**Supplemental Information**

**Method**

**Australia**

Institutional review board approval was obtained from Deakin University’s Faculty of Health Human Ethics Advisory Group (2020-131). Data collection took place from June 6, 2020 to July 30, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 24, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited from online posts on various social media websites (e.g., Facebook, Reddit), professional networking websites (e.g., LinkedIn), and on crowdsourcing websites for research participation (e.g., Prolific, Online Social Psychology Studies – Social Psychology Network). Participants recruited from Prolific were compensated seven AUD at the end of the survey. All other participants could choose to enter a raffle to win one of five $500 gift certificates at the end of the survey.

***Participants***

A total of 823 participants accessed the survey. Based on screening criteria, twenty-three participants were ineligible, and 325 cases dropped out of the survey due to incomplete participation. Sixteen cases were removed for completing the survey in under 10 minutes, which had been established as the minimum time required for a naïve participant to complete the survey, and 235 were removed for taking over 24 hours to complete the survey.

***Measures***

All measures were administered in English. However, items related to stress communication in the DCI (Randall et al., 2016) were not included.

**Austria**

Institutional review board approval was obtained from the University of Vienna (00547). Data collection took place from April 28, 2020 to May 17, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 16, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited across Austria by survey distribution on various social media sites (e.g., Facebook), the institutional website of the research group, and via mailing lists of professional associations. Participants could choose to enter a raffle to win one of twenty 25 EUR e-gift cards for Amazon or another local bookstore at the end of the survey.

***Participants***

A total of 1,200 participants accessed the survey. Based on screening criteria, 215 participants were ineligible, and 208 cases dropped out of the survey due to incomplete participation. 23 were removed for completing the survey in under 10 minutes, which had been established as the minimum time required for a naïve participant to complete the survey, and two were removed for taking over 24 hours to complete the survey. One hundred and forty-one cases were removed due to responding “Yes” or “I don’t know” when asked if their partner also completed the survey.

***Measures***

The German version of the DASS-21 (Nilges & Essau, 2015) and DCI (Bodenmann, 2008) were administered. The PRQC (Fletcher, 2000) was translated from English to German following appropriate translation procedures.

**Bangladesh**

Institutional review board approval was obtained from International University of Business, Agriculture and Technology (27/05/2020). Data collection took place from July 10, 2020 to August 19, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 15, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited across Bangladesh by survey distribution on various social media (e.g., Facebook, WhatsApp) and university student networking sites (e.g., Departmental Facebook page). Participants could choose to enter a raffle to win one of 25 $6 Amazon e-gift cards at the end of the survey.

***Participants***

A total of 650 participants accessed the survey. Based on screening criteria, one hundred and two participants were ineligible. One hundred and ninety-five cases were removed for completing the survey in under 15 minutes, which had been established as the minimum time required for a naïve participant to complete the survey, and two were removed for taking over 24 hours to complete the survey.

***Measures***

The DASS-21 (Lovibond & Lovibond, 1995), PRQC (Fletcher, 2000), and DCI (Randall et al., 2016) were translated from English to Bengali following appropriate translation procedures.

**Belgium**

Institutional review board approval was obtained from Ghent University (ref: 2020/40) and University of Mons (no reference number available). Data collection took place from May 19, 2020 to August 7, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 8, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited across Belgium by survey distribution on various social media sites (e.g., Facebook), professional networking sites (e.g., LinkedIn), and personal networks. Participants could choose to enter a raffle to win one of eleven 50€ vouchers at the end of the survey.

***Participants***

A total of 2,160 participants accessed the survey. Based on screening criteria, six hundred and seventy-two participants were ineligible. One hundred and fourteen cases were removed due to responding “Yes” or “I don’t know” when asked if their partner also completed the survey. Participants were not removed for their response time. Additionally, 96 participants were removed due to having the French nationality. Lastly, four participants were removed because they reported they reported not to cohabit on the relationship status question in the survey.

***Measures***

The Dutch and French versions of the DASS-21 (*Dutch*: de Beurs et al., 2001; *French*: Ciobanu et al., 2018), French version of the PRQC (Rodrigue et al., 2018), and Dutch and French version of the DCI (*Dutch*: Ponnet, 2012; *French*: Ledermann et al., 2010) were administered. The Dutch version of the PRQC (Fletcher, 2000) was translated from English following appropriate translation procedures.

**Brazil**

Institutional approval was obtained from the Graduate Program of Psychology at Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro and guaranteed by resolution 510/2016 (recommendations of research with human beings) of the National Health Council, framing it as a public opinion survey. Data collection took place from April 22, 2020 to July 6, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 23, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited across Brazil through invitations made available on social networks, on the Lab’s website (www.L2PS.org), and distribution of email-invitations to lists of people registered to receive Lab research invitations. Participants could choose to enter a raffle to win one of 20 $7.25 Amazon e-gift cards at the end of the survey.

***Participants***

A total of 2,393 participants accessed the survey. Based on screening criteria, one thousand four hundred and fifty participants were removed from the final sample because did not meet the eligibility criteria, and 275 cases were removed due to incomplete participation. Participants were not removed based on their response time. Lastly, one participant was removed because they reported they were “single” on the relationship status question in the survey.

