

1 WORKING DRAFT: NOT YET PEER REVIEWED

2

3 Problem drinking before and during the COVID-19 crisis in US and UK adults:

4 Evidence from two population-based longitudinal studies

5

6 Michael Daly\*<sup>1</sup> PhD & Eric Robinson<sup>2</sup> PhD

7 <sup>1</sup>Department of Psychology, Maynooth University, Co. Kildare, Ireland

8 <sup>2</sup> Institute of Population Health Sciences, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United

9 Kingdom

10

11 \* Corresponding author: Michael Daly

12 Address correspondence to:

13 Michael Daly Ph.D.

14 Department of Psychology

15 1.1.7 Education House

16 Maynooth University

17 Maynooth

18 Ireland

19 Tel: (01) 474 7742

20 Email: [Michael.A.Daly@mu.ie](mailto:Michael.A.Daly@mu.ie)

21

22 **Word count:** 4,185

23 **Declarations of interest:** The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

24 **NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

25 **Abstract**

26 ***Background***

27 The impact of the COVID-19 crisis on potentially harmful alcohol consumption is unclear.

28 ***Aims***

29 To test whether the prevalence of problem drinking has changed from before to during the  
30 COVID-19 crisis in the US and UK.

31 ***Design/Setting***

32 We examined nationally representative longitudinal data on how problem drinking has  
33 changed from pre-pandemic levels among adults in the US (N=7,327; Understanding  
34 America Study) and UK (N=12,594; UK Household Longitudinal Study).

35 ***Methods***

36 In the US, we examined rates of consuming alcohol  $\geq 4$  times in the past week at baseline  
37 (March, 2020) and across four waves of follow-up (April-May, 2020). In the UK we assessed  
38 the prevalence of consuming alcohol  $\geq 4$  times per week and weekly heavy episodic drinking  
39 using the AUDIT-C at baseline (2017-2019) and during the COVID-19 lockdown (April,  
40 2020). We also tested whether there were specific groups at greater risk of increased problem  
41 drinking during the pandemic.

42 ***Results***

43 Among US adults, there was a statistically significant increase in the percentage of  
44 participants reporting drinking alcohol  $\geq 4$  times a week which rose significantly from 11.7%  
45 to 17.9% (53% increase,  $p < .001$ ) as the COVID-19 crisis developed in the US. Among UK  
46 adults, the percentage of participants reporting drinking  $\geq 4$  times a week increased  
47 significantly from 14.2% to 23% (62% increase,  $p < .001$ ) and heavy episodic drinking at  
48 least weekly increased significantly from 9.7% to 16.6% (71% increase,  $p < .001$ ) when  
49 compared to pre-COVID-19 lockdown levels. Trends were similar across population

50 demographics, although those aged under 50 years and higher income groups displayed the  
51 largest increases.

## 52 *Conclusions*

53 The COVID-19 crisis has been associated with substantial increases in problematic drinking  
54 in both US and UK adults.

55

56 **Key words:** COVID-19; coronavirus infection; alcohol consumption; hazardous drinking;  
57 longitudinal research; nationally representative study.

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

## INTRODUCTION

76 The COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in governments introducing drastic measures to reduce  
77 viral transmission. Many governments have introduced ‘social lockdown’ orders, which have  
78 had severe effects on the economy and far reaching interpersonal consequences on working  
79 life, childcare, travel and social contact. Although social lockdown orders will have reduced  
80 the number of deaths caused by COVID-19, as of June 2020, in the UK alone there have been  
81 more than 30,000 deaths attributed to COVID-19 (1, 2). There is also emerging evidence on  
82 the indirect effects the COVID-19 pandemic has had on population health. For example,  
83 initial findings from both the UK and the US indicate that the COVID-19 pandemic is likely  
84 to have impacted mental health, with substantial increases in the prevalence of mental health  
85 problems and depression estimated from nationally representative studies (3, 4).

86 The extent to which alcohol use has changed as a result of COVID-19 crisis is  
87 unclear. There is already a considerable public health burden caused by problematic drinking  
88 (5) and alcohol misuse could increase risk of mortality from COVID-19 because of immune  
89 function related health effects (6). For these reasons, it is crucial to understand how patterns  
90 of problematic drinking have changed since the emergence of the COVID-19 crisis. In the US  
91 and UK, there have been mass closures of non-essential businesses, including pubs, bars and  
92 restaurants, which may have reduced the amount of alcohol that the population are drinking.  
93 However, this has also coincided with a sharp rise in alcohol sales in supermarkets (7). There  
94 are also concerns that COVID-19 social lockdown measures may result in a spike in alcohol  
95 misuse, particularly among groups that are already at risk for problematic drinking patterns  
96 (8, 9).

97 Prior research has shown that exposure to traumatic events such as Hurricane Katrina  
98 (10) and the 9/11 terrorist attacks (11) predicts alcohol misuse and drinking to alleviate  
99 distress and worry related to the event. Yet, research studies examining problematic drinking

100 during the COVID-19 crisis are limited. In two non-representative cross-sectional studies  
101 relying on retrospective recall of alcohol drinking prior to the COVID-19 pandemic,  
102 approximately one quarter of Australian adults and one third of Chinese adults reported that  
103 their alcohol consumption had increased as a result of COVID-19 lockdown (12, 13). In a  
104 repeated cross-sectional survey, there was an increase in the prevalence of high-risk drinking  
105 of approximately 50% among 1700 UK adults (14) when comparing drinking before and after  
106 COVID-19 social lockdown. Although these studies are suggestive of changes in problematic  
107 drinking, findings may be explained by the use of retrospective recall and/or differences  
108 between participants sampled before vs. during the COVID-19 crisis. Therefore, there is a  
109 need for research that allows for examination of longitudinal changes in person-by-person  
110 problematic drinking behavior before and after the development of the COVID-19 pandemic.

