	1.66
		T (df)	0.03 (96)	T (df)	1.1 (127)
		P	0.974	P	0.272
Marital Status	Married	- 7.68	10.51	- 0.25	1.58
	Single	- 11.19	7.31	0.19	2.53
		T (df)	1.91 (96)	T (df)	1.15 (127)
		P	0.059	P	0.254
Educational Levels	Diploma	- 13.25	3.68	- 0.02	1.54
	Bachelor's degree	- 11.75	6.86	0.05	2.73
	High-level education	- 1.32	11.72	- 0.13	1.25
		F (df_1, df_2)	17.58 (2,95)	F (df_1, df_2)	0.045 (2,126)
		P	< 0.001	P	0.956
Is your job related to COVID-19?	Related	- 13.00	3.32	0.77	3.34
	Unrelated	- 8.75	9.78	- 0.19	1.73
		T (df)	1.66 (96)	T (df)	1.97 (127)
		P	0.100	P	0.050
Do you work from home?	Yes	- 5.20	8.99	- 0.15	3.10
	No	- 10.16	9.10	0.07	1.60
		T (df)	1.95 (96)	T (df)	0.52 (127)

		P	0.055	P	0.600
Having a vulnerable family member in your home?	Yes	- 7.02	10.22	- 0.30	1.68
	No	- 14.31	3.03	0.17	2.39
		T (df)	3.94 (96)	T (df)	1.19 (127)
		P	< 0.001	P	0.237
Having psychiatric disorders?	Yes	- 9.33	9.34	- 0.02	2.18
	No	- 11.67	1.15	1.50	0.71
		T (df)	0.43 (96)	T (df)	0.99 (127)
		P	0.667	P	0.326
Percentage of lung infection at T1	30-50%	- 9.77	10.33		
	50-70%	- 8.17	8.00		
	Over 70%	- 12.11	6.27		
		F (df1, df2)	0.752 (2,95)		
		P	0.474		
Percentage of lung infection at T2	10-30%	- 9.37	9.38		
	30-50%	- 9.83	6.65		
		T (df)	0.787 (87)		
		P	0.434		
Form of Caring of COVID-19 infected member	Primary	- 10.41	9.14		
	Secondary	- 5.91	8.78		
		T (df)	2.05 (96)		
		P	0.043		

Note: FIM+ = Families with an Infected Member; FIM– = Families without an Infected Member.

Table 4 shows that individuals with lower educational levels experienced more significant OCS changes than those with higher educational backgrounds in FIM+. Moreover, individuals in FIM+ who reported not having a vulnerable family member in their homes exhibited the most significant changes in OCS. Additionally, primary caregivers indicated a significantly more reduction in OCS changes than secondary caregivers at T2.

4. Correlations between Demographic Characteristics, PHQ-9, IES-R, and Health Beliefs with OCS Changes

As shown in Table 5, all T1 scores, except for age, were significantly related to changes in OCS in the FIM+ group. Except for depressive symptoms and perceived barriers which had significant negative relationships with OCS changes, most variables had significant positive relationships with OCS changes in this group. Only self-efficacy demonstrated a significant positive correlation with OCS changes in the FIM– group. When changes in health beliefs are calculated over time (T1-T2), the results indicate that perceived susceptibility and severity changes have significant correlations with OCS changes in the FIM+ group, whereas perceived barriers changes have significant negative correlations with OCS changes. On the other hand, there is a positive, meaningful relationship between perceived benefits changes and OCS changes in FIM– group.

5. Prediction of OCS Changes

Only individuals in the FIM+ group reported significant changes in OCS; thus, health beliefs at T1 were used to predict OCS changes in the group. Our analysis revealed that having vulnerable family members and educational levels are significantly associated with changes in OCS; the authors, therefore, include these variables as covariates in addition to the IES-R and PHQ-9 at T1.

