

Monitoring Depression Trend on Twitter during the COVID-19 Pandemic

Yipeng Zhang¹, Hanjia Lyu^{1*}, Yubao Liu^{1*}, Xiyang Zhang², Yu Wang¹, Jiebo Luo¹

¹University of Rochester, ²University of Akron
{yzh232, hlyu5}@ur.rochester.edu

Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic has severely affected people's daily lives and caused tremendous economic loss worldwide. However, its influence on people's mental health conditions has not received as much attention. To study this subject, we choose social media as our main data resource and create by far the largest English Twitter depression dataset containing 2,575 distinct identified depression users with their past tweets. To examine the effect of depression on people's Twitter language, we train three transformer-based depression classification models on the dataset, evaluate their performance with progressively increased training sizes, and compare the model's "tweet chunk"-level and user-level performances. Furthermore, inspired by psychological studies, we create a fusion classifier that combines deep learning model scores with psychological text features and users' demographic information and investigate these features' relations to depression signals. Finally, we demonstrate our model's capability of monitoring both group-level and population-level depression trends by presenting two of its applications during the COVID-19 pandemic. We hope this study can raise awareness among researchers and the general public of COVID-19's impact on people's mental health.

1 Introduction

COVID-19, or the coronavirus disease of 2019, is an infectious disease that reportedly originated in China and has been spreading rapidly across the globe in 2020. It was first identified on December 31st, 2019, and was officially declared as a pandemic by the World Health Organization (WHO) on March 11th, 2020.¹ As of May 29th, 2020, COVID-19 has infected 216 countries, areas or territories with over 5.7 million confirmed cases and

3.5 hundred thousand confirmed deaths¹. In response to the pandemic, over 170 countries have issued nationwide closure of educational facilities², and many governments have issued flight restrictions and stay-at-home-orders, affecting everyday lives of people around the globe.

Multiple studies have investigated the economic and social impacts of COVID-19 (Fernandes, 2020; Baker et al., 2020; Nicola et al., 2020), but what mental impact the drastic life changes bring to people and how to quantify it at the population level are yet to be studied. Mental disorders are disturbing approximately 380 million people of all ages worldwide.³ Previous studies have shown that mental disorders lead to many negative outcomes including suicide (Inskip et al., 1998; San Too et al., 2019), but individuals who suffer from mental disorders are sometimes unwilling or ashamed to seek help (Yoshikawa et al., 2017). Moreover, it is infeasible for psychological studies to obtain and track a large sample of diagnosed individuals and perform statistically significant numerical analysis.

In the past decade, people have been increasingly relying on social media platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram to express their feelings. We believe that social media is a resourceful medium to mine information about general public's mental health conditions. As shown in Figure 1, we use data from the ForSight by Crimson Hexagonplot⁴ to plot the word frequencies of several mental disorders on Twitter, including "depression", "PTSD", "bipolar disorder", "autism", from January 1st, 2020 to May 4th, 2020. Note that we exclude false positive tweets that contain misleading phrases such as "economic depression" or "great depression". We notice a rapid growth of the word frequencies of autism and depression starting

* Equal contribution.

¹<https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019>

²<https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse>

³<https://www.who.int/en/news-room/factsheets/detail/mental-disorders>

⁴<https://www.brandwatch.com/>

from March 17th, when the pandemic spread across most of the globe¹. Since depression occurs substantially more frequently compared to the other three mental disorders, we focus on understanding COVID-19’s impact on depression in this study.




Figure 1: Density of Twitter coverage regarding “depression”, “ptsd”, “bipolar disorder”, and “autism”.

Previous studies have used n-gram language models (Coppersmith et al., 2014), topic models (Armstrong, 2018), and deep learning models such as 1-dimensional convolutional neural networks (CNN) and bidirectional long short-term memory (BiLSTM) (Orabi et al., 2018) to classify depression at the user level using Twitter data. All these works use small samples of fewer than 500 users. Shen et al. (2017) extend previous studies by expanding the dataset to contain 1,402 depression users and using a multimodal dictionary learning approach to learn the latent features of the data.

In this study, we create a dataset of 5,150 Twitter users, including half identified depression users and half control users, along with their tweets within past three months and their Twitter activity data. We develop a chunking and regrouping method to construct 32,420 tweet chunks, 250 words each in the dataset. Recently, transformer-based deep learning language models have achieved state-of-the-art performance in multiple language modeling tasks. We investigate the performance of some of these models, including BERT (Devlin et al., 2018), RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019), and XLNet (Yang et al., 2019) on our dataset. We progressively add data to our training set and notice a clear performance growth on all models, which validates the importance of our dataset. We compare the models’ performance at the chunk level as well as the user level, and observe further performance gain which adds credibility to our chunking method.

Furthermore, we build a more accurate classification model upon the deep learning models along with linguistic analysis of dimensions including personality, Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) - a well-validated psycholinguistic dictionary (Tausczik and Pennebaker, 2010), sentiment features and demographic information.

