Social buffering of human fear is shaped by gender, social concern and the presence of real vs virtual agents

Yanyan Qi^{1, 2}, PhD; Dorothée Bruch¹; Philipp Krop³, BS; Martin J. Herrmann¹, PhD; Marc E. Latoschik³, PhD; Jürgen Deckert¹, MD; & Grit Hein¹, PhD

¹ Center of Mental Health, Department of Psychiatry, Psychosomatic and Psychotherapy, Translational Social Neuroscience Unit, University of Würzburg, Würzburg, 97080, Germany

² Department of Psychology, School of Education, Zhengzhou University, Zhengzhou, 450001, China

³ Human-Computer Interaction, University of Würzburg, Am Hubland, 97074, Würzburg

Corresponding authors:

Grit Hein, PhD, Center of Mental Health, Department of Psychiatry, Psychosomatic and Psychotherapy, Translational Social Neuroscience Unit, University of Würzburg, Würzburg, 97080, Germany. E-mail: Hein_G@ukw.de

Yanyan Qi, PhD, Department of Psychology, School of Education, Zhengzhou University, Zhengzhou, 450001, China. E-mail: Qi_Yanyan@outlook.com

Running title: Social buffering in real-life and virtual reality

Keywords: fear reduction; social buffering; social concern; virtual reality; gender differences; skin conductance responses

1 **Abstract**

2 The presence of a partner can attenuate physiological fear responses, a phenomenon
3 known as social buffering. However, not all individuals are equally sociable. Here we
4 investigated whether social buffering of fear is shaped by sensitivity to social anxiety
5 (social concern) and whether these effects are different in females and males. We
6 collected skin conductance responses (SCRs) and affect ratings of female and male
7 participants when they experienced aversive and neutral sounds alone (alone
8 treatment) or in the presence of an unknown person of the same gender (social
9 treatment). Individual differences in social concern were assessed based on a well-
10 established questionnaire. Our results showed that social concern had a stronger effect
11 on social buffering in females than in males. The lower females scored on social
12 concern, the stronger the SCRs reduction in the social compared to the alone
13 treatment. The effect of social concern on social buffering of fear in females
14 disappeared if participants were paired with a virtual agent instead of a real person.
15 Together, these results showed that social buffering of human fear is shaped by
16 gender and social concern. In females, the presence of virtual agents can buffer fear,
17 irrespective of individual differences in social concern. These findings specify factors
18 that shape the social modulation of human fear, and thus might be relevant for the
19 treatment of anxiety disorders.

20

Introduction

Excessive fear responses are characteristic of anxiety disorders and pave the way for a variety of other psychological and psychiatric problems. There is evidence from animal models that autonomic (1, 2) and neural (2-5) fear responses are reduced in the presence of a conspecific, a phenomenon known as social buffering (6-8). Adapting the paradigms that were used to study social buffering in animals, recent studies have shown similar social buffering of autonomic fear responses in humans (9, 10). These results showed that the mere presence of another individual can buffer fear in humans, similar to basic social modulation mechanisms observed in animals. Moreover, there is recent evidence suggesting that the virtual presence of another person can buffer responses to social stress, if participants believe that the virtual agent was steered by a real person (11, 12).

Given that it can attenuate physiological fear responses, the effects of social buffering on fear in humans is potentially relevant for the diagnosis and treatment of anxiety disorders. Strengthening this point, there is evidence that individuals who score higher on trait (13, 14) or state (9, 15) anxiety show a stronger reduction of fear responses in the presence of another individual as compared to less anxious individuals.

However, not all humans are equally sociable. In some individuals, the presence of another person induces anxiety, paralleled by an increase in autonomic fear and hormonal stress responses (16-18). In virtual social interaction, i.e., interactions with

virtual agents, stress responses related to social anxiety tend to be reduced compared to personal interactions (19). There is evidence that social anxiety manifests differently in females and in males. In females, social anxiety tends to be generalized, i.e., to occur in a variety of different social contexts (20, 21). In contrast, males are mainly concerned and anxious in situations related to mating, indicated by increased physiological fear responses in the presence of a potential partner (22).

The sensitivity to anxiety in social situations has been defined as an independent dimension of human anxiety, known as social concern (23-26). Social concern is characterized by worries about publicly observable anxious reactions to social censure or rejection (23, 27). Thus, individuals scoring high on social concern might be more prone to experiencing social anxiety in the presence of another individual, rather than a social buffering effect, i.e., a reduction of subjective and autonomic fear responses.

Taken together, there is prior evidence that the mere presence of a real or virtual person can buffer physiological fear responses in humans. However, it remains unclear as to whether and how social buffering of human fear is shaped by social concern, and whether the effects of social concern are different in females and males.

To address these questions, we first tested how social concern influences the social buffering of fear in the presence of an unknown person in females and males (real-life; Study 1). Second, we investigated the effect of social concern on social buffering in the presence of a virtual agent (virtual reality, VR; Study 2). The agent was an exact virtual representation (created based on a body scan) of the real partner in Study 1 and was placed in a virtual environment that was identical to the testing

room used in the real-life study (Fig. 1). It was clear to the participants that the agent was not steered by a real person.

In more detail, in the real-life and the VR studies, participants were presented with the same aversive, fear-inducing or neutral sounds, and their autonomic responses (skin conductance responses, SCRs) and subjective ratings were measured. Participants experienced the sounds alone (real-life / VR alone treatment groups), or in the presence of an unknown person of the same gender and ethnicity, or a virtual representation of a person (real-life / VR social treatment groups). The real or virtual partners faced away from the participant and her or his screen and fixated on the opposite wall (Fig. 1). This manipulation was important to minimize social interaction and the effect of social evaluation. Hence, the partner was merely physically present, without direct social interaction, similar to studies that investigated social buffering in animals. The gender of the partner (confederate) matched the gender of the participants to avoid the potential complications inherent in mixed-gender pairings and consistent with same-sex setting used by most animal studies (28, 29).

Figure 1. Virtual environment including the virtual agent. The virtual environment in the VR study was an exact replication of the testing room used in the real-life study.

The virtual agent was created based on a body scan of the person that was present in the real-life study.