Table 5. Pearson Correlation Coefficients of the Study Variables, and Obsessive-Compulsive Symptoms Changes According to the Families with an Infected Member and Families without an Infected Member

Variables	FIM+ (n = 98)		FIM– (n = 129)	
	r	P-Value	r	P-Value
IES-R	0.20	0.047	- 0.13	0.137
PHQ-9	- 0.30	0.002	0.17	0.060

Age	0.16	0.113	0.06	0.481
Perceived Susceptibility	0.48	< 0.001	- 0.02	0.854
Perceived Severity	0.54	< 0.001	0.04	0.679
Perceived Barriers	- 0.57	< 0.001	- 0.14	0.107
Perceived Benefits	0.36	< 0.001	0.07	0.436
Self-Efficacy	0.28	0.005	0.21	0.015
Cues	0.21	0.042	- 0.11	0.219
Perceived Susceptibility Changes	0.74	< 0.001	0.10	0.281
Perceived Severity Changes	0.64	< 0.001	0.05	0.567
Perceived Barriers Changes	- 0.42	< 0.001	- 0.12	0.163
Perceived Benefits Changes	0.17	0.097	0.34	< 0.001
Self-Efficacy Changes	0.17	0.091	- 0.06	0.503
Cues Changes	- 0.18	0.084	- 0.03	0.719

Note: FIM+ = Families with an Infected Member; FIM– = Families without an Infected Member; PHQ-9 = Patient Health Questionnaire-9; IES-R = Impact of Events Scale-Revised.

Table 6. Predictors of Obsessive-Compulsive Symptoms Changes

Variables	β	Std. Error	B	T-Value	P-Value	R	R^2
Perceived Susceptibility	- 0.60	0.41	- 0.14	- 1.46	0.149		
Perceived Severity	2.20	0.44	0.57	5.01	< 0.001		
Perceived Barriers	- 0.53	0.29	- 0.18	- 1.83	0.071	0.41	0.17
Perceived Benefits	- 0.05	0.53	- 0.01	- 0.10	0.919		
Self-Efficacy	3.16	0.66	0.34	4.79	< 0.001		
Cues	0.14	0.36	0.03	0.40	0.689		

Note: The result presented by controlling IES-R (β ± SE = 0.11 ± 0.07), PHQ-9 (β ± SE = -0.86 ± 0.16), Educational levels (β ± SE = 3.77 ± 0.97), and Vulnerable family member (β ± SE = -0.2 ± 1.4197); Std. Error = Standard Error.

Perceived severity and self-efficacy remained significant predictors in the regression model after controlling for covariates, as shown in Table 6. The greater the severity and self-efficacy perceived at T1, the greater the decline in OCS from T1 to T2. Additionally, these health beliefs were found to be capable of predicting 17% of the variance (R^2) in OCS changes.

Discussion

The primary objective of this study was to determine whether contracting COVID-19 and then recovering from it in a family member changes OCS in other members, and to what extent these changes are dependent on health beliefs and demographic characteristics.

The results demonstrated that a family member's infection with COVID-19 increases the OCS in other members and the perceived severity and self-efficacy predicted a significant reduction in OCS. The findings corroborate recent research on healthcare workers who encountered COVID-19 patients (e.g., 18). Prior research indicated that confronting infected patients increased PTS and depressive symptoms in healthcare workers (19, 46). Thus, our results are promising because the current study controlled PTS, depressive symptoms, and even COVID-19-related demographic characteristics such as percentage of lung infection and form of care. At T1, individuals in the FIM+ group reacted to COVID-19 similarly to healthcare workers.

Previous research has established that during the recent pandemic, individuals with obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD) experienced an increase in OCS (47). In the current study, individuals without OCD also reported having elevated OCS scores in response to COVID-19 in a family member (96.9% of FIM+ reported having no psychiatric disorders; see Table 1). At T1, the FIM+ group scored significantly higher than the FIM– group in OCI-R and even exceeded the clinical threshold for OCD (32), suggesting a temporary overreaction to exposure to and care for patients with COVID-19 (48). However, the scores remained below the average for OCD patients (32). The present study indicated an increase in specific OCS dimensions such as washing probably as a result of health organizations' promotion of similar behaviors or fear of germs in FIM+ at T1. Furthermore, the uncertain future of this traumatic event and elevated intrusive thoughts may have increased obsessions in FIM+ at T1 (49, 50). Consequently, they had greater scores in hoarding, probably due to the traumatic event that occurred in their families (51).