111 In the present research we examine changes in problematic drinking among US and  
112 UK adults before and during the development of the COVID-19 pandemic. We make use of  
113 two longitudinal studies with well characterized sampling frames and sampling weights that  
114 provide a correction for selection probabilities and attrition bias enabling population  
115 inferences to be generated. We examined problematic drinking patterns among US adults by  
116 making use of data collected as part of the Understanding America Study. In this study,  
117 drinking behavior was reported on early in the COVID-19 pandemic and before social  
118 lockdown restrictions had been widely introduced in the US (March, 2020) vs. during  
119 lockdown restrictions (April, 2020) and after the easing of restrictions (May, 2020). We also  
120 examined drinking patterns among UK adults by making use of data collected as part of the  
121 UK Household Longitudinal study in 2017-2019 and again in April, 2020 one month after the  
122 introduction of UK-wide lockdown restrictions. To understand whether trends in problematic  
123 drinking were socially patterned, we also examined changes in problem drinking based on  
124 demographic sub-groups (age, sex, ethnicity, marital status, and income).

125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149

## METHODS

### Participants

This study used data from two nationally representative longitudinal studies: the Understanding America Study (UAS) and the UK Household Longitudinal Study (UKHLS or *Understanding Society*). The UAS is a probability-based internet panel where those without initial internet access are provided with tablet computers to ensure representativeness. The study began in 2014 and participants were recruited via address-based sampling from the US Postal Service Computerized Delivery Sequence file covering almost 100% of US households (15). In March, 2020 8,547 participants from the UAS were invited to take part in a COVID-19 Tracking Study and 7,420 agreed.

In this study we use data from 7,327 participants who provided 30,966 observations over five waves of data collection conducted fortnightly from early March to the end of May. The first wave of the survey was fielded from March 10<sup>th</sup> to 31<sup>st</sup> with 85% of participants completing the survey by March 19<sup>th</sup> when California introduced the first stay-at-home order. Most US states followed suit enacting social lockdown measures in the two-week period that followed (16). A rapid increase in COVID-19 cases took place from March 19<sup>th</sup> to April 1<sup>st</sup> when the number of confirmed cases per day increased from approximately 5,000 to over 25,000 in the US (17).

Four subsequent survey waves have been conducted as part of the UAS COVID-19 Tracking Study over 14-day periods from April 1-14, April 15-28, April 29-May 12, and May 13-26. Each participant was assigned a day to complete their survey during each wave and 93.3% did so on their assigned day (18). In this study we include the remaining surveys that were not completed on the assigned day but were completed within two weeks of the assigned date. Sampling weights were applied in all analyses to adjust for non-response and generate nationally representative estimates. In the UAS survey-wave specific sampling

150 weights are generated using an adaptive sampling algorithm described elsewhere (19). The  
151 weights account for unequal probabilities of selection into the UAS and ensure each wave of  
152 the study is aligned with the distribution of sociodemographic characteristics of the US  
153 population.

154 The UKHLS is a longitudinal study that collects extensive information annually on  
155 the health and economic circumstances of UK households. The sample combines a general  
156 population sample, ethnic minority boost samples and participants from the British  
157 Household Panel Study (BHPS) all recruited via stratified equal probability sampling of  
158 addresses from across the UK selected from the Postcode Address File. Fieldwork for each  
159 wave of the UKHLS takes over two years and survey waves partly overlap. In the current  
160 study, we draw on data from the latest (Wave 9: N =32,596) sweep of the UKHLS that ran  
161 from January 2017 to May 2019 and had a response rate of 67.9%.

162 Data from this wave was merged with the UKHLS COVID-19 study that ran from 24-  
163 30<sup>th</sup> April one month after the introduction of a stay-at-home order in the UK on March 23<sup>rd</sup>.  
164 The survey was completed by 46% of Wave 9 participants (N = 14,985) (20). The number of  
165 completed COVID-19 interviews with survey weights available to provide nationally  
166 representative estimates was 13,704 and of this group 1,110 were missing data on one or  
167 more of the study outcomes or demographic variables giving a final sample size of 12,594. A  
168 small portion of income assessments were missing (N =227; 1.8%) and were replaced with a  
169 missing data dummy variable. Participant responses were reweighted using inverse  
170 probability weights developed using the rich demographic, health, and economic variables  
171 available in the representative Wave 9 wave of the UKHLS. This provided an adjustment for  
172 both unequal selection probabilities and non-random non-response to the COVID-19 survey  
173 among those who completed the Wave 9 survey (21).

174

175 **Measures**

176 **Problem drinking.** In each wave of the UAS COVID-19 Tracking study participants  
177 were asked “Out of the past 7 days, what is your best estimate of the number of days that you  
178 did each of the following activities?” and were asked to complete the number of days they  
179 “Consumed alcohol” alongside other health behaviors. To identify potentially problematic  
180 drinking and enable comparisons with the UKHLS we dichotomized responses to this  
181 question into those who drank more or less frequently than 4 times in the past week.

182 In the UKHLS participants completed the AUDIT-C (22) in 2017-2019 and again in  
183 April, 2020. In 2017-2019 participants were asked “Thinking about the past 12 months, how  
184 often do you have a drink containing alcohol?” and responded on a four-point scale  
185 (1=Never, 2=2-4 times per month, 3=2-3 times per week, 4=4+ times per week). In order to  
186 capture drinking levels during the pandemic lockdown in the COVID-19 study the reference  
187 period for this question was changed from “past 12 months” to “past 4 weeks” and response  
188 scales were as follows: 1=Never, 2=Once, 3=2-4 times in total, 4=2-3 times per week, 5=4-6  
189 times per week, and 6=Daily. In both waves, we characterized problematic drinking as  
190 consuming alcohol 4 or more times per week.

