

1 Article

2 Dynamics of psychological responses to Covid-19 in 3 India: A longitudinal study

4 Anvita Gopal ^{1,*}, Anupam Joya Sharma ² and Malavika Ambale Subramanyam ²

5 ¹ Center for Cognitive and Brain Sciences, Indian Institute of Technology Gandhinagar, Gujarat 382 355,
6 India

7 ; anvita.gopal@iitgn.ac.in

8 ² Social Epidemiology, Indian Institute of Technology Gandhinagar, Gujarat 382 355, India

9 ; AJS: anupam.sharma@iitgn.ac.in ; MAS: malavika@iitgn.ac.in

10 * Correspondence: anvita.gopal@iitgn.ac.in

11 Received: date; Accepted: date; Published: date

12 **Abstract:** To curb the spread of the novel coronavirus, India announced a nationwide lockdown
13 on 24th March 2020 for 21 days, later extended for a longer time. This long period of lockdown
14 greatly disrupted routine life and likely affecting citizens' psychological well-being. The
15 psychological toll of the pandemic on Indians is documented. However, no study has assessed
16 whether the psychological toll changed over time due to repeated extensions of the lockdown. We
17 followed up 159 Indian adults during the first two months of the lockdown to assess any change
18 in their anxiety, stress, and depressive symptoms. Multilevel linear regression models of repeated
19 observations nested within individuals, adjusted for socio-demographic covariates, showed that
20 anxiety ($\beta=0.81$, CI: 0.03, 1.60), stress ($\beta=0.51$, CI: 0.32, 0.70), and depressive symptoms ($\beta=0.37$, CI:
21 0.13, 0.60) increased over time during the lockdown. This increase was higher among women than
22 men independent of covariates. Individual resilience was negatively associated with the
23 psychological outcomes. This suggests that the state needs to address the current mental health
24 impacts of a long-drawn out lockdown and its long-term sequelae. Disproportionate burden on
25 women needs immediate attention. Sustainable change requires addressing the root causes
26 driving the gender inequalities in psychological distress during such crises.

27 **Keywords:** Longitudinal, India, stress, gender disparity, anxiety, depression, pandemic, mental
28 health

30 1. Introduction

31 The novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19), which originated in China, was declared a public
32 health emergency by WHO on January 30th, 2020 [1]. With a steep global increase in the number of
33 infected persons, different countries took stringent measures to curb its spread, including
34 nationwide "lockdowns." The government of India called for a nationwide lockdown from the 25th
35 of March, 2020 [2]. Citizens were mandated to stay at home and all major offices, malls, factories
36 and schools were ordered to be shut down for 21 days [2]. However, it was extended until 3 May,
37 with conditional relaxations [3]. While the lockdown was intended to curb the spread of the virus, it
38 likely had a psychological impact on the citizens[4-7]. The restrictions on physical mobility due to
39 the lockdown and measures of self-isolation caused major disruptions to routine lives as well as it
40 hindered meeting of regular responsibilities--potentially affecting the physical and mental health of
41 individuals. Recent studies have studied the higher levels of stress [8,9], anxiety [8,10,11], depression
42 [10,12,13], and poorer quality of life [9,10] during the Covid-19 crisis in different populations. However,
43 the extensions in the lockdown period in India led to longer restrictions on physical mobility and
44 prolonged self-isolation measures, which could have increased the intensity of negative
45 psychological outcomes among Indian adults, leading to a poorer quality of life, not just during the

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

46 lockdown, but also after the crisis. Previous studies have shown that prolonged periods of isolation
47 and limited mobility significantly impacted mental wellbeing [14,15] during crises. Further, such
48 prolonged exposure to negative mental health outcomes could have adverse effects on physical
49 health outcomes, such as sleep disorders[16] and health-related quality of life[17].

50 While mental health effects due to the lockdown are likely to be seen among a majority of
51 Indian adults, the effect of a lockdown *extended over longer periods of time* might differ across
52 vulnerable groups. For instance, the stress experienced by persons with limited adaptive capacity,
53 fewer financial resources, lower social support, and pre-existing mental health conditions, might be
54 higher than among those who do not share these characteristics. As the lockdown period increases,
55 financially weaker individuals might face greater challenges in meeting the basic needs of their
56 family. Moreover, the continued restrictions on physical mobility could place a greater burden on
57 the social networks of vulnerable individuals, thus reducing access to social support over time and
58 impacting their adaptability. Further, in a patriarchal society such as India, with a high prevalence
59 of domestic abuse [18], the lockdown[19](especially limited mobility) potentially increases the risk of
60 experiencing domestic abuse, prolonged exposure to which can worsen the mental health of women
61 during this crisis.

62 Despite these risks, several resources that help with coping could be available to individuals.
63 Previous studies have highlighted the role of social support in reducing anxiety and stress[20,21].
64 Recent studies focused on COVID-19 also support this [11,22]. In addition to social support, there
65 could also be several individual-level resources such as resilience that could help individuals face
66 adversity [23]. Resilience was found to help strengthen mental health and reduce the possibility of
67 developing psychiatric morbidities, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic[24,25]. There is scant
68 research on the mental health effects of such protective factors during the extended lockdown in
69 India.

70 Reliably measuring the impact of lockdowns that extend over a long period of time requires a
71 longitudinal study design. While several cross-sectional studies[5-7] have focused on psychological
72 wellbeing during Covid-19 in India, we could not locate any study investigating the *change* in such
73 psychological outcomes throughout the lockdown period. A longitudinal investigation helps
74 establish temporal sequence and document trends while investigating how the adverse
75 psychological outcomes change (if at all) over time during the lockdown. To address this gap in the
76 literature, we conducted a longitudinal study in three phases to investigate the changes in three
77 psychological outcomes viz, anxiety, stress, and depressive symptoms, during the lockdown in
78 India. The research questions we addressed in our study were:

79

- 80 1. Do the levels of anxiety, stress, and depressive symptoms change during the lockdown
81 among Indian adults, independent of their age, gender, income, educational qualification,
82 place of residence, and history of mental health? We hypothesized that levels of anxiety,
83 stress, and depressive symptoms will increase over time, independent of the covariates.
- 84 2. Do these changes, if any, in the levels of anxiety, stress, and depressive symptoms, differ by
85 gender? Based on the large body of research highlighting gender disparities in the risk of
86 anxiety, stress, and depression[26], we hypothesized that in a patriarchal society such as
87 India, compared to men, women will have a greater increase in levels of anxiety, stress, and
88 depression during the lockdown.
- 89 3. Are social supports available to an individual and the level of their personal resilience
90 related to any changes in levels of their anxiety, stress, and depression? We hypothesized

91 that higher greater social support and higher resilience will be related to lower levels of
92 anxiety, stress, and depression, independent of all covariates.

