



# International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science

e-ISSN: 2544-9435

**Operating Publisher**  
**SciFormat Publishing Inc.**  
ISNI: 0000 0005 1449 8214

2734 17 Avenue SW,  
Calgary, Alberta, T3E0A7,  
Canada  
+15878858911  
editorial-office@sciformat.ca

---

## ARTICLE TITLE

THE LONELINESS EPIDEMIC IN MODERN URBAN SOCIETIES:  
SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

---

## DOI

[https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.2\(50\).2026.5520](https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.2(50).2026.5520)

---

## RECEIVED

23 February 2026

---

## ACCEPTED

05 June 2026

---

## PUBLISHED

12 June 2026

---

## LICENSE



The article is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License**.

---

© The author(s) 2026.

This article is published as open access under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), allowing the author to retain copyright. The CC BY 4.0 License permits the content to be copied, adapted, displayed, distributed, republished, or reused for any purpose, including adaptation and commercial use, as long as proper attribution is provided.

# THE LONELINESS EPIDEMIC IN MODERN URBAN SOCIETIES: SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

**Julianna Cholewa** (Corresponding Author, Email: [juliannacholewasc@gmail.com](mailto:juliannacholewasc@gmail.com))

Faculty of Medicine, Medical University of Lublin, Lublin, Poland

ORCID ID: 0009-0007-2432-1828

**Radosław Januszczyk**

University Clinical Hospital No. 4 in Lublin, Lublin, Poland

ORCID ID: 0009-0007-4088-8138

**Gabriela Anna Gilarska**

Faculty of Medicine, Medical University of Lublin, Lublin, Poland

ORCID ID: 0009-0004-4818-8070

**Agnieszka Barbara Bialek**

Faculty of Medicine, Medical University of Lublin, Lublin, Poland

ORCID ID: 0009-0004-0855-7732

**Wiktoria Bojarska**

University Clinical Hospital No. 4 in Lublin, Lublin, Poland

ORCID ID: 0009-0008-6923-2068

**Rafał Gołacki**

University Clinical Hospital No. 4 in Lublin, Lublin, Poland

ORCID ID: 0009-0002-0562-4480

**Maja Sygacz**

University Clinical Hospital No. 4 in Lublin, Lublin, Poland

ORCID ID: 0009-0006-8689-8975

**Paweł Szymonek**

Independent Public Health Care Centre in Lubartów, Lubartów, Poland

ORCID ID: 0009-0002-6345-7721

**Bartosz Burda**

University Clinical Hospital No. 4 in Lublin, Lublin, Poland

ORCID ID: 0009-0002-1871-424X

---

**ABSTRACT**

Loneliness has become a growing public health concern, particularly in urban societies where high population density does not necessarily translate into meaningful social connection. This paper aims to examine the social, psychological, and structural determinants of loneliness in modern urban environments. The study is based on a narrative review of recent interdisciplinary literature, including empirical studies and meta-analyses from the fields of public health, psychology, and urban studies.

The analysis points to several key factors contributing to urban loneliness, including the paradox of digital connectivity, characteristics of the built environment, and increasing social mobility leading to fragmented communities. The findings suggest that digital technologies play a dual role, as their impact depends on patterns of use, while urban design and access to social infrastructure significantly influence opportunities for interaction. Furthermore, loneliness is associated with a wide range of adverse outcomes, including mental health disorders, cognitive decline, and increased cardiovascular risk.

Overall loneliness can be understood as a multidimensional phenomenon shaped by the interaction between individual behaviour and broader environmental and societal factors. The paper concludes that effective mitigation strategies require an integrated approach combining community-based interventions, inclusive urban planning, and responsible use of digital technologies.

---

**KEYWORDS**

Loneliness, Social Isolation, Urban Environments, Mental Health, Social Cohesion, Urban Planning

---

**CITATION**

Julianna Cholewa, Radosław Januszczyk, Gabriela Anna Gilarska, Agnieszka Barbara Białek, Wiktoria Bojarska, Rafał Gołacki, Maja Sygacz, Paweł Szymonek, Bartosz Burda. (2026) The Loneliness Epidemic in Modern Urban Societies: Social and Psychological Implications. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*. 2(50). doi: 10.31435/ijitss.2(50).2026.5520

---

**COPYRIGHT**

© **The author(s) 2026**. This article is published as open access under the **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0)**, allowing the author to retain copyright. The CC BY 4.0 License permits the content to be copied, adapted, displayed, distributed, republished, or reused for any purpose, including adaptation and commercial use, as long as proper attribution is provided.

---

**1. Introduction**

Loneliness has increasingly been recognized as a major public health issue, often described as a "silent epidemic" of the 21st century. While urban environments are designed to facilitate human proximity, they frequently foster a unique form of social isolation. Recent meta-analyses indicate that the lack of social connection carries a health risk comparable to smoking 15 cigarettes a day, significantly increasing mortality rates across diverse populations [1,2].

