

1  
2 **Factors linked to changes in mental health outcomes**  
3 **among Brazilians in quarantine due to COVID-19**  
4  
5

6 Alberto Filgueiras<sup>1</sup>, Matthew Stults-Kolehmainen<sup>2,3</sup>  
7

8 <sup>1</sup> Department of Cognition and Human Development, Rio de Janeiro State University, Rio de  
9 Janeiro, Brazil

10 <sup>2</sup> Division of Bariatric and Minimally Invasive Surgery, Yale - New Haven Hospital, New  
11 Haven, USA

12 <sup>3</sup> Department of Biobehavioral Sciences, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York,  
13 NY, USA  
14

15 Corresponding author:

16 Alberto Filgueiras<sup>1</sup>

17 Rua São Francisco Xavier, 524, Bloco F, Sala 10.015

18 Maracanã, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil

19 Postal Code: 20550-900

20 Email address: [albertofilgueiras@gmail.com](mailto:albertofilgueiras@gmail.com)  
21

22 **Abstract**

23 The 2020 COVID-19 pandemic is a crisis of global proportions with a significant impact on the  
24 country of Brazil. The aims of this investigation were to track changes and risk factors for mental  
25 health outcomes during state-mandated quarantine. Adults residing in Brazil (n = 360, 37.9 years  
26 of age, 68.9% female) were surveyed at the start of quarantine and 1 month later. Outcomes  
27 assessed included perceived stress, state anxiety and depression. Aside from demographics,  
28 behaviors and attitudes assessed included exercise, diet, use of tele-psychotherapy and number of  
29 COVID-19 related risk factors, such as perceived risk of COVID-19, information overload, and  
30 feeling imprisoned. Overall, all mental health outcomes worsened from Time 1 to time 2,  
31 although there was a significant gender x time interaction for stress. 9.7% of the sample reported  
32 stress above the clinical cut-off (2 SD above mean), while 8.0% and 9.4% were above this cutoff  
33 for depression and anxiety, respectively. In repeated measures analysis, female gender,  
34 worsening diet and excess of COVID-19 information was related to all mental health outcomes.  
35 Changes in diet for the worse were associated with increases in anxiety. Exercise frequency was  
36 clearly related to state anxiety (0 days/week > 6 days/week). Those who did aerobic exercise did  
37 not have any increase in depression. Use of tele-psychotherapy predicted lower levels of  
38 depression and anxiety. In multiple regression, anxiety was predicted by the greatest number of

39 COVID-19 specific factors. In conclusion, mental health outcomes worsened for Brazilians  
40 during the first month of quarantine and these changes are associated with a variety of risk  
41 factors.

42 **Keywords:** COVID-19; SARS-Cov-2; Depression; Anxiety; Stress

43

## 44 Introduction

45 Mental health comprises the set of emotions, thoughts and behaviours that enable individuals to  
46 work, cope and deal with problems in everyday tasks (*WHO, 2004*). Historically, although  
47 researchers from the biomedical sciences dedicated more time and resources in the study of  
48 physical health, findings from the last 50 years have slowly captured the interest of scientists  
49 from diverse fields to look upon mental health to explain somatic diseases, physical functioning,  
50 quality-of-life, well-being and work productivity, (*Christensen et al., 1999; Prince et al., 2007;*  
51 *Stults-Kolehmainen, Tuit & Sinha, 2014*). For instance, mental health is associated with  
52 disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) and premature mortality (*Vigo, Kestel, Pendakur et al.,*  
53 *2019*) with 17% of DALYs attributable to mental health in Brazil and 22% in the United States.  
54 Those with worse mental health, such as higher levels of chronic stress, have a greater risk for  
55 physical health problems, such as cardiovascular disease (*Stults-Kolehmainen, 2013*). Poor  
56 mental health costs society a great deal of money, in terms of lost productivity, strain on  
57 healthcare systems, loss of income and other consequences (*Trautman, Rehm, Wittchen, 2016*).  
58 On the other hand, recent research from the World Health Organization suggests that every one  
59 American-dollar spent in mental health care is equivalent to a return of four American-dollars in  
60 better well-being and ability to work (*WHO, 2016*). Thus, a person who has good mental health  
61 entails someone who is physically healthy, happy and productive for themselves and the greater  
62 functioning of society (*Prince et al., 2007; WHO, 2016*).

63 The recent outbreak of the Corona Virus Disease 2019 (COVID-19 or SARS-CoV-2) around the  
64 world at the end of 2019 and the beginning of 2020 led to a series of guidelines to avoid mass  
65 contamination and limit its lethality (*WHO, 2020*). Among these recommendations are  
66 quarantine, confinement and social distancing (*Wilder-Smith & Freeman, 2020*). These  
67 impositions mean that people cannot walk freely from their homes; they need to keep a 2-meter  
68 physical distance from one another on the streets and sick people are obliged to be confined in  
69 hospitals or their own homes without any kind of physical proximity to others. These restrictions  
70 are intended to benefit the physical health and safety of all people and must be adopted to save  
71 lives. Unfortunately, such directives come at a cost to the mental health and well-being a  
72 substantial proportion of the population (*Rubin & Wessely, 2020*). Furthermore, not all  
73 individuals in Brazil adhere to quarantine guidelines, obedience of Brazilians to social isolation  
74 during quarantine peaked at 63% on March 23<sup>rd</sup> 2020 and average 47% (*INLOCO, 2020*),  
75 perhaps explaining why Brazil has the highest contagion rate ( $R_0 = 2.81$ ) in the world as of  
76 April, 2020 (*Imperial College London COVID-19 Response Team, 2020*).