We assessed individual differences in social concern (worries regarding social censure or rejection because of publicly observable reactions) (23, 24) using the Anxiety Sensitivity Index (ASI-3; 23). The ASI-3 is a well-established questionnaire that allows for assessing social concern in parallel with other anxiety dimensions, i.e., physical and cognitive concern (see below for details). The parallel assessment of different anxiety dimensions was important, because it allowed us to evaluate the effect of social concern, compared to physical and cognitive concern.

Guided by previous studies (9, 30), we assumed that the real or virtual presence of another person might reduce the subjective and autonomic fear responses, indicating a social buffering effect. In this case, the SCRs and subjective ratings to aversive sounds should be significantly smaller in the social compared to the alone treatment groups. Given that individuals scoring high on social concern tend to fear social encounters, high social concern scores should counteract social buffering. The higher the social concern, the smaller the reduction in SCRs and subjective ratings to aversive sounds in the social compared to the alone treatment groups. Inspired by findings showing more generalized social anxiety effects in females (20-22), we hypothesized that this effect might be stronger in females than in males, reflected by a significant interaction between gender (female / male), treatment (alone / social) and social concern. Motivated by studies showing a reduction of social stress during virtual compared to real-life social interactions (19), we expected that the effect of

social concern on social buffering should be significantly stronger in the presence of a real person compared to the presence of a virtual representation (agent) of this same person.

Methods and Materials

Real-life Study 1.

Participants

The sample size required to detect differential effects between treatment groups and the modulating effect of individual differences (here social concern) was estimated based on a power calculation (threshold of 80% sensitivity ($1 - \beta = 0.80$); $\alpha = 0.05$; medium effect size; 31) of our previous study (9) in which we used a similar design as in the current study. The results yielded a required sample size smaller than 26 in each group. In total, 147 healthy Caucasian participants (72 females) participated in this study. The participants had no history of neurological or psychiatric disorders and were pre-screened to exclude depressive symptoms (32). All participants gave written informed consent before the study. Participants were randomly assigned to an alone treatment group or a social treatment group. The participants in the social treatment group were paired with a person of the same gender and ethnicity, i.e., a Caucasian female or male student who was unknown to all the participants to avoid the potential complications of gender-mixed pairing of participants and confederates. Participants in the alone treatment group completed the

experiment without another person. The data of 13 participants had to be excluded: four due to technical problems, six because of extensive artefacts in the SCRs signal that could not be corrected, and three because of a lack of SCRs during the entire data acquisition. We analysed the data of 134 participants: 31 females in the alone treatment ($M_{age} = 23.74$, $SD_{age} = 0.40$), 35 females in social treatment ($M_{age} = 25.51$, $SD_{age} = 0.85$), 34 males in alone treatment ($M_{age} = 24.76$, $SD_{age} = 0.72$) and 34 males in social treatment ($M_{age} = 27.21$, $SD_{age} = 0.86$). The data of the female sample were part of an analysis reported elsewhere (9). However, none of the analyses in the current manuscript have been previously reported. The study was approved by the ethics committee of the University Hospital of Wurzburg (142/18), and all procedures were conducted in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975 and its later amendments.

Scales

Before the study, all participants were screened for depression (32) and filled in questionnaires measuring different dimensions of anxiety sensitivity (23), perceived social support (Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support, MSPSS; 33), positive and negative affect (Positive and Negative Affect Schedule, PANAS; 34) and state and trait anxiety (State-Trait Anxiety Inventory, STAI; 35). After the study, participants of the social treatment groups rated statements regarding their impressions of the other person (the confederate) on a well-established scale (36), ranging from 1 (not at all) to 9 (very much).

Stimuli and paradigm

During the test, all participants were presented with aversive and neutral sounds via headphones. The sounds were taken from the International Affective Digital Sounds system (IADS; 37), and it had been identified that the presentation of the aversive sounds can induce fear, which was significantly stronger than the neutral sounds (9, 38). The type of the sound was indicated by a preceding image (cue) presented on a black screen: a white circle was the cue for aversive sounds whereas a white square indicated neutral sounds. The sounds and corresponding images were presented in a pseudo-randomized order. Each trial started with a fixation cross, which was replaced by one of the cues. After an interval varying from 6 s to 25 s (mean interval = 16.2 s), the respective sound (4 s) was presented. Then participants rated their feeling while hearing the sound on a continuous scale from -4 (very bad) to +4 (very good) that was presented for 4 s. The cursor of the rating scale was placed at a random position in each trial to keep participants' attention and minimize rating error. There were three blocks of 18 trials with half of them including aversive sounds and the remaining half of them including neutral sounds. Before the main experiment, all participants performed four practice trials: two containing aversive sounds and two containing neutral sounds to familiarize themselves to the task.

Recording of SCRs

The SCRs were continuously collected during the main part of the experiment by a Brainamp ExG MR amplifier (Brain Products GmbH), and recorded by Vision Recorder software (Brain Products GmbH). Two Ag/AgCl electrodes filled with non-hydrating gel were attached to the thenar and hypothenar of participants' non-

dominant palm. The sample rate was 1000 Hz. The constant voltage across the two electrodes was 0.5 V (9).

Data analysis

The SCRs were pre-processed by EEGLAB toolbox (39). Low-pass filtering (1 Hz) was performed on the raw data to remove high-frequency noise. For each trial, an epoch that started 1 s before sound onset (defined as 0 s) and lasted for 10 s was segmented. The responses during the 1 s before the stimulus were used for baseline correction. Based on the grand-averaged wave, the SCRs value was characterized as the area under the curve per second in the time window from 2.5 s – 6 s after stimulus onset, a method that has been recommended if discrete SCRs are hard to discern in one experimental condition (here discrete SCRs in response to the neutral sounds were hard to detect) (9, 40-42). SCRs were transformed by $\log(x+1)$ to correct for skewness.

We conducted linear mixed models with trial by trial affect ratings and SCRs as the dependent variable (LMM, “lme4” package of the R-software; 43). We tested all fixed effects by setting a different “baseline” value for each participant (random intercept) to resolve non-independence of SCRs / affect ratings for each participant. The variables were included into the model based on our primary hypotheses. When testing the higher order interaction, all lower order terms were included in the regression equation (44). To control for unspecific effects of depression, the negative emotion and state anxiety before the test, ratings on the depression scale (32),

PANAS-Negative emotion and STAI-Pre-anxiety were included as covariates in all LMMs.

