

Evaluation of Online Medical Education During COVID-19 Pandemic in Shanghai—A Prospective Study

Yaxiang Song

Center for Nephrology and Clinical Metabolomics and Division of Nephrology and Rheumatology, Shanghai Tenth People's Hospital, Tongji University School of Medicine, Shanghai, PR China.

Shu Wang

Center for Nephrology and Clinical Metabolomics and Division of Nephrology and Rheumatology, Shanghai Tenth People's Hospital, Tongji University School of Medicine, Shanghai, PR China.

Yixian Liu

Center for Nephrology and Clinical Metabolomics and Division of Nephrology and Rheumatology, Shanghai Tenth People's Hospital, Tongji University School of Medicine, Shanghai, PR China.

Xinying Liu (✉ liuxinying@tongji.edu.cn)

Center for Nephrology and Clinical Metabolomics and Division of Nephrology and Rheumatology, Shanghai Tenth People's Hospital, Tongji University School of Medicine, Shanghai, PR China.

Ai Peng

Center for Nephrology and Clinical Metabolomics and Division of Nephrology and Rheumatology, Shanghai Tenth People's Hospital, Tongji University School of Medicine, Shanghai, PR China.

Research Article

Keywords: medical students and teachers, COVID-19, online teaching, questionnaire, prospective study

Posted Date: May 26th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-498666/v1>

License:   This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

1 Evaluation of Online Medical Education during COVID-19
2 Pandemic in Shanghai: A Prospective Study

3

4 *Yaxiang Song^{*}, Shu Wang^{*}, Yixian Liu, Xinying Liu[#] and Ai Peng*

5

6 *Center for Nephrology and Clinical Metabolomics and Division of Nephrology and Rheumatology,*
7 *Shanghai Tenth People's Hospital, Tongji University School of Medicine, Shanghai, PR China.*

8

9 **Authors contributed equally to this work*

10

11 ***#Correspondence:** Xinying Liu, Department of Nephrology & Rheumatology, Shanghai Tenth*
12 *People's Hospital, Tongji University School of Medicine, Shanghai 200072, PR China. Tel: +86*
13 *21 66302524. E-mail address: liuxinying@tongji.edu.cn (Xinying Liu, M.D.).*

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 **Abstract:**

26 **Background:** The global popularity of COVID-19 has led China's universities to
27 conduct online teaching. However, the real feedback from medical teachers and
28 students regarding online education is unclear. The purpose of this study was to
29 investigate the characteristics and effectiveness of online teaching among teachers and
30 students in Medical School of Tongji University during the COVID-19 pandemic.

31 **Methods:** A prospective survey was conducted to investigate the current status on
32 online education among teachers and students in Medical School of Tongji
33 University.

34 **Results:** 1) 488 valid questionnaires were collected from 223 males (45.7%) and 265
35 females (54.3%), including 394 students (80.7%) and 94 teachers (19.3%). 2)
36 Although students thought that too much learning tasks were assigned in the mode of
37 online teaching, most of teachers and students endorse this teaching mode. 3) Male
38 students had better performance than female students in online class. 4) Compared
39 with male teachers, female teachers had less experience on online educational course
40 recording and teaching training. They had more difficulty in adapting to online
41 education. There was no significant difference in the acceptance of online teaching
42 among teachers in different age groups

43 **Conclusions:** 1) Most teachers and students supported and satisfied with the
44 implement of online education during the epidemic pandemic. Although teachers
45 were less adaptable to online education than students, they still had the positive
46 opinions. 2) Gender influenced the acceptance of online teaching. Male teachers and
47 students showed better adaptability than female counterpart. 3) Though online
48 teaching had advantages, it still cannot completely replace traditional offline teaching.