93 **2. Materials and Methods**

94 **Recruitment of participants**

95 We collected quantitative repeated measures data on psychological wellbeing during the
96 lockdown via a set of four web-based surveys, which were administered in an intermittent manner
97 to the same participants during 2 months of the COVID-19 lockdown in India. Online Google and
98 Microsoft forms were circulated through social media platforms such as Facebook and LinkedIn to
99 recruit a diverse pool of participants. This method of recruitment was suitable due to the
100 restrictions on in-person interactions with strangers during the time of the lockdown in India, and
101 efficient, given the ability to recruit a diverse sample of participants very quickly. In addition to
102 posting the Google forms on social media, they were circulated among the social networks of the
103 authors. Moreover, we requested the participants to further share the form among their peers to
104 increase the size as well as the diversity of the sample. All the forms included a brief introduction
105 describing the major objectives of the study. Additionally, all the participants were informed that
106 their participation was completely voluntary.

107 We deployed our first survey on March 29th, during the first week of the lockdown. The online
108 survey was open for 2 weeks. We received responses from 793 participants in this round (T1).
109 However, only 561 of them shared their interest in participating in the subsequent surveys. We
110 rolled out the second follow-up survey on April 14th, 2020, the third on 2nd May, and the final
111 follow-up survey on the 24th of May. Since we recruited our participants through social media, the
112 second (T2), third (T3), and the fourth (T4) surveys received responses from newer participants as
113 well. Our analytical sample for the current study included only the 159 participants from India who
114 voluntarily participated in all four follow-ups. However, we measured the outcomes of interest of
115 the current study only at two time points. Data on anxiety and stress were collected during T1 and
116 T4, while depressive symptoms were measured during T2 and T4.

117 **Response variables**

118 *Anxiety*: We used the Generalized Anxiety Disorder-7 (GAD-7) scale to assess anxiety. The scale has
119 been widely used with a demonstrated high reliability and validity^[27]. The scale included seven
120 items such as “Feeling nervous, anxious or on edge; Not being able to stop or control worrying”
121 The responses were recorded on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from *never* (0) to *nearly every day* (3).
122 The total score of GAD-7 ranged from 0 to 21. Greater score predicted higher levels of anxiety^[27].
123 The scale has been previously used in the Indian context^[28,29]. Anxiety was measured at time points
124 T1 and T4. We found a strong internal consistency in our sample with a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.85 at
125 T1.

126

127 *Stress*: The single item, “Stress means a situation in which a person feels tense, restless, nervous or anxious
128 or is unable to sleep at night because his/her mind is troubled all the time. Do you feel this kind of stress these
129 days?”^[30] was used to measure the level of stress experienced by the participants. The participants
130 responded on a 5-point Likert ranging from *not at all* (1) to *very much* (5). We measured stress at T1
131 and T4.

132

133

134 *Depressive symptoms:* We used two items on depressive symptoms from the Patient Health
135 Questionnaire-4 (PHQ-4) developed and validated by Kroenke et al. [31] to assess depressive
136 symptoms. The scale included items such as “Over the last two weeks, how often have you been bothered
137 by the following: Feeling down, depressed or hopeless; Little interest or pleasure in doing things” Responses
138 were recorded in a 4 point Likert scale ranging from *not at all* (0) to *nearly every day* (4). A previous
139 study has used this scale in the Indian population [32]. We collected data on depressive symptoms at
140 T2 and T4.

141

142 **Predictors**

143 *Sociodemographic characteristics:* Sociodemographic information of the study participants included
144 age (in years), gender (male/female/ non-binary), education (high school or less/some college/above
145 college), annual income (in Indian Rupees) (0-3,00,000 (low)/ 3,00,000-7,00,000 (medium)/ 7,00,000
146 and above (high)), and place of residence (rural/ urban). To reduce the survey length, we included a
147 few sociodemographic variables in each of the four surveys.

148

149 *History of mental health:* We used the question, “Have you suffered from depression or any mental health
150 issues before” to assess if the participant had any history of mental illness. The responses to this
151 question were recorded as *yes* (1) or *no* (0).

152

153 *Social support:* We used the following two items to measure social support: *Is there someone you could*
154 *count on to help you if you contracted the virus and got sick, for example, to take you to the doctor or help you*
155 *with daily chores?*, and *If in these times due to unforeseen circumstances you need some extra help*
156 *financially, could you count on anyone to help you, for example, by paying any bills, housing costs, medical*
157 *expenses, or providing you with food or clothes?* Responses were converted to *yes* (1) or *no* (0).

158

159 *Resilience:* Resilience was assessed using the two-item brief Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale,
160 developed by Vaishnavi, Connor & Davidson (2007)[33]. It includes items such as “Are you someone
161 who is: Able to adapt to change; Tend to bounce back after illness or hardship” The participants responded
162 on a 5 point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). We collected data
163 on resilience at T1. We found a moderate internal consistency of the scale in our sample
164 (Cronbach’s alpha of 0.60).

165

166 **Other variables**

167 *Responsibility:* We assessed, through self-reports at T2, whether there was any increase in
168 responsibilities (social, financial, household, and personal) of the participants during the lockdown.
169 The responses were recorded as *yes* (1) or *no* (0). The aggregate of the four responsibility scores
170 reflected the total increased responsibility score.