De Choudhury et al. (2013a) demonstrate that depression prediction models can potentially be used on the population level. However, to the best of our knowledge, all Twitter user depression identification studies reviewed above focus on either tweet-level or user-level classification rather than applying the model to analyzing the mental health trends of a large population. The word frequency trend shown in Figure 1 is apparently filled with noise and lacks plausible explanation, making it unable to reflect the actual mental health trends of the population. In this study, we present two applications to monitor the change of depression level in different groups as the disease propagates. We use latent Dirichlet allocation (LDA) and psychological theories to analyze the trend we discover. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to apply these transformer-based models to identifying depression users on Twitter using a large-scale dataset and to monitoring the public depression trend.

In summary, our main contributions are:

- We develop an effective search method to identify depression users on Twitter. Using this method, we are able to create by far the largest dataset with 2,575 depression users along with their past tweets within three months. Our experiment shows that the performance of deep learning models increase as the size of the training set grows.
- To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to investigate the potential of transformer-based deep learning models on Twitter user depression classification.
- We build a tool marrying the deep learning models and psychological text analysis to further improve the classification performance.
- We build a pipeline to monitor public depression trend by aggregating individuals’ past tweets within a time frame using our model, and analyze the depression level trends during COVID-19, thus shedding light on the psychological impacts of the pandemic.

2 Related Work

The potential of machine learning models for identifying Twitter users who have been diagnosed with depression was pioneered by [De Choudhury et al. \(2013b\)](#), who analyzed how features obtained by LIWC are related to depression signals on social media and how that can be used for user-level classification on a dataset containing 171 depression users. The data was collected by designing surveys to volunteers through crowdsourcing. Following the work, [Coppersmith et al. \(2014\)](#) used LIWC, 1-gram language model, character 5-gram model, and user’s engagement on social media (user mention rate, tweet frequency, etc.) to perform tweet-level classification on a dataset containing 441 depression users.

The CLPsych 2015 Shared Task dataset containing 447 diagnosed depression users ([Coppersmith et al., 2015](#)) was published in 2015 and was favored by a wide range of studies ([Armstrong, 2018](#); [Nadeem, 2016](#); [Jamil et al., 2017](#); [Orabi et al., 2018](#)). The data was gathered by regular expression search in tweets in combination with manual annotation. Among these studies, topic modeling was shown effective by [Armstrong \(2018\)](#) using LDA; performance of traditional machine learning classification algorithms (decision trees, SVM, naive Bayes, logistic regression) on 1-grams and 2-grams was investigated by [Nadeem \(2016\)](#); [Jamil et al. \(2017\)](#) used SVM on bag of words (BOW) and depression word count, along with LIWC features and NRC sentiment features; [Orabi et al. \(2018\)](#) explored the performance of small deep neural architectures - 1-dimensional CNN and BiLSTM with context-aware attention on the task.

[Tsugawa et al. \(2015\)](#) performed analysis of models using BOW, LDA, and social media engagement features on a dataset containing 81 Japanese-speaking depression Twitter users collected by crowdsourcing. One recent work ([Shen et al., 2017](#)) proposed a multimodal dictionary learning method that utilizes topic, social media engagement, profile image, emotional features to learn a latent feature dictionary that performed well on a dataset of 1402 depression users, the largest dataset used to the best of our knowledge.

3 Data Collection and Analysis

We use the Tweepy API to obtain 41.3 million tweets posted from March 23rd to April 18th and the information of their authors. We look for sig-

nals that can tell whether the author suffers from depression from both the text and the user profile description. Normally, Twitter users suffering from depression describe themselves as depression fighters in their descriptions. Some of them may also post relevant tweets to declare that they have been diagnosed with depression. Inspired by [Coppersmith et al. \(2014\)](#), we use regular expression to find these authors by examining their tweets and descriptions. Building upon their method, we further extend our regular expression search based on some patterns we notice on manually identified depression users, in pursuit of efficacy. In tweets, we search for phrases such as “I have/developed/got/suffer(ed) from X depression”, “my X depression”, “I’m healing from X depression”, “I’m diagnosed with X depression”, where X’s are descriptive words such as “severe” and “major”. In descriptions, we further add phrases such as “depression fighter/sufferer/survivor” to the regular expression list; we remove users that have “practitioner” and “counselor” in their descriptions to exclude mental health practitioners.

Once we have found the targeted Twitter users, we use the Tweepy API to retrieve the public tweets posted by these users within last 3 months by the time of posting the depression-related tweet with a max cap of 200 tweets per user. If the user is identified from the description, we limit the time scope to 3 months by April 18th. In the end, 2,575 distinct Twitter users are considered suffering from depression (DP, Depression). We randomly select another 2,575 distinct users such that depression-related terms do not appear in their past 200 tweets or descriptions as our control group. Users in this group are not considered to be suffering from depression (ND, Non-Depression).

3.1 Personality

Previous psychological research shows that the Big-Five personality traits (openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism) are related to depression ([Bagby et al., 1996](#)). We estimate individuals’ personality scores using IBM’s Personality Insights service.⁵ For each individual, we aggregate all their tweets into a single textual input and call the Personality Insights API to obtain the scores. The minimum number of words for using the API is 100 and we are able to

⁵<https://www.ibm.com/cloud/watson-personality-insights>.

retrieve 4,697 (91.2%) of the 5,150 users’ scores. Summary statistics are shown in Appendix A.