49

50 **Keywords:** medical students and teachers; COVID-19; online teaching; questionnaire;
51 prospective study

52 **Background**

53 Respiratory symptoms are the main manifestation of COVID-19, and patients may die
54 from ARDS (Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome)(1). Due to its rapid transmission
55 (2), strong infectivity (3), high mortality (4), and no specific drug (5), COVID-19 has
56 been spread around the world and been identified by the United Nations as PHEIC
57 (Public Health Emergency of International Concern) (7). In order to control the
58 pandemic, Chinese government has taken strict prevention measures such as
59 prohibiting gatherings, closing schools, isolating people at home and keeping social
60 distance(8). Therefore, online teaching has been completely adopted by Chinese
61 colleges and universities (9).

62 Previous studies have demonstrated that more than 40% SARS (Severe Acute
63 Respiratory Syndrome) survivors had PTSD (Post Traumatic Stress Disorder)(11),
64 and people isolating at home during the SARS epidemic had more stress and
65 depression (10). Therefore, similar to SARS, as a result of the limitation of activity
66 space and the lack of outside entertainment (12), home segregation during the
67 COVID-19 epidemic will also cause anxiety and irritability in the crowd.

68 Due to various courses and high professional requirements, medical students have
69 more severe anxiety and depression (13). Every year, 3% of the students in Peking
70 Union Medical College drop out of school due to psychological problems (14).
71 Among the college students, there are gender differences on psychological status
72 toward the pandemic (15). Female college students are more worried about health
73 during quarantine and returning to school on schedule after quarantine than male
74 students (16-17).

75 However, the real opinions on medical online education of both teachers and students
76 during the epidemic were still unclear. Thus, we investigated the current status of

77 online teaching in medical school of Tongji University during the pandemic via the
78 online questionnaire survey.

79

80 **Methods**

81 An online survey was conducted from March 24, 2020 to April 10, 2020.

82 Self-designed questionnaire were distributed to teachers and students in the School of

83 Medicine of Tongji University in anonymous way. All participants are above 18 years

84 old. The teachers and students received the questionnaire file via their social software

85 accounts and needed to fulfill the questionnaire within 2 weeks. During the valid

86 period, participants were repeatedly reminded to enroll as many subjects as possible.

87 The questionnaire had a total of 43 questions. Data were collected in age, gender,

88 psychological state, opinions of online teaching, learning and teaching effect and

89 suggestions towards online teaching in the future.

90 Questionnaire data with too short response time (less than 2 minutes) were excluded,

91 and the same person could only answer the questionnaire once. All the questionnaire

92 data were imported into SPSS 24.0 software and analyzed by chi-square test. $P < 0.05$

93 was regarded as statistically significant difference.

94

95 **Results**

96 **General information**

97 A total of 490 subjects responded, including 488 valid questionnaires with an

98 effective rate of 99.6%. There were 223 males (45.7%) and 265 females (54.3%),

99 including 394 students (80.7%) and 94 teachers (19.3%). Among all the teachers, 39

100 of those (41.5%) were under 40 years old. There was no statistical difference in the

101 age ratio between male and female teachers as well as in the number of students
 102 between different genders.

103

104 **Comparison of teachers' and students' opinions on online education**

105 There were no statistical differences between teachers and students in such aspects,
 106 including "Agreement with online teaching", "Opinions on online education",
 107 "Satisfaction with online teaching", "Expectation for normalization" and "Agreement
 108 about resource sharing between colleges". However, there were statistical differences
 109 in responses to questions such as "Good communication in online class"(47.9% in
 110 teachers vs. 29.7% in students, $P<0.05$), "Appropriate amount of learning tasks" (90.6%
 111 in teachers vs. 43.9% in students, $P<0.001$) and "Ideal efficiency of online education"
 112 (68.1% in teachers vs. 43.4% in students, $P<0.05$). (Table 1)