Effect sizes reported for LLM results are based on the marginal R^2 (R^2_m) which estimates the proportion of variance explained by the fixed factors (45), calculated with the R package “MuMIn” (46). Effect sizes reported for post-hoc and simple effect tests are based on estimated marginal means (EMM) (47), calculated with the R package “emmeans”. The Kenward-roger method was used for freedom degree estimation. Continuous independent variables were normalized in all analyses.

VR Study 2.

Participants

61 healthy Caucasian females participated in the VR study. The inclusion criteria were the same as in Study 1. Participants were randomly assigned to the alone and social treatment groups. The data of 10 participants had to be excluded: one due to technical problems, one because of extensive artefacts in the SCRs signal that could not be corrected, six because of lack of SCRs and two because of problems conducting the ratings. In total, we analysed the data of 51 participants: 25 females in the alone treatment group ($M_{age} = 23.29$, $SD_{age} = 0.42$) and 26 females in social treatment group ($M_{age} = 23.98$, $SD_{age} = 0.57$). As Study 1, Study 2 was approved by the ethics committee of the University Hospital of Wurzburg, and all procedures were conducted in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975 and its later amendments.

Scales

Participants completed the same scales as in Study 1. In addition, we used a German version of the Networked Minds Measure of Social Presence (NMMSP; 48) to test how participants perceived the presence of the agent. It has two sub-dimensions, measuring perceived co-presence and psycho-behavioural accessibility. The co-presence scale measures the degree to which the presence of the agent is processed on a low-level sensory level (e.g., I was often aware of my partner in the room). The psycho-behavioural interaction scale measures the degree of perceived social interactions with the virtual agent (e.g., I was able to communicate my intentions clearly to my partner) on a scale from '1' (not at all) to '7' (very much).

Stimuli and paradigm

The stimuli and the paradigm were same as in Study 1, except that participants performed the study in a virtual environment (Fig. 1). They wore a VR headset (HTC Vive Pro). The resolution of the goggles was 2880 x 1600 pixels. The virtual environment was a precise representation of the testing room used during data collection in Study 1, which was created with Unreal Engine 4.24.3. The agent was created based on a high-resolution body scan of the female confederate that was present in Study 1, following a human avatar generation pipeline by Achenbach et al. (49). As the confederate, the virtual agent faced away from the participant (Fig. 1) and performed small humanoid movements (e.g., slightly moving the arm on the arm rest of the chair), but did not interact with the participant. The affect ratings were conducted by pressing the button on the controller.

Recording of SCRs and data analyses

Recording and pre-processing of the SCRs was identical to Study 1.

To investigate differences in social buffering effects between real and virtual social presence and the modulating effect of social concern, we combined the female data in the real-life (female data in Study 1) and the data in the VR (Study 2). Study (real-life / VR) was included as a between-subject variable.

Results

Study 1: Testing the effect of social concern on social buffering in the presence of a real person

Scales

The average scores on ASI-3, MSPSS, ADS, STAI and PANAS were comparable between the four groups (female-alone; female-social; male-alone; male-social) (Table 1). The only difference was found in impression ratings for the present partner that were more positive in the female compared to the male sample.

Table 1. Characteristics of the participants in Study 1

	Female-alone Mean (SE)	Female-social Mean (SE)	Male-alone Mean (SE)	Male-social Mean (SE)	F/t-test (p)
ASI-3					
- social concern	8.90 (.76)	8.97 (.68)	8.94 (.68)	8.94 (.71)	.002 (.96)
- physical concern	5.61 (.79)	5.77 (.68)	5.68 (.70)	4.68 (.67)	.67 (.42)
- cognitive concern	4.23 (.61)	4.34 (.68)	4.09 (.48)	4.26 (.65)	.002 (.96)
MSPSS					

- family	24.03 (.98)	23.71 (.96)	23.91 (.76)	23.61 (.67)	0001 (.99)
- friends	25.13 (.76)	25.40 (.51)	24.68 (.53)	24.44 (.63)	.17 (.68)
- significant other	25.64 (.78)	25.94 (.59)	24.79 (.50)	24.35 (.64)	.34 (.56)
ADS	7.52 (.83)	7.66 (.74)	5.91 (.62)	6.56 (.70)	.12 (.73)
STAI-Trait	35.10 (1.29)	35.29 (1.53)	32.82 (.90)	34.97 (1.56)	.52 (.47)
STAI-State	33.57 (1.27)	34.03 (1.27)	33.65 (.78)	34.00 (1.21)	.002 (.96)
PANAS-Positive	29.47 (.98)	28.77 (1.16)	3.97 (.87)	31.26 (1.10)	.23 (.64)
PANAS-negative	11.40 (.40)	11.54 (.25)	11.62 (.30)	12.21 (.39)	.44 (.61)
Impression ratings					
- pleasant		6.09 (.23)		5.21 (.22)	2.80 (.007)
- sympathetic		6.51 (.25)		5.71 (.24)	2.36 (.02)
- helpful		4.06 (.39)		2.56 (.40)	2.71 (.009)
- make the task easier		3.92 (.41)		2.89 (.37)	1.84 (.070)

Note. ASI-3: Anxiety Sensitivity Index-3; MSPSS: Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support; ADS: Allgemeine Depressions Skala; STAI: State-Trait Anxiety Inventory; PANAS: Positive and Negative Affect Schedule; SE: standard error. Bold values are significant at $p < .05$.

Aversive sounds elicited a more negative affect and larger SCRs than neutral sounds

As a manipulation check, we compared the affect ratings and SCRs to aversive and neutral sounds in the alone treatment groups. The results showed significantly more negative affect ratings for aversive compared to neutral sounds in females and males, with a stronger effect in females, $B = -.56$, $p < .001$ (females: aversive sounds, $M = -1.97$, $SE = .11$, neutral sounds, $M = 1.33$, $SE = .11$, $t(3443) = -56.28$, $p < .0001$, $EMM = -3.31$, $SE = .059$; males: aversive sounds, $M = -1.69$, $SE = .11$, neutral sounds, $M = 1.05$, $SE = .11$, $t(3443) = -48.91$, $p < .0001$, $EMM = -2.74$, $SE = .056$).

Moreover, SCRs to aversive sounds were significantly higher than neutral sounds with a stronger effect in females, $B = .083$, $p < .001$ (females: aversive sounds, $M = .15$, $SE = .010$, neutral sounds, $M = -.0063$, $SE = .010$, $t(3420) = 18.41$, $p < .001$, $EMM = .16$, $SE = .0084$; males: aversive sounds, $M = .084$, $SE = .010$, neutral sounds, $M = .012$, $SE = .010$, $t(3420) = 8.97$, $p < .001$, $EMM = .072$, $SE = .0080$).

