medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.21.20136820; this version posted June 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Mental health and health behaviours before and during the COVID-19 lockdown: Longitudinal analyses of the UK Household Longitudinal Study

Claire L Niedzwiedz [1] *

Michael Green [2] *

Michaela Benzeval [3]

Desmond D Campbell [2]

Peter Craig [2]

Evangelia Demou [2]

Alastair H Leyland [2]

Anna Pearce [2]

Rachel M Thomson [2]

Elise Whitley [2]

S Vittal Katikireddi [2, 4]

[1] Institute of Health & Wellbeing, University of Glasgow

[2] MRC/CSO Social & Public Health Sciences Unit, University of Glasgow

[3] Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex

[4] Public Health Scotland

* Equal contribution

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.21.20136820; this version posted June 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Objectives: To establish trends in mental health (psychological distress and loneliness) and health behaviours (alcohol consumption, smoking and e-cigarette use) in the UK before and during the 2020 COVID-19 'lockdown' and examine differences across population subgroups.

Design: Repeat cross-sectional and longitudinal analysis of the UK Household Longitudinal Survey.

Setting: UK general population.

Participants: Representative samples of adults (aged 18 years and over) interviewed in repeated surveys between 2015 and 2020 (n=48,426). 9,748 adults had complete data for all four surveys for longitudinal analyses.

Exposure: Experience of strict physical distancing measures including home isolation ('lockdown') introduced by the UK Government to control transmission of COVID-19.

Main outcome measures: Psychological distress was assessed using the General Health Questionnaire-12 (GHQ), with a score 4+ indicating likely anxiety/depression. Binary outcomes were created for loneliness, current smoking and use of e-cigarettes. Alcohol consumption was assessed using three binary measures: binge drinking (at least weekly consumption of 6+ drinks on a single occasion), alcohol frequency (4+ times per week) and heavy drinking (7+ drinks on a typical drinking day).

Statistical analysis: Cross-sectional weighted prevalence estimates were calculated. Multilevel Poisson regression was used to assess the association between time period and the outcomes of interest, adjusting for age, sex, ethnicity and interview year and accounting for attrition and missing data using inverse probability weights. We tested for differential effects by fitting interaction terms for age group, sex, highest education level and ethnicity.

Results: Psychological distress had substantially increased one month into the COVID-19 lockdown, with the prevalence rising from 19.4% (95% CI 18.7%-20.0%) in 2017-19 to 30.3% (95% CI 29.1%-31.6%) in April 2020. Women's mental health was particularly affected, as was that of the most educated and young adults. Loneliness remained relatively stable overall. Prevalence of current smoking fell from 15.1% (95% CI 14.4%-15.8%) to 10.9% (95% CI 9.9%-11.9%). Current e-cigarette use declined slightly. The proportion of people drinking on four or more days per week increased as did binge drinking, but the proportion of people consuming seven or more drinks on a typical drinking day decreased.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.21.20136820; this version posted June 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Conclusions: Psychological distress substantially increased one month into the COVID-19 lockdown, particularly among women and young adults. Smoking declined, but the frequency of alcohol consumption increased. Effective treatment and prevention are required to mitigate adverse impacts on physical and mental health, particularly if further waves of infection occur.

What is already known on this topic

- Countries around the world have implemented radical COVID-19 lockdown measures, with concerns that these may have unintended consequences for a broad range of health outcomes.
- Evidence on the impacts of lockdown measures on mental health and health-related behaviours remains limited.

What this study adds

- In the UK, psychological distress markedly increased during the lockdown, with women particularly adversely affected.
- Smoking and e-cigarette use fell, but the frequency of alcohol consumption and binge drinking increased.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.21.20136820; this version posted June 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Background

The onset of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has led not only to direct health risks from the infection, but also large-scale societal changes in many countries. Governments around the world have introduced substantial restrictions to people's movement, including limiting potential to attend work and school or see friends and family.[1 2] Such 'lockdown' measures could have large impacts on health, potentially affecting some population groups disproportionately.[3 4] While some impacts could arise from reduced access to healthcare during lockdown[5], the lockdown measures themselves could have direct consequences on mental health and health-related behaviours.

Research available prior to the pandemic has suggested that quarantine is linked to a range of negative psychological outcomes.[6] During the COVID-19 pandemic, concerns have been repeatedly raised about potential harms to mental health, which could be long-lasting.[7] Similarly, health-related behaviours such as alcohol consumption and smoking could be subject to rapid change in either direction. The increased stress that physical distancing places on people could increase consumption.[8 9] Alternatively, greater awareness of health risks more generally and reduced availability and socialising could lead to reduced consumption.

Following increasing public messaging about the risks COVID-19 posed, the UK Government introduced strict physical distancing measures on the 23rd March 2020.[10] This restricted the general population to staying at home, unless required to leave for the purposes of carrying out an essential job (referred to as a 'keyworker', such as a health and social care worker), to buy necessary food or similar goods (once a week) or to take exercise once a day for a maximum of one hour. Individuals with specific pre-existing medical conditions which placed them at higher risk of particularly adverse consequences of COVID-19 (referred to as 'shielded' individuals) were advised to follow even stricter isolation at home (i.e. to not leave home even for exercise).