171

172 **Statistical analyses**

173 We first performed descriptive analyses to compute the distribution of outcomes at different
 174 time points across gender, relationship status, education, annual income, and place of residence.
 175 Next, we fitted separate linear two-level (observations nested within individuals) multilevel models
 176 for each outcome (anxiety, stress, and depressive symptoms) to assess the temporal changes in the
 177 outcomes. These models accounted for any autocorrelation of the responses from the same
 178 participants. Model 1 included the primary predictor time and the sociodemographic variables.
 179 Model 2 additionally adjusted for the interaction of gender with time. Model 3 further adjusted for
 180 the buffer factors social support and resilience, and a history of mental health issues. Additionally,
 181 we ran an ANOVA model to analyze the gender differences in scores of responsibilities during the
 182 lockdown. We set alpha at 0.05 in our study. All our models were run in STATA version 12 [34].

183

184 Ethical considerations

185 The study was approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee, Indian Institute of Technology,
 186 Gandhinagar. All participants were informed about their voluntary participation through the
 187 introduction section in the Google and Microsoft forms. The participants were requested to read the
 188 details about the study, carefully read the instructions, and then respond to the survey. The
 189 participants were also informed that the collected data would be kept confidential and not be
 190 shared with anyone outside the research team. Email addresses of participants who gave consent
 191 for follow-up were collected as identifying information. Statistical analyses were performed on de-
 192 identified data.

193

194 3. Results

195 3.1. Preliminary results

196 We collected data on psychological outcomes from 159 Indian adults across a period of two
 197 months during the lockdown. Our sample comprised relatively young participants (mean age=27.44
 198 years, SD=9.17 years). About 65% of the sample were men and the remaining were women. The
 199 annual income of about half of the participants was below 3,00,000 Indian Rupees (a cut-off
 200 representing an income allowing decent living in a one-bedroom apartment for a couple in most
 201 urban areas of India). About 55% of the participants were at least college-educated, while only
 202 about 11% of the participants reported having an educational qualification less than high school.
 203 The distribution of the psychological outcomes across these groups is presented in Table 1.
 204

205 **Table 1:** Distribution (mean, standard deviation) of anxiety, stress, and depressive symptoms at T1,
 206 T2, and T4 across gender, annual income, education, and place of residence (N=159).
 207

	Anxiety		Stress		Depressive symptoms	
	T1	T4	T1	T4	T2	T4
Gender						
Men	4.02 (4.41)	4.17 (4.19)	1.98 (0.90)	2.29 (1.07)	1.42 (1.27)	1.67 (1.58)
Women	4.61 (4.14)	6.72 (4.83)	2.36 (1.13)	3.25 (1.22)	1.59 (1.41)	2.19 (1.58)
Annual income						
Low	4.59 (4.45)	5.44 (4.94)	2.10 (1.03)	2.71 (1.20)	1.57 (1.23)	1.99 (1.62)

Medium	4.37 (4.41)	5.15 (4.59)	2.18 (1.05)	2.69 (1.36)	1.64 (1.68)	2.15 (1.81)
High	3.30 (3.85)	4.08 (3.57)	2.08 (0.91)	2.37 (1.05)	1.31 91.02)	1.24 (1.10)
Education						
High school or less	5.39 (5.86)	4.17 (4.66)	1.89 (0.76)	2.78 (1.32)	1.28 (0.96)	1.5 (1.25)
Some college	3.96 (4.12)	6.02 (5.18)	1.96 (0.90)	2.77 (1.28)	1.69 (1.35)	2.35 (1.70)
Above college	4.14 (4.05)	4.63 (4.09)	2.25 (1.09)	2.60 (1.14)	1.40 (1.36)	1.62 (1.53)
Place of residence						
Rural	4.52 (3.65)	6.38 (5.13)	2.21 (0.98)	2.75 (1.33)	1.71 (0.95)	1.96 (1.57)
Urban	4.18 (4.42)	4.81 (4.44)	2.09 (1.00)	2.6 (1.19)	1.44 (1.37)	1.83 (1.60)

208

209

210

3.2 Trends of anxiety, stress, and depression during the lockdown

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

Our multilevel models adjusted for sociodemographic variables showed an increase in anxiety ($\beta=0.81$, CI: 0.03, 1.60) (Table 2) and stress scores ($\beta=0.51$, CI: 0.32, 0.70) (Table 3) during the two months (T1 to T4) of follow-up. We also found an increase in depressive symptoms ($\beta=0.37$, CI: 0.13, 0.60) in our sample between T2 and T4, independent of the covariates (Table 4). Anxiety ($\beta=1.62$, CI: 0.44, 2.81) and stress scores ($\beta=0.65$, CI: 0.37, 0.94) were found to be higher among women, versus men, independent of their sociodemographic factors. However, we could not find statistically significant associations of the other sociodemographic variables (age, annual income, educational qualification, and place of residence) with the psychological outcomes.

Table 2: Changes (regression coefficients, 95% CI) in anxiety between Week 1 and Week 8 of the lockdown (N=159).

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Anxiety			
Time	0.814 (0.025, 1.602)	0.125 (-0.831, 1.082)	0.168 (-0.860, 1.197)
Gender (ref- Men)			
Women	1.624 (0.443, 2.805)	0.619 (-0.820, 2.059)	0.306 (-1.170, 1.782)
Age	-0.042 (-0.113, 0.027)	-0.043 (-0.113, 0.027)	-0.055 (-0.125, 0.014)
Annual income (ref-Low)			
Medium	0.315 (-1.125, 1.756)	0.286 (-1.155, 1.727)	0.069 (-1.348, 1.486)
High	-0.734 (-2.178, 0.710)	-0.742 (-2.187, 0.702)	-0.694 (-2.145, 0.757)
Education (ref- High school or less)			

Some college	0.303 (-1.611, 2.217)	0.320 (-1.594, 2.236)	1.395 (-0.578, 3.370)
Above college	-0.399 (-2.393, 1.595)	-0.376 (-2.371, 1.618)	0.777 (-1.243, 2.799)
Place of residence (ref- Rural)			
Urban	-0.783 (-2.337, 0.769)	-0.790 (-2.343, 0.763)	-1.180 (-2.784, 0.423)
Gender*time			
		1.983 (0.357, 3.609)	1.893 (0.155, 3.631)
Social support			
			-0.520 (-1.574, 0.533)
Resilience			
			-0.515 (-0.896, -0.135)
History of mental health			
			2.236 (0.799, 3.673)

223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230

Model 1: Adjusted for sociodemographic variables

Model 2: Includes interaction term (gender and time) adjusted for sociodemographic variables

Model 3: Additionally, adjusted for social support, resilience, and history of mental health

Table 3: Changes (regression coefficients, 95% CI) in stress between Week 1 and Week 8 of the lockdown (N=159).

