

The impact of isolation measures due to COVID-19 on energy intake and physical activity levels in Australian university students

Linda A. Gallo^{1*}, Tania F. Gallo², Sophia L. Young^{1,3}, Karen M. Moritz^{1,3}, Lisa K. Akison^{1,3}

¹ School of Biomedical Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, The University of Queensland, St Lucia, Queensland, Australia

² North Melbourne Football Club, Arden Street, North Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

³ Child Health Research Centre, The University of Queensland, South Brisbane, Queensland, Australia

* Correspondence: l.gallo@uq.edu.au

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** The pandemic inflicted by coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) resulted in
3 physical isolation measures in many parts of the world. In Australia, nationwide restrictions
4 included staying at home, unless seeking medical care, providing care, purchasing food,
5 undertaking exercise, or attending work in an essential service. All undergraduate university
6 classes transitioned to online, mostly home-based learning. This disruption to daily life may
7 have consequences for eating and physical activity patterns.

8 **Methods:** In this observational study, we examined the effect of isolation measures, during the
9 early phase of the COVID-19 pandemic in Australia (March/April), on diet (24-hour diet recall,
10 ASA-24) and physical activity (Active Australia Survey) patterns among third-year biomedical
11 students in Brisbane, Australia. Findings were compared to students enrolled in the same
12 course in the previous two years.

13 **Results:** In females, energy intake was ~20% greater in 2020 compared with 2018 and 2019,
14 and the frequency of snacking and energy density of consumed snacks were also increased. In
15 males, there was no difference in energy intake or snacking behaviour. Physical activity was
16 impacted for both sexes, whereby fewer students undertook any walking activity and, of those
17 that did, time spent doing so was less compared with 2018 and 2019. The proportion of students
18 reporting any vigorous activity was not different for males or females but, among males who
19 participated in this level of activity, the duration was less in 2020 compared with previous
20 years. The proportion of male and female students achieving 'sufficient' levels of activity,
21 defined by at least 150 mins over at least 5 sessions, was ~30% less in 2020. Indeed, the
22 majority of students reported as having undertaken less physical activity than usual.

23 **Conclusions:** Increased energy intake for females and reduced physical activity for males and
24 females demonstrate impacts of isolation measures that may have deleterious consequences for

25 physical and mental wellbeing, with the potential to affect long-term nutrition and activity

26 patterns.

27 **Keywords:** Nutrition, Diet, Exercise, Pandemic, Late adolescents, Young adults

28 **Introduction**

29 Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), caused by SARS-CoV-2, was declared a pandemic by
30 the World Health Organization on March 11th 2020. In the majority of cases, it is an acute
31 respiratory illness including fever, cough, and a sore throat but, in moderate to severe cases,
32 the disease progresses to breathing difficulties, respiratory distress and extra-respiratory
33 symptoms including heart and kidney injury and, in some cases, death (1). As of May 10th
34 2020, the virus has already infected ~4 million people and resulted in more than 270,000 deaths
35 globally (2).

36 Human-to-human transmission occurs primarily via respiratory droplets generated through
37 coughing, sneezing, and talking; and other contagion sources include contaminated biologicals
38 and surfaces (3, 4). Intense research efforts are in place for the identification of effective
39 therapies and vaccines but, in the meantime, to contain spread and prevent overburdening our
40 healthcare systems, the most effective strategy is contact tracing and physical isolation
41 measures.

42 The Australian Government, including individual States and Territories, announced gradual
43 ‘lockdown’ measures in response to the growing number of cases that could not be adequately
44 traced. Community transmission become of major concern and, as at March 30th 2020, all but
45 essential services were shut down, and people only left their homes for work (in an essential
46 service), or to purchase food, receive or provide medical care, or exercise. Whilst the majority
47 of primary and secondary schools remained opened for the children of essential workers,
48 universities transitioned all undergraduate learning online by March 23rd 2020.

49 Whilst effective for containing outbreaks, disrupted habits involving strict isolation
50 measures can adversely affect both physical and mental health, with potentially exacerbated
51 effects among young adults who rely upon positive peer interactions for their general wellbeing
52 (5, 6). Likely consequences of home-isolation are changes to eating and physical activity

53 behaviours. It is reasonable to hypothesise that more time spent at home promotes hypercaloric
54 diets, including larger meal sizes and increased snack frequency and size. Alternatively, fewer
55 opportunities to travel outside the home may encourage more structured meal patterns and less
56 take-away foods that are typically energy-dense. For physical activity, the lockdown would be
57 anticipated to reduce both frequency and duration, not only for typically active persons who
58 are no longer able to access gyms and health clubs, but for those who achieve sufficient levels
59 of activity incidentally, through walking or cycling to work or study. This is particularly
60 pertinent to university students attending a major campus who typically walk between classes
61 numerous times a day. To this end, the impact of COVID-19-induced isolation measures on
62 diet and physical activity patterns in Australian undergraduate students was measured one week
63 after the transition to online learning and compared with data obtained in the previous two
64 years.

65 **Methods**

66 *Study design and participants*

67 This observational study was approved by The University of Queensland Human Research
68 Ethics Committee (Project Approval: 2016-02-066-PRE-3) and conducted in accordance with
69 the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (Australia).

70 Participants were recruited from third-year biomedical practical classes from The University
71 of Queensland (Brisbane, Australia) in 2018, 2019 and 2020. In 2018 and 2019, students
72 physically attended the practical classes on campus. In 2020, all undergraduate classes
73 transitioned online by March 23rd. For each year, students who provided written informed
74 consent were given a unique code (and password for the online diet questionnaire). Inclusion
75 criteria was 19-27 years of age (214 males and 295 females).