3.2 Sentiments

Besides personality, we hypothesize that individuals’ sentiment and emotions could also reflect whether they are experiencing depression or not. We estimate individuals’ sentiments using Valence Aware Dictionary and Entiment Reasoner (VADER). VADER is a lexicon and rule-based model developed by researchers from Georgia Institute of Technology (Hutto and Gilbert, 2014). We aggregate a users tweets into a single chunk, apply VADER, and retrieve its scores for positive and negative emotions. In Figure 2, we report the distributions of positive emotions and negative emotions among DP and ND, respectively.




Figure 2: Compared with individuals with no depression, those with depression tend to exhibit both stronger positive and negative emotions.

3.3 Demographics

Previous psychological studies show differences in depression rates among people of different ages and of different genders (Mirowsky and Ross, 1992; Wang et al., 2020; Wainwright and Surtees, 2002). To estimate the age and gender of the user, we adopt the M3-inference model proposed by Wang et al. (2019). The M3 model performs multimodal analysis on a user’s profile image, username, and description. Following M3’s structure, we label each user a binary gender label (as approximation) and a one-hot age label among four age intervals (≤ 18 , 19-29, 30-39, ≥ 40), which are then used in our fusion model. We are able to retrieve 5,059/5,150 (98.2%) users’ demographic information.

3.4 Linguistic Inquiry Word Count (LIWC)

We use LIWC to capture people’s psychological states by analyzing the contents of their tweets⁶. We choose 8 features that were analyzed in previous works (Coppersmith et al., 2014; Stirman

and Pennebaker, 2001; Rude et al., 2004), as well as 7 other features that we find relevant to our study. Similar to the method conducted in (Chen et al., 2020), we apply LIWC to the concatenated tweets of individuals. Figure 3 shows the linguistic profiles for the tweets of DP and ND. Both DP and ND exhibit slightly positive tone, with negligible differences. The tweets of ND show more analytical thinking, more clout and less authentic expression than those of DP. The tweets of DP score higher in both positive and negative emotion categories than the ones of ND in which suggests a higher degree of immersion (Holmes et al., 2007). Moreover, the tweets of DP also show more anxiety, anger emotions and include more “swear” words, consistent with the findings of Coppersmith et al. (2014). Death-related words appear more frequently in the tweets of DP, which echoes (Stirman and Pennebaker, 2001). Similar to Coppersmith et al. (2014); Stirman and Pennebaker (2001), we find more first-person singular in the tweets of DP.

We also find that the tweets of DP express more sadness emotion and use words related to the biological process more frequently. While there is no clear link between biological-process-related words and depression, this finding shows that people who suffer from depression may pay more attention to their biological statuses. The “power” score for the tweets of ND is higher which reflects a higher need for the power according to the findings of McClelland (1979). By comparing the “work” scores of DP and ND, we find that the users of ND pay more attention to work-related issues as well.




Figure 3: Linguistic profiles for the DP/ND tweets.

3.5 Social Media Engagement

We use the proportion of tweets with mentions, number of responses, unique users mentions, users mentions, and tweets to measure the social media engagement of each user, as did Coppersmith et al. (2014). Our analysis details are reported in Appendix A.

⁶<https://liwc.wpengine.com/how-it-works/>

4 Model

4.1 Tweet Chunking and Preprocessing

We perform stratified random sampling on our dataset. We first sample 500 users to form our testing set. On the rest of the users, we progressively add users to the training sets and record the performance of the models trained on sets of 1,000, 2,000, and 4,650 users, respectively. All the training and testing sets have a 1-1 DP-ND ratio.

Jamil et al. (2017) have shown that one single tweet does not contain enough signals to determine whether a user has depression. Thus, we concatenate consecutive tweets of the same user together to create tweet chunks of 250 words and label the chunks based on the user’s label. We preprocess the text using the tweet preprocessing pipeline proposed by Baziotis et al. (2017). We adopt this method especially due to its capability of marking Twitter-specific text habits and converting them to special tokens such as “⟨allcaps⟩” (capitalized words), “⟨elongated⟩” (repeated letters), “⟨repeated⟩” (repeated words), etc. For example,

YESSSSS, I love it so so much!!!

after preprocessing will be in the form of

Yes ⟨allcaps⟩ ⟨elongated⟩, I love it so
⟨repeated⟩ much! ⟨elongated⟩

After chunking and preprocessing, on average, each user has 6-7 text chunks, making the actual sizes of the 4,650-user train-val set and the 500-user testing set to be 29,315 and 3,105, respectively. The preprocessed tweet chunk datasets are then passed to deep learning models for training.