Table 1 Opinion comparison about online teaching between teachers and students

Question	Identity		Total(%) n=488	P value
	Student (%) N=394	Teacher (%) N=94		
Agreement with online teaching	353(89.6)	82(87.2)	435(89.1)	0.509
The views for online education				
Only an emergency measures	155(39.3)	37(39.4)	192(39.3)	0.999
Supplement to offline teaching	189(48.0)	50(53.2)	239(49.0)	0.363
Replacement of offline teaching	27(6.9)	5(5.3)	32(6.6)	0.59
Adaptation to online teaching	354(89.8)	77(81.1)	431(86.5)	0.017
Good communication in online class	117(29.7)	45(47.9)	162(33.2)	0.001
Appropriate amount of learning tasks	173(43.1)	85(90.4)	258(52.8)	<0.001
Ideal efficiency of online education	171(43.4)	64(68.1)	235(48.2)	<0.001

Satisfaction with online teaching	243(61.7)	53(60.7)	209(61.5)	0.625
Expectation for normalization	114(28.9)	25(26.6)	139(28.5)	0.652
Agreement about resource sharing	246(62.4)	66(70.2)	312(63.9)	0.158

between colleges

113

114 **Comparison on learning between male and female students**

115 Compared with females, male students had higher attendance rate (20% vs.10.1%),
 116 educational quality (27.6% vs. 15.3%), learning interest (27.6% vs. 14.9%), learning
 117 attention (29.2% vs. 14.4%), learning efficiency (30.2% vs. 16.7%), much more
 118 worrying about delaying study (82.5% vs. 73.5%) and degree of recognition for
 119 appropriate learning tasks (54.6% vs. 34.6%) ($P<0.05$). There was no significant
 120 difference in the following aspects, including “Agreement with online teaching”,
 121 “Good communication”, “Satisfaction with educational quality”, “Less exercise
 122 during quarantine”, “Irregular daily schedule”, “Anxiety moods”, “Spending extra
 123 time on electronic devices” and “Slack in online class” ($P>0.05$). (Table 2)

124

Table 2. Learning Effect of student in different gender about online learning

Item	Gender		Total(%) N=394	P value
	Male (%) N=183	Female (%) N=211		
The most concerned questions				
Delay in study	151(82.5)	155(73.5)	306(77.7)	0.031
Anxiety moods	132(72.1)	144(68.3)	276(70.1)	0.401
Irregular daily schedule	83(45.4)	97(46.0)	180(45.7)	0.903
Less exercise	74(47.0)	89(43.6)	163(41.4)	0.726
Agreement with the online teaching	158(86.3)	195(92.4)	353(89.6)	0.791
Spending extra time on electronic devices				

1-3 hours	46(24.9)	46(22.0)	92(23.4)	0.504
3-5 hours	77(41.6)	77(36.9)	154(39.1)	0.332
5-7 hours	39(21.1)	56(26.8)	95(24.1)	0.186
7-9 hours	11(6.0)	20(9.6)	31(7.9)	0.182
More time	12(6.5)	10(4.8)	22(5.6)	0.463
Attendance rate				
Reduced	24(13.0)	11(5.2)	35(8.9)	0.007
Unchanged	122(67.0)	179(84.7)	301(76.4)	<0.001
Rose	37(20.0)	21(10.1)	58(14.7)	0.005
Slack in online class	63(34.1)	67(32.1)	130(32.8)	0.674
Good communication	59(23.3)	58(27.5)	117(29.7)	0.303
Higher quality for online education	51(27.6)	32(15.3)	83(21.1)	0.003
Learning interest in online class				
Rose	51(27.6)	31(14.9)	82(20.8)	0.002
Unchanged	90(48.7)	124(59.3)	214(54.3)	0.034
Decreased	44(23.7)	54(25.8)	98(24.9)	0.638
Learning attention in online class				
Rose	54(29.2)	30(14.4)	84(21.3)	<0.001
Unchanged	61(33.0)	97(46.4)	158(40.1)	0.007
Decreased	70(37.9)	82(39.2)	152(38.6)	0.776
Better learning efficiency in class	56(30.2)	35(16.7)	91(23.1)	0.001
Appropriate learning tasks	100(54.6)	73(34.6)	173(43.1)	<0.001
Satisfaction with educational quality	125(68.3)	118(55.9)	243(91.7)	0.051