Stress	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Time	0.509 (0.315, 0.703)	0.307 (0.073, 0.541)	0.322 (0.075, 0.569)
Gender (ref- Men)	0.654 (0.370, 0.938)	0.362 (0.016, 0.709)	0.270 (-0.092, 0.632)
Age	-0.009 (-0.025, 0.006)	-0.009 (-0.025, 0.006)	-0.011 (-0.027, 0.005)
Annual income (ref- Low)			
Medium	0.081 (-0.264, 0.428)	0.081 (-0.264, 0.428)	0.074 (-0.280, 0.429)
High	-0.083 (-0.428, 0.262)	-0.083 (-0.428, 0.262)	-0.056 (-0.418, 0.305)
Education (ref- High school or less)			
Some college	0.290 (-0.172, 0.752)	0.290 (-0.172, 0.752)	0.398 (-0.098, 0.896)
Above college	0.282 (-0.196, 0.761)	0.282 (-0.196, 0.761)	0.375 (-0.131, 0.882)
Place of residence (ref- rural)			
Urban	-0.062 (-0.435, 0.310)	-0.062 (-0.435, 0.310)	-0.213 (-0.613, 0.186)

Gender* time		0.583 (0.185, 0.980)	0.577 (0.160, 0.994)
Social support			0.025 (-0.238, 0.288)
Resilience			-0.063 (-0.158, 0.031)
History of mental health			0.439 (0.085, 0.794)

231

232 **Model 1: Adjusted for sociodemographic variables**

233 **Model 2: Includes interaction term (gender and time) adjusted for sociodemographic variables**

234 **Model 3: Additionally, adjusted for social support, resilience, and history of mental health**

235

236 **Table 2:** Changes (regression coefficients, 95% CI) in stress between Week 3 and Week 8 of the
 237 lockdown (N=159).

238

Depressive symptoms	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Time	0.367 (0.130, 0.604)	0.248 (-0.042, 0.539)	0.181 (-0.122, 0.484)
Gender (ref- Men)	0.380 (-0.011, 0.773)	0.208 (-0.255, 0.672)	0.055 (-0.439, 0.550)
Age	-0.021 (-0.043, 0.000)	-0.021 (-0.043, 0.000)	-0.028 (-0.052, -0.005)
Annual income (ref- Low)			
Medium	0.325 (-0.152, 0.804)	0.325 (-0.153, 0.803)	0.428 (-0.078, 0.934)
High	-0.369 (-0.847, 0.107)	-0.370 (-0.847, 0.107)	-0.286 (-0.802, 0.229)
Education (ref- High school or less)			
Some college	0.659 (0.021, 1.298)	0.660 (0.022, 1.298)	0.598 (-0.110, 1.307)
Above college	0.165 (-0.494, 0.825)	0.166 (-0.493, 0.826)	0.163 (-0.558, 0.884)
Place of residence (ref- rural)			
Urban	-0.062 (-0.577, 0.451)	-0.062 (-0.576, 0.452)	-0.082 (-0.652, 0.487)
Gender*time		0.344 (-0.151, 0.839)	0.369 (-0.142, 0.882)
Social support			-0.112 (-0.488, 0.264)

Resilience			-0.004 (-0.140, 0.130)
History of mental health			0.705 (0.200, 1.209)

239

240

Model 1: Adjusted for sociodemographic variables

241

Model 2: Includes interaction term (gender and time) adjusted for sociodemographic variables

242

Model 3: Additionally, adjusted for social support, resilience, and history of mental health

243

244

245

3.3 Differential increase of anxiety, stress, and depressive symptoms across gender

246

The interaction of gender with time was statistically significant for the anxiety (p-value for interaction = 0.017) and stress (p-value for interaction = 0.004) outcomes in our models adjusted for sociodemographic variables. Women showed a greater rate of increase in anxiety and stress scores between T1 and T4, as compared to men, after accounting for the sociodemographic covariates. Holding age, education, income and place of residence constant, men showed an average increase of 0.13 points in anxiety and 0.31 points in stress scores during the follow-up. The corresponding figures for women were 2.73 and 1.25 points, respectively. Further, this interaction was found to be significant even after adjusting for social support, resilience, and a history of mental health.

254

However, we did not find statistical evidence supporting the interaction of gender with time in our models for depressive symptoms.

255

256

257

3.4 Other findings

258

We found statistically significant and positive associations of history of mental health with anxiety ($\beta=2.24$, CI: 0.80, 3.67), stress ($\beta=0.44$, CI: 0.09, 0.79), and depressive symptoms ($\beta=0.71$, CI: 0.20, 1.21) in our sample, independent of all covariates.

261

Our fully adjusted models also found that a higher level of resilience was associated with lower anxiety, stress, and depressive symptoms. However, the associations of social support with the psychological outcomes were not statistically significant in our models.

264

Further, one-way ANOVA analysis highlighted a gendered difference in reports of increased responsibilities during the lockdown ($p<0.001$). Our results showed that women ($M=1.35$, $SD=0.97$) reported a greater increase in their responsibilities compared to men ($M=0.90$, $SD=1.04$) during the lockdown.

267

268

269

4. Discussion

270

Using repeated measures of psychological outcomes from 159 Indian adults during a period of two months of the Covid-19 lockdown, we found that there were statistically significant increases in stress, anxiety, and depressive symptoms over this period. Moreover, this increase in negative psychological outcomes was found to be more among women, compared to men. We also found that a higher level of an individual's resilience was related to lower levels of anxiety, stress, and depressive symptoms.