4.2 Deep Learning Models

We use deep learning models to perform chunk-level classification. We set up 2 baseline models, multi-channel CNN and bidirectional LSTM with context-aware attention (Attention BiLSTM), as described in Orabi et al. (2018). We use the pre-trained GloVe embedding (840B tokens, 300d vectors) (Pennington et al., 2014) augmented with the special tokens added during preprocessing. The embedding weights are further trained jointly with the model. We also train three representative transformer-based sequence classification models - BERT, RoBERTa and XLNet - with their own pretrained tokenizers augmented with the special tokens for tokenization. We choose to use the base models for all of them since we find no noticeable performance gains using their larger counterparts.

4.3 Signal Fusion

We run the models on all the tweet chunks of the same user and take average of the confidence scores to get the user-level confidence score. There are 4,163/4,650 (89.5%) users remaining in the training set and 446/500 (89.2%) in the testing set whose entire features are retrievable. We then pass different combinations of user-level scores (personality, VADER, demographics, engagement, LIWC, and average confidence) to machine learning classification algorithms including random forest, logistic regression, and support vector machines (SVM) provided by the scikit-learn library.⁷ We only use the explainable LIWC features mentioned in the data collection section for training the classifiers.

4.4 Training Details

During training, we randomly split the train-val set to training and validation sets with a ratio of 9:1. We record the models’ performances on the validation set after each epoch and keep the model with the highest accuracy and F1 scores while training until convergence. Hyper-parameters and other experimental settings are described in Appendix B.

5 Experimental Results

5.1 Chunk-Level Classification

In Table 1, we report our classification results at the chunk level on the testing set. Our evaluation metrics include accuracy, F1 score, AUC, precision and recall.⁸ One immediate observation is that regardless of the model type, the classification performance improves as we increase the size of our train-val set. This shows that for building depression classification models it is imperative to have a large number of training samples. At the same time, it also confirms that the larger number of training samples in our experiments is indeed an advantage.

Another observation is the performance gain of transformer-based models over BiLSTM and CNN models. The CNN model slightly outperforms BiLSTM, which replicates the findings of Orabi et al. (2018). We observe BERT, RoBERTa and XLNet invariably outperform BiLSTM and CNN regardless of the size of our training set. In particular, the XLNet model records the best AUC as well as accuracy of all models when trained with our full training set.

⁷<https://scikit-learn.org/stable/>

⁸We use 0.5 as the threshold when calculating the scores.

Model	Train-Val Set	Accuracy	F1	AUC	Precision	Recall
Attention BiLSTM	1k users	70.7	69.0	76.5	70.9	67.3
	2k users	70.3	68.3	77.4	70.7	66.1
	4.65k users	72.7	71.6	79.3	72.1	71.1
CNN	1k users	71.8	72.6	77.4	72.7	72.6
	2k users	72.8	74.5	80.3	72.2	76.9
	4.65k users	74.0	70.9	81.0	77.4	68.9
BERT	1k users	72.7	74.4	79.8	72.0	76.9
	2k users	75.7	76.3	82.9	76.1	75.7
	4.65k users	76.5	77.5	83.9	76.3	78.8
RoBERTa	1k users	74.4	75.7	82.0	74.2	77.3
	2k users	75.9	77.9	83.2	73.8	82.5
	4.65k users	76.2	78.0	84.1	74.4	81.9
XLNet	1k users	73.7	75.1	80.7	73.2	77.2
	2k users	74.6	76.8	82.6	72.6	81.5
	4.65k users	77.1	77.9	84.4	77.5	78.3

Table 1: Chunk-level performance (%) of all 5 different models using training-validation sets of different sizes.

5.2 User-Level Classification

Features	Accuracy	F1	AUC
VADER	54.9	61.7	54.6
Demographics	58.7	56.0	61.4
Engagement	58.7	62.3	61.7
Personality	64.8	67.8	72.4
LIWC	70.6	70.8	76.0
V+D+E+P+L	71.5	72.0	78.3
XLNet	78.1	77.9	84.9
All (Rand. Forest)	78.4	78.1	84.9
All (Log. Reg.)	78.3	78.5	86.4
All (SVM)	78.9	79.2	86.1

Table 2: User-level performance (%) using different features. We use SVM for classifying individual features.

Next, we report our experiment results at the user level. Since XLNet trained on the 4,650-user dataset outperforms other models, we take it for user-level performance comparison. Our experimental results demonstrate a huge increase on the user-level scores of XLNet shown in Table 2 compared to the chunk-level score shown in Table 1. This indicates that more textual information of a user yields more reliable results on determining whether the user has depression. Building on the user-level XLNet scores, we further include VADER (V), demographics (D), engagement (E), personality (P), and LIWC (L) scores as signals. We first use all features and compare the performance of random forest, logistic regression, and SVM. We notice that SVM achieves the best scores on accuracy and F1, slightly surpassing logistic regression. Thus, we use SVM for testing the performance when using part of the features collected.

The results are shown in Table 2. Results have shown that using VADER, demographics, and social media engagement features alone does not help

the classification by much. Classifiers using personality features and LIWC features perform relatively better. We then use all these five feature groups and obtain a better result (accuracy 71.5%, F1 72.0%). However, the classifier is still outperformed by XLNet, showing that the transformer-based models indeed works better on depressive Twitter text modeling compared with other approaches. We further increase the classifier’s performance by using all the features, namely, VDEPL features and the averaged XLNet confidence score; the performance of the three ML algorithms does not vary much and the SVM classifier achieves the best accuracy (78.9%) and F1 (79.2%) scores.