***Measures***

The Portuguese version of the DASS-21 (Vignola & Tucci, 2014) was administered. The PRQC (Fletcher, 2000) and DCI (Randall et al., 2016) were translated from English to Portuguese following appropriate translation procedures.

**Canada**

Ethics approval was obtained from the Conjoint Faculties Research Ethics Board at the University of Calgary (REB20-0499), the Comité d’éthique de la recherche en education et en psychologie at the Université de Montréal (CEREP-20-049-D), and the Comité d’éthique de la recherche at the Université de Sherbrooke (2020-2616/Péloquin). Data collection took place from April 24, 2020 to July 31, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 13, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited across Canada through survey distribution on various social media sites (e.g., Facebook, Instagram, Twitter), the University of Calgary’s “Participate in Research at UCalgary” research portal (https://www.ucalgary.ca/research/participate/), the Canadian Psychological Association’s Recruit Research Participants Portal (R2P2 https://cpa.ca/science/r2p2/), Honeybee Hub (a Canadian online research portal https://www.honeybeehub.io/), and via snowball sampling through the researchers’ personal contacts (including fellow relationship researchers at other Canadian universities). Participants could choose to enter a raffle to win one of ten $50 Indigo.ca gift cards at the end of the survey.

***Participants***

A total of 1,390 participants accessed the survey. Based on screening criteria, nine hundred and twenty-six participants were ineligible. Seven hundred and forty-seven participants for completing the survey in less than 15 minutes, which had been established as the minimum time required for a naïve participant to complete the survey, and an additional 16 for completing it over more than a 24-hour period. Fifty-six participants were removed because they responded “yes” or “I don’t know” when asked if their partner completed the survey. Lastly, five participants were removed because they reported they were “single” on the relationship status question in the survey.

***Measures***

All measures were administered in English.

**Chile**

Chile’s PI deferred to Arizona State University’s Institutional review board approval **(**STUDY00011717). Data collection took place from April 29, 2020 to August 1, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 23, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited across the Chile by survey distribution on various social media sites (e.g., Facebook, Instagram), professional networking sites (e.g., Linkedin), and university listservs across Chile. Participants were not compensated for their participation.

***Participants***

A total of 1,302 participants accessed the survey. Based on screening criteria, one hundred and forty-nine participants were ineligible. Six hundred and sixty-eight cases were removed for completing the survey in under 15 minutes, which had been established as the minimum time required for a naïve participant to complete the survey, and 12 were removed for taking over 24 hours to complete the survey. Forty-nine cases were removed due to responding “Yes” or “I don’t know” when asked if their partner also completed the survey.

***Measures***

The Spanish version of the DASS-21 (Antúnez & Vinet, 2012), PRQC (Medina, Rivera, & Aguasvivas, 2016), and DCI (Falconier, Nussbeck, & Bodenmann, 2013) were administered.

**Germany**

Institutional review board approval was obtained from the ethics committee of the department of psychology at WWU Muenster University (identification number: 2020-18-AM). Data collection took place from April 7, 2020 to May 10, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 16, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited across Germany by survey distribution on various social media sites (e.g., Facebook), the institute’s official website and registration platforms for studies examining the psychological impact of the COVID-19 crisis. Participants could choose to enter a raffle to win one of ten 50 EURO vouchers.

***Participants***

A total of 4,404 participants accessed the survey. A total of 2, 277 participants started the questionnaire; however, one thousand one hundred and four participants were either ineligible, did not give permission to use their data, or did not answer any question beyond the first page. One hundred and forty-one cases were removed for completing the survey in under 15 minutes, which had been established as the minimum time required for a naïve participant to complete the survey, and five were removed due to a completion time of over 24 hours. Forty-nine cases were removed due to responding “Yes” or “I don’t know” when asked if their partner also completed the survey.

***Measures***

The German versions of the DASS-21 (Nilges & Essau, 2015) and DCI (Bodenmann, 2008) were administered. The PRQC (Fletcher, 2000) was translated from English to German following appropriate translation procedures.

**Ghana**

Ethics approval was obtained from the University of Ghana’s Ethics Committee for theHumanities (ECH 134/19-20). Data collection took place from April 26, 2020 to June 2, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 30, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited across Ghana electronically. The link to the survey was distributed via email; University of Ghana email system that includes both students and staff, and also to personal contacts of the study investigators. The link was also distributed widely through social media (WhatsApp contacts, and WhatsApp status). The invitation to participate through all these media were all asked to pass on the link to others in their networks and to invite them to also participate. Participants could choose to enter a raffle to win one of 80 airtime credits in the amount of $1.73 at the end of the survey.

***Participants***

A total of 830 respondents accessed the survey. Based on screening criteria, three hundred and seventy-one participants were ineligible. Seventy-four respondents were removed for completing the survey in under 15 minutes, which had been established as the minimum time required for a naïve participant to complete the survey, and 26 were removed for taking over 24 hours to complete the survey. Nine respondents were removed due to responding “Yes” or “I don’t know” when asked if their partner also completed the survey.