Understanding the impacts of these large-scale changes is important as further periods of physical distancing are likely to be necessary in many countries for some time, especially as the possibility of further waves of infection remain. These impacts may also disproportionately affect specific population subgroups, with concerns that young people, women and socioeconomically disadvantaged groups may be at greater risk. We therefore investigated the impact of the UK's COVID-19 lockdown on mental health and consumption of alcohol, tobacco and e-cigarettes, as well as assessing whether any observed impacts differed by age, sex, ethnicity and education level.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.21.20136820; this version posted June 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Methods

Data source

The UK Household Longitudinal Study (also referred to as 'Understanding Society') is a nationally representative longitudinal household panel study, based on a clustered stratified probability sample of UK households, and two boost samples of ethnic minority populations, which has been described in detail previously.[11] All adults (aged 16 years and over) in chosen households are invited to participate and asked detailed questions about sociodemographic characteristics, health and its determinants. Data collection for each 'wave' usually spans 24 months, with participants re-interviewed on an annual basis. We used pre-pandemic data from waves 7 to wave 9 (data collection 2015-2019).[11 12] Following the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, an additional wave of data was collected from participants of the Understanding Society study between 24th and 30th April 2020 (referred to as the COVID-19 wave A – henceforth the 'CA wave').[13] The response rate was 48.6% of those who took part at wave 9. Participants in the CA wave differed on several observed characteristics from those surveyed at wave 9 (see Appendix 1 for details of inverse probability weight adjustment).[14 15] We analysed data from all adults aged 18 years and over who participated in each wave for repeated cross-sectional analysis. When analysing educational inequalities we restricted analyses to adults aged 25 years and over as educational attainment tends to be stable from that age onwards.[16] For longitudinal analysis, we included participants with complete data from all four waves and aged 18 years and over during wave 9.

The UK Household Longitudinal Study was approved by the University of Essex Ethics Committee. No additional ethical approval was necessary for this secondary data analysis.

Outcomes

Mental health was assessed at all four waves using the General Health Questionnaire-12 (GHQ-12), which is a screening tool for psychological distress that has been validated for use in epidemiological studies.[17] The questionnaire covers twelve items, including feelings of happiness, enjoyment of day-to-day-activities, loss of sleep and reduced concentration. Respondents scoring 4 or more (out of a possible total of 12) are likely to be experiencing symptoms of a common mental health disorder, such as anxiety and/or depression.[18 19] To better understand the driving symptoms of any change in psychological distress we also considered each individual GHQ item in secondary analyses, investigating trends in the proportion of respondents who selected the two most adverse response categories for each question. We also conducted sensitivity analyses with the item on enjoyment of day-to-day activities removed (since this could be affected by lockdown restrictions without

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.21.20136820; this version posted June 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

necessarily indicating poor mental health), and with the cut-off point reduced to 3 or more symptoms, as a way of examining increases in less severe psychological distress and to enable comparison with other studies using this definition. Loneliness was assessed at wave 9 and the CA wave by asking participants: "in the last 4 weeks, how often did you feel lonely?" and respondents were able to answer hardly ever or never, some of the time, or often. In the statistical models this was converted to a binary variable distinguishing those who often felt lonely versus all other responses. Smoking was self-reported at all waves and defined as current smoker versus non-smoker and among current smokers, the number of cigarettes per day was calculated (<10, 10-19, 20+ cigarettes per day) for secondary analyses. Current e-cigarette use was defined on the basis of having used e-cigarettes at least once a week (waves 8, 9 and CA wave). Lastly, information about alcohol consumption was collected (waves 7, 9 and CA wave) using the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test for Consumption (AUDIT-C) instrument.[20] However, the most recent CA wave had some modifications including asking about drinking behaviour over the last four weeks, rather than the last year. We therefore looked at three key outcomes: binge drinking (6 or more drinks in a single sitting on weekly basis), frequency of alcohol consumption (four or more times per week) and heavy drinking (7 or more drinks on a typical day when drinking).

Covariates

We included age group at wave 9 as a covariate (18-24, 25-44, 45-64, 65+ years). Sex (male/female) was based on self-report. We investigated highest education level as a marker of socioeconomic position and coded into four categories: degree-level or equivalent qualifications, A-level/AS-level or equivalent, General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) or equivalent, and no qualifications. Ethnicity was categorised into five groups: white, Asian, black, mixed, and other, but recoded to white and non-white for the statistical models due to the small numbers within specific ethnic minority groups. We also included the interview year as a continuous variable to account for the trends in outcomes across years.

Statistical analysis

Prevalence estimates (with 95% confidence intervals) over time were calculated by using all complete sets of responses from waves 7 to 9 (excluding those who had a proxy interview) and the CA wave individually. Cross-sectional inverse probability weights provided with the data were used to adjust for attrition and to create estimates that were representative of the general population over time (though the weights supplied for the CA wave weight respondents to be similar to the representative sample at wave 9). This was supplemented with additional weighting for differences in outcome non-response by age, gender, ethnicity and education. We repeated these analyses

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.21.20136820; this version posted June 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

stratified by sex, broad age group (18-24, 25-44, 45-64, 65+ years), ethnicity and highest educational attainment.

Following this, we restricted our sample to individuals who had repeated measures for all relevant waves (n=9,748). We conducted multi-level Poisson regression using the Stata mepoisson command, with robust standard errors, to assess the association between the time period an observation was taken in (CA wave or prior), adjusting for age, sex, ethnicity, and interview year. Poisson regression was used to calculate relative risks.[21] Robust standard errors were used to improve the accuracy of estimated 95% confidence intervals and p values given the data are clustered. We carried out a complete case analysis, using longitudinal inverse probability weights constructed for these models to adjust for attrition and missing data (see Appendix 1 for further details). We tested for differential effects by fitting interaction terms for broad age group, sex, highest educational level and ethnicity. Statistical analysis was conducted using Stata/MP 15.1 and R version 3.6.0 for the figures.