The SCRs to aversive sounds were significantly related to participants' affect ratings with a larger effect in females, $B = .024$, $p < .001$ (females: $B = -.057$, 95% CI = $[-.063, -.052]$, males: $B = -.033$, 95% CI = $[-.039, -.027]$). The higher the SCRs to the aversive sounds, the more negative participants' affect ratings.

Social buffering in females, but not in males

First, we tested if the presence of a real partner had an effect on the ratings that participants made after hearing the sounds. An LMM with affect ratings to aversive sounds as the dependent variable and treatment (alone / social), gender (female / male) and treatment $\times$ gender as the predictors showed no significant effects, treatment ($B = .35$, $p = .160$), gender ($B = .32$, $p = .210$), treatment $\times$ gender ($B = -.21$, $p = .560$); $R^2_m = .028$.

Second, we performed the same model with SCRs to aversive sounds as the dependent variable. The results showed significant main effects of treatment ($B = -.064$, $p < .0017$) and gender ($B = -.058$, $p = .006$), and a significant treatment $\times$ gender interaction ($B = .059$, $p = .042$) (Fig. 2, Table 2); $R^2_m = .019$. Clarifying the interaction effect, simple effect analyses showed significantly larger SCRs in the alone treatment group compared to the social treatment group in females (alone: M

285 = .14, $SE = .015$, social: $M = .077$, $SE = .014$, $t(126) = 3.13$, $p = .0022$, $EMM = .064$,
286 $SE = .021$), but not in males (alone: $M = .084$, $SE = .014$, social: $M = .078$, $SE = .014$,
287 $t(126) = .29$, $p = .77$, $EMM = .0058$, $SE = .020$). Together, these SCRs results indicate
288 a significant social buffering effect in the female sample, but not in the male sample.

289 **Figure 2.** Mean skin conductance responses (SCRs) to aversive and neutral sounds
290 for each female (upper panel) and male (lower panel) participant in the alone and
291 social treatment groups. On average, females showed a significant reduction in SCRs
292 to aversive sounds in the social treatment compared to the alone treatment groups.
293 There was no such significant effect in males. The values of SCRs were transformed
294 by $\log(x+1)$ to correct the skewness. Error bars indicate standard error.

296

297 **Table 2.** Results of LMM testing the buffering in different genders

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	χ^2	<i>Df</i>	<i>P value</i>
(Intercept)	.14	.015	86.05	1	< .001
Treatment	-.064	.021	9.82	1	.0017
Gender	-.058	.021	7.56	1	.0060
PANAS-negative	-.0039	.0093	.17	1	.68

State anxiety	.0005	.0099	.0029	1	.96
ADS	-.0004	.0091	.0021	1	.96
Treatment × Gender	.059	.029	4.14	1	.042

Note. PANAS: Positive and Negative Affect Schedule; ADS: Allgemeine
Depressions Skala; SE: standard error. Bold values are significant at $p < .05$.

Given the gender differences in impression ratings (Table 1), it is possible that females showed stronger social buffering because they perceived their partner more positively than males. In this case, the individual differences in impression ratings should significantly predict the individual differences in SCRs in the social treatment groups. Note that this analysis can only be conducted on the social treatment groups, because participants in the alone treatment groups did not have a partner and thus could not provide impression ratings. An LMM with SCRs to aversive sounds as the dependent variable and gender, impression rating, and gender × impression rating as the predictors showed no significant main effects of gender ($B = .0034$, $p = .87$) and impression rating ($B = .0098$, $p = .47$), and no significant gender × impression rating interaction ($B = -.012$, $p = .54$); $R^2_m = .0089$. According to this result, gender differences in impression ratings are unlikely to account for the observed gender difference in social buffering.

Differential effects of social concern on social buffering in females and males

To investigate the effect of social concern on social buffering in females and males, we conducted an LMM with social concern, gender (female / male), treatment (social / alone) and their interaction items as the predictors and SCRs to aversive sounds as the dependent variable. The results showed significant main effects of

319 gender ($B = -.17, p < .001$) and treatment ($B = -.16, p < .001$), significant two-way
 320 interactions between social concern and gender ($B = .013, p = .012$), between
 321 treatment and gender ($B = .23, p < .001$), and between treatment and social concern (B
 322 $= .011, p = .027$), and a significant three-way interaction between social concern,
 323 treatment and gender ($B = -.019, p = .0067$), $R^2_m = .034$ (Fig. 3 and Table 3). To
 324 unpack the three-way interaction, we conducted an LMM separately for females and
 325 males. For females, the result showed a significant main effect of treatment ($B = -.17,$
 326 $p = .006$), and a marginally significant social concern $\times$ treatment effect ($B = .011, p$
 327 $= .066$); $R^2_m = .028$. As shown in the left panel in Fig. 3, in the social treatment group,
 328 females showed a reduction in SCRs to aversive sounds with decreasing social
 329 concern ($B = .0090, p = .014$), while there was no such effect in the alone treatment
 330 group ($B = -.0061, p = .22$). In males we found a significant main effect of social
 331 concern ($B = .0085, p = .015$), and a significant social concern $\times$ treatment interaction
 332 ($B = -.0077, p = .045$); $R^2_m = .049$. The right panel of Fig. 3 reveals that in males, the
 333 interaction effect was driven by a positive relationship between social concern and
 334 SCRs to aversive sounds in the alone treatment group ($B = .0076, p = .0094$), while
 335 there was no such effect in the social treatment group ($B = .0011, p = .68$).

336

Figure 3. The interaction between treatment (alone / social), gender (female / male) and individual social concern scores predicted the skin conductance responses (SCRs) to aversive sounds. Females with lower social concern benefited more from the present female. In males, increasing social concern resulted in an increase of SCR to aversive sounds in the alone treatment. The values of SCR were transformed by log (x+1).