76

77 *Diet and physical activity questionnaires*

78 The Automated Self-Administered Dietary Assessment Tool (ASA24-Australia-2016) was
79 used to guide participants through a 24-hour recall for the previous day (7). Participants were
80 asked to recall all foods, drinks, and supplements consumed from midnight-to-midnight.
81 Participants selected an eating occasion from a pre-determined list (e.g., 'breakfast' or 'snack')
82 and reported all foods and beverages consumed at that time. Foods and beverages were entered
83 by typing in specific search terms and selecting items from a returned list. Details of food types,
84 preparation methods, portion sizes, additions, eating location, and food source were then
85 queried by the system. Participants were prompted to recall frequently omitted and forgotten
86 foods, and to complete a final review of all items consumed. The 24-hour energy intake
87 included in this analysis includes all foods, drinks, and supplements. The main meals data
88 include anything reported as 'breakfast/brunch', 'lunch' and 'dinner'. Snack data include
89 anything consumed during a 'snack', 'drink', and 'supper' occasion, which was before, after,

90 or between main meals. Plain water or zero calorie drinks on their own were not considered a
91 snack occasion. The distributions presented for eating location includes all occasions reported
92 for all participants. For all meals eaten at home, the food source for the majority of ingredients
93 reported for a given eating occasion is shown. For each year, the intake date used for the recall
94 was between: March 18-20 2018, March 24-26 2019, and March 28-April 2 2020.

95 The Active Australia Survey was used to estimate leisure-time physical activity (8).
96 Participants self-completed the survey following instruction. Sufficient activity was defined as
97 at least 150 minutes of activity over at least five sessions per week. Insufficient activity was
98 defined as undertaking some activity but not enough in total time or number of sessions to be
99 considered a health benefit. Sedentary was defined as no activity at all. Total time was
100 calculated by adding time spent in walking (continuously for at least 10 minutes), moderate
101 activity and vigorous activity (weighted by two). To distinguish vigorous *versus* moderate
102 activity, exercise intensity was estimated for each activity based on a metabolic equivalent
103 (MET) score of 3-6 for moderate or >6 for vigorous, where 1 MET was defined as the resting
104 metabolic rate, equivalent to oxygen uptake of 3.5 mL/kg/hour (9). A score for total sessions
105 was calculated by adding the number of sessions of walking (continuously for at least 10
106 minutes), moderate activity, and vigorous activity. The average time spent walking
107 (continuously for at least 10 minutes) or engaging in vigorous activity, for those who reported
108 participation in that activity, was also reported, according to the Survey guide (8). For all
109 calculations, any reported gardening or yard work was not included, as per survey guidelines.

110

111 *Statistical analyses*

112 All analyses were performed using GraphPad Prism. Exploratory analyses were conducted,
113 separately for males and females, examining the distribution and summary statistics. Where
114 data did not follow a normal distribution, determined using the Shapiro-Wilk test, non-

115 parametric tests were used, and data reported as median and either inter-quartile range (IQR)
116 and/or range. Categorical variables were reported with frequencies and proportions.
117 Distributions for participant ethnicity and dietary recalls that fell on a weekend were compared
118 between years using the chi-square (χ^2) test. Due to non-normal data, a Kruskal-Wallis test
119 was used to determine differences in age, between class years, followed by Dunn's multiple
120 comparisons test.

121 Due to non-normal data, a Kruskal-Wallis test was used to determine differences in total
122 24-hour energy intake (kJ), 24-hour energy intake and energy density attributed to main meals
123 or snacks, and the number of snacking occasions between class years, followed by Dunn's
124 multiple comparisons test, where appropriate. As there were no statistical differences between
125 2018 and 2019, these years were combined and compared with class year 2020 for the same
126 dietary parameters using a Mann-Whitney test. The proportion of participants reporting any
127 alcohol consumption was compared between the years using the chi-square test. The location
128 of eating occasions was compared between class years, using the chi-square test. As differences
129 were found for both sexes, separate chi-square tests compared the 'home' location to all other
130 locations combined. Given no statistically significant differences were found between class
131 year 2018 and 2019, these years were combined and compared with 2020 using a further chi-
132 square test. For all eating occasions at 'home', the source of food was compared between years,
133 using the chi-square test.

134 To investigate differences in physical activity participation between class years, the
135 proportion of respondents reporting any amount of walking and/or vigorous activity was
136 examined. In order to meet the assumptions of the chi-square test, that all values are >1 and
137 that no more than 20% of values are <5 , a systematic approach was taken. Class year 2018 was
138 compared to 2019 using the chi-square test and, given no statistically significant difference was
139 found, these class years were combined and compared to 2020 using a separate chi-square test.

140 Time spent in walking and vigorous activity was compared between class years using a
141 Kruskal-Wallis test, followed by Dunn's multiple comparisons test, where appropriate.
142 Influence of class year on proportion of participants achieving 'sufficient' activity was also
143 examined. Class year 2018 was compared to 2019 using a chi-square test and, given no
144 statistically significant difference was found, these class years were combined. Sedentary and
145 insufficient activity were also combined, resulting in a separate chi-square test comparing
146 2018/19 to 2020 for sedentary/insufficient *versus* sufficient levels of physical activity.