191 The AUDIT-C also includes a question on the frequency of heavy episodic alcohol  
192 use, defined for women/men as drinking 6/8 or more units on a single occasion: “How often  
193 have you had 6 or more units (if sex =female) / 8 or more units (if sex =male), on a single  
194 occasion in the last year?” Participants were instructed that “By a unit we mean ½ pint of  
195 beer, a glass of wine or a single measure of spirit or liquor.” In 2017-2019 the reference  
196 period was “the past year” and response options were: 1=Never, 2=Less than monthly,  
197 3=Monthly, 4=Weekly, 5=Daily or almost daily. Once again in April, 2020 the reference  
198 period referred to was adapted from “the past year” to “the past 4 weeks” and heavy episodic  
199 drinking was assessed with the response options: 1=Never, 2=Once, 3=Weekly, 4=Daily or



200 almost daily. In both 2017-2019 and April, 2020 those indicating that they drank heavily on a  
201 ‘Weekly’ or ‘Daily or almost daily’ basis were classified as engaging in problem drinking.

202 **Covariates.** In both the UAS and UKHLS participants reported their age, sex,  
203 ethnicity (grouped into white, non-white due to a low proportion of Black, Asian, and  
204 minority participants in the UKHLS), marital status (married, not married) and household  
205 income levels. Participants were grouped into four approximately even sized age groups (18-  
206 34, 35-49, 50-64, 65+) and three household income groups (UAS:  $\leq$ \$40,00, \$40,000–  
207 \$100,000  $\geq$ \$100,000 gross per annum; UKHLS:  $\leq$ £2,500, £2,500–£4,000,  $\geq$ £4,000 net  
208 income per month).

209

## 210 **Statistical analysis**

211 Our analyses of both datasets incorporated survey sampling weights to produce representative  
212 estimates. First, we outlined the descriptive trends in problem drinking levels across survey  
213 waves for all participants and population subgroups (i.e. age, sex, race/ethnicity, marital  
214 status, and income groupings). Next, both studies were examined separately using logistic  
215 regression analysis to test for the presence of differences in the prevalence of frequent  
216 drinking and heavy episodic drinking between the first survey wave which was treated as a  
217 baseline (UAS: March, 2020; UKHLS: 2017-2019) and subsequent survey waves which were  
218 treated as follow-up assessments (UAS: four waves across April and May, 2020; UKHLS:  
219 April, 2020 wave).

220 To do this, we first estimated the predicted probability of each problem drinking  
221 outcome at each survey wave in logistic regression models that adjusted for differences in  
222 participant age, sex, ethnicity (white, non-white), marital status (married, not married), and  
223 household income tertiles. The Stata ‘margins’ command was then used to estimate  
224 percentage-point changes in the binary outcomes of interest from the first survey wave /

225 baseline to subsequent follow-up waves while adjusting for the distribution of covariates  
226 (23). Standard errors were clustered by the individual participant identifier to account for  
227 repeated observations across waves in both studies.

228         Next, we sought to examine patterns of change in levels of problem drinking across  
229 population subgroups. Interactions between the survey wave variable and each demographic  
230 variable were introduced into the model and estimated simultaneously. The margins  
231 command was then used to estimate discrete change in levels of problem drinking from the  
232 first survey wave / baseline to subsequent follow-up assessments for each subgroup. Finally,  
233 we used the Stata `lincom` command to test for the presence of systematic differences in  
234 patterns of change in problem drinking across waves between population subgroups (e.g. to  
235 test if the magnitude of an increase in heavy episodic drinking from 2017-2019 to April, 2020  
236 in the UKHLS was larger in high income participants compared to low income participants).

237

238

## RESULTS

### 239 **Understanding America Study**

240 The sample for our analyses included 7,327 participants assessed over five waves (Ns from  
241 5,395–6,819). Participants were aged 48.5 (95% CI[48-49.1]) and 53.6% were female and  
242 66% white, as shown in Table 1. The characteristics of participants in each survey wave are  
243 outlined in Table S1 which shows that the weighted sample composition was very similar in  
244 each wave. The prevalence of drinking four or more times in the past week was 11.7% in the  
245 first survey wave conducted in March, 2020 and increased to 17.8% in early April and  
246 remained elevated at 16.5% by late May, 2020 (see Table 1). The increase in frequent  
247 drinking was largest in magnitude amongst those aged under 50 years, whites, those who  
248 were not married, and those living in households earning \$40,000 or more per year.

249

250 **Regression models**

251 In an adjusted model, the predicted probability of drinking four or more times in the past  
252 week increased from 11.7% (95% CI[10.7%-12.6%]) in March to 17.9% (95% CI[16.6%-  
253 19.2%]) in early April, 2020 a statistically significant increase of 6.2% (95% CI[5.0%-7.5%])  
254 ( $p < .001$ ), as shown in Table 2. We also examined problem drinking among participants who  
255 completed their baseline survey before lockdown measures were enacted (completed  
256 assessments on 10<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> March). We compared the prevalence of drinking  $\geq 4$  times per week  
257 in this group with the high frequency drinking levels of the same group of participants as  
258 averaged across assessment waves from April 15<sup>th</sup>-May 13<sup>th</sup>. As can be seen in Table S2 the  
259 prevalence of frequent drinking in this group (N=5,430) increased from 11.6% (95% CI[10.5-  
260 12.7]) to 17.5% (95% CI[16.2-18.6]) from March 10<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> to April/May, a statistically  
261 significant increase of 5.9% ( $p < .001$ ). Subgroup differences also aligned with those  
262 identified in our main analyses. This analysis indicated that the inclusion of participants  
263 whose baseline drinking was assessed after a small number of states had introduced  
264 lockdown measures was unlikely to affect the trends identified.