77

78 An updated systematic review on the effects of social distancing and quarantine on mental health  
79 revealed that anxiety, depression, stress, anger, insomnia, hopelessness, and sadness were all  
80 increased during those conditions (Brooks *et al.*, 2020). A recent study (Hu, Su *et al.*, 2020) from  
81 a cross-national sample (n = 992) in China found that levels of anxiety increased, and 9.6% of  
82 the population was anxious at clinically relevant levels. Other behavioural problems also appear  
83 during this period; participants in a nationwide survey recently published in China reported  
84 nutritional issues, lack of ability to exercise and numerous changes in daily routines and habits  
85 (Qiu *et al.*, 2020). Accordingly, psychosocial and behavioural dimensions seem associated under  
86 quarantine conditions (Filgueiras & Stults-Kolehmainen, 2020). Similar findings were also  
87 depicted in research conducted in other quarantine situations, such as: the Severe Acute  
88 Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) epidemic in Canada (Hawryluck *et al.*, 2004), Taiwan (Bai *et al.*,  
89 2004) and Hong Kong (Lee *et al.*, 2005), the Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS)  
90 epidemic caused by another strain of Corona Virus in Korea (Jeong *et al.*, 2016) and the equine  
91 influenza epidemic in Australia (Taylor *et al.*, 2008). Altogether, the evidence suggests that  
92 quarantine leads to an increase of mental health issues.

93 Identifying risk factors that modify the mental health experience of quarantine and social  
94 isolation is important. Research among people in normal and healthy conditions has shown that  
95 sociodemographic variables, health behaviours and other daily routines are linked to better  
96 mental health. Among the most commonly investigated demographic variables are gender  
97 (Almeida & Kessler, 1998; Nolen-Hoeksema, 2001) education (Steele *et al.*, 2007) and age  
98 (Christensen *et al.*, 1999). For health behaviours, a large literature suggests that moderate to  
99 vigorous physical exercise from three to five times per week leads to reduced anxiety (Wipfli,  
100 Rethorst & Landers, 2008), depression (Craft & Landers, 1998; de Oliveira *et al.*, 2018), stress  
101 (Stults-Kolehmainen & Sinha, 2014) and other mental health issues (Landers & Arendt, 2007).  
102 Similar associations are found with dietary habits; a diet low in fat, sugar or carbohydrate tends  
103 to be associated with fewer psychological issues (Molendijk *et al.*, 2018; O'Neil *et al.*, 2014).  
104 Aside from these health behaviors, finding and receiving mental health support is imperative for  
105 many individuals at risk. Psychologists and other mental health practitioners who provide online  
106 or tele-psychotherapy may also help to improve mental health conditions (Varker *et al.*, 2019).

107 Unfortunately, resources are scarce in every field of the health system, including those for mental  
108 health (Qiu *et al.*, 2020). Therefore, it is pivotal to establish *a priori* where and how to invest  
109 those scarce resources. This is a difficult task because the current stressor is highly unique.  
110 Quarantine is due to a pandemic of truly global proportions that has reached every level of  
111 society, with a long duration and remarkable social upheaval (WHO, 2020). There is no research  
112 on the association between psychological, demographic and behaviour variables in the general  
113 population during society-wide social isolation. Furthermore, it is a consensus that psychological  
114 phenomena, such as stress and depression, are multifactorial with a large amount of variables to  
115 consider (WHO, 2004; 2016). In order to help governments, service providers and scientists to

116 establish public policies toward resource allocation in mental health during the COVID-19  
117 pandemic crisis, this study aimed to fill the gap in the current literature. Three psychological  
118 dimensions were queried due to their relevance in the literature: (i) perceived stress (*Hawryluck*  
119 *et al.*, 2004; *Qiu et al.*, 2020), (ii) depression (*Brooks et al.*, 2020) and (iii) state anxiety (*Jeong*  
120 *et al.*, 2016; *Rubin & Wessely*, 2020). The aims of this investigation were two-fold. First, this  
121 research was intended to track mental health changes over two time points during quarantine.  
122 The second objective was to associate mental health outcomes with pertinent demographic,  
123 behavioural and COVID-19 specific factors.

124

## 125 **Materials & Methods**

126 The present research is a longitudinal psychosocial study that collected data in two periods: the  
127 first week of quarantine decreed by state authorities of the last Brazilian state that adhere to  
128 quarantine (Sao Paulo, 2020) and four weeks after this decree. The Ethical Committee of the first  
129 author's institution approved the project under the process #2020.2014-0932-12. Participants  
130 were allowed to leave the online questionnaires at any time and procedures obeyed the  
131 Declaration of Helsinki.

132 Volunteers for this study were 360 (248 women, 68.9%) Brazilians or foreigners living in Brazil  
133 from 9 States and 23 different cities. This research was conducted in Brazilian Portuguese, so it  
134 was necessary to know how to read and write in this language. All participants digitally signed  
135 the Term of Consent and agreed to be contacted after the first round of data collection to be part  
136 of the second round. A total of 1,849 participants answered the first round, nonetheless, only 360  
137 (19.5%) participated in the second round.