125

126 **Views of teachers in different gender and ages**

127 Compared with the male, female teachers had a lower proportion of votes on the
128 following aspects, including “No disagreement with online teaching” (55.6% vs.
129 77.5%), “Made preparation for online teaching” (70.4% vs. 87.5%), “Had record
130 experience before” (25.9% vs. 50%), “Had training for online teaching” (53.7%
131 vs.77.5%), and “Do not spend more time to prepare for the online class” (59.3% vs.
132 92.5%)($P < 0.05$). There was no significant difference of teachers’ age variation on
133 each question about online teaching ($P > 0.05$) (Table 3).

134

Table 3. Online teaching status of teachers

Item	Age Group		P Value	Gender		P Value
	<40 (%)	≥40 (%)		Male (%)	Female (%)	
	N=39	N=55		N=40	N=54	
Disagreement with online teaching	8(20.5)	5(9.1)	0.106	9(22.5)	24(44.4)	0.031
Had record experience	14(35.9)	20(36.4)	0.963	20(50.0)	14(25.9)	0.016
Understood the meaning of online teaching	23(59.0)	37(67.3)	0.409	30(75.0)	30(55.6)	0.052
Made preparation for online classes	30(76.9)	43(78.2)	0.885	35(87.5)	38(70.4)	0.049
Had training for online teaching	26(66.7)	34(61.8)	0.63	31(77.5)	29(53.7)	0.018
Adaptation to the online teaching	30(76.9)	47(85.5)	0.29	36(90.0)	41(75.9)	0.08
Did not spend longer time to prepare for the online class	29(74.4)	40(72.7)	0.86	37(92.5)	32(59.3)	<0.001
No influence on teaching enthusiasm	26(66.7)	40(72.7)	0.527	29(72.5)	37(68.5)	0.585
Achievement of ideal goals	27(69.2)	36(83.6)	0.701	30(75)	33(61.1)	0.127

135

136 Suggestions on future online teaching

137 Teachers hoped to improve the function of live broadcast software (70.2%),
138 strengthen the management of online learning (69.2%), make full use of current
139 online resources (55.3%) and upload supporting educational materials in time for the
140 reference (34.0%). Meanwhile, students hoped to optimize learning software (75.1%),
141 enhance online classroom experience (61.9%), and raise learning consciousness
142 (52.8%). Both teachers (67.0%) and students (59.1%) anticipate constructing the
143 resources sharing system of online teaching among different schools.

144

145 Discussion

146 Online teaching is Chinese government's initiative to prevent and control the spread
147 of COVID-19. Our research showed that the majority of teachers and students in

148 medical school supported online teaching during the epidemic. The main reasons were
149 as following: 1) Online teaching was able to effectively prevent the infection of
150 Covid-19; 2) All the students and teachers were satisfied with the government's
151 anti-epidemic work (20-21); 3) The network teaching could make the university
152 teaching work advance as scheduled; 4) Online teaching could relieve the anxiety of
153 medical students about quarantine and exert a positive effect on their mental health
154 (22-25).

155 In the process of online teaching, the majority of teachers and students could adapt to
156 the changes of teaching forms. However, teachers were less adaptable to online
157 teaching as compared with students. The elder people have less intelligence and
158 cognitive ability than the young and slow to accept new things (26). In addition, they
159 are less likely to put forward negative comments (28). Thus, teachers could be aware
160 of the shortcomings of online teaching and accurately estimate its effect.

161 Interestingly, there were significant differences in the adaptability and learning status
162 of online teaching between male and female in both teachers and students ($p < 0.05$).
163 Male teachers tended to be more adaptable to the form of online teaching. Male
164 students had higher learning satisfaction although their attendance rate was lower.
165 Males are generally more familiar with computers and more easily adaptable to online
166 teaching (17). Females usually have more sensitive emotions and higher demands on
167 themselves, which let them easier to be affected by stress (29-30). These gender
168 personality and characteristics may partly explain the differences.