265 Statistically significant increases in the probability of frequent drinking from baseline  
266 to early April assessments were identified for all population subgroups examined. In line with  
267 descriptive trends, the statistically significant increases observed were largest among those  
268 aged under 50 (18-34: 7.6%, 35-49: 7.1%), whites (7.3%), those who were not married  
269 (7.8%) and those from households earning \$40,000 or more per year (middle income: 7.1%,  
270 high income: 10.5%), as shown in Table 2. The increase in frequent drinking from March  
271 levels persisted throughout April and May in all subgroups except for those aged 18-34 and  
272 from households earning less than \$40,000 per year which did not differ from baseline in late  
273 May (see Table 2).

274 Next, we tested whether the changes in levels of drinking four or more times per week  
275 from March to subsequent survey waves differed significantly between population subgroups.  
276 This analysis showed that those with high household incomes ( $\geq$ \$100,000) reported a 7.9%  
277 (95% CI[3.9%-11.9%],  $p < .001$ ) greater increase in frequent drinking from March to early  
278 April than those on low incomes, an increase that persisted across all subsequent survey  
279 waves, as shown in Table 3. Similarly, those on middle incomes showed a rise in frequent  
280 drinking in early April that was significantly larger (by 4.5%, 95% CI[1.7%-7.4%]) than the  
281 increase experienced by those on low incomes. Among participants aged 35-49 the  
282 prevalence of drinking four or more times per week increased by 3.9% more (95% CI[0.8%-  
283 7%]) from March to late April, 2020 compared to those aged 65+.

284

### 285 **UK Household Longitudinal Study**

286 Participants (N =12,594) were aged 51.3 (95% CI[50.9-51.7]), were 53.7% female, and  
287 93.2% white, and 54.4% were married, as shown in Table 4. The prevalence of drinking 4+  
288 times per week was 14.2% in 2017-2019 and rose to 23% in April, 2020. The prevalence of  
289 heavy drinking at least once a week rose from 9.7% in 2017-2019 to 16.6% in April, 2020.  
290 Changes in frequent drinking and heavy episodic drinking were largest in magnitude amongst  
291 those aged 35-49, females, whites, and those on middle or high incomes (see Table 4).

292

### 293 **Regression models**

294 In an adjusted model, the predicted probability of consuming alcohol four or more times per  
295 week increased from 14.2 (95% CI[13.5%-14.8%]) to 23 (95% CI[22.2%-23.8%]) between  
296 2017-2019 and April, 2020, a statistically significant increase of 8.8% (95% CI[8%-9.6%]),  
297 as outlined in Table 5. Similarly, the prevalence of heavy episodic drinking at least once a  
298 week rose significantly from 9.7% (95% CI[9.0%-10.0%]) to 16.6% (95% CI[15.8%-17.4%])

299 over this period, a significant change of 6.9% (95% CI[6.1%-7.7%]). The increases in both  
300 frequent drinking and heavy episodic drinking were statistically significant at the  $p < .001$   
301 level for all population subgroups examined (see Table 5) with the exception of non-whites  
302 who did not show an increase in drinking four or more times per week.

303 The largest increase in frequent drinking (4 times or more a week) was observed  
304 among those aged 35-49 years (11.7%, 95% CI[10.0%-13.4%]), followed by those aged 18-  
305 34 (10.0%, 95% CI[7.8%-12.2%]). Both groups showed increases that were significantly  
306 larger than the increase identified among those aged 65 years and above, as shown in Table 6.  
307 Large rises in frequent drinking were also identified among middle income (10.1%, 95%  
308 CI[8.7%-11.5%]) and high income (10.2%, 95% CI[8.7%-11.7%]) groups, and these  
309 increases were significantly larger than the increase observed in the low income group (see  
310 Table 6). The increase in frequent drinking among whites was also significantly larger than  
311 the change among non-whites (by 7.4%, 95% CI[4.9%-10.0%]), as shown in Table 6.

312 The most substantial rise in episodic heavy drinking at least once per week was also  
313 among those aged 35-49 years (11.1%, 95% CI[9.3%-12.8%]) and was 7.5% (95% CI[5.3%-  
314 9.6%]) greater than the increase among those aged 65 year and over, as shown in Table 6. All  
315 age groups experienced increases in episodic heavy drinking that were significantly larger  
316 than the increase in the 65+ years age group (see Table 6). Whites also showed a greater  
317 increase in episodic heavy drinking compared to non-whites (by 3.8%, 95% CI[1.8%-6.0%])  
318 and those on high incomes showed a larger increase in episodic heavy drinking than those on  
319 low incomes (by 3.3%, 95% CI[1.3%-5.4%]).