The World Health Organization emphasizes that social isolation and loneliness are not merely issues of the elderly but affect all age groups, deeply impacting mental health and cardiovascular well-being [3]. In the digital age, the role of technology in this crisis is twofold. While digital platforms offer constant connectivity, their suboptimal use can exacerbate feelings of exclusion and social comparison, leading to a "digital paradox" where increased screen time correlates with higher levels of perceived loneliness [4].

Despite the growing body of research on loneliness, existing studies remain fragmented across disciplines, often addressing psychological mechanisms, technological influences, and urban design in isolation. As a result, there is a limited number of integrative approaches that examine how digital behaviour, built environments, and neurobiological processes jointly influence the experience of loneliness in urban contexts.

This paper attempts to address this gap by drawing on research from multiple disciplines social, psychological, and structural determinants of loneliness in urban settings. It brings together insights from public health, psychology, and urban studies to explore both the underlying causes and the broader consequences of loneliness, as well as the potential interactions between these domains.

Taking an integrative perspective, the study contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of loneliness as a phenomenon shaped by both individual and systemic factors, while also pointing to the relevance of coordinated approaches in addressing this issue.

## 2. Methodology

This study adopts a narrative review approach to examine the phenomenon of loneliness in modern urban societies. The review focuses on synthesizing existing interdisciplinary research on the social, psychological, and structural determinants of loneliness, as well as its consequences and potential mitigation strategies.

The literature selection process focused on peer-reviewed articles, meta-analyses, and institutional reports published primarily between 2015 and 2025. Key databases included PubMed, Scopus, and Google Scholar. The search was conducted using combinations of keywords such as *loneliness*, *social isolation*, *urban environment*, *digital connectivity*, *mental health*, and *built environment*.

Studies were included if they met at least one of the following criteria: (1) examined loneliness in urban or highly industrialized contexts, (2) analyzed psychological, social, or environmental determinants of loneliness, or (3) investigated health-related outcomes associated with loneliness. Preference was given to large-scale studies, longitudinal research, and systematic reviews to ensure the reliability and robustness of the findings.

## 3. Drivers of Urban Loneliness

The rise of loneliness in modern urban societies cannot be attributed to a single cause; rather, it is the result of a complex interplay of technological, structural, and socio-economic transformations. This section examines the primary drivers that contribute to the emergence and persistence of loneliness in urban environments, highlighting the paradoxes embedded in modern urban life [5].

### 3.1 The Paradox of Digital Connectivity

The digital revolution has fundamentally altered how urban dwellers interact. While technology provides the tools for constant communication, it often lacks the emotional depth of face-to-face engagement [4,6]. According to Nowland et al. (2018), the impact of the internet on loneliness depends heavily on how it is used; when digital platforms are used to escape real-world social demands or to replace physical interactions, they tend to exacerbate feelings of isolation [4].

This effect is particularly visible in cities where individuals may have thousands of "connections" online but lack a single person to rely on in immediate physical proximity [4].

One of the key mechanism explaining this effect is social comparison theory. As Vogel et al. (2014) noted, social media platforms provide a constant stream of curated, idealized versions of others' lives [7]. For urban dwellers already struggling with the anonymity of city life, this constant upward comparison leads to lower self-esteem and a heightened sense of relative isolation. When users perceive their "offline" reality as less exciting than the "online" lives of their peers, the result is a deeper psychological withdrawal from their immediate, local social circles [7].

Furthermore, the phenomenon of FOMO (fear of missing out) significantly hinders the formation of deep, ongoing relationships [8].

While much of the literature emphasizes the deleterious effects of "technoference," recent research suggests a more nuanced reality for the younger demographic. Beyond the negative perceptions of distraction, digital social multitasking- the act of using a smartphone during face-to-face interactions has been found to serve dual functions. According to C. Yang et al., 2021, this behavior may also be linked to a greater sense of efficiency and social connection [9]. For adolescents, multitasking can satisfy fundamental psychological needs, such as competence and relatedness, by allowing them to maintain multiple layers of social presence simultaneously [9].

However, this utility comes with a cognitive and relational cost. The study highlights an "asymmetric impact" of phone use: while an individual's own multitasking may diminish their friendship quality through perceived distraction, the multitasking of a friend does not necessarily compromise the bond. This suggests that the psychological impact of digital connectivity in urban social settings is heavily mediated by individual perception. Therefore, a balanced academic perspective must recognize both the risks of displacement and the opportunities for developmental growth that mobile devices provide in the modern social landscape [9].

Recent empirical evidence suggests that Social Media Addiction (SMA) is a potent catalyst for emotional decline, showing a strong positive correlation with heightened levels of anxiety, depression, and chronic loneliness. Conversely, SMA is negatively associated with self-esteem, suggesting that as digital dependency grows, the individual's internal sense of worth diminishes [10].