Table 3. Results of the LMM testing the effect of social concern on buffering in different genders

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	χ^2	<i>Df</i>	<i>P value</i>
(Intercept)	.18	.034	26.36	1	< .001
Treatment	-.16	.048	11.19	1	< .001
Gender	-.17	.049	12.11	1	< .001
Social concern	-.0040	.0035	1.31	1	.25
PANAS-negative	-.0083	.0092	.81	1	.37
State anxiety	.0015	.0098	.024	1	.88
ADS	.0029	.0091	.10	1	.75
Treatment × Gender	.23	.069	11.12	1	< .001
Treatment × Social concern	.011	.0049	4.89	1	.027
Gender × Social concern	.013	.0051	6.32	1	.012
Treatment × Gender × Social concern	-.019	.0071	7.36	1	.0067

Note. PANAS: Positive and Negative Affect Schedule; ADS: Allgemeine Depressions Skala; SE: standard error. Bold values are significant at $p < 0.05$.

To test if the observed effects are specific for social concern, we conducted the same analyses with the two other anxiety dimensions of the ASI, i.e., physical concern and cognitive concern. The respective LMMs revealed no significant three-way interactions (physical concern $\times$ treatment $\times$ gender: $B = -.0018$, $p = .800$, cognitive concern $\times$ treatment $\times$ gender: $B = .0059$, $p = .500$; Figure S1, Tables S1 and S2).

Study 2: Testing the effect of social concern on social buffering in the presence of a virtual person

Study 1 revealed that females showed a reduction in fear-related SCRs in the presence of another person, but only if they scored low on social concern. However, it is unclear if social concern counteracts social buffering in females in general, or just in the presence of a real person. If social concern reduces social buffering only in the presence of a real person, the presence of a virtual person should induce social buffering in females irrespective of social concern. Study 2 tested this assumption by investigating the effect of social concern on social buffering of fear in females in the presence of a virtual person (agent).

Scales

The questionnaire scores of the female participants in Studies 1 and 2 were comparable (Table 4). The results of the NMMSP questionnaire (48) indicated that the virtual agent induced a moderate level of perceived co-presence ($M = 3.54$, $SE = .15$) and a low level of perceived social interactions ($M = 1.39$, $SE = .013$). The

impression ratings for the real partner were more positive than for the virtual agent
(Table 4).

Table 4. Characteristics of the participants in Study 2

	Real-life-alone Mean (SE)	Real-life-social Mean (SE)	VR-alone Mean (SE)	VR-social Mean (SE)	F/t-test
ASI-3					
- social concern	8.90 (.76)	8.97 (.68)	9.88 (1.06)	9.81 (.86)	.007 (.93)
- physical concern	5.61 (.79)	5.77 (.68)	5.44 (.92)	6.31 (1.03)	.18 (.68)
- cognitive concern	4.23 (.61)	4.34 (.68)	4.52 (.71)	5.77 (.90)	.61 (.44)
MSPSS					
- family	24.03 (.98)	23.71 (.96)	24.48 (.92)	24.23 (.71)	.001 (.97)
- friends	25.13 (.76)	25.40 (.51)	25.04 (.72)	26.15 (.48)	.44 (.51)
- significant other	25.64 (.78)	25.94 (.59)	26.20 (.85)	26.11 (.58)	.072 (.79)
ADS	7.52 (.83)	7.66 (.74)	8.48 (1.03)	7.85 (.97)	.19 (.66)
STAI-Trait	35.10 (1.29)	35.29 (1.53)	34.44 (1.32)	35.54 (1.62)	.095 (.76)
STAI-State	33.57 (1.27)	34.03 (1.27)	38.52 (1.69)	37.42 (1.60)	.29 (.59)
PANAS-Positive	29.47 (.98)	28.77 (1.16)	31.20 (1.50)	33.58 (1.24)	1.58 (.21)
PANAS-negative	11.40 (.40)	11.54 (.25)	13.64 (.58)	13.38 (.59)	.20 (.66)
Impression ratings					
- pleasant		6.09 (.23)		3.57 (.23)	6.45 (< .001)
- sympathetic		6.51 (.25)		3.80 (.29)	6.75 (< .001)
- helpful		4.06 (.39)		2.78 (.32)	2.54 (.013)
- make the task easier		3.92 (.41)		2.69 (.30)	2.48 (.015)

Note. ASI-3: Anxiety Sensitivity Index-3; MSPSS: Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support; ADS: Allgemeine Depressions Skala; STAI: State-Trait Anxiety Inventory; PANAS: Positive and Negative Affect Schedule; SE: standard error. Bold values are significant at $p < 0.05$.

Aversive sounds elicited a more negative affect and larger SCRs than neutral sounds

As in Study 1, participants showed more negative ratings to aversive sounds compared to neutral sounds (aversive sounds, $M = -2.23$, $SE = .15$, neutral sounds, $M = 1.93$, $SE = .15$, $t(2966) = -6.90$, $p < .001$, $EMM = -4.16$, $SE = .068$). They also showed larger SCRs to aversive sounds compared to neutral sounds (aversive sounds, $M = .086$, $SE = .013$, neutral sounds, $M = .0011$, $SE = .013$, $t(2942) = 8.43$, $p < .001$, $EMM = .085$, $SE = .010$). Moreover, as in Study 1, there was a significant negative relationship between SCRs and affect ratings ($B = -.032$, 95% CI = $[-.038 \text{ } -.026]$), indicating that an increase in SCRs reflected a more negative emotional state.

Social buffering of fear in females in the presence of a real and a virtual person

We investigated if the mere presence of a virtual agent had a similar buffering effect on fear responses as the mere presence of a real person. First, we performed an LMM with affect ratings to aversive sounds as the dependent variable and treatment (alone / social), study (real-life / VR) and their interaction treatment $\times$ study as the predictors. The results revealed no significant effects, treatment (alone / social) ($B = .34$, $p = .190$), study (real-life / VR) ($B = -.10$, $p = .730$), treatment $\times$ study ($B = -.032$, $p = .940$), $R^2_m = .053$.

Second, we tested the same model with SCRs to aversive sounds as the dependent variable. The results showed significant main effects of study ($B = -.058$, $p = .021$) and treatment ($B = -.065$, $p = .003$), but no significant study $\times$ treatment interaction ($B = .025$, $p = .440$) (Fig.4; Table 5a); $R^2_m = .030$, indicating that the buffering effect was

comparable between the real-life and the VR study. Conducting an LMM separately for the VR study revealed a significant main effect of treatment ($B = -.040, p = .033$) (Table 5b); $R^2_m = .035$. Post-hoc analysis showed larger SCRs in the alone treatment ($M = .086, SE = .013$) compared to the social treatment group ($M = .046, SE = .013$), $EMM = .040, SE = .019$. These results indicate a significant social buffering effect in the VR study, which was comparable to the results of female participants in the real-life study.