276

Our findings suggest that anxiety, stress, and depressive symptoms increased during the lockdown among adults in India. While depressive symptoms increased in both genders, the effect size was modest. Nevertheless, the increase in the adverse psychological outcomes could be because of several reasons. First, the nationwide lockdown disrupted the citizens' daily functioning in their professional, personal, and social lives, which potentially impacted their psychological well-being. Moreover, the periodic extensions of the lockdown over a considerably long period of time, accompanied by a steep increase in the number of Covid-19 cases in the country, and even worldwide likely worsened their anxiety, stress, and depressive symptoms over time. Each announcement of the extension of the lockdown might have increased the anxiety among the citizens by engendering a perception of unpredictability. Further, the initial shocks of the lockdown

285

286 followed by the social isolation maintained for a prolonged time, and the emotional and financial
287 losses incurred during the lockdown might have created a synergistic psychological impact.
288 Second, the government of India announced a relaxation of restrictions on certain activities even
289 while extending the lockdown. These relaxations included the resumption of trains, opening up of
290 small shops, and inter-state mobility. However, these graded “unlocks” (which potentially allowed
291 increasing physical mobility as well), were not accompanied by reports of a reduction in the
292 number of new Covid-19 cases in India. On the contrary, the case numbers shot up just as the
293 “unlocking” began. This could have reduced the confidence of the citizens, leading to a higher
294 perceived risk of contracting the disease and thus further increasing their stress, anxiety, and
295 depressive symptoms. However, these findings of our study are contrary to those found by Wang
296 et al. [35] in China, where stress and anxiety were found to be stable across a 4-week period of
297 lockdown among the Chinese people. The explanation provided by Wang et al. highlights that
298 China recorded substantial improvements in curbing the spread of the virus through their rapid
299 decisive measures and the greater number of recovered patients, which might have instilled greater
300 confidence in their public health measures among the Chinese, thus avoiding a worsening of the
301 psychological toll of a prolonged lockdown [35].

302 As per the findings of our study, compared to men, women had a greater increase in stress,
303 anxiety, and depressive symptoms during the lockdown. Notably, the increases in anxiety and
304 stress in our sample were primarily due to this evidence of a greater increase in anxiety and stress
305 observed in women. There are two potential explanations for this finding. First, it was found that
306 women in the Indian context have significantly more household responsibilities, during the
307 lockdown especially because of the skewed gendered division of household labour in India [36,37].
308 For instance, due to the closure of schools and offices, all family members could be staying indoors
309 leading to an increase in household burden for women who would be expected to shoulder most of
310 the childcare, cooking, cleaning, other household management and coordination of other
311 responsibilities in most households. This would leave them with a very limited time for themselves.
312 Corroborating this, Viglione [38] reported lower publication rates among female academicians in
313 North America compared to their male counterparts during this pandemic, across all disciplines.
314 Our results from India, a society with stronger patriarchy, fit this narrative. We found that women
315 reported a greater increase in their responsibilities during the lockdown compared to men. These
316 added responsibilities combined with the lack of time for themselves could increase their stress,
317 anxiety and depression levels much more than the increase among men. Second, social isolation
318 and the restrictions on physical mobility might increase the exposure of women to hostility at
319 home, especially among women who were already vulnerable to domestic violence. Previous
320 studies have reported an increase in the risk of women across the world experiencing hostility
321 during the lockdown period [39-41]. The high prevalence (~30%) of domestic violence [18] in India is a
322 reflection of the vulnerability of Indian women to domestic violence (ranging from emotional abuse
323 from family members to physical/sexual abuse from intimate partners). Any risk of such hostility
324 could worsen during the lockdown. Prolonged exposure to any risk of domestic hostility
325 (emotional, physical or sexual) could lead to an increase in stress, anxiety, and depression among
326 Indian women during the lockdown.

327 We found that the greater increase in stress and anxiety among women versus men persisted
328 even after accounting for social support and resilience. This suggests that this gendered pattern was
329 strong enough to persist despite any protective effect exerted by these buffering factors. Even
330 though interaction of depressive symptoms with gender was not statistically significant, it
331 suggested that the rate of increase in depressive symptoms was higher among women than men,
332 thus fitting the pattern observed with anxiety and stress. Nevertheless, these findings are not in-line
333 with the findings of a similar longitudinal study by Ozamiz et al. [26] in Northern Spain. They found
334 higher levels of anxiety, stress, and depression among men compared to women. This contrast with
335 our results could be because of the cultural differences between the two countries with regard to the
336 gendered division of household labor [42,43].

337 We found that higher resilience likely dampened the increase of negative psychological
338 outcomes among our participants. Resilience is known to buffer the impact of stress on mental
339 health^[44], especially during the Covid-19 pandemic^[45]. Although not statistically significant, we
340 also found evidence suggesting that social support reduced the intensity of increase in participants'
341 stress, anxiety, and depressive symptoms. This is in line with findings from previous research. It is
342 likely that the initial announcement of the lockdown led to individuals moving to their
343 natal/marital households or enhanced their interaction with their family members and loved ones,
344 thereby increasing their social support^[4]. Such support could act as an assurance of emotional,
345 social, and financial challenges during the time of crisis. Such perceived assurance of help from
346 others during the crisis could act as stress-ameliorating factors, preventing the increase of anxiety,
347 stress, and depression. However, due to the small sample size, we did not have statistical power to
348 support this.

349 We also found that persons with a history of mental health issues were likely to have an
350 increase in anxiety, stress, and depression during the period of lockdown. Previous research has
351 highlighted that situations of social avoidance could cause a relapse of trauma and depressive
352 events^[46]. The social isolation, the added responsibilities, and any lack of perceived social support
353 (due to physical mobility restrictions) could trigger those with past depressive episodes. Studies
354 have shown higher stress and anxiety during the lockdown in India ^[47].

355 We could not find statistical evidence to support the relationship of age, annual income, and
356 education with anxiety, stress, and depressive symptoms in our sample. However, despite the lack
357 of statistical significance, we found that a higher annual income, lower age, and living in urban
358 versus rural areas, were related to lower levels of adverse psychological outcomes. A higher income
359 could reflect employment that assured job security, flexibility, and a continued salary during the
360 lockdown, which in turn may dampen the psychological impact of the prolonged lockdown. Also, it
361 likely provides individuals with financial resources to better adapt to the crisis.