138 There were four instrument measures adopted: a sociodemographic and attitudinal questionnaire,  
139 the Perceived Stress Scale with 10 items (PSS-10), the Filgueiras Depression Inventory (FDI)  
140 and the State subscale of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (S-STAI). The sociodemographic  
141 questionnaire had 20 questions in this order: (i) age, (ii) gender, (iii) education, (iv) height, (v)  
142 weight, (vi) whether the participant had any physical risk factor for COVID-19, whether he/she  
143 used during quarantine (vii) telepsychotherapy, (viii) telemedicine, (ix) online nutritionist and (x)  
144 online fitness coach. This questionnaire also asked about exercise habits: (xi) frequency of  
145 exercise during quarantine in days, (xii) whether there were changes in the frequency of exercise  
146 comparing before and during quarantine (options were “no changes”; “increased exercise  
147 frequency” and “decreased exercise frequency”) and (xiii) types of exercise (aerobic, anaerobic,  
148 both, no exercise). It also collected data regarding diet and nutritional habits: (xiv) possible  
149 changes on diet by comparing before and during quarantine; whether the person (xv) gained or  
150 (xvi) lost more than 5 kilograms since the beginning of the quarantine. Finally, attitudinal  
151 questions were also computed. One question (xvii) asked about the amount of information the  
152 participant felt he/she was receiving and the answers were provided in three possible categories  
153 to choose from: “Too much information”, “Enough information” and “Little information”.

154 Another three items were informed in a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 “Totally  
155 agree” to 5 “Totally disagree”; the items were: (xviii) “Do you feel imprisoned due to this  
156 quarantine?”, (xix) “Do you feel you are able to understand what is happening?”, (xx) “Do you  
157 trust your own ability to differentiate good from bad sources of information?”.

158 The PSS-10 (*Cohen & Williamson, 1988*) is a 10-item questionnaire that asks individuals about  
159 their perception regarding stress-like symptoms. It is answered in a five-point Likert-type scale  
160 ranging from 0 “Never” to 4 “Very often” (scores range from 0-40). The population mean is 17.0  
161 (SD = 5.02) with a score over 27 indicating excessive stress (*Cacciari, Haddad, Dalmas, 2016*).

162 The FDI (*Filgueiras et al., 2014*) is a 20-item scale that asks individuals to grade the level of  
163 association between the respondent’s own self-perception and one-word items extracted from  
164 depression symptoms listed in the DSM-V in the last fortnight. It is rated in a six-point Likert-  
165 type scale ranging from 0 “not related to me at all” to 5 “totally related to me” (scores range  
166 from 0-100). The reference mean is 53.3 (SD = 17.3) with 88 or higher indicating a cut-off for  
167 depressive symptomology (*Filgueiras et al., 2014*). The S-STAI (*Spielberg, Gorsuch & Lushene,*  
168 *1970*) is a subscale of a broader questionnaire that assess state (one’s current mood state) and  
169 trait (dispositional and personality-related traits) anxiety. The focus of S-STAI is the mood state  
170 of the respondent who answers questions about own feelings in a four-point Likert-type scale  
171 ranging from 1 “not at all” to 4 “very much so” (scores range from 0-80). Gender-specific  
172 reference means are 36.5 (SD = 21.4) for men and 43.7 (12.6) for women, with cut-offs being 66  
173 for men and 69 for women (*Pasquali, Pinelli Jr, Soha, 1994*).

174 Volunteers of the present research answered the questionnaires in the Google Forms online  
175 platform that was configured in the same order of presentation: 1) Term of Consent, 2)  
176 demographic and attitudinal questionnaire, 3) PSS-10, 4) FDI, 5) S-STAI, 6) Thank you page.  
177 Those participants who answered “no” to the Term of Consent were addressed to the Thank you  
178 page without having any contact with the other questionnaires. First round of data collection  
179 (time 1) took place between March 20<sup>th</sup> and March 25<sup>th</sup>, 2020, whereas the second round (time 2)  
180 happened between April 15<sup>th</sup> and April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2020.

181 After data collection, Google Spreadsheets were utilized to consolidate the database and to  
182 export it in the format .csv. Then, researchers used SPSS (IBM, version 21.0) to run the analyses.  
183 Descriptive statistics of PSS-10, FDI and S-STAI were calculated for each categorical  
184 (demographic) variable with exception of those that were answered in Likert-type scales. Due to  
185 the large amount of variables collected in an online platform, Cronbach’s alpha ( $\alpha$ ) was  
186 calculated for the three scales in time 1 and time 2; results were expected to show  $\alpha > .70$ .

187 Pairwise *t*-test comparisons between groups were computed to identify significant differences  
188 between the first round (time 1) and second round (time 2) of data collection for the whole  
189 sample. A repeated-measures ANOVA was performed to compare within and between groups  
190 for each demographic independent variable. Furthermore, prevalence of stress, depression and  
191 anxiety-like symptoms were calculated in percentage of participants above the means and cut-off

192 points respective to the norms developed in previous studies in the Brazilian sample (*Cacciari,*  
193 *Haddad & Dalmas, 2016; Filgueiras et al., 2014; Pasquali, Pinelli Jr & Solha, 1994*).

194 A correlation matrix of the PSS-10, FDI and S-STAI results at time 1 and time 2 were developed  
195 to identify possible discrepancies, associations and to ensure measure validity. The authors opted  
196 to compute three Linear Multiple Regressions (LMR) using the stepwise method to find the  
197 strength and ability of independent variables (i.e., demographic, behavioural and attitudinal) to  
198 predict PSS-10, FDI and S-STAI total scores in time 2. Total scores of mental health  
199 questionnaires in time 1 were put in the first step of the LMR, and the other variables were put in  
200 the second step. Categorical items were identified as dummy variables, whereas Likert-type  
201 answers were computed as ordinal data. The criterion for keeping a variable in the regression  
202 was the same as all other null-hypothesis tests (i.e., pairwise *t*-test and repeated-measures  
203 ANOVA); significance was deemed when  $p < 0.05$ . The coefficient beta ( $\beta$ ) was inspected to  
204 reveal the direction and strength of the association between independent and dependent  
205 variables; whereas the coefficient of determination ( $r^2$ ) revealed the amount of variance  
206 explained by the model.