169 In the present study, we found that students thought that teachers had assigned too
170 much online learning tasks. For the reasons may be described as below: 1) poor online
171 communication between teachers and students; 2) low learning efficiency of students
172 during home isolation (31-33); 3) lack of initiative on learning by students; 4) in order

173 to ensure the quality of teaching, teachers tended to assign more learning tasks.
174 Therefore, during the epidemic period, while improving students' learning autonomy,
175 teachers should try more to communicate with students and coordinate the amount of
176 learning tasks.

177 Our study showed that the advantages of online education for medical students
178 included as follows: 1) reducing the risk of COVID-19 infection caused by population
179 flow, meanwhile making teaching tasks be carried out during quarantine; 2) through
180 course playback and courseware sharing, students can flexibly arrange their study
181 time. However, the disadvantages of online teaching included as follow: 1)
182 objective long distance limited the interaction between teachers and students,
183 influenced teachers' personal style and students' attention in class, and made the
184 students' learning difficult to manage; 2) long-term use of electronic products could
185 damage eyesight and health. Hence, online teaching cannot completely replace
186 traditional teaching, only as a temporary alternative. Such findings were similar with
187 those of online teaching studies in other majors (34). These results indicated that the
188 combination of online and offline teaching may become the new normal of medical
189 education in the future.

190 Due to short preparation time and heavy teaching tasks, there were many problems in
191 the implementation of online teaching during the epidemic. Following solutions might
192 be helpful: 1) making full use of the uploaded online courses to avoid wasting
193 teaching resources by duplication of recording; 2) optimizing and integrating learning
194 software to improve online learning experience; 3) strengthening the interaction
195 between teachers and students in online courses.

196 First of all, our questionnaire respondents focused on clinical medicine, and the
197 conclusion only represents the feedback of online teaching. Secondly, our survey

198 relies on the respondents' online self-report. Although it is convenient to collect data,
199 the subjective judgment of respondents may lead to recall bias and misclassification.
200 To this end, we guarantee anonymity and confidentiality to the interviewees to
201 exclude the possibility of other untrue data as far as possible.

202

203 **Conclusions**

204 Most teachers and students in medical school supported and satisfied with the
205 implement of online teaching during the COVID-19 period. Although teachers were
206 less adaptable to online teaching than students, they still held the positive evaluation
207 and believed online teaching was more effective. Gender difference significantly
208 affected the acceptance of online teaching. Although online teaching has unique
209 advantages such as breaking the space limit and making learning time flexible, its
210 inherent defects of objective distance and less direct communication make it
211 impossible to replace the traditional teaching at present.

212

213 **Declarations**

- 214 • Ethics approval and consent to participate

215 All methods were carried out in accordance with relevant guidelines and
216 regulations. All experimental protocols were approved by the ethnic
217 committee of Shanghai Tenth People 's Hospital. Informed consent was
218 obtained from all subjects.

- 219 • Consent for publication

220 Not applicable

- 221 • Availability of data and materials

222 All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published
223 article.

224 • Competing interests

225 The authors declare that they have no competing interests

226 • Funding

227 Not applicable

228 • Authors' contributions

229 Xinying Liu and Ai Peng designed the questionnaire. Yaxiang Song and Shu
230 Wang were the major contributors in writing the manuscript. Shu Wang
231 coordinated the study. Yixian Liu collected and analyzed the data. All authors
232 read and approved the final manuscript.