Furthermore, our results indicated increased scores in the ordering subtype in FIM+ compared to FIM– at T1. Ordering is one of the most prevalent subtypes of OCD in Iranian people (52). Likely individuals in the FIM+ interpreted certain ordering items (e.g., "I get upset if others rearrange my things") as they did the washing items. This probably occurs because they are at risk of a contagious disease, and changing the order of things is equal to touching these objects. Moreover, when the FIM+ group observed adverse impacts of COVID-19, they had a meaningfully raised risk of PTS and depressive symptoms (19), which elevated OCS in FIM+. In addition to PTS and depressive disorders, all subtypes of OCS decreased after family members in FIM+ recovered from COVID-19 at T2, as individuals in FIM+ perceived less risk of COVID-19 transmission in comparison to T1.

In contrast to Lossen *et al*. (53), the authors found that the FIM+ group did not significantly engage in more checking and neutralization than the FIM– group at T1. Cox and Olatunji (54) confirmed that elevating in OCS was only reported in washing and hoarding subtypes rather than checking and neutralizing. It is possible that checking behaviors such as checking out windows and gas faucets had nothing to do with COVID-19 concerns. Furthermore, the FIM+ group did not believe they needed to neutralize negative thoughts through strategies such as counting.

Additionally, the result showed that FIM+ scores at T1 in terms of taking the disease seriously (perceived severity) and believing in their ability to overcome it (self-efficacy) predict a 17% reduction in OCS.

According to the health belief model, when people believe that they are at risk of contracting serious diseases, they are more likely to engage in health behaviors, especially when they face fewer barriers and reap greater benefits from those behaviors (55). Our findings showed that all health beliefs, except for self-efficacy, were higher in FIM+ than in the FIM– group at T1. Confronting an infected family member and hosting vulnerable patients may be sufficient conditions to increase perceived susceptibility in the FIM+ group. As a result, individuals in the FIM+ group are more likely to be concerned about the seriousness of COVID-19 while also perceiving the pandemic's high fatality rate. A growing body of research suggests significant associations between health beliefs and preventive behaviors during COVID-19 (56, 57). Our study generalized these findings to the excessive type of preventive behaviors which appeared in OCS.

At T1, individuals in the FIM+ group also realize more problems and more advantages when performing preventive behaviors, and they would be more likely to attend to COVID-19-related information (i.e., higher cues to action scores) probably because of their distress (more PTS in FIM+) (58). At T2, individuals in FIM+ worry significantly less about being at risk of being infected with COVID-19, and through their experiences, they may not believe that the pandemic is as deadly as they imagined before (lesser scores of FIM+ in perceived susceptibility and severity at T2, respectively; see Table 3).

Additionally, an increase in perceived susceptibility and severity changes and a decrease in perceived barrier changes were found to be significantly associated with an increase in OCS changes. In line with this, recent research emphasized the role of the aforementioned health beliefs in preventive behaviors (14, 56). The findings underscore the need for addressing health beliefs in interventions to reduce OCS in people.

Intriguingly, having a COVID-19 patient in the family did not substantially affect self-efficacy in FIM+. In contrast to our findings, Hsing *et al*. (59) stated that self-efficacy correlated with preventive behaviors for COVID-19. Self-efficacy appears to promote normal preventive behaviors rather than excessive ones. Consistent with this, Gelfand and Radomsky (60) found a significant association between low self-efficacy and a long period of excessive washing. Furthermore, Voderholzer *et al*. (61) concluded that self-efficacy is the primary mediator of the relationship between treatment effects and outcomes in OCD. Following Voderholzer *et al*. (61), the present study showed that self-efficacy scores in FIM+ at T1 were meaningfully associated with reducing OCS at T2. It is unclear to what extent these results could generalize to patients with OCD, and we suggest future studies examine the role of health beliefs on response to treatment in this sample (e.g., 62).