Patient involvement

No patients were involved in setting the research question or the outcome measures, nor were they involved in developing plans for design or implementation of the study. No patients were asked to advise on interpretation or writing up of results.

Results

We included a total of 48,426 individuals in the repeated cross-sectional analysis from 2015 to 2020 (Table 1), after excluding participants with missing data (see Figure S1 for STROBE diagram). The sample at the COVID-19 (CA) wave was 53.4% female, 40.5% were degree level educated, 8.3% were from ethnic minority groups and the mean age of participants was 49.6 (95% CI: 49.0-50.1). After weighting, respondents included in the CA wave were comparable to those at wave 9, although they had slightly higher educational qualifications. The longitudinal sample included 9,748 individuals present in all 4 waves (Table S1 for details). Representative prevalence estimates for the key outcomes before and during the COVID-19 pandemic (CA) are shown in Table 2 and Figure 1 (Appendix 2 also contains prevalence estimates for each wave and outcome by subgroup).

Psychological distress

The prevalence of psychological distress has steadily increased over time from 17.6% (95% CI: 17.0-18.2) in 2015-17 (wave 7) to 19.4% (95% CI: 18.7-20.1) in 2017-19 (wave 9), but substantially increased to 30.3% (95% CI: 29.1-31.6) during the COVID-19 pandemic (Figure 1 and Table 2). All

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.21.20136820; this version posted June 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

symptoms of psychological distress worsened over this period (Figure 2). The symptom which had the largest deterioration was enjoyment of normal day-to-day activities. Substantially worsening symptoms were also observed for concentration, sleep, feelings of unhappiness and loss of purpose. In contrast, there was less of an apparent increase in specific depressive symptoms, such as feelings of worthlessness, an inability to overcome difficulties and lacking confidence. In sensitivity analyses using 3+ symptoms as the cut-off point, the prevalence of psychological distress increased from 23.7% (95% CI: 23.0-24.5) in wave 9 to 37.8% (95% CI: 36.5-39.2) in the CA wave. We also investigated whether the decline in enjoyment of day-to-day activities was driving the increase in psychological distress. Removing this item reduced the magnitude of the increase, but it remained substantial (Table 2).

The increase in psychological distress was most pronounced among people aged under 45 years, as well as among the most educated groups (Figure S2 and Appendix 2). Women were also more adversely affected than men; among women the prevalence of psychological distress increased from 23.0% (95% CI: 22.0-23.9) in 2017-19 to 36.7% (95% CI: 35.1-38.4) during the pandemic period. Asian minority ethnic groups also experienced a large increase in psychological distress; from 18.7% (95% CI: 16.4-21.2) to 36.1% (95% CI: 30.7-41.9) (Appendix 2).

Longitudinal regression models (Table 3) adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity and interview year demonstrated that the risk of psychological distress was elevated during the pandemic compared with the pre-pandemic period (RR: 1.28, 95% CI: 1.15,1.42), taking into account prior trends. In sensitivity analyses using the lower cut-off threshold for GHQ the RR was 1.38 (95% CI: 1.25,1.51). There was evidence of differential effects by age group, sex and education level when examining the statistical interaction with time period (Table S2).

Loneliness

Overall, the prevalence of loneliness remained relatively stable before and during the pandemic lockdown period (Figure 1). However, in the repeated cross-sectional analysis, there were differences by age group (Figure S3), with younger people experiencing higher overall levels of loneliness, as well as a large increase in loneliness (from 13.3% (95% CI: 11.6-15.3) to 21.0% (95% CI: 17.2-25.5)) during lockdown. Loneliness also slightly increased among women but fell among men. In the longitudinal analyses, differences by age were less apparent (although this analysis had less statistical power), but there was evidence for an interaction between sex and time period, with women experiencing a greater increase in loneliness than men (Table S3).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.21.20136820; this version posted June 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Alcohol consumption

Binge drinking increased from 10.8% (95% CI: 10.3-11.3) in wave 9 to 16.5% (95 % CI: 15.6-17.6) during the pandemic lockdown period (Figure 1), as did the proportion of people reporting drinking on four or more days during the week (13.7% (95% CI: 13.1-14.3) in wave 9 to 22.9% (95% CI: 21.7-24.1)). Differences by age group and sex were apparent. Binge drinking remained stable in the youngest age group but increased in those aged 25 and over and also increased more among women than men (Figure S4). Binge drinking and frequent drinking also increased more among the degree educated group (Figures S4 and S5).

The proportion of people reporting drinking seven or more drinks during a typical day when drinking decreased from 4.5% (95% CI: 4.1-4.9) during wave 9 to 1.7% (95% CI: 1.3-2.1) during the pandemic lockdown (Figure 1). This decrease was marked in the youngest age group, falling from 13.1% (95% CI: 11.3-15.1) in wave 9 to 2.9% (95% CI: 1.5-5.7) during lockdown (Figure S6).