However, the dominant narrative framing digital technology primarily as a driver of loneliness may be overly reductionist. While numerous studies point to the negative consequences of excessive or passive social media use, other research highlights its potential to enhance social capital, particularly for individuals with limited offline interaction opportunities. This suggests that the relationship between technology and loneliness may not be strictly causal but highly context-dependent, mediated by factors such as user intention, platform type, and pre-existing psychological vulnerability [4,9].

Although social comparison theory provides a compelling explanation for the negative psychological effects of social media, it may not fully account for individual differences in resilience and interpretation. Not all users respond to upward comparison with decreased self-esteem; in some cases, it may serve as motivation or inspiration. Therefore, the impact of social comparison processes should be understood as conditional rather than universal, depending on personality traits, coping strategies, and social context [7].

### **3.2 Urban architecture and the loss of "Third Places".**

Urban loneliness is increasingly understood as a product not only of individual psychological factors but also of the structural characteristics of the built environment [11].

A key concept in this context is that of "Third Places," defined as informal public spaces such as libraries, parks, and cafes that facilitate spontaneous social interaction and community engagement. These environments play a crucial role in supporting what sociologists describe as "weak ties," which, although less intimate than close relationships, are essential for maintaining social cohesion and a sense of belonging [12].

Empirical research confirms that the built environment significantly influences social interaction patterns and perceived loneliness in urban populations. In particular, features such as walkability, access to green spaces, and neighbourhood design have been shown to be positively associated with social connectedness and negatively associated with loneliness [13]. Conversely, poorly designed or inaccessible urban spaces may limit opportunities for incidental social interaction, thereby increasing the risk of social isolation [13].

Elevated temperatures associated with urban heat islands (UHIs) have been found to discourage outdoor activities, particularly among vulnerable populations such as older adults and individuals with chronic health conditions, thereby limiting opportunities for social interaction. Consequently, integrating shaded areas, green spaces, and climate-sensitive urban design strategies is increasingly recognized as a critical approach to mitigating loneliness and promoting social resilience in cities [14].

Empirical studies further demonstrate that access to thermally comfortable public spaces, such as parks and tree-lined streets, is associated with higher levels of social interaction, reduced stress, and improved community cohesion [15].

While evidence strongly supports the role of the built environment in shaping social interaction, it is important to acknowledge that spatial interventions alone may be insufficient to reduce loneliness. The presence of well-designed public spaces does not automatically translate into social engagement, particularly in communities characterized by low trust or high social fragmentation. This suggests that physical infrastructure must be complemented by social programming and community-building initiatives to produce meaningful effects [13].

### **3.3 Social Mobility and Fragmented Communities**

Modern urban societies are characterized by increasing levels of geographical mobility and migration, which significantly reshape social structures and patterns of interpersonal relationships. The World Health Organization (2025) identifies social isolation and loneliness as growing global public health concerns, particularly in rapidly urbanizing environments where traditional social structures are undergoing transformation.

Longitudinal evidence indicates that loneliness is not a static condition but fluctuates over time, reflecting changes in individuals' social circumstances and relationships [3].

Individuals experiencing lower emotional well-being (or severe depressive symptoms) tend to actively withdraw from their social networks rather than being avoided by others. This self-sequestering effect is primarily driven by a tendency among those with low well-being to avoid "strong ties"- close friends who report high levels of emotional health [16].

The World Health Organization (2025) further highlights that certain populations, including migrants and individuals facing socio-economic disadvantage, are particularly vulnerable to loneliness due to barriers such as cultural differences and reduced access to social networks [3].

#### **4. Psychological Implications**

##### **4.1. Mental Health Challenges: Anxiety and Depression**

Loneliness has been consistently identified as a significant predictor of adverse mental health outcomes. Evidence from longitudinal studies indicates that greater loneliness is associated with poorer outcomes in depression, including increased symptom severity and reduced recovery [17]. Furthermore, loneliness has been identified as a predisposing factor in the development of depressive symptoms, highlighting its role as a key psychological risk factor [18].

In individuals experiencing psychosis, loneliness is associated with a range of interrelated psychological and social determinants, including higher levels of depressive and anxiety symptoms, severity of psychotic experiences, limited social support, reduced quality of life, increased internalized stigma and perceived discrimination, as well as diminished self-esteem [19].

Importantly, the relationship between loneliness and mental health challenges such as anxiety and depression is not uniform across populations, but is shaped by demographic and socioeconomic factors. Research across diverse national contexts consistently shows that certain groups are at heightened risk. Loneliness is more prevalent among women, individuals without a partner, and particularly those living alone, with evidence indicating that people who live alone are significantly overrepresented among those experiencing loneliness. Lower socioeconomic status (SES) is also strongly associated with increased loneliness and, consequently, poorer mental health outcomes [20].

Age and life stage further differentiate vulnerability. Younger adults especially women aged 18–29 have been shown to report elevated levels of loneliness, depression, and anxiety, particularly in contexts of economic insecurity or social disruption. Similarly, individuals from lower-income households and those lacking stable social support networks are more likely to experience both loneliness and psychological distress. These patterns are reinforced by findings showing that individuals who rarely receive emotional or social support are at significantly greater risk of depressive symptoms [21,22].