Figure 4: Permutation importance of different features.

In an attempt to investigate what specific textual features besides those extracted by XLNet have the most impact on depression classification, we calculate the permutation feature importance (Altmann et al., 2010) on the trained random forest classifier using the VEPL features with 10 repeats. The importance scores of individual features are shown in Figure 4. Among the LIWC features, “i”, “bio”,

“power”, “sad”, “authentic”, “clout” and “analytic” are shown to be important in classification. Among the five personality features, “conscientiousness” and “neuroticism” are shown to be closely related to depression cues. We do not observe a strong relation between VADER sentiment features or social media engagement features and the depression signals. As for the LIWC sentiment features, only “sad” and “anxiety” are shown to be relatively important; we hypothesize that the ideas a person tries to express on Twitter are more related to depression cues than his/her sentiments, which are likely to have only short-term effects.

6 Applications

In this section, we report two COVID-19 related applications of our XLNet based depression classifier: (a) monitoring the evolution of depression level among the depression group and the non-depression group, and (b) monitoring the depression level at the U.S. country level and state level during the pandemic.

6.1 Depression Monitoring on DP/ND Group

We take the 500 users from the testing set along with their tweets from January 1st, 2020 to May 22nd, 2020. We concatenate a user’s tweets consecutively from January 1st one by one until reaching 250 words and label this chunk’s date as the date of the author posting the tweet that is in the middle of the chunk. We group three days into a bin from January 1st and assign the chunks to the bins according to the labeled date. We run the XLNet model on the preprocessed tweet chunks and record the confidence scores. We trim the upper and lower 10% of the data to reduce the skew in the score distribution. We then take the mean of the scores for each time bin and plot the depression trend shown in Figure 5a. We further take a moving average of 5 time bins to smooth the curves.


We mark three important time points on the plot - the first confirmed case of COVID-19 in the U.S. (January 21st), U.S. National Emergency announcement (March 13th), and the last stay-at-home order issued (South Carolina, April 7th). In January, both groups experience a drop in depression scores. This may be caused by the fact that people’s mood usually hits its lowest in winter (Thompson et al., 1988). From the day when there was the first confirmed case in the U.S. to the day of the announcement of U.S. National Emergency, the trends of DP and ND are different. The depression level of

DP goes down slightly while the depression level of ND goes up. Aided by psychological findings, we hypothesize that depressive users are less affected by negative events happening in the outside world because they focus on their own feelings and life events, since (a) they are mostly affected by negative events that threaten them directly (Yue et al., 2016), and (b) more interactions with the outside world give them more negative feedback (Winer and Salem, 2016). Moreover, the depression levels of DP and ND both increase after the announcement of the U.S. National Emergency.


To better understand the trend, we apply the LDA model to retrieve the topics before and after the announcement of the U.S. National Emergency. Each chunk of the tweets is assigned 5 weights for the 5 topics respectively. We label the topic of the highest weight as the dominant topic of this chunk of the tweets, and count the frequency of each topic shown in Figure 5b. Details about the keywords of the topics are reported in Appendix C. Before the announcement, the 2 most frequent topics of DP and ND are the discussions about U.S. President Donald Trump and about school and work. The third most frequent topic of ND is about health, while that of DP is about entertainment. This supports the difference of the depression level trends of two groups. After the announcement of the U.S. National Emergency, the most frequent topic of DP is depression and anxiety during COVID-19, while this is the third frequent topic of ND. Further, all the 5 topics of each group are about COVID-19. This shows that when people mostly talk about COVID-19, depression signals rise for both groups.

6.2 Aggregated Depression in COVID-19


To investigate country- and state-level depression trend during COVID-19, we randomly sample users who have U.S. state locations stated in their profiles and crawl their tweets between March 3rd, 2020 and May 22nd, 2020, the period right before and after the U.S. announced National Emergency on March 13th. Using the same logic as in Section 6.1, we plot the change of depression scores of all geo-located 9,050 users as the country-level trend. For state-level comparison, we plot the aggregated scores of three representative states - economical center New York on the East Coast that is highly affected by the virus, tech center California on the West Coast that is also struck hard by the virus, and the less affected tourism center Florida in the




(a) DP-ND trends



(c) State-level trends



(b) Percentage of DP-ND topics



(d) Percentage of State-level topics

Figure 5: (a) Aggregated depression level trends of DP users and ND users from January 1st, 2020 to May 22nd, 2020. We use different y-axes for the 2 groups in order to compare them side by side. (b) Topics of DP and ND before and after the announcement of the U.S. National Emergency. (c) Aggregated depression level trends of U.S., NY, CA, and FL from Mar 3rd, 2020 to May 22nd, 2020. (d) Top 5 topics (state-level) after the announcement of the U.S. National Emergency.

southeast. Each selected state has at least 550 users in the dataset to validate our findings. Their depression levels are shown in Figure 5c.