Results from the longitudinal models supported the cross-sectional analyses, with the risk of binge drinking (RR 1.48, 95% CI: 1.27,1.74) and frequent drinking (RR 1.38, 95% CI: 1.26,1.51) increasing during the pandemic, while the risk of heavy drinking on a typical drinking day was reduced (RR 0.46, 95% CI: 0.32,0.66). There were also statistical interactions between time period and age group, as well as time period and sex for all alcohol outcomes and with education level for binge drinking (Tables S4-6).

Smoking and e-cigarette use

Current smoking has been declining over time and displayed a further decrease during the CA wave (Figure 1 and Table 2). The decrease in current smoking was more apparent in younger age groups and among the least educated (Figure S7) and seems driven by a decline in the lightest smokers (Table 2). Longitudinal models also demonstrated that the risk of smoking reduced during the pandemic (RR 0.89, 95% CI: 0.82,0.97), but there were no statistically significant interactions with age group, sex, ethnicity or education level (Table S7).

A small decrease in regular e-cigarette use was also observed in cross-sectional analyses (Figure 1). This was experienced by all age and education groups, as well as among both men and women (Figure S8). In the longitudinal analyses, risk of e-cigarette use was also lower during the pandemic (RR 0.66, 95% CI: 0.48,0.91), but no statistically significant interactions were found with the subgroups examined (Table S8).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.21.20136820; this version posted June 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Discussion

Psychological distress has substantially increased in the UK following the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. Women's mental health has been particularly affected, as were the most educated groups. The increase in psychological distress, measured after the first month of lockdown, appeared to be driven by a reduction in enjoyment of normal day-to-day activities, as well as increases in difficulties with concentration and sleep, and feelings of unhappiness. Overall, loneliness remained relatively stable. The prevalence of current smoking noticeably declined from 2017/19 to the lockdown period, and this reduction appears to largely reflect cessation among lighter smokers. Regular use of e-cigarettes also fell, but only slightly. The frequency of drinking on four or more days per week and weekly binge drinking increased. However, heavy drinking as defined by consumption of seven or more drinks on a typical day when drinking fell.

Our study has a number of strengths. We used a large nationally representative longitudinal dataset which used validated measures that have been asked relatively consistently over time. We analysed trends in health inequalities, assessing several equity characteristics, including education, age, sex and ethnicity. We also checked the extent of year-on-year variation in our outcomes of interest before the pandemic and found that secular trends tended to be small when compared to the changes observed following the onset of the pandemic. Our analyses provide meaningful estimates of population prevalence for informing public health policy, as well as regression modelling to more formally estimate the effect of the pandemic.

Some limitations should be noted. First, survey non-participation may have introduced bias in our estimates. However, the observed characteristics of non-respondents appeared to be reasonably similar to respondents and weights were used to reduce concerns about non-response and attrition. Second, there were changes in the modality by which the survey was administered for some participants (moving from face-to-face interviews to online surveys) which may have led to modest reporting changes, but empirical investigation has suggested this is unlikely to have biased responses.[22] Relatedly, there were minor wording changes to questions about alcohol consumption, so that questions related to the pandemic period rather than the entire previous year. This meant that a modified version of the AUDIT-C scale was used, which is not strictly comparable with previous years. Reporting of alcohol consumption is also known to be susceptible to recall bias.[23 24] The pandemic context may have also influenced participant reporting more broadly. For example, the increase in being less able to enjoy usual activities may not reflect low mood or anhedonia, but rather the reality of experiencing lockdown and what people perceive as a 'typical' drinking day is likely to have changed. However, even when excluding that specific GHQ item the increase in

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.21.20136820; this version posted June 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

psychological distress is substantial. Lastly, it is possible that there were other societal changes that impacted on our outcomes of interest during the time period between the two key waves of data collection. While it is possible that uncertainty about the impacts of Brexit could have contributed to some of the observed changes, the timing of the data collection during the COVID-19 lockdown suggests the lockdown is likely to have been the most substantial societal change during the time period.

While a body of literature is developing to articulate the expected indirect impacts of the pandemic[3 7 25], empirical research on how mental health and health-related behaviours have changed remains limited and largely based on non-representative samples. A longitudinal study of 212 undergraduate students in Switzerland compared mental health before and after the pandemic, finding depression increased.[26] Similarly, a repeated cross-sectional analysis comparing the results of two different representative surveys conducted before and after the pandemic in the USA also found a marked increase in psychological distress amongst adults, from 3.9% to 13.6%.[27] The study also investigated how prevalence changed across population subgroups, showing that younger people experienced the greatest relative increase in poor mental health, echoing our findings. While longitudinal evidence on changes in consumption of tobacco and alcohol are limited, some cross-sectional surveys have been conducted which ask about self-perceived changes in behaviour. A representative survey conducted on behalf of the charity Alcohol Change UK found that 21% of adults who normally drink alcohol self-reported increased consumption, but 35% reduced how often they drink or have stopped drinking altogether.[28] Similarly, an online non-representative survey with data collection following the pandemic only, also found self-reported change in tobacco and e-cigarette use, with both reducing by about one-quarter.[29] Our study builds on these emerging findings by providing stronger evidence that tobacco and alcohol consumption are changing during periods of social distancing, via harnessing a representative sample of participants followed up over time.