The results also revealed that individuals in the FIM+ are more likely to work out of the home. It seems that the higher risk of COVID-19 infection in FIM+ is partly a result of the violation of some preventive behaviors such as working from home in this group (15) (see Table 1). In addition, as some individuals in FIM+ reported that they could work from home or in an office but preferred to work in an office, they may prefer to work away from a stressful environment in their families (63, 64) (see Table 3 for a comparison of PTS in FIM+ and FIM–). Leaving home to manage stress may increase the risk of transmitting COVID-19 to others which in turn can increase worry and OCS in them and it seems to create a vicious cycle.

Additionally, the FIM+ group was found to be older than FIM–. This may account for the fact that FIM+ reported that they have more family members with vulnerable conditions. However, none of the participants in the current study were over the age of 50. Consequently, a higher number of vulnerable family members may be reported in FIM+ due to other factors such as assistance-seeking (65). Additionally, primary caregivers showed significantly greater OCS changes than secondary caregivers. This is confirmed temporary and high psychological distress in people who frequently confront infected patients (e.g., 20).

Drawing on the work of Mahaffey *et al*. (66), the authors assumed that having a vulnerable family member in one's home and lower educational attainment are associated

with higher OCS changes. In other words, individuals in the FIM+ group who have vulnerable family members and higher educational attainment experienced higher OCS at T1 and fewer changes in OCS from T1 to T2. Bik-Multanowska *et al*. (67) stated that families with chronic illness patients viewed COVID-19 as a risk; thus, individuals in FIM+ who had vulnerable family members exhibited naturally higher OCS at both T1 and T2. In general, these findings shed light on at-risk populations during the pandemic and they underscore the importance of continued support for families with chronic patients long after the pandemic's stressful period has passed.

Limitation

The current study examines multiple demographic characteristics and health beliefs through a longitudinal study; the findings should be interpreted in light of several limitations. Initially, and unexpectedly, only one participant contracted COVID-19 during the assessment period. Particularly in the FIM+ group, the risk of infection was relatively high, but infection may have not been self-reported due to the fear of stigmatization (e.g., 68) or because the disease was asymptomatic, representing a limitation. However, 78 individuals in the FIM– group were located in areas where sampling of FIM+ was performed. Thus, if any of these individuals contact COVID-19, the sampling centers notify us, as patients should be referred to these centers. According to reports of the centers, none of the FIM– groups had referred to these centers during the sampling period. Therefore, it is assumed that most FIM– had not COVID-19 or recovered at the time of sampling. Second, the authors assessed outcomes using self-report measures, introducing social desirability bias into the study. Third, the online assessment made it difficult to control situational factors that could affect completion and responses. Fourth, the two groups lacked pre-pandemic data; thus, no conclusions about both groups' data prior to the pandemic could be drawn. However, the longitudinal study allows for the tracking of changes in outcomes.

Conclusion

The current study that was conducted two years after the beginning of COVID-19 showed that people without OCD are also susceptible to temporarily suffering from high OCS when one of their significant others got infected with COVID-19. In addition, the present research highlights the role of demographic characteristics such as having vulnerable patients at home in response to this traumatic event and recovering from it. The findings emphasized the need for addressing health beliefs like perceived severity and self-efficacy for treating psychopathology during the pandemic.

Acknowledgment

We would like to express our deep and sincere gratitude to our research supervisor, Professor Lena Jelinek, for providing invaluable guidance throughout this research. We would also like to thank all families and the health centers' internal managers who passionately cooperated with the research team for participating in the present study.

Conflict of Interest

None.