320

321

322

323

324 **DISCUSSION**

325 In the present research we examined changes in problematic drinking among US and UK  
326 adults following the development of the COVID-19 crisis. Among US adults, we first  
327 examined problem drinking in March 2020 (baseline) when the US death toll of COVID-19  
328 was relatively low (~5,000) and few states had enacted social lockdown restrictions. We  
329 examined the same group of participants across April, when almost all US states had  
330 introduced social lockdown restrictions. In this period the proportion of the sample reporting  
331 drinking 4 or more times per week increased from 12% to 18%. By May 2020, easing of  
332 social lockdown restrictions had occurred across states, but the proportion of the sample  
333 reporting drinking 4 or more times per week (17%) remained similar to March levels and was  
334 significantly higher compared to baseline. Among UK adults, the baseline assessment was  
335 2017-2019 and 14% of the sample reported drinking four or more drinks per week at this  
336 time. Four weeks into social lockdown restrictions in the UK, the prevalence was  
337 significantly higher (23%). The UK study we used also included a measure of weekly binge  
338 drinking and there was an increase in prevalence from 10% to 17%. Increases in problem  
339 drinking were consistently observed across population sub-groups among both UK and US  
340 participants. However, there was evidence that more pronounced increases in problem  
341 drinking were observed in some sub-groups. In both samples, participants from higher  
342 income households showed larger increases in problem drinking. In the UK sample (but not  
343 US), there was also evidence that increases were largest among white participants and those  
344 ages under 65, with those 35-49 years old group showing the most pronounced increase.

345 There are a number of plausible mechanisms that may explain population-wide  
346 increases in problem drinking. The COVID-19 crisis is thought to have had a considerable  
347 burden on population level mental health and this may have resulted in an increase in people  
348 using alcohol to cope with stress and negative affect (24, 25). In line with this, a cross-

349 sectional study of alcohol use in COVID-19 social lockdown found that using alcohol to cope  
350 was associated with increased drinking in lockdown (26). Likewise, previous research  
351 examining how economic crises affect alcohol consumption indicate that rises in  
352 psychological distress during times of crisis contribute to increased alcohol use (27).  
353 Furthermore, social lockdown measures have resulted in restrictions in travel, leisure time  
354 and physical social engagement, which for many may have resulted in increased boredom.  
355 Boredom is thought to have a range of effects on behavior and boredom proneness is linked  
356 to higher alcohol consumption (28, 29), which may in part explain why alcohol use has  
357 increased alongside the introduction of social lockdown measures.

358         Across both UK and US samples, higher income participants experienced the largest  
359 increases in problem drinking. Associations between socioeconomic status and alcohol use  
360 are complex, but higher income tends to be associated with more frequent binge drinking (30,  
361 31). Historical data also suggests that alcohol related harm during times of economic crisis is  
362 disproportionately large among the wealthy (32) and more educated (33). During the  
363 COVID-19 crisis, it may be the case that existing tendencies towards problem drinking and  
364 available material wealth make higher incomes groups more likely to respond to boredom  
365 and/or stress by drinking heavily. In a similar vein, increases in problem drinking being larger  
366 in white vs. other ethnic groups among UK participants may reflect that abstinence is more  
367 common in non-white ethnic groups (34) and such groups would be less likely to use alcohol  
368 to cope in times of stress. We also found that among UK (but not US) participants, those  
369 under the age of 65 showed the smallest increases in problem drinking. It is plausible that  
370 older adults may not be experiencing some of the stressors that younger age groups (e.g. job  
371 insecurity due to already being retired, childcare and homeschooling arrangements) will be  
372 having to cope with as a result of the COVID-19 crisis.

373           There are a number of strengths and limitations of the present research. We were able  
374 to examine longitudinal changes in problem drinking during the COVID-19 crisis on a  
375 person-by-person basis in large nationally representative samples of both UK and US  
376 participants. In US participants, the first wave of data collection occurred in March 2020, a  
377 period when US states had begun to introduce social lockdown orders and concerns about  
378 COVID-19 would have been growing in the US. We conducted sensitivity tests to show  
379 increases in frequent drinking were also observed when only participants who were assessed  
380 prior to the introduction of lockdown measures in March were examined. Nevertheless, it is  
381 plausible that problem drinking had already started to increase at this point, which would  
382 result in our analyses underestimating the size of increase in problem drinking associated  
383 with the COVID-19 crisis. Likewise, because social lockdown orders were staggered across  
384 US states, we cannot attribute overall changes in problem drinking solely to social lockdown  
385 orders alone. However, in our UK sample, baseline data was collected prior to the emergence  
386 of the COVID-19 crisis and then again after nationwide social lockdown orders.

387           A limitation of the UK data we used is that baseline data was collected across 2017-  
388 2019, whereas follow up data was collected in a single month, though there do not appear to  
389 be pronounced seasonality effects on alcohol use in the UK that would explain the sharp rise  
390 in problem drinking observed (35). There are also limitations to the measures of alcohol  
391 drinking used. Although self-report measures are valid indicators of alcohol consumption,  
392 they are prone to bias and error (36). There were also differences in the way that UK  
393 participants reported on alcohol consumption at baseline and follow-up. For example, at  
394 baseline participants reported using a 12-month time frame, whereas at follow-up the  
395 reporting time scale was limited to 4 weeks (to reflect the period of COVID-19 lockdown). It  
396 is plausible that reporting error (e.g. underestimation of alcohol consumption) could be larger  
397 using a 12-month time frame vs. a 4-week time frame and this may in part contribute to



398 differences in reported alcohol use at baseline vs. follow-up. However, we note that in the US  
399 sample the same reporting time frame was used and similar sized increases in problem  
400 drinking were observed. As is the case with any longitudinal study there was some level of  
401 attrition in both the UK and US samples. In the context of the COVID-19 crisis it is difficult  
402 to predict how this may affect estimates of problem drinking. It is conceivable that  
403 participants who have developed more substantial alcohol use problems may be more likely  
404 to be lost at follow-up and this would underestimate size of change in problem drinking.

405

#### 406 *Conclusions*

407 The COVID-19 crisis has been associated with substantial increases in problematic drinking  
408 in both US and UK adults.