362

363 **Limitation and strengths**

364 The study has several limitations which we acknowledge. First, the survey was conducted
365 online limiting the sample to only those who had access to the Internet. However, the online
366 method of recruitment helped us collect data from a diverse sample within a short time, given the
367 restriction of physical mobility due to the lockdown. Second, we could not follow-up with the
368 majority of our participants during the study. This was likely because we relied on only one way of
369 communication, their email, for follow-up. In the chaos of the Covid-19 pandemic and the
370 challenges it brought, the participants might have missed the emails related to the follow-ups.
371 However, to our knowledge, this is the first web-based longitudinal study from India capturing key
372 insights of psychological well-being *over time* during a lockdown that was periodically extended.
373 Third, our sample size of 159 participants was modest; yet, it allowed us to analyze the changes in
374 the psychological outcomes during the lockdown with several statistically significant results.
375 Fourth, since the survey was in English, all participants who volunteered were comfortable in
376 English and unsurprisingly 89% had some college education. Therefore, the results cannot be
377 generalized to the whole of India. However, we found policy-relevant results showing an increase
378 of anxiety, stress, and depressive symptoms in a relatively well-educated sample. We argue that the
379 relatively underprivileged (socially as well as economically) are potentially even more vulnerable to
380 such adverse psychological outcomes during the lockdown. Lastly, we used self-reported measures
381 to assess anxiety, stress, and depressive symptoms in our sample. While clinical interviews would
382 have yielded better results, we argue that the use of validated, reliable, and widely cited scales
383 make our results credible.

384 Despite these limitations, the strength of our study lies in its longitudinal nature which sheds
385 light on the trend of psychological outcomes during the lockdown in India. Moreover, we
386 measured the outcomes at two interesting time points, one during the initiation of the lockdown
387 and the other during a phase of relative relaxation, allowing us to assess if the psychological
388 outcomes changed during differing dynamics of the lockdown. Despite a modest sample size, we
389 also found statistical evidence to highlight the gender-based disparities in the effect of the
390 lockdown, which was likely due to the gendered interpretation of circumstances created due to this
391 pandemic plus a gendered emotional and behavioral response to the subsequent lockdown, all of
392 which could in turn be socially determined.

393

394 **Implications**

395 Our salient findings highlight a long-term impact of the lockdown on the mental wellbeing of
396 Indian adults. These findings can help mental health policymakers to design disaster-response
397 policies to address the psychological needs of the citizens during such crises, including a plan for
398 follow-ups. Additionally, our findings suggest that these policies should be socially inclusive, with
399 prioritized care for the vulnerable such as women and those with existing mental health issues. A
400 longer-term perspective on preparedness would benefit from policies designed to enhance
401 resilience among Indian citizens and prepare them to adapt to such crises.

402 An immediate response to our findings would be the involvement of philanthropic non-
403 governmental organizations, social workers, and other community service providers to provide
404 emotional support to communities during and after the Covid-19 pandemic, with a special focus on
405 women and the underprivileged.

406

407 **5. Conclusions**

408 The Covid-19 crisis and the accompanying lockdown have no doubt affected everyone's life in
409 some way or the other. While the lockdown may help in effectively addressing this pandemic, the
410 state and society at large need to be sensitive to the mental health impacts of a long-drawn out
411 lockdown. Vulnerable populations such as women and the marginalized deserve immediate
412 attention. However, our responsibility also lies in addressing the root causes driving the unequal
413 distribution of psychological distress during such crises.

414 **Author Contributions:** Conceptualization (initial), AG; Conceptualization (additional), AJS and MAS;
415 methodology, AG and MAS; software, AJS; validation, AG and AJS; formal analysis, AJS; investigation, AG;
416 resources, AG and MAS; data curation, AG; writing—original draft preparation, AG and AJS; writing—review
417 and editing, AG, AJS, and MAS; supervision, MAS; project administration, AG and AJS. All authors have read
418 and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

419 **Funding:** This research received no external funding

420 **Acknowledgments:** This project was completed with the help and support of a lot of people, and we want to
421 acknowledge their contribution. AG conveys special thanks to Vardhaman Gopal for his timely suggestion,
422 which set the ball rolling and for being a pillar of support. AG is immensely grateful to her parents for being
423 super helpful and patient during the entire process, particularly their unwavering support throughout the
424 extended lockdown. AG thanks all her friends and family who not only helped in the circulation of the survey
425 but were a continuous support. AG thanks Sitesh Kumar for his help with numerical data representation. AG,
426 AJS, and MAS thank Nilesh Thube for his help in the results tables. We cannot thank the participants enough
427 for their continuous contribution towards diligently filling up the forms longitudinally. AG was supported by
428 fellowship from University Grants Commission (UGC)-NET-JRF, India. AJS was supported by fellowship from
429 the Department of Science and Technology, India and IIT Gandhinagar.