Living conditions and structural inequalities also play a crucial role. Studies conducted in low-income and subsidized housing environments demonstrate that loneliness can account for a substantial proportion of variance in depressive symptoms, even when controlling for physical health and life stressors. This suggests that loneliness functions not only as a correlate but also as a key explanatory factor in mental health disparities among marginalized populations [23].

Loneliness among university students is very common and closely tied to emotional problems. Work from Australia shows that higher loneliness in first-year students was moderately to highly correlated with psychological distress and lower well-being [24]. In a German sample, 32.4% felt moderately lonely and 3.2% severely lonely; both emotional and social loneliness were positively associated with feelings of depression and anxiety [25]. A cross-national Italy- UK study found anxiety and depressive symptoms were the most frequent conditions, and loneliness was significantly correlated with anxiety, depression and insomnia in both countries [26].

Qualitative and mixed-methods research emphasizes the university phase as a transition period with changes in residence, relationships and expectations, during which loneliness is common and linked to depression, anxiety, psychotic experiences, and suicidal behaviour (measured in the project) [27].

Students moving into metropolitan universities and those from working-class or rural backgrounds can be less socially connected on arrival, making them more vulnerable to loneliness and poorer sustained well-being [24]. In a Chinese city sample, 97% of students had moderate to high loneliness, and the urban built environment (e.g., density and type of facilities) was significantly related to loneliness; authors note that prolonged loneliness can trigger emotional disorders and even suicidal behaviour [28].

The available evidence provides strong support for the second point: university students particularly those undergoing significant social and status transitions associated with entry into urban academic environments exhibit elevated levels of loneliness, which are closely associated with increased symptoms of anxiety, depression, and broader psychological distress.

In contrast, the first point referring to individuals living alone, those with lower income, younger women, and populations residing in minority or subsidized housing is not explicitly addressed in the specific studies cited here. However, this pattern is consistent with a substantial body of broader empirical research, which identifies these groups as being at increased risk of loneliness and related adverse mental health outcomes.

#### 4.2 Cognitive and behavioral consequences

Large-scale neuroimaging studies reveal that chronic loneliness is associated with significant changes in both the structural and functional connectivity of the Default Mode Network (DMN) a system comprising the medial prefrontal cortex, posterior cingulate cortex, and the hippocampus [29].

In lonely individuals, functional connectivity patterns exhibit reduced modularity within the DMN and limbic networks. Furthermore, microstructural analyses of white matter have identified reduced fractional anisotropy in neural pathways that connect regions associated with empathy and self-efficacy [30].

The impact of loneliness on the brain is not a generalized impairment but rather exhibits a high degree of domain specificity. Research indicates that executive functions and visuospatial abilities are significantly more susceptible to the effects of social isolation than episodic memory. This specific pattern of impairment is a key diagnostic marker because it distinguishes loneliness-related cognitive deficits from the typical progression of Alzheimer's disease pathology, which typically attacks episodic memory first [31].

Gene expression analyses conducted in the human nucleus accumbens, the brain's primary reward center, reveal that loneliness induces transcriptional changes that significantly overlap with genetic risk factors for both Alzheimer's and Parkinson's disease. These overlaps may help explain for why lonely people have a higher incidence of neurodegenerative diseases [31].

The link between persistent loneliness and adverse cognitive outcomes is increasingly supported by large-scale clinical evidence. A landmark meta-analysis by Lara et al. (2019) confirms that loneliness is significantly associated with an increased risk of developing dementia and plays a detectable role in the onset of mild cognitive impairment (MCI). These findings suggest that the subjective experience of isolation acts as a neurobiological stressor that accelerates the depletion of cognitive reserves in urban populations [32,33].

A notable development in recent literature is the identification of gender as a significant moderator in this relationship. Empirical data from Zhou et al. (2018) indicates that among individuals aged 65 years and older, loneliness significantly increases the risk of developing dementia, yet this effect varies remarkably by gender. Specifically, the study found that men who felt lonely were more likely to suffer from dementia than women in the same age bracket [33,34].

#### 4.3 Physical Health Consequences of Loneliness

Loneliness has been identified as a significant risk factor for a range of adverse physical health outcomes. Meta-analytic evidence indicates that loneliness is associated with increased risk of premature mortality [1].

Recent prospective evidence indicates a significant association between social isolation, loneliness, and an increased risk of coronary heart disease (CHD). These findings highlight the importance of preventive strategies targeting social isolation, particularly among high-risk populations. Community-based interventions that promote social engagement, along with the integration of mental health services into primary care, may help mitigate these risks. Moreover, a multidisciplinary approach that addresses physical, psychological, and social dimensions of health is essential for reducing the overall burden of CHD [35].