409

410

411

#### 412 **Acknowledgements**

413 We are grateful to Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex, for their  
414 management of the UKHLS data and to the UK Data Archive for making them available. We  
415 are also grateful to the University of Southern California's Center for Economic and Social  
416 Research for their management of the UAS data and for making them available. The UKHLS  
417 / Understanding Society COVID-19 study is funded by the Economic and Social Research  
418 Council and the Health Foundation. However, these organisations bear no responsibility for  
419 the analysis or interpretation of the data.

420

421

422

423

## References

- 424 1. National Health Service (NHS). *COVID-19 daily deaths* 2020;  
425 <https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/statistical-work-areas/covid-19-daily-deaths/>.
- 426 2. National Records of Scotland (NRS). *Deaths involving coronavirus (COVID-19) in*  
427 *Scotland* 2020; <https://www.nrscotland.gov.uk/covid19stats>
- 428 3. Daly M., Sutin, A.R., Robinson E. Longitudinal changes in mental health and the  
429 COVID-19 pandemic: Evidence from the UK Household Longitudinal Study.  
430 *PsyArXiv* 2020; <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/qd5z7>.
- 431 4. McGinty E.E., Presskreischer R., Han H., Barry C.L. Psychological Distress and  
432 Loneliness Reported by US Adults in 2018 and April 2020. *JAMA* 2020. doi:10.1001/  
433 [jama.2020.9740](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.9740)
- 434 5. Rehm J., Mathers C., Popova S., Thavorncharoensap M., Teerawattananon Y., Patra  
435 J. Global burden of disease and injury and economic cost attributable to alcohol use  
436 and alcohol-use disorders. *Lancet* 2009; **373**: 2223-2233.
- 437 6. Enos G. Effects on lung, immune function offer warning for drinking in crisis.  
438 *Alcoholism Drug Abuse Weekly* 2020; **32**: 1-8.
- 439 7. Office of National Statistics (ONS). *Retail sales, Great Britain: March 2020* 2020;  
440 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/businessindustryandtrade/retailindustry/  
441 bulletins/retailsales/march2020#retail-sales-by-sector](https://www.ons.gov.uk/businessindustryandtrade/retailindustry/bulletins/retailsales/march2020#retail-sales-by-sector).
- 442 8. Clay J.M., Parker M.O. Alcohol use and misuse during the COVID-19 pandemic: a  
443 potential public health crisis? *Lancet Public Health* 2020; **5**: e259.
- 444 9. Finlay I., Gilmore I. Covid-19 and alcohol—a dangerous cocktail. *BMJ* 2020; **369**:  
445 m1987.

- 446 10. Flory K., Hankin B.L., Kloos B., Cheely C., Turecki G. Alcohol and cigarette use and  
447 misuse among Hurricane Katrina survivors: psychosocial risk and protective factors.  
448 *Subst Use Misuse* 2009; **44**: 1711-1724.
- 449 11. Stein B.D., Elliot M.N., Jaycox L.H., Collins R.L., Berry S.H., Klein D. J. A national  
450 longitudinal study of the psychological consequences of the September 11, 2001  
451 terrorist attacks: Reactions, impairment, and help-seeking. *Psychiatry* 2004; **67**: 105-  
452 117.
- 453 12. Stanton R., To Q.G., Khalesi S., Williams S.L., Alley S.J., Thwaite T.L. Depression,  
454 anxiety and stress during COVID-19: Associations with changes in physical activity,  
455 sleep, tobacco and alcohol use in Australian adults. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*  
456 2020; **17**: 4065.
- 457 13. Sun Y., Li Y., Bao Y., Meng, S., Sun, Y., Schumann, G. Brief Report: Increased  
458 Addictive Internet and Substance Use Behavior During the COVID-19 Pandemic in  
459 China. *Am J Addict* 2020; **29**: 268-270.
- 460 14. Jackson S.E., Garnett C., Shahab L., Oldham M., Brown, J. Association of the Covid-  
461 19 lockdown with smoking, drinking, and attempts to quit in England: an analysis of  
462 2019-2020 data. *medRxiv* 2020; [https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/  
463 2020.05.25.20112656v1.full.pdf](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.25.20112656v1.full.pdf)
- 464 15. Alattar L., Messel M., Rogofsky D. An introduction to the Understanding America  
465 Study Internet panel. *Soc Secur Bull* 2018; 78: 13-28.
- 466 16. Fullman N, Bang-Jensen B, Reinke G., Amano K., Adolph C., Wilkerson J. *State-  
467 level social distancing policies in response to COVID-19 in the US. Version 1.41*;  
468 2020; [www.covid19statepolicy.org](http://www.covid19statepolicy.org)