References

1. Wheaton MG, Messner GR, Marks JB. Intolerance of uncertainty as a factor linking obsessive-compulsive symptoms, health anxiety and concerns about the spread of the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) in the United States. J Obsessive Compuls Relat Disord. 2021;28:100605.
2. Akbarpour S, Nakhostin-Ansari A, Sadeghniiat Haghighi K, Etesam F, Alemohammad ZB, Aghajani F, et al. COVID-19 Fear Association with Depression, Anxiety, and Insomnia: A National Web-Based Survey on the General Population. Iran J Psychiatry. 2022;17(1):24-34.
3. Pardamean E, Roan W, Iskandar KTA, Prayangga R, Hariyanto TI. Mortality from coronavirus disease 2019 (Covid-19) in patients with schizophrenia: A systematic review, meta-analysis and meta-regression. Gen Hosp Psychiatry. 2022;75:61-7.
4. Vindegaard N, Benros ME. COVID-19 pandemic and mental health consequences: Systematic review of the current evidence. Brain Behav Immun. 2020;89:531-42.
5. Honein MA, Christie A, Rose DA, Brooks JT, Meaney-Delman D, Cohn A, et al. Summary of Guidance for Public Health Strategies to Address High Levels of Community Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and Related Deaths, December 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2020;69(49):1860-1867.
6. Banerjee DD. The other side of COVID-19: Impact on obsessive compulsive disorder (OCD) and hoarding. Psychiatry Res. 2020;288:112966.
7. Samuels J, Holingue C, Nestadt PS, Bienvenu OJ, Phan P, Nestadt G. Contamination-related behaviors, obsessions, and compulsions during the COVID-19 pandemic in a United States population sample. J Psychiatr Res. 2021;138:155-62.
8. Khosravani V, Aardema F, Samimi Ardestani SM, Sharifi Bastan F. The impact of the coronavirus pandemic on specific symptom dimensions and severity in OCD: A comparison before and during COVID-19 in the context of stress responses. J Obsessive Compuls Relat Disord. 2021;29:100626.