147 **Results**

148 *Study participants*

149 Table 1 shows the sample size for each outcome variable in males and females, and the
150 proportion of dietary recalls that fell on a weekend relative to a weekday. This differed for both
151 sexes between 2018 and 2019 due to differences in practical class scheduling (69% of students
152 in 2018 and 36% in 2019 were scheduled on a Monday and therefore reported on meals and
153 drinks consumed on Sunday; males: $X^2(1) = 9.042, p < 0.01$; females: $X^2(1) = 31.72, p <$
154 0.0001). In 2020, students did not attend campus and had the option to complete the virtual
155 practical class on any day within the specified week. In 2020, 31% of students reported
156 weekend intakes which was significantly less compared with students in 2018 (males: $X^2(1) =$
157 $23.52, p < 0.0001$; females: $X^2(1) = 21.00, p < 0.0001$) but not compared with 2019 (males: X^2
158 $(1) = 3.723, p = 0.054$; females: $X^2(1) = 0.7808, p = 0.377$). There were no differences in
159 energy intake between weekday and weekend recalls for each year among males and females
160 (data not shown; Student's unpaired *t*-test or Mann-Whitney test, where appropriate).

161 **Table 1.** Participants included in the study

162

	Year 2018	Year 2019	Year 2020
Males			
Entered study (N)	75	80	70
>27 years of age or unknown (N)	1	2	4
No diet and physical activity data (N)	3	1	0
Total included in study (N)	71	77	66
Included for diet [N, (%)]	65 (91.5)	63 (81.8)	64 (97.0)
Missing diet data (N)	6	14	2
Weekend:weekday diet recall [N, (% weekend)]	45:20 (69.2)	27:36 (42.9)**	17:47 (26.6)****
Included for physical activity [N, (%)]	61 (85.9)	73 (94.8)	66 (100)
Missing physical activity data (N)	10	4	0
Females			
Entered study (N)	105	112	89
>27 years of age or unknown (N)	2	2	5
No diet and physical activity data (N)	0	2	0
Total included in study (N)	103	108	84
Included for diet [N, (%)]	101 (98.1)	96 (88.9)	82 (97.6)
Missing diet data (N)	2	12	2
Weekend:weekday diet recall [N, (% weekend)]	70:31 (69.3)	28:68 (29.2)****	29:53 (35.4)****
Included for physical activity [N, (%)]	97 (94.2)	104 (96.3)	83 (98.8)
Missing physical activity data (N)	6	4	1

163 ** $p < 0.01$ vs. 2018, **** $p < 0.0001$ vs. 2018.

164 Table 2 summarises the demographic characteristics by class year. A significant age
165 difference was found between class year for both males ($H(2) = 27.37, p < 0.0001$) and females
166 ($H(2) = 22.79, p < 0.0001$). For males, median age was significantly higher in year 2020
167 compared with 2019 ($p < 0.01$) and 2018 ($p < 0.0001$). Similarly, for females, median age was
168 significantly higher in class year 2020 compared with 2019 ($p < 0.0001$) and 2018 ($p < 0.01$).
169 There was no difference in age between 2018 and 2019 for males or females. A chi-square test
170 revealed no significant differences in ethnicity proportions between collection years for both
171 males ($X^2(8) = 11.73, p = 0.164$) and females ($X^2(8) = 7.271, p = 0.508$).

172 **Table 2.** Participant demographics

	Year 2018	Year 2019	Year 2020
Males	N=71	N=77	N=66
Age [median (range), years]	19 (19-25)	20 (19-25)	20 (19-27)*^
Ethnicity [N (%)]			
Asian	23 (32.4%)	18 (23.4%)	25 (37.9%)
Asian sub-continental	4 (5.6%)	7 (9.1%)	6 (9.1%)
Caucasian	39 (54.9%)	42 (54.5%)	29 (43.9%)
Multi	2 (2.8%)	1 (1.3%)	4 (6.1%)
Other/Not disclosed	3/0 (4.2%)	5/4 (11.7%)	2/0 (3.0%)
Females	N=103	N=108	N=84
Age [median (range), years]	20 (19-26)	20 (19-23)	21 (19-26)*^
Ethnicity [N (%)]			
Asian	29 (28.2%)	28 (25.9%)	27 (32.1%)
Asian sub-continental	3 (2.9%)	10 (9.3%)	8 (9.5%)
Caucasian	65 (63.1%)	60 (55.6%)	44 (52.4%)
Multi	3 (2.9%)	6 (5.6%)	2 (2.4%)
Other/Not disclosed	3/0 (2.9%)	3/1 (3.7%)	2/1 (3.6%)

173 * $p < 0.05$ vs. 2018, ^ $p < 0.05$ vs. 2019.

174 *Dietary intake from ASA 24-hour recall*

175 For male participants, total 24-hour energy intake was not different between class years ($H(2)$
176 = 0.992, $p = 0.609$; Figure 1A). For females, a significant difference was found ($H(2) = 7.60$,
177 $p < 0.05$), whereby total 24-hour energy intake during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 tended
178 to be higher compared with the year 2019 (+13.2%; $p = 0.067$) and was significantly higher
179 compared with the year 2018 (+24.3%; $p < 0.05$; Figure 1B). As there was no significant
180 difference between 2018 and 2019, these years were combined and compared with 2020.
181 Among males, there remained no difference (Figure 1C) and, among females, total 24-hour
182 energy intake was 19.5% higher in 2020 compared with 2018/19 combined ($p < 0.01$; Figure
183 1D).