Figure 4. Mean skin conductance responses (SCRs) to aversive and neutral sounds for participants in the real-life study (upper panel) and in the VR study (lower panel). On average, females showed a significant reduction in SCRs to aversive sounds in the social treatment compared to the alone treatment groups in both studies. The values of SCRs were transformed by $\log(x+1)$ to correct the skewness. Error bars indicate standard error.

Table 5. Results of the LMM testing the social buffering effects in the real-life and the VR studies.

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	χ^2	<i>Df</i>	<i>P value</i>
a. LMM testing the two-way interaction effect					
(Intercept)	.14	.016	76.89	1	< .001
Study	-.058	.025	5.35	1	.021
Treatment	-.065	.022	9.047	1	.0026
PANAS-negative	-.0057	.011	.26	1	.61
State anxiety	.012	.010	1.35	1	.25
ADS	-.0049	.0097	.25	1	.62
Study $\times$ Treatment	.025	.033	.59	1	.44
b. LMM testing the buffering effect in VR study					
(Intercept)	.086	.013	41.85	1	< .001
Treatment	-.040	.019	4.54	1	.033
PANAS-negative	-.0034	.012	.079	1	.78
State anxiety	.023	.011	4.03	1	.045
ADS	-.015	.011	1.83	1	.18

Note. PANAS: Positive and Negative Affect Schedule; ADS: Allgemeine Depressions Skala; SE: standard error. Bold values are significant at $p < 0.05$.

Given the differences in impression regarding the real partner and the virtual agent (Table 4), we tested whether impression ratings significantly predicted individual differences in SCRs in the social treatment groups. An LMM with SCRs to aversive sounds as the dependent variable and study (real-life / VR), impression rating, and study $\times$ impression rating as the predictors showed no significant main effects of study ($B = .0041$, $p = .85$) and impression rating ($B = .021$, $p = .23$), and no significant study $\times$ impression rating interaction ($B = -.0056$, $p = .79$); $R^2_m = .014$, indicating that differences in impression ratings does not predict the SCRs in social treatment groups.

Virtual social buffering occurs independently of social concern

Next, we tested if the social buffering of fear in the presence of a virtual person is shaped by social concern. The LMM with social concern, treatment (social / alone), study (real-life / VR) and their interaction items as the predictors, SCRs to aversive sounds as the dependent variable showed a significant main effect of treatment ($B = -.16, p = .001$), significant two-way interactions between social concern and treatment ($B = .011, p = .035$), and between treatment and study ($B = .17, p = .025$), and a significant three-way interaction between social concern, treatment and study ($B = -.016, p = .032$), $R^2_m = .028$ (Fig. 5, Table 6). This indicates that the reduction in SCRs in the social treatment group decreased with social concern in the real-life study (Fig. 5, left panel), while there was no such effect in the VR study ($B = -.0066, p = .110$; Fig. 5, right panel); $R^2_m = .052$. According to these results, social concern did not modulate the buffering effect in the VR study.

Figure 5. The interaction between treatment (alone / social), study (real-life / VR) and individual social concern scores predicted the skin conductance responses (SCRs) to

aversive sounds. Females with lower social concern benefited more from the present female in the real-life study. There was no such significant effect in the VR study. The values of SCRs were transformed by $\log(x+1)$.

Table 6. Results of the LMM testing the effect of social concern on buffering in the presence of a real-life and a virtual person.

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	χ^2	<i>Df</i>	<i>P value</i>
(Intercept)	.180	.037	23.78	1	< .001
Study	-.092	.053	3.08	1	.079
Treatment	-.16	.052	1.19	1	.0014
Social concern	-.0040	.0038	1.14	1	.29
PANAS-negative	-.0037	.012	.10	1	.75
State anxiety	.016	.011	2.28	1	.13
ADS	-.0062	.0097	.40	1	.53
Study $\times$ Treatment	.17	.077	5.02	1	.025
Study $\times$ Social concern	.0035	.0050	.49	1	.49
Treatment $\times$ Social concern	.011	.0053	4.45	1	.035
Study $\times$ Treatment $\times$ Social concern	-.016	.0074	4.61	1	.032

Note. PANAS: Positive and Negative Affect Schedule; ADS: Allgemeine Depressions Skala; SE: standard error. Bold values are significant at $p < 0.05$.

In addition, we conducted the same analysis on the other ASI-3 subscales: physical concern and cognitive concern. Both LMMs on physical concern and on cognitive concern showed no significant effects (all $p > .05$, Tables S3 and S4), indicating no modulating effect of cognitive concern and physical concern.

Discussion

First, our results showed an increased social buffering effect in females (Fig. 2) that is mainly driven by those participants that scored low on social concern (Fig. 3, left panel). In males, social concern increased the SCRs to aversive sounds in the

alone treatment group (Fig. 3, right panel). A similar increase in SCRs in the male sample was also observed with increasing physical concern (Fig. S1a), indicating that in the male sample, social concern had no specific effect. Importantly, the differential effects of social concern on social buffering in females and males were found although both samples had a comparable social concern score (Table 1). This means that females scored as high (or low) on social concern as males, but, in contrast to males, individual social concern affected the individual extent of female social buffering.

When experiencing the aversive sound alone, females showed higher SCRs compared to males (Fig. 2), consistent with previous findings indicating that females respond more strongly to aversive events than males (50-52). However, this gender difference in SCRs in the alone treatment groups cannot account for the differential effect of social concern on SCRs in the social treatment groups between females and males in Study 1, and between real and virtual social presence (comparison of Study 1 and Study 2).

The differential effect of social concern in females and males supports previous evidence, suggesting that females are affected by social anxiety in a large variety of social situations (20, 21), while males are specifically affected in mating contexts, i.e., typically in the presence of a female (22). Building upon these previous results, our findings showed that individual differences in social concern can account for gender differences in social buffering.

Second, our results showed that females also benefit from the presence of a virtual person, indicated by a reduction of fear-related SCRs in the presence of a virtual agent (Fig. 4). In contrast to social buffering in the presence of a real person, the virtual social buffering effect occurred independently of individual social concern scores (Fig. 5). The finding of social buffering effects in a VR environment is in line with previous studies showing a reduction of fear responses (12) or social stress (11) if participants believed that the agent was controlled by a real person, such as a romantic partner (12).