233 • Acknowledgements

234 Not applicable

235

236 **References**

- 237 1. Adhikari SP, Meng S, Wu YJ, Mao YP, Ye RX, Wang QZ, et al. Epidemiology, causes, clinical
238 manifestation and diagnosis, prevention and control of coronavirus disease (COVID-19) during
239 the early outbreak period: a scoping review. *Infect Dis Poverty*. 2020;9(1):29.
- 240 2. Xia J, Tong J, Liu M, Shen Y, Guo D. Evaluation of coronavirus in tears and conjunctival
241 secretions of patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection. *J Med Virol*. 2020;92(6):589-94.
- 242 3. Chen H, Guo J, Wang C, Luo F, Zhang Y. Clinical characteristics and intrauterine vertical
243 transmission potential of COVID-19 infection in nine pregnant women: a retrospective review of
244 medical records. *Obstetric Anesthesia Digest*. 2020;41(1):51.
- 245 4. Sohrabi C, Alsafi Z, O'Neill N, Khan M, Agha R. World Health Organization declares global
246 emergency: A review of the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19). *Int J Surg*.
247 2020;76:71-76.

- 248 5. Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, Zhu F, Liu X, Zhang J, et al. Clinical characteristics of 138 hospitalized
249 patients with 2019 novel coronavirus infected pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA*.
250 2020;323(11):1061-69.
- 251 6. Zhao S, Musa SS, Lin QYmailto:please_login, Ran JJ, Yang GP, Wang WM, et al. Estimating
252 the unreported number of novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) cases in China in the first half of
253 January 2020: A data-driven modelling analysis of the early outbreak. *J Clin Med*. 2020;9(2):388.
- 254 7. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, Li X, Yang B, Song J, et al. Huang B, Shi W, Lu R. China novel
255 coronavirus investigating and research team. A novel coronavirus from patients with pneumonia
256 in China, 2019. *N Engl J Med*. 2020; 382(8):727-33.
- 257 8. Wang C, Horby PW, Hayden FG, Gao GF. A novel coronavirus outbreak of global health
258 concern. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10223):470-73.
- 259 9. COVID-19 infection leading group office should be handled by the Ministry of education on
260 guiding the organization and management of online teaching in ordinary colleges and universities
261 during the period of epidemic prevention and control (Higher Education Hall No. 2020). People's
262 Republic of China Ministry of education, Accessed 20 May 2020
- 263 10. Wang K, Shi HS, Geng FL, Zou LQ, Tan SP, Wang Y, et al. Cross-cultural validation of the
264 depression anxiety stress scale-21 in China. *Psychological Assessment*. 2015;28(5):88-100
- 265 11. Hong X, Currier GW, Zhao X, Jiang Y, Zhou W, Wei J. Posttraumatic stress disorder in
266 convalescent severe acute respiratory syndrome patients: a 4-year follow-up study. *Gen Hosp*
267 *Psychiatry*. 2009; 31(6):546-54.
- 268 12. Reynolds DL, Garay JR, Deamond SL, Moran MK, Gold W, Styra R. Understanding,
269 compliance and psychological impact of the SARS quarantine experience. *Epidemiol Infect*.
270 2008;136(7):997-1007.
- 271 13. Haldorsen H, Bak NH, Dissing A, Petersson B. Stress and symptoms of depression among
272 medical students at the University of Copenhagen. *Scand J Public Health*. 2014;42(1):89-95.
- 273 14. Moutinho IL, Maddalena NC, Roland RK, Lucchetti AL, Tibiriçá SH, Ezequiel
274 OD, Depression, stress and anxiety in medical students: A cross-sectional comparison between
275 students from different semesters. *Rev Assoc Med Bras (1992)*. 2017; 63(1):21-28.
- 276 15. Codispoti M, Surcinelli P, Baldaro B. Watching emotional movies: affective reactions and
277 gender differences. *Int J Psychophysiol*. 2008, 69(2):90-95.
- 278 16. Mota NP, Medved M, Wang J, Asmundson GJ, Whitney D, Sareen J. Stress and mental
279 disorders in female military personnel: comparisons between the sexes in a male dominated
280 profession. *J Psychiatr Res*. 2012 Feb;46(2):159-67.
- 281 17. Bloise SM, Johnson MK. Memory for emotional and neutral information: gender and
282 individual differences in emotional sensitivity. *Memory*. 2007;15(2):192-204.
- 283 18. Notice on publication of the Novel Coronavirus Pneumonia Health Protection Guidelines for
284 Public Places. Bureau of Disease Control and Prevention. 2020.