The first observation of the plot is that depression scores of all three states and the U.S. behave similarly during the pandemic; they experience a decrease right before the National Emergency, a steady increase after that, a slight decrease past April 23rd, and another sharp increase after May 10th. We also notice that the overall depression score of Florida is significantly lower than the U.S. average as well as the other two states. Since Florida has a lower score both before and after the virus breakout, we hypothesize that it has a lower depression level overall compared to the average U.S. level irrespective of the pandemic.

We calculate the topics at the state level after the announcement of the U.S. National Emergency. As shown in the Figure 5d, the most frequent topic is the government's policy on COVID-19. California and Florida are the states that pay relatively more attention to this topic compared to the U.S. average and New York. Florida also talks more about the life change during COVID-19. Another finding is that people in New York talk more about the

hospital news, likely because the state contains the majority of cases in the country by May 22nd⁹.

7 Conclusion

COVID-19 has infected over five million people globally, virtually brought the whole world to a halt. During this period, social media witnessed a spike in depression terms. Against this backdrop, we have developed transformer-based models trained with by far the largest dataset on depression. We have analyzed our models' performance in comparison to existing models and verified that the large training set we compile is beneficial to improving the models' performance. We further show that our models can be readily applied to the monitoring of stress and depression trend of targeted groups over geographical entities such as states. We notice significant increases in depression signals as people talk more about COVID-19. We hope researchers and mental health practitioners find our models useful and this study can raise the awareness of the mental health impacts of the pandemic.

⁹<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/cases-updates/cases-in-us.html>

References

- André Altmann, Laura Toloşi, Oliver Sander, and Thomas Lengauer. 2010. Permutation importance: a corrected feature importance measure. *Bioinformatics*, 26(10):1340–1347.
- William Armstrong. 2018. Using topic models to investigate depression on social media. Technical report, Technical report, University of Maryland, USA, 2015. Scholarly paper.
- R Michael Bagby, Deborah R Schuller, Anthony J Levitt, Russell T Joffe, and Kate L Harkness. 1996. Seasonal and non-seasonal depression and the five-factor model of personality. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 38(2-3):89–95.
- Scott R Baker, Nicholas Bloom, Steven J Davis, and Stephen J Terry. 2020. Covid-induced economic uncertainty. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Christos Baziotis, Nikos Pelekis, and Christos Doulkeridis. 2017. [DataStories at SemEval-2017 task 4: Deep LSTM with attention for message-level and topic-based sentiment analysis](#). In *Proceedings of the 11th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2017)*, pages 747–754, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Long Chen, Hanjia Lyu, Tongyu Yang, Yu Wang, and Jiebo Luo. 2020. In the eyes of the beholder: Sentiment and topic analyses on social media use of neutral and controversial terms for covid-19. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.10225*.
- Glen Coppersmith, Mark Dredze, and Craig Harman. 2014. Quantifying mental health signals in twitter. In *Proceedings of the workshop on computational linguistics and clinical psychology: From linguistic signal to clinical reality*, pages 51–60.
- Glen Coppersmith, Mark Dredze, Craig Harman, Kristy Hollingshead, and Margaret Mitchell. 2015. Clpsych 2015 shared task: Depression and ptsd on twitter. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Computational Linguistics and Clinical Psychology: From Linguistic Signal to Clinical Reality*, pages 31–39.
- Munmun De Choudhury, Scott Counts, and Eric Horvitz. 2013a. Social media as a measurement tool of depression in populations. In *Proceedings of the 5th Annual ACM Web Science Conference*, pages 47–56.
- Munmun De Choudhury, Michael Gamon, Scott Counts, and Eric Horvitz. 2013b. Predicting depression via social media. In *Seventh international AAAI conference on weblogs and social media*.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*.
- Nuno Fernandes. 2020. Economic effects of coronavirus outbreak (covid-19) on the world economy. Available at SSRN 3557504.
- Danielle Holmes, Georg W Alpers, Tasneem Ismailji, Catherine Classen, Talor Wales, Valerie Cheasty, Andrew Miller, and Cheryl Koopman. 2007. Cognitive and emotional processing in narratives of women abused by intimate partners. *Violence against women*, 13(11):1192–1205.
- Clayton J Hutto and Eric Gilbert. 2014. Vader: A parsimonious rule-based model for sentiment analysis of social media text. In *Eighth international AAAI conference on weblogs and social media*.
- Hazel Inskip, Clare Harris, and Brian Barraclough. 1998. Lifetime risk of suicide for affective disorder, alcoholism and schizophrenia. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 172(1):35–37.
- Zunaira Jamil, Diana Inkpen, Prasadith Buddhitha, and Kenton White. 2017. Monitoring tweets for depression to detect at-risk users. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop on Computational Linguistics and Clinical Psychology From Linguistic Signal to Clinical Reality*, pages 32–40.
- Yinhan Liu, Mylène Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*.
- David C McClelland. 1979. Inhibited power motivation and high blood pressure in men. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 88(2):182.
- John Mirowsky and Catherine E Ross. 1992. Age and depression. *Journal of health and social behavior*, pages 187–205.
- Moin Nadeem. 2016. Identifying depression on twitter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.07384*.
- Maria Nicola, Zaid Alsafi, Catrin Sohrabi, Ahmed Kerwan, Ahmed Al-Jabir, Christos Iosifidis, Maliha Agha, and Riaz Agha. 2020. The socio-economic implications of the coronavirus and covid-19 pandemic: A review. *International Journal of Surgery*.
- Ahmed Hussein Orabi, Prasadith Buddhitha, Mahmoud Hussein Orabi, and Diana Inkpen. 2018. Deep learning for depression detection of twitter users. In *Proceedings of the Fifth Workshop on Computational Linguistics and Clinical Psychology: From Keyboard to Clinic*, pages 88–97.
- Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher D. Manning. 2014. [Glove: Global vectors for word representation](#). In *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1532–1543.
- Stephanie Rude, Eva-Maria Gortner, and James Pennebaker. 2004. Language use of depressed and depression-vulnerable college students. *Cognition & Emotion*, 18(8):1121–1133.