184 Daily energy intake and energy density coming from main meals or from snacks were
185 compared between the class years. There were no significant differences between 2018 and

186 2019, and thus these years were combined and compared with 2020. Daily energy intake from
187 main meals was not different, but energy density tended to be less in male (-5.2%; $p = 0.068$),
188 but not female, participants in 2020 compared with 2018/19 (Figure **2A-D**). Among males,
189 there was no difference in the number of snack occasions, energy intake attributed to snacks,
190 or the energy density of consumed snacks between 2020 and 2018/19 (Figure **2E, G, I**).
191 However, in females, there was an increase to two snack occasions in 2020 compared with one
192 in 2018/19 ($p < 0.05$; Figure **2F**). In addition, energy intake and energy density attributed to
193 snacks were increased in 2020 compared with 2018/19 among female students (+50%; $p =$
194 0.083 and +62%; $p < 0.05$, respectively; Figure **2H, J**).

195 The proportion of participants who consumed any alcohol between the class years was not
196 different for males (19% average across all years, $X^2(2) = 2.297$, $p = 0.317$) or females (13%
197 average across all years, $X^2(2) = 3.425$, $p = 0.180$; data not shown).

198 The distribution of eating location by class year was significantly different for both males
199 ($X^2(8) = 71.27$, $p < 0.0001$) and females ($X^2(8) = 86.53$, $p < 0.0001$). Separate chi-square tests
200 comparing the 'home' location to all other locations revealed a significant difference, with the
201 vast majority of participants consuming food at home (males: 96.2% in 2020 and 73.8% in
202 2018/19 combined; $X^2(1) = 62.37$, $p < 0.0001$; females: 95.8% in 2020 and 75.5% in 2018/19
203 combined; $X^2(1) = 78.33$, $p < 0.0001$; Figure **3A-B**). For all foods consumed at home, the food
204 source was not different between class years (males: $X^2(8) = 5.957$, $p = 0.652$; females: $X^2(8)$
205 = 14.12, $p = 0.079$; Figure **3C-D**).

206

207 *Physical activity levels from the Active Australia Survey*

208 The proportion of participants reporting any amount of physical activity, for walking and
209 vigorous, can be seen in Figure **4A-B**. In males, a chi-square analysis comparing year 2020 to
210 2018/19 combined revealed a significant reduction in walking participation ($X^2(1) = 3.969$, p

211 < 0.05) but no difference for vigorous activity ($X^2(1) = 1.287, p = 0.257$; Figure 4A). A similar
212 result was seen for females with a significant reduction for walking participation in 2020
213 compared with 2018/19 ($X^2(1) = 6.299, p < 0.05$) but no difference for vigorous activity ($X^2(1)$
214 = 1.35, $p = 0.245$; Figure 4B).

215 Among those who reported any walking, a Kruskal-Wallis test revealed a significant
216 difference in the time spent in this activity for both males ($H(2) = 19.11, p < 0.0001$) and
217 females ($H(2) = 8.964, p < 0.05$). Post-hoc analysis for male participants revealed that time
218 spent walking was significantly less in year 2020 compared with 2019 (-52.5 min; $p < 0.05$)
219 and 2018 (-87.5 min; $p < 0.0001$; Figure 4C). Similarly, for females, time spent walking in
220 2020 was significantly less than 2019 (-30 min; $p < 0.05$) and non-significantly less than 2018
221 (-30 min; $p = 0.068$; Figure 4D). Time spent walking between class years 2018 and 2019 were
222 not different for either males or females. Time spent in vigorous activity was also found to be
223 significantly different for males ($H(2) = 19.63, p < 0.0001$), with class year 2020 spending
224 significantly less time in this activity compared with 2019 (-60 min; $p < 0.05$) and 2018 (-150
225 min; $p < 0.0001$; Figure 4E). There was no difference in time spent in vigorous activity between
226 males in year 2018 and 2019. Additionally, among females, no differences in time spent in
227 vigorous activity were seen between the class years (Figure 4F).

228 The proportion of participants achieving 'sufficient' activity, relative to insufficient and
229 sedentary levels can be seen in Figure 5A-B. A chi-square analysis comparing class year 2020
230 to 2018/19, revealed a significant difference for males ($X^2(1) = 13.36, p < 0.001$; Figure 5A)
231 and females ($X^2(1) = 20.88, p < 0.0001$; Figure 5B), whereby fewer participants achieved
232 'sufficient' levels of activity in 2020. Figure 5C-D demonstrates the proportion of participants
233 from class year 2020 reporting typical *versus* atypical amounts of physical activity during the
234 COVID-19 pandemic; the majority (56% for males and 61% for females) reported less than
235 usual physical activity levels.

236 Discussion

237 This is the first study to assess energy intake and physical activity levels in young adults during
238 the COVID-19 pandemic. Our study was conducted in a cohort of Australian university
239 undergraduate students within one week of government-imposed physical isolation measures
240 and the transition from face-to-face to online classes. These data were compared with students
241 enrolled in the same course over the preceding two years. The major findings are an increase
242 in total energy intake, snacking frequency, and energy density of consumed snacks in female
243 students, and a reduction in physical activity levels in both males and females.

244 Almost all (~96%) eating occasions during the pandemic were based at home compared
245 with only three-quarters in 2018/19. This was expected, given the ban on dining-in at food
246 venues that had remained open. Takeaway options remained available, but more than 90% of
247 all foods consumed in the home were sourced from grocery stores and/or fresh markets, which
248 was consistent with previous years. There was a small (~5%) reduction in the energy density
249 of main meals consumed by male students in 2020 and, while the location of meal preparation
250 was not examined in this study, this could reflect a reduction in foods prepared away from
251 home, which are typically more energy dense compared with home-prepared foods (10). Total
252 energy intake was unaffected, indicating a compensatory increase in main meal portion size.
253 Compared with the difference in males, the maintenance of main meal energy density in
254 females may reflect their higher consumption of home-prepared meals in general, pre-
255 pandemic (11). Our data suggest, however, that more time spent at home promoted a
256 hypercaloric diet in female students, which was attributed to increased frequency and energy
257 density of snacks. Foods consumed away from home, including self-prepared lunches and
258 snacks, are typically pre-portioned to a limited size. Thus, increased consumption at home may
259 result from increased food visibility and opportunities to snack, possibly exaggerated by ‘panic
260 buying’ and stockpiled food that coincided with national lockdown measures (12, 13).

