

Methods: An ad hoc survey have been sent from May to June 2020.

Results: These results refer to the Italian survey of a multicenter investigation with partnership of Spain and Portugal universities. The investigation is in progress being a longitudinal study. Of the total 292 subjects investigated (age xM: 34; sD14.13), 118 (40,41%) had been in SI. Subjects forced into SI report more interference in the life satisfaction ($p=0.003$) though no more anxiety, depression and hostility we found in the SI group.

Conclusions: During the phase 2 of Italian COVID-19 diffusion, we found an impact on the life satisfaction more than psychopathology. We can assume that the impact of mental health it may occur as the reduction in life satisfaction associated with forced SI continues.

Keywords: social isolation; Health Survey; COVID-19; Life satisfaction

EPP0472

Emergency state in COVID-19 pandemic: Hungarian patients' experiences

L. Pogany^{1,2*}, A. Horváth¹, E. Rozsavolgyi^{3,4}, A. Slezák⁵ and J. Lazary¹

¹Department Of General Psychiatry B, Nyírő Gyula National Institute of Psychiatry and Addictions, Budapest, Hungary; ²Janos Szentagothai Doctoral School Of Neurosciences, Semmelweis University, Budapest, Hungary; ³Ambulatory Mental Health Service, Zugló Health Service, Budapest, Hungary; ⁴Department Of General Psychiatry D, Nyírő Gyula Institute of Psychiatry and Addictions, Budapest, Hungary and ⁵Ambulatory Care Service, Nyírő Gyula Institute of Psychiatry and Addictions, Budapest, Hungary

*Corresponding author.

doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2021.838

Introduction: The COVID-19 pandemic made necessary the declaration of emergency state in Hungary from 11 March 2020 to 18 June 2020. During this period hospitals were reserved for emergency use, ambulatory care was limited and replaced by telemedicine.

Objectives: We assessed the opinions of patients of two ambulatory psychiatric care units in Budapest regarding the emergency state.

Methods: We enrolled 438 outpatients in the survey (305 women and 133 men, mean age: 51.9 ± 16.2 years). Our questionnaire comprised 10 items on emotions and mental state and a 12 item „Problem evaluation scale” (included 'Fear', 'Isolation' and 'Health status' subscales). General linear model (GLM), pairwise comparison and Tukey's post hoc test were performed.

Results: Up to 34% of patients considered that their condition worsened during this period, but 12% of them thought that this was not related to emergency state. Twice as many participants (12.8%) were concerned about their financial situation than about their health status (6.1%). Worsening health status, higher fear and more common adaptation difficulties were reported by patients < 50 years, than by subjects > 50 years ($p=0.001$; $p=0.045$; $p=0.003$). Isolation caused higher distress among women than in men ($p=0.003$). The abundance of information caused higher distress in patients with anxiety disorder than with psychotic disorders ($p=0.024$). Patients with affective disorders perceived higher vulnerability compared to subjects with psychotic disorders ($p=0.004$).

Conclusions: Adaptation difficulties were reported by the half of the sample. Depletion of psychological resources can be expected during the next stage of the pandemic.

Keywords: isolation; adaptation; pandemic; Fear

EPP0473

Effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on mental health - what do we know so far?

M. Marguilho* and A. Nobre

Clínica 5, Centro Hospitalar Psiquiátrico de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal

*Corresponding author.

doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2021.839

Introduction: The devastating effects of the current pandemic are profoundly affecting peoples' physical and psychological health. Numerous studies on the effects of previous infectious outbreaks have been published. Similarly, an increasingly growing body of research on COVID-19 has been developed and released, reporting a substantial psychological impact of both the outbreak and the response, suggesting that the population may express high levels of psychological symptoms.

Objectives: This presentation aims to synthesize existent literature that reports on the effects of COVID-19 on psychological outcomes of the general population, groups with higher vulnerability and its associated risk factors.

Methods: Bibliographic research was made through scientific databases such as PubMed and EMBASE. No time limit was used. Pertinent articles were carefully reviewed for additional relevant citations.

Results: Generally, there is a higher prevalence of symptoms of adverse psychiatric outcomes among the public when compared to the prevalence before the pandemic. Psychological reactions to pandemics include maladaptive behaviours, emotional distress and symptoms of stress, anxiety, depression, and avoidance behaviors. The groups known to be at higher risk for mental health problems during the pandemic are: women, healthcare workers, people under 40 years old and with chronic diseases. Other risk factors are: frequent exposure to social media/news relating to COVID-19, poor economic status, lower education level, and unemployment.

Conclusions: The COVID-19 pandemic represents an unprecedented threat to mental health. In addition to flattening the curve of viral transmission, special attention needs to be paid to the challenges it poses to the mental health of the population at a global scale.

Keywords: COVID19; mental; health; psychological

EPP0475

The impact of protective face masks and coverings on patient-health provider communication

I. Ganhao^{1*}, M. Trigo² and A. Paixao³

¹Clinic 6, Centro Hospitalar Psiquiátrico de Lisboa, Quinta do Anjo, Portugal; ²Psychology Unit, Centro Hospitalar Psiquiátrico de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal and ³Clinic 4, Centro Hospitalar Psiquiátrico de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal

*Corresponding author.

doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2021.840

Introduction: Amid the COVID-19 pandemic the trend points to universal use of protective face masks. The impact posed on verbal and non-verbal communication by masks is yet another challenge to be addressed in clinical care.