430 **Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

431 **References**

- 432 1. Kandel, N.; Chungong, S.; Omaar, A.; Xing, J. Health Security Capacities in the Context of COVID-19
433 Outbreak: An Analysis of International Health Regulations Annual Report Data from 182 Countries.
434 *Lancet* 2020, 395 (10229), 1047–1053. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30553-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30553-5).
- 435 2. Government of India Notification 1. https://www.mohfw.gov.in/pdf/DOletter_secretary.pdf (accessed Jun
436 10, 2020).
- 437 3. Government of India Notification 2.
438 https://www.mha.gov.in/sites/default/files/PR_Extensionoflockdown_14042020.pdf (accessed Jun 10,
439 2020).
- 440 4. Joya Sharma, A. Psychological Impact of Covid-19 Lockdown in India: Different Strokes for Different
441 Folks. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.25.20111716>.
- 442 5. Roy, D.; Tripathy, S.; Kar, S. K.; Sharma, N.; Verma, S. K.; Kaushal, V. Study of Knowledge, Attitude,
443 Anxiety & Perceived Mental Healthcare Need in Indian Population during COVID-19 Pandemic. *Asian J.*
444 *Psychiatr.* 2020, 51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajp.2020.102083>.
- 445 6. Rahul Krishna, P.; Undela, K.; Palaksha, S. Knowledge and Beliefs of General Public of India on COVID-
446 19: A Web-Based Cross-Sectional Survey Self-Medication Practices among People Living with Type 2
447 Diabetes in India View Project PRODRUGS View Project. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.22.20075267>.
- 448 7. Chakraborty, K.; Chatterjee, M. Psychological Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on General Population in
449 West Bengal: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Indian J. Psychiatry* 2020, 62 (3), 266.
450 https://doi.org/10.4103/psychiatry.indianjpsychiatry_276_20.
- 451 8. Liu, S.; Yang, L.; Zhang, C.; Xiang, Y.-T.; Liu, Z.; Hu, S.; Zhang, B. Online Mental Health Services in China
452 during the COVID-19 Outbreak. *The Lancet Psychiatry* 2020, 7, e17–e18. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366\(20\)30046-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30046-8).
- 453 9. Pieh, C.; Budimir, S.; Probst, T. Mental Health during COVID-19 Lockdown: A Comparison of Austria
454 and the UK. *SSRN Electron. J.* 2020. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3592372>.
- 455 10. Gao, J.; Zheng, P.; Jia, Y.; Chen, H.; Mao, Y.; Chen, S.; Wang, Y.; Fu, H.; Dai, J. Mental Health Problems
456 and Social Media Exposure during COVID-19 Outbreak. *PLoS One* 2020, 15 (4), e0231924.
457 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0231924>.
- 458 11. Xiao, H.; Zhang, Y.; Kong, D.; Li, S.; Yang, N. The Effects of Social Support on Sleep Quality of Medical
459 Staff Treating Patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in January and February 2020 in
460 China. *Med. Sci. Monit.* 2020, 26, e923549. <https://doi.org/10.12659/MSM.923549>.
- 461 12. Qiu, J.; Shen, B.; Zhao, M.; Wang, Z.; Xie, B.; Xu, Y. A Nationwide Survey of Psychological Distress
462 among Chinese People in the COVID-19 Epidemic: Implications and Policy Recommendations. *General*
463 *Psychiatry*. BMJ Publishing Group March 6, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1136/gpsych-2020-100213>.
- 464 13. Wang, C.; Pan, R.; Wan, X.; Tan, Y.; Xu, L.; Ho, C. S.; Ho, R. C. Immediate Psychological Responses and
465 Associated Factors during the Initial Stage of the 2019 Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Epidemic among
466 the General Population in China. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 2020, 17 (5), 1729.
467 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17051729>.
- 468 14. Shankar, A.; Mcmunn, A.; Banks, J.; Steptoe, A. Loneliness, Social Isolation, and Behavioral and Biological
469 Health Indicators in Older Adults. 2011. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022826>.
- 470 15. Smith, S. G.; Jackson, S. E.; Kobayashi, L. C.; Steptoe, A. Social Isolation, Health Literacy, and Mortality
471 Risk: Findings from the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing. *Heal. Psychol.* 2018, 37 (2), 160–169.
472 <https://doi.org/10.1037/hea0000541>.
- 473 16. Kim, E. J.; Dimsdale, J. E. The Effect of Psychosocial Stress on Sleep: A Review of Polysomnographic
474 Evidence. *Behav. Sleep Med.* 2007, 5 (4), 256–278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15402000701557383>.
- 475 17. Seib, C.; Whiteside, E.; Humphreys, J.; Lee, K.; Thomas, P.; Chopin, L.; Crisp, G.; O'Keeffe, A.; Kimlin, M.;
476 Stacey, A.; Anderson, D. A Longitudinal Study of the Impact of Chronic Psychological Stress on Health-
477 Related Quality of Life and Clinical Biomarkers: Protocol for the Australian Healthy Aging of Women
478 Study. *BMC Public Health* 2014, 14 (1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-14-9>.
- 479 18. International Institute for Population Sciences. National Family Health Survey (NFHS-4) 2015-16 India.
480 *Int. Inst. Popul. Sci. ICF* 2017, 1–192. [https://doi.org/kwm120 \[pii\]10.1093/aje/kwm120](https://doi.org/kwm120[pii]10.1093/aje/kwm120).
- 481