Lay San Too, Matthew J Spittal, Lyndal Bugeja, Lennart Reifels, Peter Butterworth, and Jane Pirkis. 2019. The association between mental disorders and suicide: A systematic review and meta-analysis of record linkage studies. *Journal of affective disorders*.

Guangyao Shen, Jia Jia, Liqiang Nie, Fuli Feng, Cunjun Zhang, Tianrui Hu, Tat-Seng Chua, and Wenwu Zhu. 2017. Depression detection via harvesting social media: A multimodal dictionary learning solution. In *IJCAI*, pages 3838–3844.

Shannon Wiltsey Stirman and James W Pennebaker. 2001. Word use in the poetry of suicidal and non-suicidal poets. *Psychosomatic medicine*, 63(4):517–522.

Yla R Tausczik and James W Pennebaker. 2010. The psychological meaning of words: Liwc and computerized text analysis methods. *Journal of language and social psychology*, 29(1):24–54.

Chris Thompson, Deborah Stinson, Margaret Fernandez, Jeffrey Fine, and Geoffrey Isaacs. 1988. A comparison of normal, bipolar and seasonal affective disorder subjects using the seasonal pattern assessment questionnaire. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 14(3):257–264.

Sho Tsugawa, Yusuke Kikuchi, Fumio Kishino, Kosuke Nakajima, Yuichi Itoh, and Hiroyuki Ohsaki. 2015. Recognizing depression from twitter activity. In *Proceedings of the 33rd annual ACM conference on human factors in computing systems*, pages 3187–3196.

NWJ Wainwright and Paul G Surtees. 2002. Childhood adversity, gender and depression over the life-course. *Journal of affective disorders*, 72(1):33–44.

Cuiyan Wang, Riyu Pan, Xiaoyang Wan, Yilin Tan, Linkang Xu, Cyrus S Ho, and Roger C Ho. 2020. Immediate psychological responses and associated factors during the initial stage of the 2019 coronavirus disease (covid-19) epidemic among the general population in china. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 17(5):1729.

Zijian Wang, Scott A. Hale, David Adelani, Przemyslaw A. Grabowicz, Timo Hartmann, Fabian Flöck, and David Jurgens. 2019. Demographic inference and representative population estimates from multilingual social media data. In *Proceedings of the 2019 World Wide Web Conference*. ACM.

E Samuel Winer and Taban Salem. 2016. Reward devaluation: Dot-probe meta-analytic evidence of avoidance of positive information in depressed persons. *Psychological bulletin*, 142(1):18.

Zhilin Yang, Zihang Dai, Yiming Yang, Jaime Carbonell, Russ R Salakhutdinov, and Quoc V Le. 2019. Xlnet: Generalized autoregressive pretraining for language understanding. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 5754–5764.

Eisho Yoshikawa, Toshiatsu Taniguchi, Nanako Nakamura-Taira, Shin Ishiguro, and Hiromichi Matsumura. 2017. Factors associated with unwillingness to seek professional help for depression: a web-based survey. *BMC research notes*, 10(1):673.

Li Yue, Zhang Dajun, Liang Yinghao, and Hu Tianqiang. 2016. Meta-analysis of the relationship between life events and depression in adolescents. *Journal of Pediatric Care*, 2(1):1–13.

A Supplementary Data Statistics

In Table 3, we report the summary statistics of the personality estimates. We observe that all the estimates fall between 0 and 1. The standard deviations range from 0.24 to 0.28. *Openness* has the highest mean value at 0.61 and *conscientiousness* has the lowest mean value at 0.28.

	Count	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Openness	4697	0.00	1.00	0.61	0.28
Conscientiousness	4697	0.00	1.00	0.28	0.26
Extraversion	4697	0.00	1.00	0.32	0.24
Agreeableness	4697	0.00	1.00	0.30	0.26
Neuroticism	4697	0.00	1.00	0.56	0.28
<i>N</i>	4697				

Table 3: Summary statistics of personality scores of users in the data set. *SD* stands for standard deviation.

In Table 4, we further report the correlation coefficients between the personality variables. We observe that *extraversion* is highly correlated with *conscientiousness* and *agreeableness* (correlation coefficients > 0.45). Meanwhile, *neuroticism* is negatively correlated with *openness*, *conscientiousness*, and *extraversion*.