Objectives: To reflect on the consequences of face mask and covering use on communication in the clinical setting, including mental health settings.

Methods: Pubmed and Google Scholar literature search using terms face mask / face covering and communication / emotion.

Results: There is a lack of literature on the impact of protective face masks and coverings on communication in clinical settings. Face masks and coverings may have a significant impact on patient-healthcare professional relationship due to disruption of verbal (poorer quality of speech transmission) and non-verbal communication (emotional expression and recognition) with consequences on: 1) clarity of communication with potential for misunderstanding clinical information, advice and prescriptions posing safety issues, 2) emotion perception, expression and reciprocity, 4) perception of healthcare professionals' empathy and therefore, 3) patient satisfaction, 4) quality of care, and 5) clinical outcomes. Difficulties in communication between the patients' family or other carers and healthcare providers and between healthcare professionals are likewise challenged. People with hearing impairment, children and people with mental illness may be especially vulnerable to these difficulties in communication.

Conclusions: Protective face masks and coverings are undoubtedly important in preventing spread of COVID-19, nonetheless mental healthcare professionals should take into account their significant impact on verbal and non-verbal communication in clinical care. Alternative strategies to enhance communication and rapport may be warranted.

Keywords: face masks; face coverings; communication; emotion

EPP0476

Psychosocial effects of COVID-19 pandemic in Bolivia. Preliminary results

D. Valdés¹, F. Molina¹, C. Barrientos¹, P. Valenzuela¹, A. Basaigoitia², M. Burrone^{1*}, G. Reginatto¹, I. Leniz³ and M. Solis-Soto¹

¹Instituto De Ciencias De La Salud, Universidad de O'Higgins, Rancagua, Chile; ²Consulting Office, Salud Global, Sucre, Bolivia and ³Dirección De Asuntos Estudiantiles, Universidad de O'Higgins, Rancagua, Chile

*Corresponding author.

doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2021.841

Introduction: The global health crisis due to Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) and related containment measures have led to changes in daily life and, therefore, social and psychological impacts on the population.

Objectives: To explore the psychological and social impact of COVID-19 in the general population of Bolivia.

Methods: Cross-sectional study was implemented using an anonymous and self-administered online questionnaire. Adult people were invited to participate through social networks between May to June 2020. The questionnaire included sociodemographic information, coping strategies, changes in income and working conditions and psychological distress (K10 Scale).

Results: A total of 878 adults living in Bolivia answered the questionnaire. Most people considered COVID-19 as a quite/very serious health problem that affects the entire population, without distinction. 65% reported to accomplish lock down measure, however, one of the main reasons for non-compliance is the need to go out to work. Half of participants (50%) reduced

worked hours and 18% modified their employment contract. However, 70% reduced household income. A considerable percentage (62%) reported psychological distress (46% with moderate or severe). It was higher in women, young people and among those with lower household income. In addition, social networks and watching series and movies were the main coping strategies reported.

Conclusions: The COVID-19 pandemic has a considerable impact on psychological and social level. The negative impact was greater in some population groups such as women, young people, and those with a lower socioeconomic level, which may further increase inequities.

Keywords: COVID-19; Bolivia; psychosocial; mental health

EPP0477

The interrelation between proactive coping and job stressors subjective evaluation in healthcare professionals during the early phase of the COVID-19 pandemic

A. Kuznetsova* and M. Gushchin

Faculty Of Psychology, Lomonosov Moscow state university, Moscow, Russian Federation

*Corresponding author.

doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2021.842

Introduction: Proactive coping helps to reduce stress "in advance" – by possible stressors' anticipating (Greenglass & Fiksenbaum, 2009). Does it helps to reduce distress in hazardous work environment with extremely high uncertainty level – like in healthcare professionals' work at the beginning COVID-19 pandemic? Data showed the lower level of proactive coping in healthcare professionals in comparison with non-medical group (Pearman, Hughes, Smith & Neupert, 2020). The acute issue is to investigate proactive coping among medical professionals with different stress level.

Objectives: Specialists of Moscow public dispensaries (doctors, n=209; nurses, n=131) were checked during pandemic breakout (April 2020) - in order to compare proactive coping and job stressors' subjective evaluation in groups with high and low chronic states.

Methods: The diagnostic set included: the job stress survey (Spielberger, 1994); the proactive coping inventory (Greenglass, 2002); the chronic stress and fatigues inventories (Leonova, 2012).

Results: Cluster analysis by combination of stress-fatigue scores extracted equal 22% of professionals in risk subgroups. Surprisingly no proactive coping differences were found in nurses; among doctors preventive coping is significantly lower in risk subgroup ($t=7.05$; $p=0.009$). Revealed job stressors in risk groups for nurses are quite typical; but for doctors they are unusual: extreme workload ($t=33.97$; $p<0.001$), low coworkers support ($t=48.94$; $p<0.001$), lack of positive feedback ($t=62.29$; $p<0.001$).

Conclusions: Despite the undeniable workload increase, well-to-do professionals perceived no high job stressors. In risk subgroup with lack of preventive coping, perceived stressors are likely connected with inability to predict strain increase and to minimize the impact of its negative effects (Moore, 2017).

Keywords: proactive coping; Chronic Stress; job stressors; COVID-19