Chronic loneliness can have significant effects on physical health through complex neuroendocrine, immune, and molecular mechanisms. One of the central pathways mediating these effects is the hypothalamic–pituitary–adrenal (HPA) axis, which plays a key role in the physiological response to stress. Prolonged social isolation is associated with dysregulation of HPA axis activity, including alterations in diurnal cortisol rhythms, increased total cortisol output, and the development of glucocorticoid resistance. This latter phenomenon reflects reduced cellular sensitivity to cortisol despite elevated circulating levels, leading to impaired regulation of inflammatory and metabolic processes. Loneliness experienced in later life is more commonly associated with chronic hyperactivation of the stress response system and cumulative allostatic load [31]. Neuropeptide systems, especially oxytocin and vasopressin, also play a crucial role in mediating the physiological effects of social disconnection [36]. Social isolation has been shown to alter oxytocinergic signaling in brain regions involved in social reward and bonding, potentially reducing motivation for social engagement [37]. Although emerging evidence suggests that interventions such as intranasal oxytocin may alleviate loneliness, individual variability in responsiveness highlights the need for personalized approaches [31].

Although the association between loneliness and adverse health outcomes is well established, the underlying mechanisms remain complex and not fully understood. Many studies highlight strong correlations; however, confounding variables such as socioeconomic status, pre-existing health conditions, and lifestyle factors may partially account for these relationships. Consequently, caution is required when interpreting loneliness as an independent causal factor rather than part of a broader network of health determinants [1,33].

## **5. Strategies for Rebuilding Social Bonds**

### **5.1 Community-led initiatives and social innovations.**

Community-based initiatives play a central role in reducing loneliness by fostering social interaction and strengthening local networks [3]. Programs that promote social participation, such as group activities and peer support networks, have been shown to improve well-being and reduce perceived isolation [38].

Social innovation in urban environments increasingly leverages Information Technology (IT) to bridge the gap between physical isolation and communal belonging. According to National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2020), community-led programs that provide "meaningful access" to digital tools can transform the social landscape for older adults. A key example is the CHIPS (Computers for Homebound and Isolated Persons) Program, which demonstrated that creating dedicated online communities for homebound individuals significantly increases satisfaction with social contact and fosters a sense of belonging among peers in similar life circumstances [38].

Furthermore, social innovation is manifested through the deployment of "Virtual Communities" and peer-support groups (e.g., private social media groups). These platforms allow for the exchange of emotional support and information, effectively generating both bonding capital (maintaining close existing ties) and bridging capital (forming new connections across diverse networks)[38]. Research highlights that when these digital interventions are supplemented by training such as the PRISM (Personal Reminder Information and Social Management) system they yield long-term improvements in perceived loneliness and social support, particularly in congregate housing and independent living communities [38, 39].

Finally, the integration of Social Robots and Conversational Agents (e.g., PARO or AI-driven assistants) represents a frontier in social innovation. These tools are not intended to supplant human interaction but to serve as "social anchors" that improve engagement and stress indicators. By mimicking human conversation and empathy, these agents provide a sense of companionship for those with limited mobility, proving that technological adaptability is a crucial component of modern, resilient urban communities [38, 40].

### **5.2 The role of urban planning in fostering human connection.**

Urban planning plays a critical role in shaping opportunities for social interaction by influencing the design and accessibility of shared spaces. Inclusive urban design, which ensures accessibility for diverse populations, is essential for fostering social cohesion and reducing isolation [13]. High-density urban environments do not necessarily reduce loneliness; without adequate social infrastructure, they may even exacerbate social isolation [41].

Urban planning strategies aimed at mitigating the effects of urban heat islands (UHIs) play a crucial role in fostering social interaction and improving well-being in cities. Evidence indicates that urban greening interventions such as increasing vegetation, implementing green roofs, and developing shaded public spaces can reduce local temperatures while encouraging outdoor activity and social engagement. In addition, climate-sensitive urban design, including the use of reflective materials, shaded walkways, and cooling infrastructure, enhances the usability of public spaces and supports community interaction. Importantly, equitable access to green and shaded environments is essential, as disparities in availability may reinforce social inequalities and limit opportunities for social connection. Inclusive and accessible green spaces, designed to accommodate diverse populations, can therefore function as key social hubs that promote cohesion and resilience in urban communities [14].

Despite the promising nature of these interventions, their scalability and long-term effectiveness remain uncertain. Many community-based and technological solutions are tested in controlled or small-scale environments, raising questions about their applicability in diverse urban settings. Future research should therefore focus on evaluating the sustainability and real-world impact of such interventions across different cultural and socio-economic contexts [38].

## 6. Discussion

The findings of this review confirm that loneliness in urban environments is a multidimensional phenomenon shaped by the interaction between psychological, social, and structural determinants. Rather than being attributable to a single cause, urban loneliness emerges from the convergence of individual vulnerability and broader systemic conditions, including technological change and urbanization [3,5,11]. This integrative perspective helps bridge gaps between previously fragmented disciplines and supports the need for interdisciplinary frameworks in both research and policy development.