Our study has important implications for public health policy. The substantial increase in psychological distress highlights the tension between implementing lockdown measures to control the pandemic and the risk of health harms that such action could have. It is worth noting that the magnitude of this change is substantial. By comparison, poor mental health after the Great Recession (assessed using the same GHQ outcome used in this study) increased from 13.7% to 16.4%[30] – an effect size approximately one-quarter of that observed in this study. Finding that women have been disproportionately affected illustrates broader unequal power relations within society, with women more likely to experience the additional burden of childcare and more likely to work in sectors worst affected by the lockdown.[31] It is worth noting that this more recent decline in mental health among women occurs after a period of austerity, during which women's mental

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.21.20136820; this version posted June 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

health had already been showing adverse trends.[32-34] The reductions in smoking and e-cigarette use, despite the adverse societal circumstances, illustrates the likely importance of the availability of these products in influencing behaviour. There is an increasing evidence base which suggests that availability of unhealthy commodities drives consumption and contributes to health inequalities[35] – our study provides supportive evidence for this hypothesis. The trends in alcohol consumption merit further exploration. The frequency of alcohol consumption and binge drinking appear to have increased, but the proportion of people drinking 7+ drinks on a typical day when drinking decreased. This may reflect the change in what a typical drinking day is and the change in the frequency of alcohol consumption.

Our study highlights that a potential population mental health crisis may be developing, particularly for women and young adults. Further research is needed to understand the mechanisms by which these impacts may be arising and whether the large increase in psychological distress continues following the easing of the lockdown or is rekindled if lockdown measures are subsequently tightened. We also found psychological distress increased among the most educated groups, which may reflect that this group was more likely to move to remote working during the pandemic, and for some, this was combined with the requirement for home-schooling of children. Monitoring this group to see if they are better able to recover from the initial shock of the lockdown will be important to understand the implications for mental health inequalities. While the UK Government introduced aggressive fiscal policies to minimise adverse economic risks, it is likely that at least some of these impacts reflect the start of a potentially long-lasting economic crisis.[36] Understanding to what extent health is also being impacted by income and unemployment shocks will help inform decisions about ongoing support over the coming months and years.[37] However, improved medical treatment, including psychological support, may also be necessary. There has been concern that reduced use of healthcare services could lead to unmet need. This is likely to be the case for mental health care too, but data are lacking to understand how important a contribution under-treatment of both mental and physical health conditions is playing. Lastly, our research provides an early picture of the broader consequences of the pandemic – clearly, longer term monitoring will be necessary. Poor mental health is an important predictor of future mortality and several physical health conditions.[38 39] Given this, further monitoring of the determinants of health, as well as health outcomes, are required.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.21.20136820; this version posted June 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Data Sharing

Understanding Society data are available through the UK Data Service (SN 6614, SN 8644). Researchers who would like to use Understanding Society need to register with the UK Data Service before being allowed to download datasets.

Funding

MG, DDC, PC, ED, AHL, AP, EW and SVK acknowledge funding from the Medical Research Council (MC_UU_12017/13) and Scottish Government Chief Scientist Office (SPHSU13). In addition, CLN acknowledges funding from a Medical Research Council Fellowship (MR/R024774/1); AP acknowledges funding from the Wellcome Trust (205412/Z/16/Z); RT acknowledges funding from a Wellcome Trust Research Fellowship for Health Professionals (218105/Z/19/Z); and SVK acknowledges funding from a NRS Senior Clinical Fellowship (SCAF/15/02). MB acknowledges funding from the Economic and Social Research Council (ES/N00812X/1).

The funders had no role in the study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report.

Transparency declaration

The first and corresponding authors had full access to the study datasets. All authors had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication. The lead and corresponding authors affirm that this manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned (and, if relevant, registered) have been explained.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the participants of the Understanding Society study. The Understanding Society COVID-19 study is funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (ES/K005146/1) and the Health Foundation (2076161). Fieldwork for the survey is carried out by Ipsos MORI and Kantar. Understanding Society is an initiative funded by the Economic and Social Research Council and various Government Departments, with scientific leadership by the Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex.

Authors' contributions

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.21.20136820; this version posted June 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

SVK and CLN conceived the idea for the study. CLN, MG and SVK conducted the analysis. SVK, CLN and MG drafted the manuscript. All authors contributed to the study design, interpretation of the findings and critically revised the manuscript. All authors approved the final version of the paper.

Competing interests

All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf and declare: support from the Medical Research Council, Scottish Government Chief Scientist Office, Economic and Social Research Council and a NRS Senior Clinical Fellowship; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years; and no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.21.20136820; this version posted June 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