285 <http://www.nhc.gov.cn/jkj/s7916/202001/d9ae8301384a4239a8041d6f77da09b6.shtml>. Acces
286 sed 20 May 2020

287 19. Kucharski AJ, Russell TW, Diamond C, Liu Y, Edmunds J, Funk S, et al. Centre for
288 mathematical modelling of infectious diseases COVID-19 working group. early dynamics of
289 transmission and control of COVID-19: a mathematical modelling study. *Lancet Infect Dis.*
290 2020;20(5):553-58.

291 20. Muniz-Rodriguez K, Chowell G, Cheung CH, Jia D, Lai PY, Lee Y, et al. Doubling time of
292 the COVID-19 epidemic by Chinese province. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2020;doi:
293 10.1101/2020.02.05.20020750

294 21. Ming, WK, Huang J, Zhang CJP. Breaking down of healthcare system: mathematical
295 modelling for controlling the novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) outbreak in Wuhan, China.
296 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.27.922443>. Accessed 20 May 2020

297 22. Waqas A, Khan S, Sharif W, Khalid U, Ali A. Association of academic stress with sleeping
298 difficulties in medical students of a Pakistani medical school: a cross sectional survey. *PeerJ.* 2015;
299 doi: 10.7717/peerj.840.

300 23. Sreeramareddy CT, Shankar PR, Binu VS, Mukhopadhyay C, Ray B, Menezes RG.
301 Psychological morbidity, sources of stress and coping strategies among undergraduate medical
302 students of Nepal. *BMC Med Educ.* 2007; doi: 10.1186/1472-6920-7-26.

303 24. Ye ZW, Jin DY. Diagnosis, treatment, control and prevention of SARS-CoV-2 and
304 coronavirus disease 2019: back to the future. *Chin J Biotech.* 2020;36(4):571-92.

305 25. Grubic N, Badovinac S, Johri AM. Student mental health in the midst of the COVID-19
306 pandemic: A call for further research and immediate solutions. *Int J Soc Psychiatry.*
307 2020;66(5):517-18.

308 26. Slotterback CS, Saarnio DA. Attitudes toward older adults reported by young adults: variation
309 based on attitudinal task and attribute categories. *Psychol Aging.* 1996;11(4):563-71.

310 27. Harris K, Krygsman S, Waschenko J, Laliberte Rudman D. Ageism and the Older Worker: A
311 Scoping Review. *Gerontologist.* 2018;58(2):1-14.

312 28. Jeffers MW, Foner A. Ageing and society . New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1968

313 29. Mota NP, Medved M, Wang J, Asmundson GJ, Whitney D, Sareen J. Stress and mental
314 disorders in female military personnel: comparisons between the sexes in a male dominated
315 profession. *J Psychiatr Res.* 2012; 46(2):159-67.

316 30. Bloise SM, Johnson MK. Memory for emotional and neutral information: gender and
317 individual differences in emotional sensitivity. *Memory.* 2007;15(2):192-204.

318 31. Heylighen F. Complexity and information overload in society: why increasing efficiency leads
319 to decreasing control. *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association.* 2004;87:2-44.

320 32. Zimmermann P, Iwanski A. Emotion regulation from early adolescence to emerging adulthood
321 and middle adulthood age differences, gender difference and emotion-specific developmental
322 variations. *Int J Behav.* 2014;38(31):182-94.

- 323 33. Yuan J, Luo Y, Yan JH, Meng X, Yu F, Li H. Neural correlates of the females' susceptibility
324 to negative emotions: an insight into gender-related prevalence of affective disturbances. Hum
325 Brain Mapp. 2009;30(11):3676-86.
- 326 34. Metzger J, Flanagina J, Zwarun L. College student webuse, perceptions of information
327 credibility, and verification behavior. Computers&Education. 2003;41(3):271-29.