- 482 19. Nigam, S. COVID-19: INDIA'S RESPONSE TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE NEEDS RETHINKING. No. May
483 2020.
- 484 20. Zimet, G. D.; Dahlem, N. W.; Zimet, S. G.; Farley, G. K. The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social
485 Support. *J. Pers. Assess.* 1988, 52 (1), 30–41. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa5201_2.
- 486 21. George, L. K.; Blazer, D. G.; Hughes, D. C.; Fowler, N. Social Support and the Outcome of Major
487 Depression. *Br. J. Psychiatry* 1989, 154 (APR.), 478–485. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.154.4.478>.
- 488 22. Xiao, H.; Zhang, Y.; Kong, D.; Li, S.; Yang, N. Social Capital and Sleep Quality in Individuals Who Self-
489 Isolated for 14 Days during the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in January 2020 in
490 China. *Medical Science Monitor. International Scientific Information, Inc.* March 20, 2020.
491 <https://doi.org/10.12659/MSM.923921>.
- 492 23. Davydov, D.; Stewart, R.; Ritchie, K.; Chaudieu, I. Resilience and Mental Health. *Clin. Psychol. Rev.* 2010,
493 No. 5, 30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2010.03.003i>.
- 494 24. Ho Su Hui, C.; Ho, C. S.; Chee, C. Y.; Ho, R. C. Mental Health Strategies to Combat the Psychological
495 Impact of COVID-19 Beyond Paranoia and Panic; 2020.
- 496 25. Polizzi, C.; Lynn, S. J.; Perry, A. Stress and Coping in the Time of COVID-19: Pathways to Resilience and
497 Recovery. *Clin. Neuropsychiatry* 2020, 17 (2), 59–62. <https://doi.org/10.36131/CN20200204>.
- 498 26. Ozamiz, N.; Mondragon, N. I.; Santamaria, M. D.; Gorrotxategi, M. P. Psychological Symptoms during
499 the Two Stages of Lockdown in Response to the COVID-19 Outbreak: An Investigation in a Sample of
500 Citizens in Northern Spain. *Front. Psychol.* 2020, 11, 1491. <https://doi.org/10.3389/FPSYG.2020.01491>.
- 501 27. Spitzer, R. L.; Kroenke, K.; Williams, J. B. W.; Löwe, B. A Brief Measure for Assessing Generalized
502 Anxiety Disorder: The GAD-7. *Arch. Intern. Med.* 2006, 166 (10), 1092–1097.
503 <https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.166.10.1092>.
- 504 28. Mina, S.; Jabeen, M.; Singh, S.; Verma, R. Gender Differences in Depression and Anxiety among Atopic
505 Dermatitis Patients. *Indian J. Dermatol.* 2015, 60 (2), 211. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0019-5154.152564>.
- 506 29. Kumar, V.; Avasthi, A.; Grover, S. Somatosensory Amplification, Health Anxiety, and Alexithymia in
507 Generalized Anxiety Disorder. *Ind. Psychiatry J.* 2018, 27 (1), 47. https://doi.org/10.4103/ipj-ipj_72_17.
- 508 30. Elo, A. L.; Leppänen, A.; Jahkola, A. Validity of a Single-Item Measure of Stress Symptoms. *Scand. J.*
509 *Work. Environ. Heal.* 2003, 29 (6), 444–451. <https://doi.org/10.5271/sjweh.752>.
- 510 31. Kroenke, K.; Spitzer, R. L.; Williams, J. B. W.; Löwe, B. An Ultra-Brief Screening Scale for Anxiety and
511 Depression: The PHQ-4. *Psychosomatics* 2009, 50 (6), 613–621. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0033-3182\(09\)70864-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0033-3182(09)70864-3).
- 512 32. Daruvala, R.; Ghosh, M.; Fratazzi, F.; Norzan, S.; Laha, A.; Ahmed, R.; Panda, S.; Datta, S. Emotional
513 Exhaustion in Cancer Clinicians: A Mixed Methods Exploration. *Indian J. Med. Paediatr. Oncol.* 2019, 40
514 (1), 111. https://doi.org/10.4103/ijmpo.ijmpo_168_17.
- 515 33. Vaishnavi, S.; Connor, K.; Davidson, J. R. T. An Abbreviated Version of the Connor-Davidson Resilience
516 Scale (CD-RISC), the CD-RISC2: Psychometric Properties and Applications in Psychopharmacological
517 Trials. *Psychiatry Res.* 2007, 152 (2–3), 293–297. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2007.01.006>.
- 518 34. StataCorp. Stata Statistical Software: Release 12. College Station (TX): Stata Corporation LP. College
519 Station, TX: StataCorp LP. 2011.
- 520 35. Wang, C.; Pan, R.; Wan, X.; Tan, Y.; Xu, L.; McIntyre, R. S.; Choo, F. N.; Tran, B.; Ho, R.; Sharma, V. K.;
521 Ho, C. A Longitudinal Study on the Mental Health of General Population during the COVID-19 Epidemic
522 in China. *Brain. Behav. Immun.* 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbi.2020.04.028>.
- 523 36. Sharma, N.; Chakrabarti, S.; Grover, S. Gender Differences in Caregiving among Family - Caregivers of
524 People with Mental Illnesses. *World J. Psychiatry* 2016, 6 (1), 7. <https://doi.org/10.5498/wjp.v6.i1.7>.
- 525 37. Manoharan, S. Health Status of the Indian Women - A Brief Report. *MOJ Proteomics Bioinforma.* 2017, 5
526 (3). <https://doi.org/10.15406/mojpb.2017.05.00162>.
- 527 38. Viglione, G. Are Women Publishing Less during the Pandemic? Here's What the Data Say. *Nature* 2020,
528 581 (7809), 365–366. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-01294-9>.
- 529 39. Mahase, E. Covid-19: EU States Report 60% Rise in Emergency Calls about Domestic Violence.
530 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1872>.
- 531 40. Taub, A. A New Covid-19 Crisis: Domestic Abuse Rises Worldwide; 2020.
- 532 41. Chandan, J. S.; Taylor, J.; Bradbury-Jones, C.; Nirantharakumar, K.; Kane, E.; Bandyopadhyay, S. COVID-
533 19: A Public Health Approach to Manage Domestic Violence Is Needed. *Lancet Public Heal.* 2020, 5 (6),
534 e309. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s2468-2667\(20\)30112-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2468-2667(20)30112-2).
- 535

- 536 42. Sevilla-Sanz, A.; Gimenez-Nadal, J. I.; Fernández, C. Gender Roles and the Division of Unpaid Work in
537 Spanish Households. *Fem. Econ.* 2010, 16 (4), 137–184. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13545701.2010.531197>.
- 538 43. Srivastava, A. Time Use and Household Division of Labor in India—Within-Gender Dynamics. *Popul.*
539 *Dev. Rev.* 2020, *padr.12309*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padr.12309>.
- 540 44. Catalano, D.; Chan, F.; Wilson, L.; Chiu, C. Y.; Muller, V. R. The Buffering Effect of Resilience on
541 Depression Among Individuals With Spinal Cord Injury: A Structural Equation Model. *Rehabil. Psychol.*
542 2011, 56 (3), 200–211. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024571>.
- 543 45. Hou, T.; Zhang, T.; Cai, W.; Song, X.; Chen, A.; Deng, G.; Ni, C. Social Support and Mental Health among
544 Health Care Workers during Coronavirus Disease 2019 Outbreak: A Moderated Mediation Model. *PLoS*
545 *One* 2020, 15 (5), e0233831. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0233831>.
- 546 46. Lye, M.-S.; Tey, Y.-Y.; Tor, Y.-S.; Shahabudin, A. F.; Ibrahim, N.; Ling, K.-H.; Stanslas, J.; Loh, S.-P.; Rosli,
547 R.; Lokman, K. A.; Badamasi, I. M.; Faris-Aldoghachi, A.; Abdul Razak, N. A. Predictors of Recurrence of
548 Major Depressive Disorder. *PLoS One* 2020, 15 (3), e0230363.
549 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0230363>.
- 550 47. Varshney, M.; Parel, J. T.; Raizada, N.; Sarin, S. K. Initial Psychological Impact of COVID-19 and Its
551 Correlates in Indian Community: An Online (FEEL-COVID) Survey. *PLoS One* 2020, 15 (5), e0233874.
552 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0233874>.
- 553

554