9. Abba-Aji A, Li D, Hrabok M, Shalaby R, Gusnowski A, Vuong W, et al. COVID-19 Pandemic and Mental Health: Prevalence and Correlates of New-Onset Obsessive-Compulsive Symptoms in a Canadian Province. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2020;17(19).
10. Zaccari V, D'Arienzo MC, Caiazzo T, Magno A, Amico G, Mancini F. Narrative Review of COVID-19 Impact on Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder in Child, Adolescent and Adult Clinical Populations. Front Psychiatry. 2021;12:673161.
11. Jelinek L, Moritz S, Miegel F, Voderholzer U. Obsessive-compulsive disorder during COVID-19: Turning a problem into an opportunity? J Anxiety Disord. 2021;77:102329.
12. Jelinek L, Voderholzer U, Moritz S, Carsten HP, Riesel A, Miegel F. When a nightmare comes true: Change in obsessive-compulsive disorder over the first months of the COVID-19 pandemic. J Anxiety Disord. 2021;84:102493.
13. Hubbard G, den Daas C, Johnston M, Dixon D. Sociodemographic and Psychological Risk Factors for Anxiety and Depression: Findings from the Covid-19 Health and Adherence Research in Scotland on Mental Health (CHARIS-MH) Cross-sectional Survey. Int J Behav Med. 2021;28(6):788-800.
14. Jose R, Narendran M, Bindu A, Beevi N, L M, Benny PV. Public perception and preparedness for the pandemic COVID 19: A Health Belief Model approach. Clin Epidemiol Glob Health. 2021;9:41-6.
15. Wong EL, Ho KF, Dong D, Cheung AW, Yau PS, Chan EY, et al. Compliance with Standard Precautions and Its Relationship with Views on Infection Control and Prevention Policy among Healthcare Workers during COVID-19 Pandemic. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021;18(7).
16. Jelinek L, Röhrig G, Moritz S, Göritz AS, Voderholzer U, Riesel A, et al. Unrealistic pessimism and obsessive-compulsive symptoms during the COVID-19 pandemic: Two longitudinal studies. Br J Clin Psychol. 2022;61(3):816-35.
17. Cisler JM, Brady RE, Olatunji BO, Lohr JM. Disgust and Obsessive Beliefs in Contamination-related OCD. Cognit Ther Res. 2010;34(5):439-48.
18. Dai Y, Hu G, Xiong H, Qiu H, Yuan X. Psychological impact of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak on healthcare workers in China. medrxiv. 2020:2020.03. 03.20030874.
19. Zhu Z, Xu S, Wang H, Liu Z, Wu J, Li G, et al. COVID-19 in Wuhan: Sociodemographic characteristics and hospital support measures associated with the immediate psychological impact on healthcare workers. EClinicalMedicine. 2020;24:100443.
20. Kisely S, Warren N, McMahon L, Dalais C, Henry I, Siskind D. Occurrence, prevention, and management of the psychological effects of emerging virus outbreaks on healthcare workers: rapid review and meta-analysis. Bmj. 2020;369:m1642.
21. Cao W, Fang Z, Hou G, Han M, Xu X, Dong J, et al. The psychological impact of the COVID-19 epidemic on college students in China. Psychiatry Res. 2020;287:112934.
22. Tsai FJ, Hu YJ, Chen CY, Tseng CC, Yeh GL, Cheng JF. Using the health belief model to explore nursing students' relationships between COVID-19 knowledge, health beliefs, cues to action, self-efficacy, and behavioral intention: A cross-sectional survey study. Medicine (Baltimore). 2021;100(11):e25210.
23. Wong MCS, Wong ELY, Huang J, Cheung AWL, Law K, Chong MKC, et al. Acceptance of the COVID-19 vaccine based on the health belief model: A population-based survey in Hong Kong. Vaccine. 2021;39(7):1148-56.
24. Wang X, Che Q, Ji X, Meng X, Zhang L, Jia R, et al. Correlation between lung infection severity and clinical laboratory indicators in patients with COVID-19: a cross-sectional study based on machine learning. BMC Infect Dis. 2021;21(1):192.
25. Asmundson GJG, Paluszek MM, Landry CA, Rachor GS, McKay D, Taylor S. Do pre-existing anxiety-related and mood disorders differentially impact COVID-19 stress responses and coping? J Anxiety Disord. 2020;74:102271.
26. Quilty BJ, Clifford S, Hellewell J, Russell TW, Kucharski AJ, Flasche S, et al. Quarantine and testing strategies in contact tracing for SARS-CoV-2: a modelling study. Lancet Public Health. 2021;6(3):e175-e183.
27. Woodruff A. COVID-19 Follow up Testing. J Infect. 2020;81(4):647-79.
28. Knowles KA, Olatunji BO. Anxiety and safety behavior usage during the COVID-19 pandemic: The prospective role of contamination fear. J Anxiety Disord. 2021;77:102323.
29. Zhang M, Li Q, Du X, Zuo D, Ding Y, Tan X, et al. Health Behavior Toward COVID-19: The Role of Demographic Factors, Knowledge, and Attitude Among Chinese College Students During the Quarantine Period. Asia Pac J Public Health. 2020;32(8):533-5.
30. Hawryluck L, Gold WL, Robinson S, Pogorski S, Galea S, Styra R. SARS control and psychological effects of quarantine, Toronto, Canada. Emerg Infect Dis. 2004;10(7):1206-12.
31. Birimoglu Okuyan C, Begen MA. Working from home during the COVID-19 pandemic, its effects on health, and recommendations: The pandemic and beyond. PPC. 2022;58(1):173-9.
32. Foa EB, Huppert JD, Leiberg S, Langner R, Kichic R, Hajcak G, et al. The Obsessive-Compulsive Inventory: development and validation of a short version. Psychol Assess. 2002;14(4):485-96.
33. Abramowitz JS, Deacon BJ. Psychometric properties and construct validity of the Obsessive-Compulsive Inventory--Revised: Replication and extension with a clinical sample. J Anxiety Disord. 2006;20(8):1016-35.
34. Huppert JD, Walther MR, Hajcak G, Yadin E, Foa EB, Simpson HB, et al. The OCI-R: validation of