261 Increased snacking in female, but not male, students while in home-isolation may reflect
262 differences in social influence and perceived norms (14). When in the presence of mixed-sex
263 peers, which is likely in the university setting, females have been shown to eat less than when
264 in same-sex groups (15). Eating behaviour is also known to be impacted by stress and anxiety
265 and, indeed, there has been a marked increase in telephone calls to youth mental health
266 organisations during the pandemic, the majority from young women aged 19-25 (16). Females
267 appear to be more likely to ‘stress-eat’ and consume hyperpalatable ‘comfort’ foods (17-19),
268 which, in line with the current study, are typically energy dense. The addictive properties of
269 energy-dense comfort foods can lead to long-lasting changes to eating behaviours (20).

270 As our reference control group, the median 24-hour energy intake in 2018/19 combined was
271 10,338 kJ for males and 6,776 kJ for females. This is slightly less than the latest data on energy
272 intake from the Australian Health Survey, which included a broader representation of
273 Australian residents (11,004 kJ in males and 7,863 kJ in females; means for 19-30 year age
274 group) (21). Lower energy intake in biomedical science students compared with the general
275 public may be due, in part, to greater health awareness and more balanced eating patterns.
276 Alternatively, albeit somewhat related, is the established inverse relationship between
277 education status and obesity in high-income nations (22). It should also be noted that the
278 national nutrition data was attained in 2011-12, which may confound comparisons with the
279 current data. Nevertheless, our data are consistent with a previous report in health science
280 students in Spain (-22% and -8% compared with national survey data in males and females,
281 respectively) (23), suggesting that university students consume less energy than age-matched
282 national averages.

283 Isolation measures also saw a substantial reduction in physical activity levels in both male
284 and female students, despite widespread recommendations to maintain physical activity during
285 the pandemic (24, 25). Specifically, in 2020, fewer students reported any amount of walking

286 (males 88%; females 93%) compared to 2018/19 (males 96%; 99% females), and of those that
287 did, less time was spent doing so. It is reasonable to attribute this finding to the loss of
288 incidental walking through commute, daily activities, or as part of one's vocation, including
289 walking between classes on campus. Those choosing to participate in vigorous activity, which
290 was not different between the class years, are perhaps more ingrained in their prioritisation of
291 physical activity (26) and found ways to continue doing so during lockdown. Notably,
292 however, of those that did participate in vigorous activity, the time spent doing so in 2020 was
293 less for males compared with previous years. With males more likely to participate in vigorous
294 activity, as we and others have shown (27), and be motivated by mastery and competition (28),
295 the closure of recreational sport and community gyms was likely to impact their activity levels.

296 The positive health benefits of physical activity are well established, with unequivocal
297 evidence linking physical inactivity to non-communicable diseases (29). Many government
298 bodies have established physical activity guidelines, not only as a prevention strategy for
299 chronic diseases, but for psychological benefits (30-33). The most recent Australian Guidelines
300 recommend adults between 18-64 years achieve at least 150 minutes of moderate intensity
301 activity, on most days of the week, to achieve health benefits (34). In our population of
302 undergraduate biomedical students, over 80% of participants were deemed to be 'sufficiently
303 active' in the control years, which well-surpasses the age-controlled Australian average of 53%
304 (35). While university educated persons have been reported to be more physically active, and
305 have a reduced risk of being overweight (36), the reductions in sufficient activity seen during
306 the COVID-19 pandemic, to 62% and 55% for males and females, respectively, is less than
307 favourable. Specific targets have been set for 'sufficient activity' to achieve substantial health
308 benefits, but the Australian Guidelines also stipulate that "doing any physical activity is better
309 than doing none" (34). This is supported by research showing a dose-response relationship
310 between positive health effects and physical activity, with no obvious lower threshold for

311 benefit and a continuous risk reduction (37). Therefore, in this study, the increase in sedentary
312 behaviour and reduction in physical activity raises health concerns.

313 While several weeks, or even a few months, of physical inactivity is unlikely to result in an
314 abrupt onset of metabolic disease, sudden exercise cessation can decrease insulin sensitivity,
315 cause muscle and bone loss, and abolish many of the positive exercise-induced metabolic and
316 cardiovascular adaptations (38, 39). A further consequence is, undoubtedly, the loss of
317 psychological benefits associated with physical activity (40). This may be compounded by the
318 lack of social support during isolation periods, which is also important to maintain activity
319 (41). This impact of inactivity on psychological health is further linked to the, potential stress-
320 associated, increase in energy intake among female students. Arguably, the greatest risk to
321 mortality, however, is the lasting impact on behaviour, that any time in lockdown may trigger.
322 This is particularly true for those who are extrinsically motivated to participate in activity (*i.e.*,
323 to achieve outcome-based goals such as physical appearance) *versus* those who are intrinsically
324 motivated and genuinely enjoy taking part in physical activity (42). It is worth noting that a
325 hasty return to pre-pandemic activity levels, upon easing of isolation measures, can raise the
326 risk of injury, particularly with the return to vigorous activity (43).