The analysis highlights the conditional and context-dependent role of digital technologies. While the “digital paradox” is supported by existing literature, the findings suggest that digital engagement is not inherently detrimental [4,6]. Its impact depends on user behavior, intention, and psychological predispositions. Active, socially meaningful use may strengthen social capital, whereas passive consumption and comparison-driven engagement may intensify perceived isolation [4,7,10]. This distinction emphasizes the importance of quality over quantity in digital interactions.

The results also underline the importance of the built environment in facilitating or constraining social interaction. Features such as walkability, green spaces, and access to informal “third places” create opportunities for spontaneous engagement and the formation of weak social ties [12,13]. However, the presence of such infrastructure alone is insufficient. Social cohesion depends equally on trust, community dynamics, and cultural context, suggesting that urban design must be complemented by community-oriented initiatives [13].

The findings demonstrate that loneliness is unevenly distributed across populations and strongly influenced by structural inequalities. Individuals experiencing socioeconomic disadvantage, migration-related disruption, or limited access to social networks are at increased risk [3,20]. These structural conditions interact with psychological processes such as withdrawal and reduced self-esteem, reinforcing cycles of isolation [16]. This highlights the importance of addressing loneliness through both individual-level interventions and broader social policy.

The review further confirms that loneliness is associated with significant mental and physical health outcomes, including depression, anxiety, cognitive decline, and cardiovascular risk [17,31,35]. These findings support the conceptualization of loneliness as a biopsychosocial stressor [1,33]. However, the causal mechanisms remain complex, and the role of confounding variables such as pre-existing health conditions and socioeconomic factors must be considered [1,33]. Future research should prioritize longitudinal and experimental approaches to better establish causality.

Evidence suggests that loneliness is a modifiable condition, and a range of interventions show promising results. Community-based programs, digital inclusion initiatives, and urban planning strategies can contribute to strengthening social connections [3,38]. However, the scalability and long-term sustainability of these interventions remain uncertain, as many have been evaluated only in limited or controlled settings [38].

This study is subject to several limitations. As a narrative review, it does not follow a fully systematic methodology, which may introduce selection bias. Additionally, differences in how loneliness is defined and measured across studies limit comparability. Despite these constraints, the review provides a comprehensive synthesis of current interdisciplinary knowledge.

Future research should focus on developing standardized measures of loneliness and exploring the interactions between digital behavior, environmental design, and neurobiological mechanisms. Greater attention should also be given to cultural and regional differences in the experience of loneliness, particularly in rapidly urbanizing societies [11,14].

In summary, loneliness in urban contexts should be understood as a structurally embedded and socially mediated phenomenon rather than solely an individual experience. Addressing it effectively requires coordinated, multi-level strategies that integrate public health, urban planning, and responsible technological use [3,5].

## 7. Conclusions

The analysis presented in this paper demonstrates that loneliness in modern urban societies has evolved into a multifaceted and systemic phenomenon, extending far beyond an individual emotional experience. It emerges from the dynamic interaction between technological advancement, urban design, and shifting social structures, positioning loneliness as a critical public health challenge of the 21st century [3,5].

One key conclusion is the paradoxical nature of contemporary urban life. Cities, despite offering high population density and unprecedented opportunities for interaction, often fail to facilitate meaningful social connections. This paradox is further intensified by digital technologies, which simultaneously enable constant communication and contribute to emotional detachment. The concept of the “digital paradox” point out that the quality not the quantity of social interaction is the key determinant of perceived connectedness [4, 6].

The findings also highlight that loneliness is not distributed evenly across populations. Structural inequalities, including socio-economic disadvantage, migration, and limited access to social infrastructure, significantly increase vulnerability to social isolation [3,11]. At the same time, individual psychological mechanisms-such as social comparison, withdrawal behaviors, and reduced self-esteem interact with these structural conditions, reinforcing a self-perpetuating cycle of loneliness [7,16].

The consequences of loneliness are both significant and multidimensional. Beyond its well-documented association with anxiety and depression, loneliness has measurable neurobiological and physiological effects, including alterations in brain connectivity, increased risk of cognitive decline, and heightened vulnerability to cardiovascular disease [17,31,35]. These findings confirm that loneliness should be understood not only as a psychological state but also as a biological stressor with long-term health implications [1,33].

However, this paper also emphasizes that loneliness is a modifiable condition. Effective responses require a multidisciplinary approach that integrates public health, urban planning, and technological innovation. Community-based initiatives, the development of inclusive “third places,” and the thoughtful use of digital tools can all play a crucial role in rebuilding social bonds [12,38]. Moreover, urban design strategies that promote accessibility, walkability, and climate-sensitive public spaces are essential for fostering everyday social interactions and reducing isolation [13,14].

Overall, addressing the loneliness epidemic requires a shift-from viewing social connection as a private matter to recognizing it as a collective societal responsibility. Future research should continue to explore the complex interplay between environmental, technological, and psychological factors, while policymakers must prioritize the creation of socially resilient urban environments. Only through coordinated, cross-sectoral efforts can modern societies effectively mitigate the growing burden of loneliness and promote long-term well-being [3,5].