- 469 17. Schuchat F.A., CDC COVID-19 Response Team. Public health response to the  
470 initiation and spread of pandemic COVID-19 in the United States, *MMWR Morb*  
471 *Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020; **69**: 551–556.
- 472 18. Understanding America Study (UAS). *Methodology and Topline Results UAS 244 –*  
473 *Wave 5 May 13 – June 9, 2020* 2020; [https://uasdata.usc.edu/](https://uasdata.usc.edu/index.php?r=eNpLtDKyqi62MrFSKkhMT1WyLrYyNAeyS5NyMpP1UhJLEvUSU1Ly80ASQDWJKZkpIKaxlZKRpbGSdS1cMG0VEuM)  
474 [index.php?r=eNpLtDKyqi62MrFSKkhMT1WyLrYyNAeyS5NyMpP1UhJLEvUSU1](https://uasdata.usc.edu/index.php?r=eNpLtDKyqi62MrFSKkhMT1WyLrYyNAeyS5NyMpP1UhJLEvUSU1Ly80ASQDWJKZkpIKaxlZKRpbGSdS1cMG0VEuM)  
475 [Ly80ASQDWJKZkpIKaxlZKRpbGSdS1cMG0VEuM](https://uasdata.usc.edu/index.php?r=eNpLtDKyqi62MrFSKkhMT1WyLrYyNAeyS5NyMpP1UhJLEvUSU1Ly80ASQDWJKZkpIKaxlZKRpbGSdS1cMG0VEuM).
- 476 19. Angrisani M., Kapteyn A., Meijer E., Saw H.W. Sampling and weighting the  
477 Understanding America Study. *Working Paper No. 2019-004*; 2019;  
478 <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3502405>
- 479 20. Institute for Social and Economic Research (ISER). *Understanding Society COVID-*  
480 *19 User Guide. Version 1.0*; 2020; [http://doc.ukdataservice.ac.uk/](http://doc.ukdataservice.ac.uk/doc/8644/mrdoc/pdf/8644_ukhls_covid19_user_guide_v1.0.pdf)  
481 [doc/8644/mrdoc/pdf/8644\\_ukhls\\_covid19\\_user\\_guide\\_v1.0.pdf](http://doc.ukdataservice.ac.uk/doc/8644/mrdoc/pdf/8644_ukhls_covid19_user_guide_v1.0.pdf)
- 482 21. Benzeval M., Burton J., Crossley T.F., Fisher P., Jäckle A., Low H., et al. The  
483 idiosyncratic impact of an aggregate shock: the distributional consequences of  
484 COVID-19. *SSRN 3615691* 2020; <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3615691>; 2020.
- 485 22. Babor T.F., Higgins-Biddle J.C., Saunders J.B., Monteiro M.G. *Alcohol Use*  
486 *Identification Test*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization; 2001.
- 487 23. Long J.S., Freese J. *Regression models for categorical dependent variables using*  
488 *Stata*: College Station, TX. Stata Press; 2014.
- 489 24. Howell A.N., Leyro T.M., Hogan J., Buckner J.D., Zvolensky M.J. Anxiety  
490 sensitivity, distress tolerance, and discomfort intolerance in relation to coping and  
491 conformity motives for alcohol use and alcohol use problems among young adult  
492 drinkers. *Addictive Behaviors* 2010; **35**: 1144-1147.

- 493 25. Martens M.P., Neighbors C., Lewis M.A., Lee C.M., Oster-Aaland L., Larimer M.E.  
494 The roles of negative affect and coping motives in the relationship between alcohol  
495 use and alcohol-related problems among college students. *J Stud Alcohol Drugs* 2008;  
496 **69**: 412-419.
- 497 26. Wardell J, Kempe T, Rapinda KK, Single A., Bilevicius E., Frohlich J.R. Drinking to  
498 cope during the COVID-19 pandemic: The role of external and internal stress-related  
499 factors in coping motive pathways to alcohol use, solitary drinking, and alcohol  
500 problems. *PsyArXiv* 2020; doi:10.31234/osf.io/8vfp9.
- 501 27. De Goeij M.C., Suhrcke M., Toffolutti V., van de Mheen D., Schoenmakers T.M.,  
502 Kunst A.E. How economic crises affect alcohol consumption and alcohol-related  
503 health problems: a realist systematic review. *Soc Sci Med* 2015; **131**:131-146.
- 504 28. Biolcati R., Passini S., Mancini G. “I cannot stand the boredom.” Binge drinking  
505 expectancies in adolescence. *Addict Behav Rep* 2016; **3**: 70-76.
- 506 29. Carlson S.R., Johnson S.C., Jacobs P.C. Disinhibited characteristics and binge  
507 drinking among university student drinkers. *Addict Behav* 2010; **35**: 242-51.
- 508 30. Collins, S.E. Associations between socioeconomic factors and alcohol outcomes.  
509 *Alcohol Res* 2016; **38**: 83-94.
- 510 31. Office of National Statistics (ONS). *Adult drinking habits in Great Britain: 2005 to*  
511 *2016* 2017; [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/drugusealcoholandsmoking/bulletins/opinionsandlifestylesurveyadultdrinkinghabitsingreatbritain/2005to2016)  
512 [healthandsocialcare/drugusealcoholandsmoking/bulletins/opinionsandlifestylesurveya](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/drugusealcoholandsmoking/bulletins/opinionsandlifestylesurveyadultdrinkinghabitsingreatbritain/2005to2016)  
513 [dultdrinkinghabitsingreatbritain/2005to2016](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/drugusealcoholandsmoking/bulletins/opinionsandlifestylesurveyadultdrinkinghabitsingreatbritain/2005to2016)
- 514 32. Alonso I., Vallejo F., Regidor E., Belza, MJ, Sordo L, Otero-García L. et al. Changes  
515 in directly alcohol-attributable mortality during the great recession by employment  
516 status in Spain: a population cohort of 22 million people. *J Epidemiol Community*  
517 *Health* 2017; **71**: 736-744.

- 518 33. Mateo-Urdiales A., Anta G.B., Belza M.J., Guerras J.M., Regidor E. Changes in drug  
519 and alcohol-related mortality by educational status during the 2008-2011 economic  
520 crisis: Results from a Spanish longitudinal study. *Addict Behav* 2020; **104**: 106255.
- 521 34. Hurcombe R., Bayley M., Goodman A. *Ethnicity and alcohol: a review of the UK*  
522 *literature*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2010
- 523 35. de Vocht F., Brown J., Beard E., Angus C., Brennan A., Michie S. et al. Temporal  
524 patterns of alcohol consumption and attempts to reduce alcohol intake in England.  
525 *BMC Public Health* 2016; **16**: 917.
- 526 36. Greenfield T.K., Kerr W.C. Alcohol measurement methodology in epidemiology:  
527 recent advances and opportunities. *Addiction* 2008; **103**: 1082-1099.
- 528

**Table 1.**

Sample characteristics and the prevalence of drinking alcohol 4+ times in the past week before (March, 2020) and during the COVID-19 pandemic (April, 2020) in five waves of the Understanding America Study (UAS) (N = 7,327; Obs. = 30,966).