327 While these findings are undesirable, it is possible that our data reflect short-term
328 consequences to an abrupt change in daily habits, and that over several weeks, participants
329 recalibrated their diet and physical activity behaviours upon a newly established routine. For
330 example, females may have started to consider the implications of increased snacking and both
331 males and females may have taken the time to establish 'at-home' workouts, gain access to
332 equipment, and/or incorporate a walk into their day. Indeed, in this study, 56% of males and
333 61% of females felt they had undertaken 'less than typical' physical activity levels during the
334 first week of isolation and the transition to online study, and such self-awareness may increase
335 the likelihood of positive behaviour adjustments.

336 **Conclusions**

337 The global outbreak of COVID-19 resulted in restrictive isolation measures in many parts of
338 the world. This was aimed at limiting transmission and hence reducing the burden on our
339 healthcare systems, *i.e.* ‘flattening the curve’. In our study, which was conducted during the
340 early phase of physical isolation and transition to online learning, energy intake in female
341 students was increased and physical activity levels in both males and females was reduced
342 compared with students in the previous two years. Undesirable changes to diet and physical
343 activity patterns have the potential to persist for some time, even after isolation measures are
344 eased. These changes, particularly if sustained, can have deleterious consequences for both
345 physical and mental wellbeing.

346 **Abbreviations**

347 COVID-19: Coronavirus disease 2019; MET: Metabolic equivalents; SD: Standard deviation

348

349 **Declarations**

350

351 *Ethics approval and consent to participate*

352 This study was approved by The University of Queensland Human Research Ethics Committee

353 (Project Approval: 2016-02-066-PRE-3) and conducted in accordance with the National

354 Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (Australia).

355 Informed written consent was obtained from the study participants.

356

357 *Consent for publication*

358 Not applicable.

359

360 *Availability of data and materials*

361 Available upon request.

362

363 *Competing interests*

364 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

365

366 *Funding*

367 The study was funded by institutional support from the School of Biomedical Sciences, The

368 University of Queensland, Australia. LAG was supported by an Early Career Fellowship from

369 the National Health and Medical Research Council and Heart Foundation (Australia, 2015-19)
370 and University of Queensland Amplify Fellowship (2020-21). KMM was supported by a
371 Senior Research Fellowship from the National Health and Medical Research Council.

372

373 *Authors' contributions*

374 LAG, KMM, and LKA conceptualized the study. LAG, SLY, and LKA performed the data
375 collection. LAG and TFG completed the statistical analysis. LAG, TFG, and SLY drafted the
376 manuscript. All authors read, reviewed, and approved the final version of the manuscript.

377

378 *Acknowledgments*


379 We thank the student volunteers from BIOM3020 Integrated Endocrinology (The University
380 of Queensland) who took part in the study.

381 References

- 382 1. Akhmerov A, Marban E. COVID-19 and the Heart. *Circ Res.* 2020;126:1443-55.
- 383 2. Coronavirus disease (COVID-2019) Situation Report - 111. World Health Organization.
- 384 2020. [https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200509covid-19-sitrep-110.pdf?sfvrsn=3b92992c_4)
- 385 [reports/20200509covid-19-sitrep-110.pdf?sfvrsn=3b92992c_4](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200509covid-19-sitrep-110.pdf?sfvrsn=3b92992c_4). Accessed 11 May 2020.
- 386 3. Guo YR, Cao QD, Hong ZS, Tan YY, Chen SD, Jin HJ, et al. The origin, transmission and
- 387 clinical therapies on coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak - an update on the
- 388 status. *Mil Med Res.* 2020;7:11.
- 389 4. van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, Holbrook MG, Gamble A, Williamson BN,
- 390 et al. Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV-1. *N Engl*
- 391 *J Med.* 2020;382:1564-7.
- 392 5. Hopmeyer A, Medovoy T. Emerging Adults' Self-Identified Peer Crowd Affiliations, Risk
- 393 Behaviour, and Social-Emotional Adjustment in College. *Emerging Adulthood.* 2017;5:143-
- 394 8.
- 395 6. Umberson D, Crosnoe R, Reczek C. Social Relationships and Health Behaviour Across
- 396 Life Course. *Annu Rev Sociol.* 2010;36:139-57.
- 397 7. Subar AF, Kirkpatrick SI, Mittl B, Zimmerman TP, Thompson FE, Bingley C, et al. The
- 398 Automated Self-Administered 24-hour dietary recall (ASA24): a resource for researchers,
- 399 clinicians, and educators from the National Cancer Institute. *J Acad Nutr Diet.*
- 400 2012;112:1134-7.
- 401 8. The Active Australia Survey: a guide and manual for implementation, analysis and
- 402 reporting. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW); 2003.
- 403 9. Ainsworth BE, Haskell WL, Whitt MC, Irwin ML, Swartz AM, Strath SJ, et al.
- 404 Compendium of physical activities: an update of activity codes and MET intensities. *Med Sci*
- 405 *Sports Exerc.* 2000;32:S498-504.
- 406 10. Nguyen BT, Powell LM. The impact of restaurant consumption among US adults:
- 407 effects on energy and nutrient intakes. *Public Health Nutr.* 2014;17:2445-52.
- 408 11. Seguin RA, Aggarwal A, Vermeylen F, Drewnowski A. Consumption Frequency of
- 409 Foods Away from Home Linked with Higher Body Mass Index and Lower Fruit and
- 410 Vegetable Intake among Adults: A Cross-Sectional Study. *J Environ Public Health.*
- 411 2016;2016:3074241.
- 412 12. Wansink B. Environmental factors that increase the food intake and consumption
- 413 volume of unknowing consumers. *Annu Rev Nutr.* 2004;24:455-79.
- 414 13. Nicola M, Alsaifi Z, Sohrabi C, Kerwan A, Al-Jabir A, Iosifidis C, et al. The Socio-
- 415 Economic Implications of the Coronavirus and COVID-19 Pandemic: A Review. *Int J Surg.*
- 416 2020; doi: 10.1016/j.ijssu.2020.04.018.
- 417 14. Higgs S, Thomas J. Social influences on eating. *Curr Opin Behav Sci.* 2016;9:1-6.
- 418 15. Brindal E, Wilson C, Mohr P, Wittert G. Eating in groups: Do multiple social
- 419 influences affect intake in a fast-food restaurant? *J Health Psychol.* 2015;20:483-9.
- 420 16. Ton W. Kids Helpline strains under youth demand. Australian Associated Press. 2020.
- 421 <https://www.aap.com.au/kids-helpline-strains-under-youth-demand/>. Accessed 7 May 2020.
- 422 17. Stress and Gender. In: *Stress in America.* American Psychological Society. 2010.
- 423 <https://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/stress/2010/gender-stress.pdf>. Accessed 7 May
- 424 2020.
- 425 18. Yau YHC, Potenza MN. Stress and eating behaviours. *Minerva Endocrinol.*
- 426 2013;38:255-67.
- 427 19. Asarian L, Geary N. Sex differences in the physiology of eating. *Am J Physiol Regul*
- 428 *Integr Comp Physiol.* 2013;305:R1215-67.