References

1. Hale T, Webster S, Petherick A, et al. Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker. Oxford: Blavatnik School of Government, 2020.
2. International Monetary Fund. Policy responses to COVID-19 Washington DC2020 [7/6/2020]. Available from: https://www.imf.org/en/Topics/imf-and-covid19/Policy-Responses-to-COVID-19 accessed 7/6/2020.
3. Douglas M, Katikireddi SV, Taulbut M, et al. Mitigating the wider health effects of covid-19 pandemic response. *BMJ* 2020;369:m1557. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m1557
4. Wright L, Steptoe A, Fancourt D. Are we all in this together? Longitudinal assessment of cumulative adversities by socioeconomic position in the first 3 weeks of lockdown in the UK. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2020:jech-2020-214475. doi: 10.1136/jech-2020-214475
5. Kuderer NM, Choueiri TK, Shah DP, et al. Clinical impact of COVID-19 on patients with cancer (CCC19): a cohort study. *The Lancet* doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31187-9
6. Brooks SK, Webster RK, Smith LE, et al. The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. *The Lancet* 2020;395(10227):912-20. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30460-8
7. Gunnell D, Appleby L, Arensman E, et al. Suicide risk and prevention during the COVID-19 pandemic. *The Lancet Psychiatry* 2020;7(6):468-71. doi: 10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30171-1
8. Patwardhan P. COVID-19: Risk of increase in smoking rates among England's 6 million smokers and relapse among England's 11 million ex-smokers. *BJGP Open* 2020:bjgpopen20X101067. doi: 10.3399/bjgpopen20X101067
9. Clay JM, Parker MO. Alcohol use and misuse during the COVID-19 pandemic: a potential public health crisis? *The Lancet Public Health* 2020;5(5):e259.
10. Dunn P, Allen L, Cameron G, et al. COVID-19 policy tracker: A timeline of national policy and health system responses to COVID-19 in England. London: Health Foundation, 2020.
11. Understanding Society: Waves 1-9, 2009-2018 and Harmonised BHPS: Waves 1-18, 1991-2009, User Guide. Colchester: University of Essex, 2020.
12. Institute for Social and Economic Research. Understanding Society: Waves 1-9, 2009-2018 and Harmonised BHPS: Waves 1-18, 1991-2009. [data collection]. In: NatCen Social Research, Kantar Public, eds. 12th Edition ed. University of Essex: UK Data Service, 2019. http://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-6614-13
13. Institute for Social and Economic Research. Understanding Society: COVID-19 Study, 2020. [data collection]. 1st Edition ed. UK Data Service: University of Essex, 2020. http://doi.org 10.5255/UKDA-SN-8644-1
14. Institute for Social and Economic Research. Understanding Society COVID-19 User Guide. Colchester: University of Essex, 2020.
15. Benzeval M, Burton J, Crossley TF, et al. The Idiosyncratic Impact of an Aggregate Shock: The Distributional Consequences of COVID-19. *Available at SSRN 3615691* 2020
16. Galobardes B, Shaw M, Lawlor DA, et al. Indicators of socioeconomic position (part 1). *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2006;60(1):7-12. doi: 10.1136/jech.2004.023531
17. GOLDBERG DP, GATER R, SARTORIUS N, et al. The validity of two versions of the GHQ in the WHO study of mental illness in general health care. *Psychol Med* 1997;27(01):191-97. doi: doi:null
18. Aalto A-M, Elovainio M, Kivimäki M, et al. The Beck Depression Inventory and General Health Questionnaire as measures of depression in the general population: A validation study using the Composite International Diagnostic Interview as the gold standard. *Psychiatry Res* 2012;197(1):163-71. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2011.09.008
19. Holi MM, Marttunen M, Aalberg V. Comparison of the GHQ-36, the GHQ-12 and the SCL-90 as psychiatric screening instruments in the Finnish population. *Nordic journal of psychiatry* 2003;57(3):233-38.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.21.20136820; this version posted June 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

20. Bradley KA, DeBenedetti AF, Volk RJ, et al. AUDIT-C as a Brief Screen for Alcohol Misuse in Primary Care. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research* 2007;31(7):1208-17. doi: 10.1111/j.1530-0277.2007.00403.x
21. Zou G. A modified poisson regression approach to prospective studies with binary data. *Am J Epidemiol* 2004;159(7):702-06.
22. Davillas A, Jones AM. The COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on inequality of opportunity in psychological distress in the UK. *Available at SSRN 3614940* 2020
23. Gorman E, Leyland AH, McCartney G, et al. Assessing the Representativeness of Population-Sampled Health Surveys Through Linkage to Administrative Data on Alcohol-Related Outcomes. *Am J Epidemiol* 2014;180(9):941-48. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwu207
24. Boniface S, Shelton N. How is alcohol consumption affected if we account for under-reporting? A hypothetical scenario. *Eur J Public Health* 2013;23(6):1076-81. doi: 10.1093/eurpub/ckt016
25. Holmes EA, O'Connor RC, Perry VH, et al. Multidisciplinary research priorities for the COVID-19 pandemic: a call for action for mental health science. *The Lancet Psychiatry* 2020;7(6):547-60. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30168-1
26. Zhang J, Lu H, Zeng H, et al. The differential psychological distress of populations affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. *Brain Behav Immun* 2020
27. McGinty EE, Presskreischer R, Han H, et al. Psychological Distress and Loneliness Reported by US Adults in 2018 and April 2020. *JAMA* 2020 doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.9740
28. Holmes S. https://alcoholchange.org.uk/blog/2020/covid19-drinking-during-lockdown-headline-findings London: Alcohol Change UK; 2020 [Available from: https://alcoholchange.org.uk/blog/2020/covid19-drinking-during-lockdown-headline-findings accessed 1/6/2020.
29. Klemperer EM, West JC, Peasley-Miklus C, et al. Change in tobacco and electronic cigarette use and motivation to quit in response to COVID-19. *Nicotine Tob Res* 2020:ntaa072. doi: 10.1093/ntr/ntaa072
30. Katikireddi SV, Niedzwiedz CL, Popham F. Trends in population mental health before and after the 2008 recession: a repeat cross-sectional analysis of the 1991–2010 Health Surveys of England. *BMJ Open* 2012;2(5):e001790. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2012-001790
31. Devine BF, Foley N. Women and the Economy. London: House of Commons Library, 2020.
32. Thomson RM, Niedzwiedz CL, Katikireddi SV. Trends in gender and socioeconomic inequalities in mental health following the Great Recession and subsequent austerity policies: a repeat cross-sectional analysis of the Health Surveys for England. *BMJ Open* 2018;8(8):e022924. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-022924
33. Thomson RM, Katikireddi SV. Mental health and the jilted generation: Using age-period-cohort analysis to assess differential trends in young people's mental health following the Great Recession and austerity in England. *Soc Sci Med* 2018;214:133-43. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2018.08.034
34. Barr B, Kinderman P, Whitehead M. Trends in mental health inequalities in England during a period of recession, austerity and welfare reform 2004 to 2013. *Soc Sci Med* 2015;147:324-31. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.11.009
35. Macdonald L, Olsen JR, Shortt NK, et al. Do 'environmental bads' such as alcohol, fast food, tobacco, and gambling outlets cluster and co-locate in more deprived areas in Glasgow City, Scotland? *Health & Place* 2018;51:224-31. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2018.04.008
36. OECD. OECD Economic Outlook Paris: OECD iLibrary; 2020 [Available from: https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/0d1d1e2e-en/index.html?itemId=/content/publication/0d1d1e2e-en accessed 12/6/2020.
37. McKee M, Stuckler D. If the world fails to protect the economy, COVID-19 will damage health not just now but also in the future. *Nat Med* 2020 doi: 10.1038/s41591-020-0863-y