***Measures***

All measures were administered in English.

**Greece**

Institutional review board approval was obtained from the University of Crete Research Ethics Committee (120/22.05.2020). Data collection took place from April 10, 2020 to May 9, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 23, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited across the Greece by survey distribution on various social media sites (e.g., Facebook, Twitter) and university listservs. Participants were not compensated for their participation.

***Participants***

A total of 586 participants accessed the survey. Based on screening criteria, eighty-four participants were ineligible, mostly because they responded “Yes” or “I don’t know” when asked if their partner also completed the survey. Participants were not removed based on their response time.

***Measures***

The Greek versions of the DASS-21 (Lyrakos et al., 2011), PRQC (Roussi & Karademas, 2016), and DCI (Roussi & Karademas, 2016) were administered.

**Hungary**

Institutional review board approval was obtained from Unified Ethical Committee forPsychological Research of Hungarian Universities (EPKEB-2020-42). Data collection took place from April 13, 2020 to May 17, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 16, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited across Hungary by survey distribution on

various social media sites (e.g., Facebook), professional and personal networks. Psychology

students obtained partial course credit for participating in the distribution of the survey link. Participants could choose to enter a raffle to win one of 20 $14.50 Amazon e-gift cards at the end of the survey.

***Participants***

A total of 2,033 participants accessed the survey, and 1,490 of them submitted responses. Based on screening criteria, four hundred and sixty-nine participants were ineligible. Four hundred and thirty-five cases were removed for completing the survey in under 15 minutes, which had been established as the minimum time required for a naïve participant to complete the survey, and one was removed for taking over 24 hours to complete the survey. One hundred and ten cases were removed due to responding “Yes” or “I don’t know” when asked if their partner also completed the survey.

***Measures***

The Hungarian versions of the DASS-21 (Mezei et al., 2015) and DCI (Martos et al., 2012) were administered. The PRQC (Fletcher, 2000) was translated from English to Hungarian following appropriate translation procedures.

**India**

Institutional review board approval was obtained from Pondicherry University(HECPU/2020/03/11-11-2020). Data collection took place from May 28, 2020 to July 25, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 24, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited across India by distributing the survey on various social media platforms (e.g., WhatsApp groups and Facebook) and via email. In addition, printed survey forms were circulated in residential apartments in a few towns. Participants could choose to enter a raffle to win one of 26 $5 Amazon e-gift cards at the end of the survey.

***Participants***

A total of 635 participants accessed the survey. Based on screening criteria, twenty-six participants were ineligible. Responses of 98 participants were removed due to responding “Yes” or “I don’t know” when asked if their partner also completed the survey. Participants were not removed based on their response time.

***Measures***

All measures were administered in English.

**Indonesia**

Indonesia’s PI deferred to Arizona State University’s Institutional review board approval (STUDY00011717) as explained by Chairman of Research Ethics Board, Bina Nusantara University (Letter Number: 021/VR.RTT/III/2020). Data collection took place from April 22, 2020 to June 29, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 18, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited across Indonesia by survey distribution on various social media sites (e.g., Instagram), professional networking sites (e.g., BINUS University’s Lecturer email blast), and researcher’s personal network (e.g., WhatsApp group). Participants could choose to enter a raffle to win one of four 500,000 IDR e-gift cards at the end of the survey.

***Participants***

A total of 2,021 participants accessed the survey. Based on screening criteria, eight hundred and fifty-six participants were ineligible. Six hundred and thirty-seven cases were removed for completing the survey in under 15 minutes, which had been established as the minimum time required for a naïve participant to complete the survey, and nine were removed for taking over 24 hours to complete the survey. Sixty-seven cases were removed due to responding “Yes” or “I don’t know” when asked if their partner also completed the survey.

***Measures***

The Bahasa versions of the DASS-21 (Damanik, 2011) was administered. The PRQC (Fletcher, 2000) and DCI (Randall et al., 2016) were translated from English to Bahasa following appropriate translation procedures.

**Ireland**

Institutional review board approval was obtained from UniversityCollege Dublin**(**HS-E-20-66-Burke). Data collection took place from April 18, 2020 to June 8, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 16, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited across Ireland by survey distribution on various social media sites (e.g., Twitter), professional networking sites (e.g., LinkedIn), and was promoted by national media coverage (TheJournal.ie). Participants could choose to enter a raffle to win one of five $30 Amazon e-gift cards at the end of the survey.

***Participants***

A total of 1,620 participants accessed the survey. Based on screening criteria, seven hundred and nineteen participants were ineligible for completing the survey in under 15 minutes, which had been established as the minimum time required for a naïve participant to complete the survey, or for taking over 24 hours to complete the survey. Lastly, sixty-four participants were removed because they reported they were “single” on the relationship status question in the survey.

***Measures***

All measures were administered in English.

**Israel**

Institutional review board approval was obtained from Ben-Gurion University. Data collection took place from March 29, 2020 to June 27, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 19, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited to the study by survey distribution on various social media sites and word of mouth. Participants were not compensated for their participation.