the subscales in a clinical sample. J Anxiety Disord. 2007;21(3):394-406.
35. Mohammadi A, Zamani R, Fata L. Validation of the Persian version of the obsessive-compulsive inventory-revised in a student sample. Psychol. Res. 2008;11(1-2):66-78.
36. Shahnazi H, Ahmadi-Livani M, Pahlavanzadeh B, Rajabi A, Hamrah MS, Charkazi A. Assessing preventive health behaviors from COVID-19: a cross sectional study with health belief model in Golestan Province, Northern of Iran. Infect Dis Poverty. 2020;9(1):157.
37. Rosenstock IM, Strecher VJ, Becker MH. Social learning theory and the Health Belief Model. Health Educ Q. 1988;15(2):175-83.
38. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JB. The PHQ-9: validity of a brief depression severity measure. J Gen Intern Med. 2001;16(9):606-13.
39. Martin A, Rief W, Klaiberg A, Braehler E. Validity of the Brief Patient Health Questionnaire Mood Scale (PHQ-9) in the general population. Gen Hosp Psychiatry. 2006;28(1):71-7.
40. Farrahi H, Gharraee B, Oghabian MA, Zare R, Pirmoradi MR, Najibi SM, et al. The Study of Psychometric Properties of the Persian Version of the Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9) Among Students of Guilan University of Medical Sciences in the Academic Year 2017-18. IJPCP. 2020:0-.
41. Weiss DS. The impact of event scale: revised. Cross-cultural assessment of psychological trauma and PTSD: Springer; 2007. p. 219-38.
42. Beck JG, Grant DM, Read JP, Clapp JD, Coffey SF, Miller LM, et al. The impact of event scale-revised: psychometric properties in a sample of motor vehicle accident survivors. J Anxiety Disord. 2008;22(2):187-98.
43. Bienvenu OJ, Williams JB, Yang A, Hopkins RO, Needham DM. Posttraumatic stress disorder in survivors of acute lung injury: evaluating the Impact of Event Scale-Revised. Chest. 2013;144(1):24-31.
44. Panaghi L, Mogadam JA. Persian version validation in impact of event Scale-Revised. TUMJ TUMS Publications. 2006;64(3):52-60.
45. Stengler-Wenzke K, Beck M, Holzinger A, Angermeyer MC. [Stigma experiences of patients with obsessive compulsive disorders]. Fortschr Neurol Psychiatr. 2004;72(1):7-13.
46. Wu P, Fang Y, Guan Z, Fan B, Kong J, Yao Z, et al. The psychological impact of the SARS epidemic on hospital employees in China: exposure, risk perception, and altruistic acceptance of risk. Can J Psychiatry. 2009;54(5):302-11.
47. Silva RM, Shavitt RG, Costa DL. Obsessive-compulsive disorder during the COVID-19 pandemic. Braz J Psychiatry. 2020;43(1):108.
48. Bahçecioğlu Turan G, Köse S, Aksoy M. Analysis of nursing students' obsessive and coping behaviors during the COVID-19 pandemic. PPC. 2021;57(4):1628-36.
49. Arnáez S, García-Soriano G, López-Santiago J, Belloch A. Dysfunctional beliefs as mediators between illness-related intrusive thoughts and health anxiety symptoms. Behav Cogn Psychother. 2020;48(3):315-26.
50. Acenowr CP, Coles ME. OCD during COVID-19: Understanding clinical and non-clinical anxiety in the community. Psychiatry Res. 2021;300:113910.
51. Cromer KR, Schmidt NB, Murphy DL. Do traumatic events influence the clinical expression of compulsive hoarding? Behav Res Ther. 2007;45(11):2581-92.
52. Ghassemzadeh H, Mojtabai R, Khamseh A, Ebrahimkhani N, Issazadegan AA, Saif-Nobakht Z. Symptoms of obsessive-compulsive disorder in a sample of Iranian patients. Int J Soc Psychiatry. 2002;48(1):20-8.
53. Loosen AM, Skvortsova V, Hauser TU. Obsessive-compulsive symptoms and information seeking during the Covid-19 pandemic. Transl Psychiatry. 2021;11(1):309.
54. Cox RC, Olatunji BO. Linking insomnia and OCD symptoms during the coronavirus pandemic: Examination of prospective associations. J Anxiety Disord. 2021;77:102341.
55. Rosenstock IM. Historical origins of the health belief model. Health Educ Monogr. 1974;2(4):328-35.
56. Smail E, Schneider KE, DeLong SM, Willis K, Arrington-Sanders R, Yang C, et al. Health Beliefs and Preventive Behaviors Among Adults During the Early COVID-19 Pandemic in the United States: a Latent Class Analysis. Prev Sci. 2021;22(8):1013-22.
57. Rodriguez M, López-Cepero A, Ortiz-Martínez AP, Fernández-Repollet E, Pérez CM. Influence of Health Beliefs on COVID-19 Vaccination among Individuals with Cancer and Other Comorbidities in Puerto Rico. Vaccines (Basel). 2021;9(9).
58. Hwang J, Borah P, Shah D, Brauer M. The Relationship among COVID-19 Information Seeking, News Media Use, and Emotional Distress at the Onset of the Pandemic. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021;18(24).
59. Hsing JC, Ma J, Barrero-Castillero A, Jani SG, Pulendran UP, Lin BJ, et al. Influence of Health Beliefs on Adherence to COVID-19 Preventative Practices: International, Social Media-Based Survey Study. J Med Internet Res. 2021;23(2):e23720.
60. Gelfand LA, Radomsky AS. Beliefs about control and the persistence of cleaning behaviour: an experimental analysis. J Behav Ther Exp Psychiatry. 2013;44(2):172-8.
61. Voderholzer U, Hilbert S, Fischer A, Neumüller J, Schwartz C, Hessler-Kaufmann JB. Frequency and level of self-efficacy predict the effectiveness of therapist- and self-guided exposure in obsessive compulsive disorder. Behav Cogn Psychother. 2020;48(6):751-5.
62. Salmani B, Mancini F, Hasani J, Zanjani Z. Anti-Disgust Cognitive Behavioral Therapy for Contamination-Based Obsessive Compulsive Disorder: A Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial. J Clin Med. 2022;11(10).