Extending these studies, our results showed social buffering of fear in females in the mere presence of a virtual person, i.e., an agent that was facing away and that was not controlled by a human agent. According to their ratings on the NMMSP questionnaire (48), our participants perceived the virtual agent as present, but not as a social interaction partner. Despite this rather minimalistic virtual social treatment, we observed social buffering in females irrespective of individual differences in social concern. This finding is interesting in two ways. First, it bolsters the claim that at least in females the mere presence of another individual can buffer autonomic fear responses (9). Second, our findings indicate that females scoring high on social concern can benefit from virtual social presence, although they show reduced social buffering in the presence of a real person.

In our study, we used an identical paradigm to investigate social buffering of human fear in females and males in the presence of a real person and in the presence of a virtual representation of this person. Based on this systematic approach, we could

directly compare how social concern affects the social buffering of human fear across genders, and in different environments (real-life vs VR). On the theoretical level, our findings provide novel insights into individual differences that shape the social modulation of autonomic human fear responses. Our finding that the mere virtual presence of another person can attenuate autonomic fear responses in females independently of individual differences in social concern is of potential practical relevance for the treatment of anxiety disorders.

Acknowledgements. We thank Tomonori Nakayama for help with data analysis. This work was supported by the German Research Foundation [HE 4566/5-1 to GH], the Sino-German (CSC-DAAD) Postdoc Scholarship Program [No. 201804910929 to YQ], and the National Natural Science Foundation of China [32000733 to YQ].

Disclosures. JD is an investigator in an EU-funded study by P1Vital and corecipient of a grant of the Bavarian state government to BioVariance. All other co-authors reported no biomedical financial interests or potential conflicts of interest.

Code and Data availability. Data and scripts of both studies are provided at https://osf.io/zcu67/?view_only=0d4449de234d45e99adfea1c18f22b26

529 **References**

- 530 1. Fuzzo F, Matsumoto J, Kiyokawa Y, Takeuchi Y, Ono T, Nishijo H. Social buffering
531 suppresses fear-associated activation of the lateral amygdala in male rats: behavioral and
532 neurophysiological evidence. *Frontiers in neuroscience*. 2015;9:99.
- 533 2. Kiyokawa Y, Takeuchi Y, Mori Y. Two types of social buffering differentially mitigate
534 conditioned fear responses. *Eur J Neurosci*. 2007;26(12):3606-13.
- 535 3. Sterley TL, Baimoukhametova D, Fuzesi T, Zurek AA, Daviu N, Rasiah NP, et al. Social
536 transmission and buffering of synaptic changes after stress. *Nat Neurosci*. 2018;21(3):393-
537 403.
- 538 4. Loewen SP, Baimoukhametova DV, Bains JS. Sex-specific vasopressin signaling buffers
539 stress-dependent synaptic changes in female mice. *Journal of Neuroscience*.
540 2020;40(46):8842-52.
- 541 5. Smith AS, Wang Z. Hypothalamic oxytocin mediates social buffering of the stress
542 response. *Biological psychiatry*. 2014;76(4):281-8.
- 543 6. Majumdar S, Lungwitz EA, Andrews KD, Chambers JE, Truitt WA. Animal Models to
544 Investigate Social Support Induced Anxiety Reductions. *Neurobiology of Abnormal Emotion*
545 *and Motivated Behaviors: Elsevier*; 2018. p. 224-40.
- 546 7. Kiyokawa Y, Hennessy MB. Comparative studies of social buffering: A consideration of
547 approaches, terminology, and pitfalls. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 2018;86:131-41.
- 548 8. Levy DR, Yizhar O. Stress and sociability. *Nat Neurosci*. 2018;21(3):304-6.
- 549 9. Qi Y, Herrmann MJ, Bell L, Fackler A, Han S, Deckert J, et al. The mere physical presence
550 of another person reduces human autonomic responses to aversive sounds. *Proc Biol Sci*.
551 2020;287(1919):20192241.
- 552 10. Pan Y, Olsson A, Golkar A. Social safety learning: Shared safety abolishes the recovery of
553 learned threat. *Behaviour research and therapy*. 2020;135:103733.
- 554 11. Kothgassner OD, Goreis A, Kafka JX, Kaufmann M, Atteneder K, Beutl L, et al. Virtual
555 social support buffers stress response: an experimental comparison of real-life and virtual
556 support prior to a social stressor. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*.
557 2019;63:57-65.
- 558 12. Kane HS, McCall C, Collins NL, Blascovich J. Mere presence is not enough: Responsive
559 support in a virtual world. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. 2012;48(1):37-44.
- 560 13. Hyde LW, Gorka A, Manuck SB, Hariri AR. Perceived social support moderates the link
561 between threat-related amygdala reactivity and trait anxiety. *Neuropsychologia*.
562 2011;49(4):651-6.
- 563 14. von Mohr M, Krahé C, Beck B, Fotopoulou AJSc, neuroscience a. The social buffering of
564 pain by affective touch: a laser-evoked potential study in romantic couples.
565 2018;13(11):1121-30.
- 566 15. Ditzen B, Heinrichs M. Psychobiology of social support: the social dimension of stress
567 buffering. *Restor Neurol Neurosci*. 2014;32(1):149-62.
- 568 16. Spence SH, Rapee RM. The etiology of social anxiety disorder: An evidence-based
569 model. *Behav Res Ther*. 2016;86:50-67.