***Participants***

A total of 1,064 participants accessed the survey. Based on screening criteria, five hundred and thirty-nine participants were ineligible. Four hundred and thirty-three cases were removed for completing the survey in under 10 minutes, which had been established as the minimum time required for a naïve participant to complete the survey, and eight participants were removed for completing the survey in over 24 hours.

***Measures***

The DASS-21 (Lovibond & Lovibond, 1995), PRQC (Fletcher, 2000), and DCI (Randall et al., 2016) were translated from English to Hebrew following appropriate translation procedures.

**Italy**

Institutional review board approval was obtained from “Sapienza” University of Rome, Department of Dynamic and Clinical Psychology (n. 0000329). Data collection took place from March 19, 2020 to May 3, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 11, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited across Italy by survey distribution on various social media sites (e.g., Facebook and Instagram) and university listservs. Participants could choose to enter a raffle to win one of five 15 EUR Amazon e-gift cards or one of six 10 EUR Amazon e-gift cards at the end of the survey.

***Participants***

A total of 1,794 participants accessed the survey. Based on screening criteria, seven hundred and fifty-one participants were ineligible. One hundred and twelve cases were removed for completing the survey in under 15 minutes, which had been established as the minimum time required for a naïve participant to complete the survey, and 13 were removed for taking over 24 hours to complete the survey. Sixty-eight cases were removed due to responding “Yes” or “I don’t know” when asked if their partner also completed the survey. Lastly, twenty-four participants were removed because they reported they were “single” on the relationship status question in the survey.

***Measures***

The Italian versions of the DASS-21 (Bottesi et al., 2015) and DCI (Donato et al., 2009) were administered. The PRQC (Fletcher, 2000) was translated from English to Italian following appropriate translation procedures.

**Malaysia**

Institutional review board approval was obtained from UCSI University (IEC-2020-FoSSLA009). Data collection took place from May 5, 2020 to July 31, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 18, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited across from survey distribution on various social media sites (e.g., Facebook, WhatsApp), and academic social-networking platform (e.g., Course Networking). Participants could choose to enter a raffle to win one of three $50 Amazon e-gift cards at the end of the survey.

***Participants***

A total of 496 participants accessed the survey. Based on screening criteria, one hundred and twenty-seven participants were ineligible. One hundred and thirty-five cases were removed for completing the survey in under 15 minutes, which had been established as the minimum time required for a naïve participant to complete the survey. No participants were removed based on whether they had answered “Yes” or “I don’t know” to their partner completing the survey.

***Measures***

The Malay versions of the DASS-21 (Nordin et al., 2017) was administered. The PRQC (Fletcher, 2000) and DCI (Randall et al., 2016) were translated from English to Malay following appropriate translation procedures.

**Netherlands**

Ethics approval was obtained from by the Ethics Review Board of the Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences, University of Amsterdam (Study 2020-SP-12150). Data collection took place from May 7, 2020 to June 5, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 16, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited across the Netherlands through private networks, paid ads on social media sites (e.g., Facebook), as well as through listservs at the investigators’ universities. Participants could choose to enter a raffle to win one of ten 50 EUR vouchers for a popular Dutch supermarket chain at the end of the survey.

***Participants***

A total of 2,377 participants accessed the survey. Based on screening criteria, three hundred and sixty-seven participants were ineligible, and 730 participants were removed due to incomplete participation. One hundred and seventy-two cases were removed for completing the survey in under 12 minutes, which had been established as the minimum time required for a naïve participant to complete the survey. Moreover, twelve participants were removed for taking over 24 hours to complete the survey. Forty-nine participants were removed due to responding “Yes” or “I don’t know” when asked if their partner also completed the survey.

***Measures***

The Dutch versions of the DASS-21 (de Beurs et al., 2010) and DCI (Ponnet, 2012) were administered. The PRQC (Fletcher, 2000) was translated from English to Dutch following appropriate translation procedures.

**Pakistan**

The Director office, University of Sargodha, Sub-campus, Bhakkar, Pakistan issued a letter of Agreement with ASU’s IRB protocol via Ref. no. SU/BK/403 dated 31 March 2020 for the use of Arizona State University (ASU) IRB Protocol (IRB ID: STUDY00011717) in Pakistan with necessary modification. In response to the letter of Agreement, ASU’s IRB issued a letter of approval for modification. Data collection took place from April 15, 2020 to June 5, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 23, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited across Pakistan by online distribution of survey questionnaires through social media sites (e.g., Facebook and WhatsApp) and professional network of colleagues across Pakistan. Participants could choose to enter a raffle to win one of 29 $5 Amazon e-gift cards at the end of the survey.

***Participants***

A total of 1,600 individuals accessed the survey. Based on screening criteria, three hundred and sixty-six were ineligible. Nine cases were removed for completing the survey in less than 900 seconds, which had been established as the minimum time required for a naïve participant to complete the survey, and 29 were removed for taking more than 24 hours to complete the survey. Six hundred and seventy-nine were removed due to responding “Yes” or “I don’t know” when asked if their partner also completed the survey.

***Measures***

The Urdu versions of the DASS-21 (Aslam, 2007) and DCI (Shujja et al., in press) were administered. The PRQC (Fletcher, 2000) was translated from English to Urdu following appropriate translation procedures.