207 Finally, effect-sizes for the *t*-test of the LMR and the repeated-measures ANOVA (between,  
208 within and interaction) were calculated using the software G\*Power 3.1 that also provided the  
209 interpretation criteria. The *t*-test effect-size was measured by the Cohen's *d*, rule of thumb for  
210 this measure is: above 0.20 and below 0.50, the effect is small, above 0.50 and below 0.80, the  
211 effect is moderate, above 0.80 the effect is large. The repeated-measure ANOVA effect-size was  
212 measured by Cohen's *f* and categorization goes as follows: above 0.10 and below 0.30, the effect  
213 is small, above 0.30 and below 0.50 the effect is moderate, and above 0.50 the effect is large.

## 214 **Results**

215 Participants reported an age average of 37.90 (SD=12.33) years and were in quarantine for 3.52  
216 (SD=1.77) days in the first round of data collection and 19.08 (SD=3.86) days in the second  
217 round. Regarding Education, 98 volunteers reported to have either begun or finished high school  
218 (27.2%), 175 had at least began College (48.6%), 57 were attending to a Master's course (15.8%)  
219 and 30 (8.3%) had begun their PhD.

220 Participants reported changes in diet during the second round of data collection in reference to  
221 the first round. One hundred and sixteen participants (32.2%) reported to have worsened their  
222 diets from time 1 to time 2, 59 (16.4%) reported no significant changes in diet habits, whereas  
223 185 (51.4%) answered that they were having a better diet than when they began quarantine.

224 At time 1, those reporting no exercise were 219 (60.8%), 1-to-3 days a week N=72 (20.0%) and  
225 4 or more days a week N=69 (19.2%). At time 2, no exercise was 69 (19.2%), 1-to-3 days a week  
226 N=14 (3.9%) and 4 or more days of exercise N=277 (76.9%). No one reported exercising 7 days  
227 a week. This was in contrast to *perceptions* of change in exercise. One hundred eleven (30.8%)  
228 of respondents reported exercising less, 147 (40.8%) reported the same level of exercise and 102

229 (28.3%) reported more exercise. The percentage of women and men who did tele-psychotherapy  
230 was 72.8% and 27.2%, respectively.

231 Even though data collection used an online platform and participants had to answer a large  
232 amount of questions, Scales were reliable according to the adopted criterion ( $\alpha > .70$ ) in both  
233 time 1 and 2. The PSS-10 had  $\alpha = .855$  in the first round and  $\alpha = .834$  in the second round. The  
234 FDI presented  $\alpha = .911$  and  $\alpha = .954$  in times 1 and 2, respectively. The SSTAI showed  $\alpha = .759$   
235 in the first time period and  $\alpha = .713$  in the second time period.

236 Table 1 depicts average and standard deviation (SD) of PSS-10, FDI and S-STAI stratified by the  
237 independent variables at time 1 and time 2. Mental health variables worsened significantly from  
238 the first round of data collection to the second, *i.e.*, stress ( $p = .007$ ), depression ( $p = .00003$ ) and  
239 anxiety ( $p = .004$ ). Repeated-measures ANOVA revealed that within-group effects were  
240 significant for all outcomes (criterion  $p < .05$ ) demonstrating that from time 1 to time 2 there was  
241 an increase in stress, depression and anxiety. Across all mental health outcome variables,  
242 significant between-group effects were observed for the following 3 predictors: 1. gender  
243 (women had significantly higher scores than men), 2. changes in diet (participants who felt that  
244 their diet worsened reported increased levels of psychological issues), and 3. amount of  
245 information (those who reported to receive too much information about COVID-19/quarantine  
246 also showed greater mental health dysfunction). Effect sizes ranged from .01 to .51. A gender  $\times$   
247 time interaction was observed ( $p = .0000008$ ) for perceived stress. Men did not change in stress  
248 level but women had a significant increase (effect size = .28).

249 Beyond those three variables, between groups significant differences regarding perceived stress  
250 occurred for four other variables: number of days of exercise per week, type of exercise, use of  
251 online fitness coaching and risk for COVID-19. Regarding depression, statistical differences  
252 appeared in four other variables: education, type of exercise, use of online nutritionists and use  
253 of tele-psychotherapy. Finally, regarding anxiety, between groups significant differences were  
254 shown in two other variables: risk for COVID-19 and use of tele-psychotherapy. Results for the  
255 repeated-measures ANOVA are depicted in the supplemental material.

256 -----

257 PLEASE, INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

258 -----

259 For perceived stress, 237 (65.8%) and 269 (74.7%) of participants scored above the population  
260 mean at time 1 and 2, respectively. Prevalence of excessive stress ( $\geq 2$  SD above reference mean)  
261 was 6.9% (IC 95 5.2%-8.6%) in the first round and 9.7% (IC 95 8.2%-11.2%) in the second  
262 round. Of the 34 individuals in this category, 94% of these individuals were women. 82% did no  
263 exercise at all, but the remaining 18% complete 6 days a week of exercise. Also, 0% utilized  
264 tele-psychotherapy. Regarding depression, 224 (62.2%) and 260 (72.2%) of participants were  
265 above the reference mean at Time 1 and 2, respectively. High depression ( $\geq 2$  SD above reference  
266 mean) had a prevalence of 4.2% (IC 95 3.6%-4.8%) at time 1 and 8.0% (IC 95 7.1%-8.9%) at

267 time 2. Participants > 2 SD (n = 24) were mostly women (88%) and did not utilized tele  
268 psychotherapy (88%). The number of male participants above the reference mean for state  
269 anxiety was 54 (48.2%) and 72 (64.3%) at time 1 and 2, respectively. For women it was 132  
270 (53.2%) and 163 (65.7%). Prevalence of excessive state anxiety ( $\geq 2$  SD above reference mean)  
271 was 8.7% (IC 95 7.4%-10.0%) in the first round against 14.9% (IC 95 12.3%-17.5%) in the  
272 second round. Those > 2 SD had worsening diet (45 of 53 participants) and reported no tele-  
273 psychotherapy (81%).