	Openness	Conscientious	Extraversion	Agreeableness	Neuroticism
Openness	1				
Conscientious	0.238***	1			
Extraversion	0.265***	0.475***	1		
Agreeableness	-0.0768***	0.441***	0.469***	1	
Neuroticism	-0.232***	-0.279***	-0.285***	0.0460**	1

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table 4: Correlation between the personality variables.

To better understand the difference of social media engagement between DP and ND, we add 0.1 to the number of responses, unique users mentions, users mentions, and tweets and take the logarithm.




Figure 6: Density plots of proportion of tweets with mentions, log-scale number of responses, unique users mentions, users mentions, and tweets.

The density comparisons are shown in Figure 6. By applying the Mann-Whitney rank test, we find that except for the number of unique users mentions, other features are statistically different ($p < 0.05$) between DP and ND. The users of DP post more tweets and reply more. They tend to post fewer tweets with mentions while the number the users mentioned for DP is larger, which suggests that when users of DP post tweets to interact with other users, it involves more users.

B Hyper-Parameters and Other Experimental Settings

We manually select the hyper-parameters that give the best accuracy and F1 scores on the deep learning models. We use Adam optimizer with learning rate $7e-3$, weight decay $1e-4$ for training Attention BiLSTM. We use Adam optimizer with a learning rate of $5e-4$ for training CNN. We use AdamW optimizer with a learning rate of $2e-5$ for training BERT and RoBERTa, $8e-6$ for training XLNet. We use the cross entropy loss for all our models during training. We use SGD optimizer with adaptive learning rate with initial learning rate as 0.1 for training SVM and logistic regression classifier.

The experiments of the deep learning models are performed on a single NVIDIA Tesla T4 GPU. We record the models' number of parameters and their average training time per epoch on the 4,650-user training set. The BiLSTM and CNN model has 23 million and 57 million parameters, respectively (including the embedding weights). We train BiLSTM using batch size 32 and it takes 27 seconds per epoch. We train CNN using batch size 32 and it takes 39 minutes per epoch. The transformer-based models (BERT, RoBERTa, XLNet) have 110 million parameters and their speeds do not vary much. We train these models using batch size 8 and they take 1 hour 37 minutes per epoch. We train SVM, logistic regression classifier, and random forest on CPU.

We use the *ekphrasis* Python library¹⁰ for majority of the preprocessing and use the *transformers* library¹¹ for building our transformer-based models.

C LDA Topics

We use latent Dirichlet allocation (LDA) provided by the *gensim* library¹² to model the topics of the tweets. To better understand the topics, we remove all the adjectives, adverbs and verbs from the text, and only keep the nouns. The number of the topics is set to be 5. In total we have trained three LDA models: one for tweets before the announcement of U.S. National Emergency, one for tweets after the announcement of U.S. National Emergency, and one for national and state level tweets between March 3rd, 2020 and May 22nd, 2020. Table 5 shows the top 15 keywords for each topic.

¹⁰<https://pypi.org/project/ekphrasis/>

¹¹<https://github.com/huggingface/transformers>

¹²<https://pypi.org/project/gensim/>

Model 1: Before Announcement of U.S. National Emergency	
School and Work	time, day, people, anyone, thing, support, work, man, class, today, school, week, watch, love, dog
Health	day, world, time, week, thank, today, ko, health, hope, video, news, something, hell, job, people
Trump Discussions	people, life, time, day, work, love, trump, lot, man, today, person, someone, thing, way, hope
Cancer	time, year, people, day, work, way, tweet, city, cancer, head, friend, death, today, love, problem
Entertainment	love, people, time, way, song, something, day, man nothing, everyone, tonight, year, today, game, guy
Model 2: After Announcement of U.S. National Emergency	
Hoarding related to COVID-19	time, dog, people, man, everything, call, work, way, covid, hope, news, food, night, thank, someone
Quarantine and Depression	time, work, love, day, people, something, man, thank, thing, hope, everyone, life, quarantine, house, home
Chinese News about COVID-19	china, people, time, love, day, street, song, name, person, trump, news, government, expert, virus, dey
Depression and Anxiety during COVID-19	people, today, time, day, covid, work, home, love, virus, man, hope, tweet, thing, depression, everyone
Work from Home	day, people, time, love, everyone, job, quarantine, today, year, thing, life, home, way, week, video
Model 3: State-level Topics	
Life Change during COVID-19	day, today, march, morning, week, life, run, friend, show, death, man, place, mayor, order, change
Quarantine	day, time, love, quarantine, today, ass, night, year, thank, tomorrow, house, video, game, life, miss
Hospital News	covid, state, home, work, health, news, county, week, hospital, testing, today, day, world, time, order
Government's policy on COVID-19	trump, people, president, time, virus, care, vote, country, china, money, need, medium, nothing, job, everyone
Family and Work	time, people, love, man, way, job, thank, day, work, lot, someone, something, thing, family, today

Table 5: Top 15 keywords for each topic