**Portugal**

Institutional review board approval was obtained from Comissão de Ética e Deontologia da Investigação (CEDI) from Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences - University of Coimbra. Data collection took place from April 6, 2020 to May 28, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 18, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited across all the country (islands included - Madeira and Azores) by survey distribution on various social media sites (e.g., Facebook) and professional networking (e.g., webpages of University of Coimbra, Center of Social Studies). Participants could choose to enter a raffle to win one of six $25 Amazon e-gift cards at the end of the survey.

***Participants***

A total of 1,378 participants accessed the survey. Based on screening criteria, three hundred and fifty-five participants were ineligible. Three hundred and seventy-three cases were removed for completing the survey in under 12 minutes, which had been established as the minimum time required for a naïve participant to complete the survey, and 11 were removed for taking over 24 hours to complete the survey. Fifty-eight cases were removed due to responding “Yes” or “I don’t know” when asked if their partner also completed the survey.

***Measures***

The Portuguese versions of the DASS-21 (Apóstolo, Tanner & Arfken, 2012), PRQC (Crespo, Narciso & Costa, 2004), and DCI (Vedes et al., 2013) were administered. However, the PRQC was reduced to 6 items, each corresponding to a dimension of the complete scale (Relationship Satisfaction, Commitment, Intimacy, Trust, Passion, Love).

**Romania**

The present study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Suceava, Romania (number 7425/24.04.2020). Data collection took place from April 25, 2020 to May 18, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 16, 2020.

***Recruitment***

The survey was sent by email to different student groups, alumni, teachers, medical personnel (doctors, nurses) and people working in local administration. In addition, the survey was distributed on different Facebook pages (Faculty Facebook, groups of parents, personal Facebook pages of teachers and students) and in an announcement in a local newspaper. Moreover, students were asked to distribute the survey and collect dyadic data (every student was instructed to collect data from 2 couples) and they received academic course credits. Participants could choose to enter a raffle to win one of five $30 Amazon e-gift cards at the end of the survey.

***Participants***

A total of 3,558 participants accessed the survey. Based on screening criteria 3011 participants were ineligible. One thousand, three hundred and sixty-four cases were removed for completing the survey in under 15 minutes, which had been established as the minimum time required for a naïve participant to complete the survey, and 55 were removed for taking over 24 hours to complete the survey. One thousand, three hundred and twenty-two cases were removed due to responding “Yes” or “I don’t know” when asked if their partner also completed the survey.

***Measures***

The Romanian versions of the DASS-21 (Szabo, 2010) and DCI (Rusu et al., 2016) were administered. The PRQC (Fletcher, 2000) was translated from English to Romanian following appropriate translation procedures.

**Spain**

Institutional review board approval was obtained from FPCEE Blanquerna (Ramon Llull University), Barcelona. Data collection took place from April 15, 2020 to June 10, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 14, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited across Spain by asking for the collaboration of psychology students from various universities and on various social media sites. Participants could choose to enter a raffle to win one of two $50 Amazon e-gift cards or one $45 Amazon e-gift card at the end of the survey.

***Participants***

A total of 1,317 participants accessed the survey. Based on screening criteria, five hundred and seven participants were ineligible. Seven hundred and fifteen cases were removed for completing the survey in under 15 minutes, which had been established as the minimum time required for a naïve participant to complete the survey, and 493 were removed for taking over 24 hours to complete the survey. Six hundred and ninety-five cases were removed due to responding “Yes” or “I don’t know” when asked if their partner also completed the survey.

***Measures***

The DASS-21 (Lovibond & Lovibond, 1995), PRQC (Fletcher, 2000), and DCI (Randall et al., 2016) were translated from English to Spanish following appropriate translation procedures.

**South Korea**

Institutional review board approval was obtained from Yonsei University (7001988-202004-HR-852-03). Data collection took place from April 24, 2020 to April 29, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 4, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited across the South Korea by survey distribution on various social media sites (e.g., Kakao) and listservs of online panels of a survey company in South Korea. Participants could choose to enter a raffle to win one of ten 15,000 Korean won gifticon at the end of the survey.

***Participants***

A total of 726 participants accessed the survey. Based on screening criteria, ninety-seven participants were ineligible. Eighty-nine cases were removed for completing the survey in under 15 minutes, which had been established as the minimum time required for a naïve participant to complete the survey or taking over 24 hours to complete the survey.

***Measures***

The DASS-21 (Lovibond & Lovibond, 1995), PRQC (Fletcher, 2000), and DCI (Randall et al., 2016) were translated from English to Korean following appropriate translation procedures.

**Switzerland**

The regulations of the Ethics Committee (for psychological and related research) of the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Zurich provide for a two-stage procedure for the ethical evaluation of investigations. In the first stage, the researchers themselves assess whether the planned study is ethically questionable using a checklist. If one of the questions on the checklist is answered with "Yes", an application for approval of the study in question must be submitted to the Ethics Committee at a second stage. Since all items on the checklist could be answered with "No", no official ethics application had to be submitted. Participants could choose to enter a raffle to win the book *Was Paare Stark Macht* ("What Strengthens Couples") by Prof. Dr. Guy Bodenmann and Carolin Fux at the end of the survey. Data collection took place from April 8, 2020 to May 15, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 17, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited across the German speaking part of Switzerland by survey distribution on various social media sites (e.g., Facebook), professional networking sites (e.g., LinkedIn), listservs from the University of Zurich and word-of-mouth distribution.