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.21.20136820; this version posted June 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

38. Russ TC, Stamatakis E, Hamer M, et al. Association between psychological distress and mortality: individual participant pooled analysis of 10 prospective cohort studies. *BMJ* 2012;345:e4933. doi: 10.1136/bmj.e4933
39. Batty GD, Russ TC, Stamatakis E, et al. Psychological distress in relation to site specific cancer mortality: pooling of unpublished data from 16 prospective cohort studies. *BMJ* 2017;356:j108.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.21.20136820; this version posted June 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 1: Description of the repeated cross-sectional sample (weighted %)

	Wave 7 (2015-2017)		Wave 8 (2016-18)		Wave 9 (2017-19)		COVID-19 Wave (April 2020)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age group								
18-24	3009	11.1	2619	11.2	2292	11.6	655	10.5
25-44	8504	30.7	7584	30.3	6511	29.5	2727	29.1
45-64	9766	35.0	9202	35.1	8496	35.3	4661	37.5
65+	5862	23.2	5826	23.4	5524	23.6	2934	22.8
Sex								
Male	12106	48.0	11308	47.9	10216	47.8	4609	46.6
Female	15035	52.1	13923	52.1	12607	52.2	6368	53.4
Ethnic group								
White	22238	92.0	20905	92.1	19214	92.1	9814	91.7
Asian	2870	4.3	2587	4.3	2224	4.3	718	4.6
Black	1284	1.9	1083	1.9	844	1.9	216	1.9
Mixed	531	1.1	476	1.1	405	1.2	176	1.4
Other	218	0.6	180	0.6	136	0.6	53	0.5
Education level								
Degree	10504	36.8	9903	37.0	9131	37.4	5228	40.5
A Level	3231	11.4	2965	11.7	2699	12.0	1269	13.4
GCSE	7246	28.2	6733	28.3	6029	28.2	2737	28.9
None	6160	23.7	5630	23.0	4964	22.5	1743	17.2
Total	27141	100.0	25231	100.0	22823	100.0	10977	100.0

Table 2: Mental health and health behaviours before and during the COVID-19 lockdown (April 2020)

	Wave 7 (2015-2017)			Wave 8 (2016-18)			Wave 9 (2017-19)			COVID-19 Wave (April 2020)		
	Proportion	Lower 95% CI	Upper 95% CI	Proportion	Lower 95% CI	Upper 95% CI	Proportion	Lower 95% CI	Upper 95% CI	Proportion	Lower 95% CI	Upper 95% CI
Psychological distress (GHQ 4+)												
No	0.824	0.818	0.830	0.811	0.805	0.818	0.806	0.799	0.813	0.697	0.684	0.709
Yes	0.176	0.170	0.182	0.189	0.182	0.195	0.194	0.187	0.201	0.303	0.291	0.316
Psychological distress (GHQ 3+)												
No	0.780	0.774	0.787	0.770	0.763	0.777	0.763	0.755	0.770	0.622	0.608	0.635
Yes	0.220	0.213	0.226	0.230	0.223	0.237	0.237	0.230	0.245	0.378	0.365	0.392
Psychological distress (GHQ 4+ excluding activities item)												
No	0.836	0.830	0.842	0.826	0.819	0.832	0.818	0.811	0.825	0.735	0.723	0.747
Yes	0.164	0.158	0.170	0.174	0.168	0.181	0.182	0.175	0.189	0.265	0.253	0.277
Loneliness												
Never or hardly ever	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.624	0.615	0.632	0.614	0.601	0.627
Sometimes	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.290	0.283	0.298	0.299	0.287	0.311
Often	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.086	0.081	0.091	0.087	0.079	0.096
Binge drinking												
No	0.885	0.880	0.890	-	-	-	0.892	0.887	0.897	0.835	0.824	0.844
Yes	0.115	0.110	0.120	-	-	-	0.108	0.103	0.113	0.165	0.156	0.176
Number of drinks on typical drinking day												
0-6	0.954	0.951	0.958	-	-	-	0.955	0.951	0.959	0.983	0.979	0.987
7+	0.046	0.042	0.049	-	-	-	0.045	0.041	0.049	0.017	0.013	0.021
Alcohol frequency												
0-3 days per week	0.872	0.866	0.877	-	-	-	0.863	0.857	0.869	0.771	0.759	0.783
4+ days per week	0.128	0.123	0.134	-	-	-	0.137	0.131	0.143	0.229	0.217	0.241
Smoking												
Non-smoker	0.828	0.822	0.835	0.837	0.831	0.844	0.849	0.842	0.856	0.891	0.881	0.901