274 Correlations between mental health variables were all statistically significant, but varied between  
275 small and moderate at time ( $r = .33 - .50$ ) at time 1 and small ( $r = .20 - .27$ ) at time 2. The  
276 intertemporal correlations from time 1 to time 2 for stress, depression and anxiety were .61, .69  
277 and .79, respectively. Small correlations were found between different predictor variables, such  
278 as exercise frequency and perceived stress ( $r = -.28$ ); whereas, moderate correlations were found  
279 between the same variable between time 1 and time 2 (intertemporal correlations). Tables 3 and  
280 Supplemental 2 provide the correlation matrix of the psychological variables.

281

282 -----

283 PLEASE, INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

284 -----

285 The linear multiple regression (LMR) model for perceived stress revealed that the dependent  
286 variable (PSS-10, time 2) was predicted by the score of the PSS-10 at time 1, number of days of  
287 exercise, risk for COVID-19, types of exercise, changes in the frequency of exercise, feeling  
288 imprisoned, days in quarantine and gender in order of strength of the coefficient  $\beta$ . Altogether,  
289 those variables explained 56% of the variance. The depression LMR showed that the dependent  
290 variable (FDI time 2) was predicted by the score of the FDI time 1, types of exercise, own ability  
291 to understand what is happening, level of education and gender respectively. Independent  
292 variables explained 33% of the variance of depression in the second round of data collection.  
293 Finally, the state anxiety LMR depicted that the dependent variable (S-STAI time 2) was  
294 predicted, in order of association, risk for COVID-19, feeling safe, the score of S-STAI time 1,  
295 weight loss, changes on diet, amount of information, feeling imprisoned and age. Independent  
296 variables of this LMR explained cumulatively 42% of the variance. Table 3 presents the  
297 coefficient  $\beta$ , the  $t$ -test statistics, effect-size and coefficient of determination for the three LMR.

298 -----

299 PLEASE, INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

300 -----

## 301 Discussion

302 The current investigation provides a unique glimpse into the mental health of Brazilians in the  
303 midst of quarantine from the COVID-19 pandemic, a novel, disruptive and society-wide stressor.  
304 Findings indicate that a substantial portion of respondents were distressed at both time points,

305 with worsening mental health from the initiation of quarantine to a point one month later. More  
306 specifically, increases in perceived stress, depression and state anxiety were observed, with a  
307 gender x time interaction recorded for stress. Men experienced increases in depression and  
308 anxiety over time, but not for perceived stress. Across genders, the number of days in quarantine  
309 was linearly related to worse perceptions of perceived stress. Repeated measures ANOVA  
310 revealed that 3 factors were all related to worse levels of stress, depression and anxiety: female  
311 gender, worsening diet and excess of COVID-19 information. In regression analyses, however,  
312 mental health outcomes were influenced by a variety of other demographic, COVID-19 specific,  
313 and behavioural factors, such as use of tele-psychotherapy. Exercise-related factors, such as  
314 exercise frequency, were the predominate predictors of perceived stress.

315 A substantial portion of the participants reported levels of stress, depression and anxiety above  
316 established means for the population. At time 2, greater than 70% of the sample was above the  
317 normative mean for both stress and depression. For anxiety, >60% of both men and women were  
318 above the normative mean. More importantly, some participants scored very high for mental  
319 health disturbances, especially at time 2. For stress, 9.7% of the sample was above 2 SD at time  
320 2, whereas the prevalence according to the Brazilian norms is 6.8% (*Cacciari, Haddad &*  
321 *Dalmas, 2016*). This was an increase from 6.9% at time 1. Similar trends were seen for  
322 depression (4.2% at time 1, 8.0% at time 2; versus a norm of 4.1%) (*Filgueiras et al., 2014*) and  
323 state anxiety (8.7% increasing to 14.9%; versus a norm of 9.4%) (*Pasquali, Pinelli Jr &*  
324 *Solha, 1994*). This is similar to anxiety levels observed in a large sample during quarantine in  
325 China (*Hu, Su et al., 2020*). While the percentage of individuals scoring at these extremes is still  
326 relatively low, it potentially represents a huge increase in burden to society when multiplied  
327 across the entire population. Mental health initiatives on the national level would have to be  
328 scaled up to meet new demand (*WHO, 2008*). Key to this endeavour would be a) identifying  
329 those most at risk and b) properly assessing their condition.