- 429 20. Gearhardt AN, Grilo CM, DiLeone RJ, Brownell KD, Potenza MN. Can food be
430 addictive? Public health and policy implications. *Addiction*. 2011;106:1208-12.
- 431 21. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Australian Health Survey: Nutrition First Results -
432 Foods and Nutrients, 2011-12. Report 4364.0.55.007 Table 1.1.
433 [http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DetailsPage/4364.0.55.0072011-](http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DetailsPage/4364.0.55.0072011-12?OpenDocument)
434 [12?OpenDocument](http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DetailsPage/4364.0.55.0072011-12?OpenDocument). Accessed 1 May 2020.
- 435 22. Cohen AK, Rai M, Rehkopf DH, Abrams B. Educational attainment and obesity: a
436 systematic review. *Obes Rev*. 2013;14:989-1005.
- 437 23. Correa-Rodriguez M, Pocovi G, Schmidt-RioValle J, Gonzalez-Jimenez E, Rueda-
438 Medina B. Assessment of dietary intake in Spanish university students of health sciences.
439 *Endocrinol Diabetes Nutr*. 2018;65:265-73.
- 440 24. Lippi G, Henry BM, Sanchis-Gomar F. Physical inactivity and cardiovascular disease
441 at the time of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Eur J Prev Cardiol*. 2020;
442 doi:10.1177/2047487320916823.
- 443 25. Nyenhuis SM, Greiwe J, Zeiger JS, Nanda A, Cooke A. Exercise and Fitness in the age
444 of social distancing during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract*. 2020;
445 doi:10.1016/j.jaip.2020.04.039.
- 446 26. Ball JW, Bice MR, Parry T. Adults' Motivation for Physical Activity: Differentiating
447 Motives for Exercise, Sport, and Recreation. *RSJ*. 2014;38:130-42.
- 448 27. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Australian Health Survey: Physical Activity, 2011-
449 2012. Report 4364.0.55.004. Table 8.1.
450 [https://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DetailsPage/4364.0.55.0042011-](https://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DetailsPage/4364.0.55.0042011-12?OpenDocument)
451 [12?OpenDocument](https://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DetailsPage/4364.0.55.0042011-12?OpenDocument). Accessed 7 May 2020.
- 452 28. Molanorouzi K, Khoo S, Morris T. Motives for adult participation in physical activity:
453 type of activity, age, and gender. *BMC Public Health*. 2015;15:66.
- 454 29. Lee IM, Shiroma EJ, Lobelo F, Puska P, Blair SN, Katzmarzyk PT, et al. Effect of
455 physical inactivity on major non-communicable diseases worldwide: an analysis of burden of
456 disease and life expectancy. *Lancet*. 2012;380:219-29.
- 457 30. World Health Organization. Global Recommendations on Physical Activity for Health.
458 2010. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK305057/pdf/Bookshelf_NBK305057.pdf.
459 Accessed 7 May 2020.
- 460 31. King AC, Powell KE, Kraus WE. The US Physical Activity Guidelines Advisory
461 Committee Report-Introduction. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2019;51:1203-5.
- 462 32. Tremblay MS, Warburton DE, Janssen I, Paterson DH, Latimer AE, Rhodes RE, et al.
463 New Canadian physical activity guidelines. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab*. 2011;36:36-58.
- 464 33. Department of Health, UK Chief Medical Officers' Physical Activity Guidelines. 2019.
465 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/832868/uk-chief-medical-officers-physical-activity-guidelines.pdf)
466 [/file/832868/uk-chief-medical-officers-physical-activity-guidelines.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/832868/uk-chief-medical-officers-physical-activity-guidelines.pdf). Accessed 7 May
467 2020.
- 468 34. Australian Government. Australia's Physical Activity & Sedentary Behaviour
469 Guidelines for Adults (18-64 years). 2014.
470 [https://www1.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/Content/health-publhlth-strateg-](https://www1.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/Content/health-publhlth-strateg-phys-act-guidelines#npa1864)
471 [phys-act-guidelines#npa1864](https://www1.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/Content/health-publhlth-strateg-phys-act-guidelines#npa1864). Accessed 7 May 2020.
- 472 35. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Australian Health Survey: Physical Activity, 2011-
473 2012. Report 4364.0.55.004. Table 1.1.
474 [https://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DetailsPage/4364.0.55.0042011-](https://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DetailsPage/4364.0.55.0042011-12?OpenDocument)
475 [12?OpenDocument](https://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DetailsPage/4364.0.55.0042011-12?OpenDocument). Accessed 1 May 2020.
- 476 36. Grech A, Allman-Farinelli M. Prevalence and period trends of overweight and obesity
477 in Australian young adults. *Eur J Clin Nutr*. 2016;70:1083-5.