***Participants***

A total of 1,670 participants accessed the survey. Based on screening criteria, one hundred and fifteen participants were ineligible. Sixteen cases were removed for completing the survey in under 12 minutes, which had been established as the minimum time required for a naïve participant to complete the survey, and one case was removed for taking over 24 hours to complete the survey. Thirty-four cases were removed due to responding “Yes” or “I don’t know” when asked if their partner also completed the survey.

***Measures***

The German versions of the DASS-21 (Nilges & Essau, 2015) and DCI (Bodenmann, 2008) were administered. The PRQC (Fletcher, 2000) was translated from English to German following appropriate translation procedures.

**Turkey**

Institutional review board approval was obtained from Middle East Technical University (Ankara) (166 ODTU 2020). Data collection took place from May 11, 2020 to June 2, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 14, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited across Turkey by survey distribution on various social media sites (e.g., Instagram, Facebook, LinkedIn) and several professional listservs. Participants could choose to enter a raffle to win one of five $15 Amazon e-gift cards or one of seven $10 Amazon e-gift cards at the end of the survey.

***Participants***

A total of 601 participants accessed the survey. Based on the screening criteria, one hundred and seven cases were ineligible. Two hundred and forty-seven cases were removed for completing the survey in under 10 minutes, which had been established as the minimum time required for a naïve participant to complete the survey, and one case was removed for taking over 24 hours to complete the survey. Eighty-six cases were removed due to responding “Yes” or “I don’t know” when asked if their partner also completed the survey. Lastly, three participants were removed because they reported they were “single” on the relationship status question in the survey.

***Measures***

The Turkish versions of the DASS-21 (Yıldırım, Boysan, & Kefeli, 2018) and DCI (Kurt & Akbas, 2019) were administered. The PRQC (Fletcher, 2000) was translated from English to Turkish following appropriate translation procedures.

**United Kingdom**

Institutional review board approval was obtained from the University of Southampton (ERGO ID 56289) and from Brunel University London (23007-A-Jun/2020- 25998-1). Data collection took place from April 18, 2020 to July 29, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 23, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited across the United Kingdom by survey distribution on various social media sites (i.e., Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn); university-specific participant pool recruitment platforms; and the Academic Prolific survey site. Participants were awarded with one of three types of incentives (entered a raffle to win one of six £50 Amazon e-gift cards; received research credits from the University where the study was conducted; or received payment of £3.75 via Prolific) at the end of the survey.

***Participants***

A total of 638 participants accessed the survey. Based on screening criteria, one hundred and twenty-three participants were ineligible. One hundred and sixteen cases were removed for completing the survey in under 15 minutes, which had been established as the minimum time required for a naïve participant to complete the survey, and two were removed for taking over 24 hours to complete the survey. Lastly, one participant was removed because they reported they were “single” on the relationship status question in the survey.

***Measures***

All measures were administered in English.

**United States**

Institutional review board approval was obtained from Arizona State University **(**STUDY00011717). Data collection took place from March 18, 2020 to May 31, 2020; country level restrictions went into effect on March 11, 2020.

***Recruitment***

Participants were recruited across the U.S. by survey distribution on social media sites (e.g., Facebook), ResearchMatch, and university Listservs. Participants could choose to enter a raffle to win one of ten $50 Amazon e-gift cards at the end of the survey.

***Participants***

A total of 1,289 participants accessed the survey. Based on screening criteria, three hundred and 85 participants were ineligible. Seven hundred and eighty-four cases were removed for completing the survey in under 15 minutes, which had been established as the minimum time required for a naïve participant to complete the survey, and 16 were removed for taking over 24 hours to complete the survey. Three cases were removed due to responding “Yes” or “I don’t know” when asked if their partner also completed the survey.

***Measures***

All measures were administered in English.

**Data Collection**

Please see supplementary Table 1 for the dates of data collection across countries.

**Data Screening Procedures**

After initial data screening by the country teams, the resulting datasets were further screened for indicators of careless responding (Brühlmann et al., 2020; Curran, 2016). In each country datasets, three indicators were calculated for the responses of the psychological scales (in sum, 114 items): percentage of missing responses, long string index (i.e., the highest number of same responses consecutively in a row) and person-total correlation (i.e., Pearson-correlation coefficient between the individual responses and the sample level averages of the same items). The calculation of long string index was based on 72 items, which included BIPQ (7 items; Broadbent et al., 2006), DCI (37 items; Randall et al., 2016), PRQC (18 items; Fletcher, Simpson, & Thomas, 2000), and WMBWS (14 items; Tennant et al., 2007).