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.21.20136820; this version posted June 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Current Smoker	0.172	0.165	0.178	0.163	0.156	0.169	0.151	0.144	0.158	0.109	0.099	0.119
Number of cigarettes per day												
Non-Smoker	0.829	0.823	0.836	0.838	0.831	0.844	0.850	0.843	0.857	0.891	0.881	0.901
<10	0.054	0.051	0.058	0.051	0.047	0.054	0.049	0.045	0.053	0.028	0.024	0.033
10-19	0.075	0.071	0.080	0.073	0.068	0.078	0.066	0.061	0.071	0.053	0.047	0.061
20+	0.041	0.038	0.044	0.039	0.035	0.042	0.035	0.032	0.039	0.027	0.023	0.033
Weekly e-cigarette use												
No	-	-	-	0.957	0.953	0.960	0.951	0.947	0.955	0.957	0.951	0.963
Yes	-	-	-	0.043	0.040	0.047	0.049	0.045	0.053	0.043	0.037	0.049

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.21.20136820; this version posted June 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 3: Risk ratios (RR) for mental health and health behaviour outcomes

	Psychological distress (GHQ 4+)	Psychological distress (GHQ 3+)	Loneliness	Binge drinking	Drinking 4+ days per week	7+ drinks on typical drinking day	Current Smoking	Regular e-cigarettes
	RR [95% CI]	RR [95% CI]	RR [95% CI]	RR [95% CI]	RR [95% CI]	RR [95% CI]	RR [95% CI]	RR [95% CI]
Year	1.06*** [1.03,1.09]	1.05*** [1.02,1.07]	1.00 [0.83,1.20]	1.02 [0.98,1.06]	1.05*** [1.03,1.08]	0.99 [0.92,1.07]	0.99 [0.97,1.01]	1.11* [1.00,1.22]
Age group: 18-24	2.33*** [2.03,2.67]	2.08*** [1.85,2.34]	4.76*** [3.55,6.39]	1.59*** [1.25,2.01]	0.17*** [0.13,0.23]	36.88*** [21.83,62.30]	2.85*** [1.62,5.02]	2.04 [0.95,4.39]
25-44	2.01*** [1.83,2.22]	1.82*** [1.68,1.98]	2.73*** [2.15,3.46]	1.73*** [1.50,2.01]	0.48*** [0.43,0.54]	13.42*** [8.34,21.61]	6.56*** [4.42,9.75]	6.23*** [4.14,9.37]
45-64	1.71*** [1.55,1.88]	1.54*** [1.43,1.67]	2.02*** [1.61,2.54]	1.98*** [1.74,2.26]	0.87** [0.79,0.95]	4.64*** [2.88,7.48]	5.29*** [3.56,7.87]	3.94*** [2.70,5.74]
65+ (ref)								
Sex: Male (ref)								
Female	1.58*** [1.48,1.69]	1.51*** [1.43,1.60]	1.64*** [1.41,1.91]	0.53*** [0.49,0.59]	0.62*** [0.57,0.67]	0.45*** [0.35,0.57]	1.00 [0.82,1.22]	0.76* [0.58,0.99]
Ethnicity: White (ref)								
Non-white	1.14* [1.02,1.27]	1.08 [0.98,1.19]	1.12 [0.88,1.44]	0.27*** [0.20,0.36]	0.34*** [0.26,0.43]	0.23*** [0.12,0.44]	1.19 [0.88,1.61]	0.52* [0.32,0.86]
Period: Pre-COVID-19	1.00 [1.00,1.00]	1.00 [1.00,1.00]	1.00 [1.00,1.00]	1.00 [1.00,1.00]	1.00 [1.00,1.00]	1.00 [1.00,1.00]	1.00 [1.00,1.00]	1.00 [1.00,1.00]
During COVID-19	1.28*** [1.15,1.42]	1.38*** [1.25,1.51]	0.90 [0.55,1.47]	1.48*** [1.27,1.73]	1.38*** [1.26,1.51]	0.46*** [0.32,0.66]	0.89** [0.82,0.97]	0.66* [0.48,0.91]
Observations	38992	38992	19496	29244	29244	29244	38992	29244

95% confidence intervals in brackets
* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.21.20136820; this version posted June 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .


Period
Before COVID−19
During COVID−19
Proportion
0.0
0.1
0.2
0.3
Psychological distress GHQ (4+)
Loneliness (often)
Binge drinking (weekly or more)
Drinks on typical drinking day (7+)
Alcohol frequency (4+ times/week)
Smoking (current)
Number of cigarettes (20+/day)
E−cigarette use (weekly)


GHQ Problem concentrating
GHQ Loss of sleep
GHQ Not feeling useful
GHQ Less capable of making decisions
GHQ Constantly under strain
GHQ Problem overcoming difficulties
GHQ Less able to enjoy day−to−day activities
GHQ Less able to face problems
GHQ Unhappy or depressed
GHQ Losing confidence
GHQ Feeling worthless
GHQ Feeling less happy
Period
Before COVID−19
During COVID−19
0.0
0.1
0.2
0.3
0.4
Proportion