63. Hersch RK, Cook RF, Deitz DK, Kaplan S, Hughes D, Friesen MA, et al. Reducing nurses' stress: A randomized controlled trial of a web-based stress management program for nurses. Appl Nurs Res. 2016;32:18-25.
64. Zhang SX, Sun S, Afshar Jahanshahi A, Alvarez-Risco A, Ibarra VG, Li J, et al. Developing and testing a measure of COVID-19 organizational support of healthcare workers - results from Peru, Ecuador, and Bolivia. Psychiatry Res. 2020;291:113174.
65. Aldalaykeh M, Al-Hammouri MM, Rababah J, Al-Dwaikat T. COVID-19 Help-Seeking Behaviors: Application of the Theory of Planned Behavior. Psychol Belg. 2021;61(1):391-400.
66. Mahaffey BL, Levinson A, Preis H, Lobel M. Elevated risk for obsessive-compulsive symptoms in women pregnant during the COVID-19 pandemic. Arch Womens Ment Health. 2022;25(2):367-76.
67. Bik-Multanowska K, Mikocka-Walus A, Fernando J, Westrupp E. Mental distress of parents with chronic diseases during the COVID-19 pandemic in Australia: A prospective cohort study. J Psychosom Res. 2021;152:110688.
68. Gronholm PC, Nosé M, van Brakel WH, Eaton J, Ebenso B, Fiekert K, et al. Reducing stigma and discrimination associated with COVID-19: early stage pandemic rapid review and practical recommendations. Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci. 2021;30:e15.