Country-level distributions for person-total correlations (PTCs) and long string indices (LSIs) were calculated. For PTC, we calculated the cutoff value according to the following procedure: We searched for the lowest country level average PTC (.78), subtracted two standard deviations (2\*.25) that resulted in a rounded .30 value which was uniformly used for all country datasets. This cutoff value was more strict than 0.00 recommended by Brühlmann and colleagues (2020), however, the number of screened cases was relatively low. For LSI, analysis showed that scores of 19 and above were uncommon, which also met the recommendation of Brühlmann and colleagues (2020); that is, more than half of the item number of the longest questionnaire (in our case, DCI with 37 items). Finally, cases with missing responses above 25% were also considered as ineligible for inclusion in the final dataset and the subsequent data imputation procedure (Schlomer et al., 2010). The exact number of screened cases by countries is provided in the table below (see supplementary Table 2).

**Multilevel Confirmatory Factor Analysis**

An issue that may muddle the accuracy of our estimates is the clustered structure of our data (i.e., people nested in countries). Group-level factors (e.g., shared culture, language, etc.) may cause the factor structure for psychological distress (i.e., DASS-21) to differ between country, which could impede the validity of estimates in multilevel regression (Julian, 2001). Therefore, we choose to conduct a multilevel confirmatory factor analysis (MCFA) to confirm that a one-factor structure was invariant across within- and between-country levels for pre- and post-COVID-19 psychological distress, respectively. Following the recommendations of Hox et al. (2018) and Huang (2018) , we decomposed the total sample covariance matrix into a pooled within-covariance matrix (i.e., **S­PW**) and a between-covariance matrix (i.e., **SB**) using the ‘mcfa’ package in RStudio version 1.3.959 (see Huang, 2018 for a technical definition; RStudio Team, 2020). Next, a systematic set of steps outlined by Hox et al. (2018) and Huang (2018) were followed to conduct a MCFA using the cfa() function in the ‘lavaan’ package (Rosseel, 2012).

For step 1, we used **SPW** to fit both a three-factor model and a one-factor model while ignoring **SB** (i.e., ignoring group-level variability). A secondary goal of this step was to confirm that a one-factor structure was an acceptable measurement model for the DASS-21 (Lovibond & Lovibond, 1995). If models from step 1 fit poorly, we moved to step 2, where both **SPW** and **SB** were used to fit unique within- and between-country factor structures while constraining factor loadings and variances to be equal across levels (i.e., the null model). Finally, if models from step 2 fit poorly, we moved to step 3, where **SPW** and **SB** were used to estimate different factor structures for within- and between-levels, respectively, while estimating unique variances across levels and constraining factor loadings to a fixed scaling factor at the between-level (see Huang, 2018 for an explanation) (i.e., the independence model). If the independence model had acceptable fit, then it would suggest that there is significant difference in within- and between-country variance, but no unique differences in factor structure that could conflate estimates (Huang, 2018). Intraclass-correlations were very low across all pre-COVID-19 responses (i.e., range = 0.02 to 0.08) and post-COVID-19 responses (i.e., range = 0.01 to 0.09), therefore, the one-factor model was expected to fit adequately at the within- and between-country levels (Hox et al., 2018).

***Pre-COVID-19 Psychological Distress***

In step 1, the three-factor model proved to be the superior fit χ2(186) = 6463.01, RMSEA = 0.05, CFI = 0.95, SRMR = 0.03; however, the one-factor model seemed to fit the data adequately, χ2(189) = 14716.74, RMSEA = 0.08, CFI = 0.88, SRMR = 0.05, per general guidelines for accepting model fit in structural equation modeling (e.g., RMSEA < 0.10, SRMR < 0.08; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2015). Therefore, we elected to proceed with a one-factor structure to fit the null model in step 2.

 When specifying unique structures for **SPW** and **SB**, model fit seemed to border the cutoffs for acceptance, χ2(420) = 24845.08, RMSEA = 0.09, CFI = 0.80, SRMR = 0.06, therefore, we choose to proceed with step 3 and estimate an independence model to explain the between-country variance. The independence model appeared to fit better than the null model, χ2(420) = 15569.06, RMSEA = 0.07, CFI = 0.88, SRMR = 0.05, and seemed to meet most cutoffs for acceptable fit (Hox et al., 2018; Kline, 2015). This signifies that there is significance between-country variability in DASS-21 responses, but no unique factor structure at the between-country level. Therefore, this provides evidence for retaining at one-factor structure for pre-COVID-19 psychological distress at the within- and between-country level (Hox et al., 2018, Huang, 2018).

***Post-COVID-19 Psychological Distress***

For the post-COVID-19 DASS-21 data, the three-factor model was a better fit, χ2(186) = 8211.13, RMSEA = 0.06, CFI = 0.95, SRMR = 0.04; however, the one-factor model fit the data adequately, χ2(189) = 21213.19, RMSEA = 0.09, CFI = 0.86, SRMR = 0.06, (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2015). Therefore, we proceeded with a one-factor structure to fit the null model in step 2.