- 478 37. Blair SN, Kohl HW, Gordon NF, Paffenbarger RS, Jr. How much physical activity is
479 good for health? *Annu Rev Public Health*. 1992;13:99-126.
- 480 38. Charansonney OL, Despres JP. Disease prevention--should we target obesity or
481 sedentary lifestyle? *Nat Rev Cardiol*. 2010;7:468-72.
- 482 39. McGuire DK, Levine BD, Williamson JW, Snell PG, Blomqvist CG, Saltin B, et al. A
483 30-year follow-up of the Dallas Bedrest and Training Study: I. Effect of age on the
484 cardiovascular response to exercise. *Circulation*. 2001;104:1350-7.
- 485 40. Stathopoulou G, Powers MB, Berry AC, Smits JAJ, Otto MW. Exercise Interventions
486 for Mental Health: A Quantitative and Qualitative Review. *Clin Psychol (New York)*.
487 2006;13:179-93.
- 488 41. Eyster AE, Wilcox S, Matson-Koffman D, Evenson KR, Sanderson B, Thompson J, et
489 al. Correlates of physical activity among women from diverse racial/ethnic groups. *J*
490 *Womens Health Gend Based Med*. 2002;11:239-53.
- 491 42. Teixeira PJ, Carraca EV, Markland D, Silva MN, Ryan RM. Exercise, physical activity,
492 and self-determination theory: a systematic review. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2012;9:78.
- 493 43. Drew MK, Finch CF. The Relationship Between Training Load and Injury, Illness and
494 Soreness: A Systematic and Literature Review. *Sports Med*. 2016;46:861-83.




495

496 **Figure 1.** Total 24-hour energy intake in male and female students in class year 2020 (N=64
497 males, 82 females) compared with 2018 (N=65 males, 101 females) and 2019 (N=63 males,
498 96 females; A, B). No statistical differences were observed between 2018 and 2019 and
499 therefore these years were combined (N=128 males, 197 females) and compared with 2020 (C,
500 D). Data are presented as median \pm IQR and range. * $p < 0.05$ between 2020 and 2018 by
501 Kruskal-Wallis test. ** $p < 0.01$ between 2020 and 2018/19 by Student's unpaired t -test.


MALES



FEMALES




503 **Figure 2.** 24-hour energy intake and energy density attributed to main meals (A-D) or snacks
504 (E-H), and snacking frequency (I, J) in male and female students in class year 2020 (N=64
505 males, 82 females) compared with 2018/19 (N=128 males, 197 females). No statistical
506 differences were observed between 2018 and 2019 and therefore these years were combined.
507 Data are presented as median \pm IQR and range. * $p < 0.05$ between 2020 and 2018/19 by
508 Student's unpaired *t*-test.




509

510 **Figure 3.** Eating location (A, B) and food source for all eating occasions at home (C, D) in
511 male and female students in class year 2020 (N=66 males, 83 females) compared with 2018
512 (N=61 males, 97 females) and 2019 (N=73 males, 104 females). Data are presented as the
513 proportion of students included in this analysis each year. No statistical differences were
514 observed between 2018 and 2019 and therefore these years were combined for statistical
515 comparisons with 2020. **** $p < 0.0001$ between 2020 and 2018/19 for 'home' vs. all other
516 locations by chi-square test.



517

518 **Figure 4.** Levels of participation in physical activity (A, B) and time spent in walking (C, D)
 519 or vigorous activity (E, F) in class year 2020 (N=66 males, 83 females) compared with 2018
 520 (N=61 males, 97 females) and 2019 (N=73 males, 104 females). Data are presented as the
 521 proportion of students included in this analysis each year (A, B), or median \pm IQR and range
 522 (C-F). For A-B, no statistical differences were observed between 2018 and 2019 and therefore,
 523 to meet the assumptions of the chi-square test, these years were combined and compared with
 524 2020; * $p < 0.05$ between 2020 and 2018/19 by chi-square test. For C-E, * $p < 0.05$ between
 525 2020 and 2019 and **** $p < 0.0001$ between 2020 and 2018 by Kruskal-Wallis test.



526

527 **Figure 5.** Students achieving ‘sufficient’ physical activity levels in class year 2020 (N=66
 528 males, 83 females) compared with 2018 (N=61 males, 97 females) and 2019 (N=73 males, 104
 529 females) (A, B) and students self-indicating ‘typical’ levels of physical activity in year 2020
 530 (C, D). Data are presented as the proportion of students included in this analysis each year. For
 531 A-B, no statistical differences were observed between 2018 and 2019 and therefore, to meet
 532 the assumptions of the chi-square test, these years were combined and compared with 2020;
 533 *** $p < 0.001$ and **** $p < 0.0001$ between 2020 and 2018/19 for ‘sufficient’ vs.
 534 ‘sedentary/insufficient’ by chi-square test.