No conflicts of interest to declare.

## REFERENCES

1. Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B., Baker, M., Harris, T., & Stephenson, D. (2015). Loneliness and social isolation as risk factors for mortality. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 10(2), 227–237. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691614568352>
2. Novotney, A. (2020, March 24). The risks of social isolation. *Monitor on Psychology*, 50(5). <https://www.apa.org/monitor/2019/05/ce-corner-isolation>
3. Garcia, L. I., Hunter, R., & Anderson, N. I. (2025). *From loneliness to social connection: Charting a path to healthier societies*. World Health Organization.
4. Nowland, R., Necka, E. A., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2018). Loneliness and social internet use: Pathways to reconnection in a digital world? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 13(1), 70–87. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617713052>
5. Jeste, D. V., Lee, E. E., & Cacioppo, S. (2020). Battling the modern behavioral epidemic of loneliness: Suggestions for research and interventions. *JAMA Psychiatry*, 77(6), 553–554. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.0027>
6. Baumeister, R. F., Bibby, M. T., Tice, D. M., & Bushman, B. J. (2026). Socializing while alone: Loss of impact and engagement when interacting remotely via technology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 21(2), 154–172.
7. Vogel, E. A., Rose, J. P., Roberts, L. R., & Eckles, K. (2014). Social comparison, social media, and self-esteem. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture*, 3(4), 206–222. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ppm0000047>
8. Przybylski, A. K., Murayama, K., DeHaan, C. R., & Gladwell, V. (2013). Motivational, emotional, and behavioral correlates of fear of missing out. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(4), 1841–1848. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.02.014>

9. Yang, C.-C., Pham, T., Ariati, J., & others. (2021). Digital social multitasking (DSMT), friendship quality, and basic psychological needs satisfaction among adolescents: Perceptions as mediators. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 50, 2456–2471. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-021-01442-y>
10. Jing, Z., Yang, W., Lei, Z., Junmei, W., Hui, L., & Tianmin, Z. (2025). Correlations between social media addiction and anxiety, depression, FoMO, loneliness and self-esteem among students: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLOS ONE*, 20(9), Article e0329466. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0329466>
11. Ochnik, D., Buława, B., Nagel, P., Gachowski, M., & Budziński, M. (2024). Urbanization, loneliness and mental health model: A cross-sectional network analysis with a representative sample. *Scientific Reports*, 14, Article 24974. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-76813-z>
12. Klinenberg, E. (2018). *Palaces for the people: How social infrastructure can help fight inequality, polarization, and the decline of civic life*. Crown Publishing Group.
13. Bower, M., Kent, J., Patulny, R., Green, O., McGrath, L., Teesson, L., Jamalishahni, T., Sandison, H., & Rugel, E. (2023). The impact of the built environment on loneliness: A systematic review and narrative synthesis. *Health & Place*, 79, Article 102962. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2022.102962>
14. Olawade, D. B., McLaughlin, M., Adeniji, Y. J., Egbon, G. O., Rahimi, A., & Boussios, S. (2025). Urban microclimates and their relationship with social isolation: A review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 22(6), Article 909. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph22060909>
15. Hedblom, M., Gunnarsson, B., Irvani, B., & others. (2019). Reduction of physiological stress by urban green space in a multisensory virtual experiment. *Scientific Reports*, 9, Article 10113. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-46099-7>
16. Elmer, T., Boda, Z., & Stadtfeld, C. (2017). The co-evolution of emotional well-being with weak and strong friendship ties. *Network Science*, 5(3), 278–307. <https://doi.org/10.1017/nws.2017.20>
17. Wang, J., Mann, F., Lloyd-Evans, B., & others. (2018). Associations between loneliness and perceived social support and outcomes of mental health problems: A systematic review. *BMC Psychiatry*, 18, Article 156. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-018-1736-5>
18. Erzen, E., & Çikrikci, Ö. (2018). The effect of loneliness on depression: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 64(5), 427–435. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020764018776349>
19. Lim, M. H., Gleeson, J. F. M., Alvarez-Jimenez, M., & Penn, D. L. (2018). Loneliness in psychosis: A systematic review. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 53(3), 221–238. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-018-1482-5>
20. Beutel, M., Klein, E., Brähler, E., Reiner, I., Jünger, C., Michal, M., Wiltink, J., Wild, P., Münzel, T., Lackner, K., & Tibubos, A. (2017). Loneliness in the general population: Prevalence, determinants and relations to mental health. *BMC Psychiatry*, 17, Article 97. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-017-1262-x>
21. McQuaid, R. J., Cox, S. M. L., Ogunlana, A., & Jaworska, N. (2021). The burden of loneliness: Implications of the social determinants of health during COVID-19. *Psychiatry Research*, 296, Article 113648. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113648>
22. Mykyta, L. (2024). Living alone and feelings of depression among adults age 18 and older. *National Health Statistics Reports*, 199, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.15620/cdc:136451>
23. Huang, L., & Wang, D. (2023). Socioeconomic status and students' mental health during the COVID-19 university closure: Mediating roles of perceived social support and self-efficacy. *Behavioral Sciences*, 13(10), Article 871. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13100871>
24. Dingle, G., Han, R., & Carlyle, M. (2022). Loneliness, belonging, and mental health in Australian university students pre- and post-COVID-19. *Behaviour Change*, 39(3), 146–156. <https://doi.org/10.1017/bec.2022.6>
25. Diehl, K., Jansen, C., Ishchanova, K., & Hilger-Kolb, J. (2018). Loneliness at universities: Determinants of emotional and social loneliness among students. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 15(9), Article 1865. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15091865>
26. Riboldi, I., Crocamo, C., Piacenti, S., Capogrosso, C., Calabrese, A., Paioni, L., Bartoli, F., Armes, J., Taylor, C., & Carrà, G. (2025). Mental health and loneliness in university students: A structural equation modelling comparing Italy and the UK. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 71, 1574–1586. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00207640251346273>
27. Calvo, A., & Lara, E. (2025). Studying loneliness and its impact on mental health among university students: The SONDEU Project. *European Psychiatry*, 68, S323. <https://doi.org/10.1192/j.eurpsy.2025.693>
28. Deng, S., Su, J., Yang, H., Liang, J., & Zhu, S. (2025). Urban built environment and its impact on university students' loneliness: A mechanistic study. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 13, Article 1514820. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2025.1514820>
29. Matthews, G. A., Nieh, E. H., Vander Weele, C. M., Halbert, S. A., Pradhan, R. V., Yosafat, A. S., Glober, G. F., Izadmehr, E. M., Thomas, R. E., Lacy, G. D., Wildes, C. P., Ungless, M. A., & Tye, K. M. (2016). Dorsal raphe dopamine neurons represent the experience of social isolation. *Cell*, 164(4), 617–631. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2015.12.040>