330 In the effort to identify those most at risk, pertinent predictors of mental health outcomes were  
331 analysed. Interestingly, each mental health indicator was predicted by a varying set of factors.  
332 Anxiety was predicted by the greatest number of COVID-19 related factors: feelings of safety,  
333 feelings of being imprisoned, risk for COVID-19 and amount of information. In other words,  
334 those who felt unsafe, cooped up, at risk for infection and being inundated with information  
335 demonstrated higher levels of anxiety. This falls in line with an expansive literature reporting  
336 that feelings of anxiety burgeon when people feel under threat, unsafe, and have too many  
337 options and an uncertain future (*Carreta et al., 2014; Gilbert et al., 2008*). Depression, a typically  
338 condition of regrets about the past (*Buechler, 2015*), was understandably not predicted by  
339 COVID-19 related factors. Only “understanding what is happening” was a significant inverse  
340 predictor. Stress was predicted by feelings of being imprisoned, days in quarantine and risk for  
341 COVID-19 and also by a number of exercise factors.

342 In general, exercise was associated with mental health outcomes in the expected manner – more  
343 frequent exercise and aerobic exercise being related to the lowest levels of distress. For all 3

344 mental health outcomes, those with no exercise (0 days per week) had the highest average levels  
345 of stress (22.9 at time 1 to 26.4 at time 2), depression (69.0 to 74.6) and anxiety (48.2 to 54.7).  
346 These seems to support the previous findings that “something is better than nothing” (Ekkekakis,  
347 2000; Werneck, Oyeyemi, Silva, 2018). In linear regression, perceived stress was related to the  
348 greatest number of exercise-related factors: exercise frequency per week, type of exercise and  
349 perceived changes in exercise behaviour. Higher frequency of exercise (days/week) were  
350 associated with *less* stress. However, the linear relationship between perceived stress and  
351 exercise frequency was small ( $r = -.28$ ), which is line with previous investigations (Stults-  
352 Kolehmainen & Sinha, 2014). It should be noted that 58.2% of the sample reported that they  
353 perceived that their exercise behaviour changed with a month of quarantine (30.8% doing less  
354 and 28.3% doing more), which follows the known phenomenon that stressful events can either  
355 inhibit or activate changes in exercise behaviors (Stults-Kolehmainen & Sinha, 2014).  
356 Furthermore, those who *perceived* that they exercised more frequently from Time 1 to Time 2  
357 had less stress. Interestingly, of those very high for stress ( $< 2SD$ ), 82% do no exercise at all, but  
358 the remaining 18% complete 6 days a week of exercise. In LMR analysis, exercise factors  
359 explained 13.1% of the adjusted variance in stress. For repeated measures, the results were  
360 slightly different, with changes in exercise not being significant, but use of online fitness  
361 coaching reaching significance. An interaction was observed in that those who performed  
362 aerobic exercise had the lowest levels of depression at both time points. In fact, those who did  
363 aerobic exercise did not have any increase in depression. However, the clearest association of  
364 exercise frequency and mental health was for anxiety. Those at the highest levels of exercise had  
365 the lowest anxiety and each day less was associated with more anxiety.

366 Aside from exercise, there were notable findings for dietary habits and use of tele-  
367 psychotherapy. Those who rated their dietary habits as becoming worse also had the highest  
368 levels of stress, depression and anxiety. Those with the highest levels of anxiety were those with  
369 worsening diet at the second time point (effect size for interaction was .37). Those who used  
370 online nutrition services had lower levels of depression, but there was no difference for stress or  
371 anxiety. Those who utilized online psychotherapy reported lower levels of depression and  
372 anxiety. While there is no income data to explain use of online resources, those using online  
373 resources were more educated. Thus one might surmise that those from better off demographic  
374 groups are less affected partly because of greater access to resources. Given the limited quantity  
375 of resources to mitigate mental health impairments during crises, such as pandemic and  
376 quarantine, it is crucial to identify the risk factors that may predispose individuals for worsening  
377 outcomes.

378 Despite the progress this study makes in tracking changes in mental health and identifying risk  
379 factors, the current research does demonstrate some limitations. First of all, there was no pre-  
380 quarantine baseline and assessments spanned just a single month. Furthermore, this was a  
381 relatively well-off population with higher-educated individuals being over-represented in the  
382 sample. There was no measure of adherence to quarantine guidelines. It is possible that those  
383 with higher compliance to regulations could be of either higher or lower distress. To lessen

384 survey fatigue for participants, validated measures of exercise and dietary habits, which can be  
385 very lengthy, were not utilized. More importantly, the current data needs interpreted with some  
386 caution because factors other than quarantine could contribute to changes in the mental health  
387 outcomes observed, such as growing political and economic unrest in Brazil (*THE LANCET*,  
388 2020). Also, it should be noted that effect sizes for changes over 1 month were small (Cohen's  $d$   
389 were .25 – stress, .30 – depression, and .38 – anxiety), possibly because in some cases  
390 individuals had improved mental health ( $n = 31$ ; 8.6%) due to quarantine conditions, such as  
391 being closer to loved ones throughout the day or being removed from dangerous work  
392 environments. Lastly, correlations between instruments at time 1 or time 2 were small – possibly  
393 indicating the uniqueness of the quarantine as a stressor, particularly given the rapidly changing  
394 circumstances during this time period (Main, Zhou et al., 2011).

395

## 396 **Conclusion**

397 This study provides crucial data needed to understand how pandemic, state-mandated quarantine  
398 is related to changes in mental health outcomes. From the time point when quarantine was  
399 decreed until 1 month later, worsening perceived stress, depression and anxiety was observed in  
400 this sample of the Brazilian population. Moreover, many individuals in the sample reported very  
401 high levels of distress ( $> 2$  SD). At the time of writing of this study, the quarantine is still being  
402 enforced and cases of COVID-19 and associated deaths on rising rapidly (*THE LANCET*, 2020;  
403 *Imperial College COVID-19 Response Team*, 2020). Future research should continue to track  
404 these trends as the crisis unfolds. Analyses from this study identified several risk factors for  
405 mental health, including gender (being female), lower education, less exercise, worsening diet  
406 and a lack of resources, such as access to tele-psychotherapy. COVID-19 related factors  
407 predicted anxiety and stress more so than depression. The implications of these data is clear;  
408 mental health worsens with great change, requiring more resources to improve the experience of  
409 life in quarantine. The extent to which these can be diligently developed and allocated will  
410 depend on a data-driven process such as described here.