- 570 17. Gu R, Ao X, Mo L, Zhang D. Neural correlates of negative expectancy and impaired social
571 feedback processing in social anxiety. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci*. 2020;15(3):285-91.
- 572 18. Stegmann Y, Ahrens L, Pauli P, Keil A, Wieser MJ. Social aversive generalization learning
573 sharpens the tuning of visuocortical neurons to facial identity cues. *Elife*. 2020;9.
- 574 19. Owens ME, Beidel DC. Can Virtual Reality Effectively Elicit Distress Associated with
575 Social Anxiety Disorder? *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*.
576 2014;37(2):296-305.
- 577 20. Asher M, Aderka IM. Gender differences in social anxiety disorder. *J Clin Psychol*.
578 2018;74(10):1730-41.
- 579 21. Asher M, Asnaani A, Aderka IM. Gender differences in social anxiety disorder: A review.
580 *Clin Psychol Rev*. 2017;56:1-12.
- 581 22. Xu Y, Schneier F, Heimberg RG, Princisvalle K, Liebowitz MR, Wang S, et al. Gender
582 differences in social anxiety disorder: results from the national epidemiologic sample on
583 alcohol and related conditions. *J Anxiety Disord*. 2012;26(1):12-9.
- 584 23. Taylor S, Zvolensky MJ, Cox BJ, Deacon B, Heimberg RG, Ledley DR, et al. Robust
585 dimensions of anxiety sensitivity: development and initial validation of the Anxiety
586 Sensitivity Index-3. *Psychol Assess*. 2007;19(2):176-88.
- 587 24. Reiss S, Peterson RA, Gursky DM, McNally RJ. Anxiety sensitivity, anxiety frequency and
588 the prediction of fearfulness. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*. 1986;24(1):1-8.
- 589 25. Reiss S. Expectancy model of fear, anxiety, and panic. *Clinical psychology review*.
590 1991;11(2):141-53.
- 591 26. McNally RJ. Anxiety sensitivity and panic disorder. *Biological psychiatry*.
592 2002;52(10):938-46.
- 593 27. Taylor S. *Anxiety sensitivity: Theory, research, and treatment of the fear of anxiety*:
594 Routledge; 2014.
- 595 28. Gutzeit VA, Ahuna K, Santos TL, Cunningham AM, Sadsad Rooney M, Munoz Zamora A,
596 et al. Optogenetic reactivation of prefrontal social neural ensembles mimics social buffering
597 of fear. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2020;45(6):1068-77.
- 598 29. Ishii A, Kiyokawa Y, Takeuchi Y, Mori Y. Social buffering ameliorates conditioned fear
599 responses in female rats. *Horm Behav*. 2016;81:53-8.
- 600 30. Reddan MC, Young H, Falkner J, Lopez-Sola M, Wager TD. Touch and social support
601 influence interpersonal synchrony and pain. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci*. 2020.
- 602 31. Cohen J. A power primer. *Psychol Bull*. 1992;112(1):155-9.
- 603 32. Hautzinger M, Bailer M. *Allgemeine Depressions-Skala: ADS; Manual: Beltz-Test-GmbH*;
604 1993.
- 605 33. Zimet GD, Dahlem NW, Zimet SG, Farley GK. The multidimensional scale of perceived
606 social support. *Journal of personality assessment*. 1988;52(1):30-41.
- 607 34. Watson D, Clark LA, Tellegen A. Development and validation of brief measures of
608 positive and negative affect: the PANAS scales. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*.
609 1988;54(6):1063.
- 610 35. Spielberger CD, Gonzalez-Reigosa F, Martinez-Urrutia A, Natalicio LF, Natalicio DS. The
611 state-trait anxiety inventory. *Revista Interamericana de Psicologia/Interamerican Journal of*
612 *Psychology*. 2017;5(3 & 4).

613 36. Hein G, Engelmann JB, Vollberg MC, Tobler PN. How learning shapes the empathic
614 brain. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*.
615 2016;113(1):80-5.

616 37. Bradley M, Lang PJ. The International affective digitized sounds (IADS)[: stimuli,
617 instruction manual and affective ratings: NIMH Center for the Study of Emotion and
618 Attention; 1999.

619 38. Herrmann MJ, Boehme S, Becker MP, Tupak SV, Guhn A, Schmidt B, et al. Phasic and
620 sustained brain responses in the amygdala and the bed nucleus of the stria terminalis during
621 threat anticipation. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2016;37(3):1091-102.

622 39. Delorme A, Makeig S. EEGLAB: an open source toolbox for analysis of single-trial EEG
623 dynamics including independent component analysis. *J Neurosci Methods*. 2004;134(1):9-21.

624 40. Naqvi NH, Bechara A. Skin conductance: A psychophysiological approach to the study of
625 decision making. In: Senior C, Russell T, Gazzaniga MS, editors. *Methods in mind*. Cambridge,
626 Massachusetts: The MIT Press; 2006. p. 103-22.

627 41. Figner B, Murphy RO. Using skin conductance in judgment and decision making
628 research. In: Schulte-Mecklenbeck M, Kuehberger A, Ranyard R, editors. *A handbook of*
629 *process tracing methods for decision research*. New York: Psychology Press; 2011. p. 163-84.

630 42. Damasio AR, Grabowski TJ, Bechara A, Damasio H, Ponto LL, Parvizi J, et al. Subcortical
631 and cortical brain activity during the feeling of self-generated emotions. *Nat Neurosci*.
632 2000;3(10):1049-56.

633 43. Bates D, Machler M, Bolker BM, Walker SC. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using
634 lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2015;67(1):1-48.

635 44. Cohen J, Cohen P, West SG, Aiken LS. *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis*
636 *for the behavioral sciences*: Routledge; 2013.

637 45. Nakagawa S, Schielzeth H, O'Hara RB. A general and simple method for
638 obtaining R² from generalized linear mixed-effects models. *Methods in Ecology and*
639 *Evolution*. 2013;4(2):133-42.

640 46. Barton K, Barton MK. Package 'MuMIn'. Version. 2015;1:18.

641 47. Lenth R, Singmann H, Love J, Buerkner P, Herve M. Emmeans: Estimated marginal
642 means, aka least-squares means. R package version. 2018;1(1):3.

643 48. Biocca F, Harms C, Gregg J, editors. *The networked minds measure of social presence:*
644 *Pilot test of the factor structure and concurrent validity*. 4th annual international workshop
645 *on presence*, Philadelphia, PA; 2001.

646 49. Achenbach J, Waltemate T, Latoschik ME, Botsch M, editors. *Fast generation of realistic*
647 *virtual humans*. *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM Symposium on Virtual Reality Software and*
648 *Technology*; 2017.

649 50. Day AL, Livingstone HA. Gender differences in perceptions of stressors and utilization of
650 social support among university students. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*.
651 2003;35(2):73.

652 51. Ali N, Nitschke JP, Cooperman C, Baldwin MW, Pruessner JC. Systematic manipulations
653 of the biological stress systems result in sex-specific compensatory stress responses and
654 negative mood outcomes. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2020:1-11.

655 52. McLean CP, Anderson ER. Brave men and timid women? A review of the gender
656 differences in fear and anxiety. Clin Psychol Rev. 2009;29(6):496-505.

657