30. Zhang, Y., Tatewaki, Y., Liu, Y., Tomita, N., Thyreau, B., & Taki, Y. (2024). Longitudinal loneliness changes are associated with cognitive decline and brain structure alterations: Evidence from the Whitehall II cohort study. *Alzheimer's & Dementia*, 20(S4). <https://doi.org/10.1002/alz.084884>
31. Mavrych, V., Mansour, G. K., Hajjar, A. W., & Bolgova, O. (2026). Hormonal and behavioral consequences of social isolation and loneliness: Neuroendocrine mechanisms and clinical implications. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, 27(1), Article 84. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms27010084>
32. Lara, E., Martín-María, N., De la Torre-Luque, A., Koyanagi, A., Vancampfort, D., Izquierdo, A., & Miret, M. (2019). Does loneliness contribute to mild cognitive impairment and dementia? A systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Ageing Research Reviews*, 52, 7–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arr.2019.03.002>
33. Park, C., Majeed, A., Gill, H., Tamura, J., Ho, R. C., Mansur, R. B., Nasri, F., Lee, Y., Rosenblat, J. D., Wong, E., & McIntyre, R. S. (2020). The effect of loneliness on distinct health outcomes: A comprehensive review and meta-analysis. *Psychiatry Research*, 294, Article 113514. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113514>
34. Zhou, Z., Wang, P., & Fang, Y. (2018). Loneliness and the risk of dementia among older Chinese adults: Gender differences. *Ageing & Mental Health*, 22(4), 519–525. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13607863.2016.1277976>
35. Yang, Z., Liu, C., He, L., Zhao, H., Jian, J., Chen, H., Wei, H., Niu, J., & Luo, B. (2025). Social isolation and loneliness increase the risk of coronary heart disease: Insights from a prospective cohort study. *Social Science & Medicine*, 366, Article 117701. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2025.117701>
36. Ahmed, M., Cerda, I., & Maloof, M. (2023). Breaking the vicious cycle: The interplay between loneliness, metabolic illness, and mental health. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 14, Article 1134865. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2023.1134865>
37. Krimberg, J. S., Lumertz, F. S., Orso, R., Viola, T. W., & De Almeida, R. M. M. (2022). Impact of social isolation on the oxytocinergic system: A systematic review and meta-analysis of rodent data. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 134, Article 104549. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2022.104549>
38. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2020). *Social isolation and loneliness in older adults: Opportunities for the health care system*. The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/25663>
39. Czaja, S. J., Boot, W. R., Charness, N., Rogers, W. A., & Sharit, J. (2018). Improving social support for older adults through technology: Findings from the PRISM randomized controlled trial. *The Gerontologist*, 58(3), 467–477. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gnw249>
40. Pu, L., Moyle, W., Jones, C., & Todorovic, M. (2019). The effectiveness of social robots for older adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled studies. *The Gerontologist*, 59(1), e37–e51. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gny046>
41. Ikeda, S. (2023). The paradox of urban diversity and cohesion. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-5362-2\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-5362-2_4)