411

## 412 **Acknowledgements**

413 The present research is funded by the Coordenacao de Aperfeicoamento de Pessoal de Nivel  
414 Superior (CAPES) of the Ministry of Education of Brazil under the PROAP program.

415

## 416 **Conflict of interest**

417 Authors report no conflict of interest.

418

## 419 **References**

- 420 Almeida D, Kessler R. 1998. Everyday stressors and gender differences in daily distress. *Journal*  
421 *of personality and social psychology*; 75: 670-80.
- 422 Bai Y, Lin CC, Lin CY, et al. 2004. Survey of stress reactions among health care workers  
423 involved with the SARS outbreak. *Psychiatric Services*, 55(9), 1055-1057.
- 424 Brooks S, Webster R, Smith L, et al. 2020. The psychological impact of quarantine and how to  
425 reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. *The Lancet*; 395: 14-20.
- 426 Buechler S. 2015. La alegría, la vergüenza, el arrepentimiento y la tristeza en la terapia1. *Clínica*  
427 *e Investigación Relacional*, 9(2):345-57.
- 428 Cacciari P, Haddad MDCL & Dalmas JC. 2016. Nível de estresse em trabalhadores readequados  
429 e readaptados em universidade estadual pública. *Texto & Contexto-Enfermagem*,  
430 25(2):e4640014.
- 431 Carretta CM, Ridner SH, Dietrich MS. 2014. Hope, hopelessness, and anxiety: A pilot  
432 instrument comparison study. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, 28(4):230-4.
- 433 Cohen S, Williamson GM. 1988. Perceived stress in a probability sample of the United States.  
434 In: Spacapan S, Oskamp S. *The social psychology of health: Claremont Symposium on Applied*  
435 *Social Psychology* (pp. 31–67). Newbury Park: Sage.
- 436 Christensen H, Jorm A, Mackinnon A, et al. 1999. Age differences in depression and anxiety  
437 symptoms: a structural equation modelling analysis of data from a general population sample.  
438 *Psychological medicine*; 29: 325-39.
- 439 Craft LL, Landers DM. 1998. The effect of exercise on clinical depression and depression  
440 resulting from mental illness: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 20(4),  
441 339-357.
- 442 Ekkekakis P, Hall EE, VanLanduyt LM, Petruzzello SJ. 2000. Walking in (affective) circles: can  
443 short walks enhance affect?. *Journal of behavioral medicine*, 23(3):245-75.
- 444 Filgueiras A, Hora G, Fioravanti-Bastos AC, et al. 2014. Development and psychometric  
445 properties of a novel depression measure. *Trends in Psychology*; 22: 249-69.
- 446 Filgueiras A, Stults-Kolehmainen M. 2020. The Relationship Between Behavioural and  
447 Psychosocial Factors Among Brazilians in Quarantine Due to COVID-19. *SSRN*, e3566245.
- 448 Gilbert P, McEwan K, Mitra R, Franks L, Richter A, Rockliff H. 2008. Feeling safe and content:  
449 A specific affect regulation system? Relationship to depression, anxiety, stress, and self-  
450 criticism. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 3(3):182-91.
- 451 Hawryluck L, Gold W, Robinson S, et al. 2004. SARS control and psychological effects of  
452 quarantine, Toronto, Canada. *Emerg Infect Dis*; 10: 1206-12.

- 453 Hu W, Su L, Qiao J, Zhu J, Zhou Y. 2020. Countrywide quarantine only mildly increased  
454 anxiety level during COVID-19 outbreak in China. *medRxiv*, e20041186.
- 455 Imperial College COVID-19 Response Team. 2020. Short-term forecasts of COVID-19 deaths in  
456 multiple countries. London: Imperial College, Available at: [https://mrc-ide.github.io/covid19-](https://mrc-ide.github.io/covid19-short-term-forecasts/index.html)  
457 [short-term-forecasts/index.html](https://mrc-ide.github.io/covid19-short-term-forecasts/index.html) (accessed: 12 May 2020)
- 458 INLOCO. 2020. *Mapa brasileiro da COVID-19* [Brazilian Map for COVID-19]. Recife: Inloco.  
459 Available at: <https://mapabrasileirodacovid.inloco.com.br/pt> (accessed 12 May 2020).
- 460 Jeong H, Yim HW, Song Y-J, et al. 2016. Mental health status of people isolated due to Middle  
461 East respiratory syndrome. *Epidemiol Health*; 38: e2016048.
- 462 Landers DM, Arent SM 2007. Physical activity and mental health. In Tenenbaum & Eklund  
463 (Eds.), *Handbook of sport psychology* (p. 469–491) New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- 464 Main A, Zhou Q, Ma Y, Luecken LJ, Liu X. 2011. Relations of SARS-related stressors and  
465 coping to Chinese college students' psychological adjustment during the 2003 Beijing SARS  
466 epidemic. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 58(3), 410-423.
- 467 Molendijk M, Molero P, Sánchez-Pedreño FO, et al. 2018. Diet quality and depression risk: a  
468 systematic review and dose-response meta-analysis of prospective studies. *Journal of affective*  
469 *disorders*, 226, 346-354.
- 470 Nolen-Hoeksema S. 2001. Gender differences in depression. *Current directions in psychological*  
471 *science*; 10: 173-76.
- 472 de Oliveira GD, Oancea SC, Nucci LB, Vogeltanz-Holm N. 2018. The association between  
473 physical activity and depression among individuals residing in Brazil. *Social psychiatry and*  
474 *psychiatric epidemiology*, 53(4):373-83.
- 475 O'neil A, Quirk SE, Housden S, et al. 2014. Relationship between diet and mental health in  
476 children and adolescents: a systematic review. *American journal of public health*, 104(10), e31-  
477 e42.
- 478 Pasquali L, Pinelli Jr B, Solha AC. 1994. Contribuição à validação e normalização da escala de  
479 ansiedade-traço do IDATE. *Psicol. teor. pesqui*, 411-20.
- 480 Prince M, Patel V, Saxena S, et al. 2007. No health without mental health. *The Lancet*; 370: 859-  
481 77. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(07)61238-0.
- 482 Qiu J, Shen B, Zhao M, et al. 2020. A nationwide survey of psychological distress among  
483 Chinese people in the COVID-19 epidemic: implications and policy recommendations. *Bmj*; 33:  
484 e100213.
- 485 Rubin G, Wessely S. 2020. The psychological effects of quarantining a city. *Bmj*; 368.
- 486 Sao Paulo, 2020. *Decreto 64.881: Decreta quarentena no Estado de São Paulo, no contexto da*  
487 *pandemia do COVID-19 (Novo Coronavírus), e dá providências complementares*. Sao Paulo,