 When specifying unique factor structures for **SPW** and **SB**, model fit seemed fall just outside of cutoffs for acceptance, χ2(420) = 32029.00, RMSEA = 0.11, CFI = 0.80, SRMR = 0.06, therefore, we choose to proceed with step 3 and estimate an independence model. The independence model appeared to fit better than the null model, χ2(420) = 21946.44, RMSEA = 0.09, CFI = 0.86, SRMR = 0.06, and seemed to meet most cutoffs for acceptable fit (Hox et al., 2018; Kline, 2015). Therefore, this provides evidence for retaining at one-factor structure for post-COVID-19 psychological distress at the within- and between-country level (Hox et al., 2018, Huang, 2018).
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Supplementary Table 1: *Dates of Data Collection Across Countries*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Data Collection** |   |
|   | **Start** | **End** | **Start Date of Quarantine** |
| **North America and West Europe** |  |  |
| Austria | 4/28/2020 | 5/17/2020 | 3/16/2020 |
| Belgium | 5/25/2020 | 7/8/2020 | 3/8/2020 |
| Belgium - French part | 5/19/2020 | 7/5/2020 | 3/8/2020 |
| Canada | 4/24/2020 | 7/31/2020 | 3/13/2020 (Quebec); 3/18/2020 (all provinces) |
| Germany | 4/7/2020 | 5/10/2020 | 3/16/2020 |
| Greece | 4/10/2020 | 5/9/2020 | 3/23/2020 |
| Ireland | 4/18/2020 | 6/8/2020 | 3/16/2020 |
| Italy | 3/19/2020 | 5/3/2020 | 3/11/2020 |
| Netherlands | 5/7/2020 | 6/5/2020 | 3/16/2020 |
| Portugal | 4/6/2020 | 5/26/2020 | 3/18/2020 |
| Spain | 4/15/2020 | 6/10/2020 | 3/14/2020 |
| Switzerland | 4/8/2020 | 5/15/2020 | 3/17/2020 |
| United Kingdom | 4/18/2020 | 7/29/2020 | 3/23/2020 |
| United States  | 3/18/2020 | 5/31/2020 | 3/11/2020 |
|  |  |  |  |
| **East Europe** |  |  |  |
| Hungary | 4/13/2020 | 5/17/2020 | 3/16/2020 |
| Romania | 4/25/2020 | 5/18/2020 | 3/16/2020 |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Asia** |  |  |  |
| Bangladesh | 7/10/2020 | 8/19/2020 | 3/15/2020 |
| India | 5/28/2020 | 7/25/2020 | 3/24/2020 |
| Indonesia | 4/22/2020 | 6/29/2020 | 3/18/2020 |
| Malaysia | 5/5/2020 | 7/31/2020 | 3/18/2020 |
| Pakistan | 4/15/2020 | 5/5/2020 | 3/23/2020 |
| South Korea | 4/24/2020 | 4/29/2020 | 3/4/2020 |
| Turkey | 5/11/2020 | 6/2/2020 | 3/14/2020 |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Middle East** |  |  |  |
| Israel | 3/29/2020 | 6/27/2020 | 3/19/2020 |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Africa** |  |  |  |
| Ghana | 4/26/2020 | 6/2/2020 | 3/30/2020 |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Middle and South America** |  |  |  |
| Brazil | 4/22/2020 | 7/6/2020 | 3/23/2020 |
| Chile | 4/29/2020 | 8/1/2020 | 3/23/2020 |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Oceania** |  |  |  |
| Australia | 6/6/2020 | 7/30/2020 | 3/24/2020 |

Supplementary Table 2: *Reports of Data Screening Numbers*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | PTC | longstring | missing | screened sum |
| **North America and West Europe** |  |  |  |  |
|  Austria | 9 | 0 | 41 | 42 |
|  Belgium | 4 | 2 | 0 | 6 |
|  Canada | 0 | 0 | 14 | 14 |
|  Germany | 0 | 1 | 39 | 40 |
|  Greece | 2 | 1 | 9 | 11 |
|  Ireland | 0 | 1 | 30 | 31 |
|  Italy | 5 | 1 | 0 | 6 |
|  Netherlands | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  Portugal | 6 | 3 | 49 | 55 |
|  Spain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  Switzerland | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  United Kingdom | 5 | 0 | 14 | 17 |
|  United States | 5 | 1 | 28 | 30 |
| **East Europe** |  |  |  |  |
|  Hungary | 7 | 1 | 19 | 26 |
|  Romania | 5 | 6 | 17 | 25 |
| **Asia** |  |  |  |  |
|  Bangladesh | 0 | 12 | 35 | 47 |
|  India | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
|  Indonesia | 7 | 3 | 42 | 49 |
|  Malaysia | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
|  Pakistan | 2 | 5 | 0 | 6 |
|  South Korea | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
|  Turkey | 0 | 2 | 19 | 21 |
| **Middle East** |  |  |  |  |
|  Israel | 6 | 0 | 67 | 67 |
| **Africa**  |  |  |  |  |
|  Ghana | 0 | 0 | 53 | 53 |
| **Middle and South America** |  |  |  |  |
|  Brazil | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
|  Chile | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| **Oceania**  |  |  |  |  |
|  Australia | 12 | 0 | 6 | 13 |

*Note:* PTC = person-total correlation index; longstring = long string index; missing = missing cases > 25%; screened sum = number of total screened cases.