- 488 Brazil. Available at: <https://www.saopaulo.sp.gov.br/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/decreto->  
489 [quarentena.pdf](https://www.saopaulo.sp.gov.br/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/decreto-quarentena.pdf) (accessed 24 April 2020).
- 490 Spielberg CD, Gorsuch, RL, Lushene RD. 1970. *STAI: manual for the State-Trait Anxiety*  
491 *Inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- 492 Steele LS, Dewa CS, Lin E, Lee KL. 2007. Education level, income level and mental health  
493 services use in Canada: Associations and policy implications. *Healthcare Policy*, 3(1), 96.
- 494 Stults-Kolehmainen MA. 2013. The interplay between stress and physical activity in the  
495 prevention and treatment of cardiovascular disease. *Frontiers in physiology*, 4:346.
- 496 Stults-Kolehmainen M, Sinha R. 2014. The effects of stress on physical activity and exercise.  
497 *Sports medicine*; 44: 81-121.
- 498 Stults-Kolehmainen MA, Tuit K, Sinha R. 2014. Lower cumulative stress is associated with  
499 better health for physically active adults in the community. *Stress*, 17(2):157-68.
- 500 Taylor M, Agho K, Stevens G, et al. 2008. Factors influencing psychological distress during a  
501 disease epidemic: data from Australia's first outbreak of equine influenza. *BMC Public Health*;  
502 8: 347.
- 503 THE LANCET. 2020. COVID-19 in Brazil: "So what?" Editorial. *The Lancet*; 395:1461.
- 504 Trautmann S, Rehm J, Wittchen HU. 2016. The economic costs of mental disorders. *EMBO*  
505 *reports*, 17(9):1245-9.
- 506 Vigo DV, Kestel D, Pendakur K, Thornicroft G, Atun R. 2019. Disease burden and government  
507 spending on mental, neurological, and substance use disorders, and self-harm: cross-sectional,  
508 ecological study of health system response in the Americas. *The Lancet Public Health*, 4(2):e89-  
509 96.
- 510 Werneck AO, Oyeyemi AL, Silva DR. 2018. Physical activity and depression: is 150 min/week  
511 of moderate to vigorous physical activity a necessary threshold for decreasing risk of depression  
512 in adults? Different views from the same data. *Social psychiatry and psychiatric epidemiology*,  
513 53(3):323-4.
- 514 Wilder-Smith A, Freedman D. 2020. Isolation, quarantine, social distancing and community  
515 containment: pivotal role for old-style public health measures in the novel coronavirus (2019-  
516 nCoV) outbreak. *Journal of travel medicine*; 27: taaa020.
- 517 WHO. 2016. *Out of the shadows: making mental health a global development priority*.  
518 Washington, D.C.: Seth Mnookin, World Bank Group and World Health Organization. Available  
519 at: [https://www.who.int/mental\\_health/advocacy/wb\\_background\\_paper.pdf](https://www.who.int/mental_health/advocacy/wb_background_paper.pdf) (accessed 21 April  
520 2020).
- 521 WHO. 2004. *Promoting mental health: concepts, emerging evidence, practice (Summary*  
522 *Report)*. Geneva: World Health Organization. Available at:  
523 [https://www.who.int/mental\\_health/evidence/en/promoting\\_mhh.pdf](https://www.who.int/mental_health/evidence/en/promoting_mhh.pdf) (accessed 21 April 2020).

- 524 WHO. 2020. *Considerations for quarantine of individuals in the context of containment for*  
525 *coronavirus disease (COVID-19): interim guidance, 19 March 2020* (WHO/2019-  
526 nCoV/IHR\_Quarantine/2020.2). Geneva: World Health Organization. Available at:  
527 <https://apps.who.int/iris/rest/bitstreams/1272428/retrieve> (accessed 23 April 2020)
- 528 Wipfli BM, Rethorst CD, Landers DM. 2008. The anxiolytic effects of exercise: a meta-analysis  
529 of randomized trials and dose–response analysis. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*,  
530 30(4), 392-410.