Sample characteristics <sup>a</sup>	Alcohol consumed 4+ times in last week					
	–	1	2	3	4	5
Wave	–	1	2	3	4	5
Wave start date	–	March 10 <sup>th</sup>	April 1 <sup>st</sup>	April 15 <sup>th</sup>	April 29 <sup>th</sup>	May 13 <sup>th</sup>
Sample size	N = 7,327	N = 6,819	N = 5,395	N = 6,203	N = 6,305	N = 6,244
Variable	%	%	%	%	%	%
Overall sample	–	11.7	17.8	17.5	17.2	16.5
Age group						
18 – 34	23.7	8.5	16.0	14.5	13.4	10.9
35 – 49	29.9	9.6	16.8	17.2	17.1	15.7
50 – 64	26.5	12.2	18.1	17.4	16.9	17.5
65+	20.0	17.8	21.3	21.4	22.4	22.4
Male	48.4	15.1	22.1	22.1	21.9	21.9

Female	51.6	8.4	13.8	13.2	12.8	11.4
White	66.0	14.0	21.1	20.5	19.9	19.5
Non-white	34.0	7.1	11.5	11.5	12.1	10.4
Married	55.8	12.4	18.4	18.6	18.0	17.6
Not married	44.2	10.7	17.1	16.1	16.2	15.0
Low income <sup>a</sup>	37.0	9.2	12.2	12.2	12.5	10.5
Middle income <sup>a</sup>	40.1	10.6	17.5	16.7	15.8	16.2
High income <sup>a</sup>	22.9	17.5	27.8	27.1	27.3	26.5

Note: Estimates are derived from weighted data.

<sup>a</sup> Households earning less than \$40,000 a year classified as low income, those earning \$40,000 - \$100,000 middle income, and those above this threshold as high-income households.



1 **Table 2.**

2 Regression estimates of percentage point changes in drinking 4+ times in the past week from March, 2020 to

3 April-May 2020 in the Understanding America Study (UAS) (N = 7,327; Obs. = 30,966).

Wave	2	3	4	5
Wave start date	April 1 <sup>st</sup>	April 15 <sup>th</sup>	April 29 <sup>th</sup>	May 13 <sup>th</sup>
	% Change (95% CI)	% Change (95% CI)	% Change (95% CI)	% Change (95% CI)
Overall sample	6.2*** (5.0, 7.5)	5.8*** (4.6, 6.9)	5.6*** (4.4, 6.7)	4.7*** (3.6, 5.9)
Age group <sup>a</sup>				
18 – 34	7.6*** (4.5, 10.8)	6.4*** (3.6, 9.2)	5.0*** (2.3, 7.8)	2.5 (-0.1, 5.1)
35 – 49	7.1*** (4.8, 9.3)	7.5*** (5.2, 9.7)	7.4*** (5.0, 9.8)	6.1*** (3.7, 8.5)
50 – 64	6.1*** (3.8, 8.4)	5.2*** (3.0, 7.3)	4.7*** (2.7, 6.7)	5.2*** (3.2, 7.2)
65+	3.8** (1.5, 6.2)	3.6** (1.5, 5.7)	4.8*** (2.6, 7.1)	4.6*** (2.5, 6.8)
Male	7.0*** (5.0, 8.9)	6.8*** (4.9, 8.6)	6.7*** (4.9, 8.5)	6.3*** (4.5, 8.0)
Female	5.5*** (3.8, 7.3)	4.8*** (3.3, 6.3)	4.5*** (2.9, 6.1)	3.1*** (1.6, 4.7)

White	7.3*** (5.8, 8.7)	6.5*** (5.2, 7.9)	5.8*** (4.5, 7.2)	5.2*** (3.9, 6.6)
Non-white	4.3** (1.7, 6.9)	4.4*** (2.1, 6.7)	5.1*** (2.8, 7.5)	3.6** (1.3, 6.0)
Married	5.3*** (3.7, 6.8)	5.4*** (3.9, 6.8)	4.8*** (3.5, 6.2)	4.0*** (2.6, 5.4)
Not married	7.8*** (5.6, 10)	6.5*** (4.4, 8.5)	6.7*** (4.6, 8.8)	6.1*** (4.1, 8.2)
Income level <sup>a</sup>				
Low income	2.6* (0.5, 4.8)	3.1** (1.1, 5.0)	3.2** (1.3, 5.1)	1.1 (-0.8, 3.1)
Middle income	7.1*** (5.3, 9.0)	6.1*** (4.4, 7.9)	5.3*** (3.5, 7.0)	5.6*** (3.8, 7.4)
High income	10.5*** (7.3, 13.7)	9.4*** (6.5, 12.2)	9.9*** (7.0, 12.8)	8.8*** (6.2, 11.5)

4 *Note:* Estimates are from marginal effects calculated after a logistic regression clustered by the individual participant  
5 identifier and controlling for all characteristics presented.

6 \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ . \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

13 **Table 3.**

14 Regression estimates of subgroup differences in percentage point changes in drinking 4+ times in the past week from  
 15 March, 2020 to April-May 2020 in the Understanding America Study (UAS) (N = 7,327; Obs. = 30,966).

Wave	2	3	4	5
Wave start date	April 1 <sup>st</sup>	April 15 <sup>th</sup>	April 29 <sup>th</sup>	May 13 <sup>th</sup>
	% Change (95% CI)	% Change (95% CI)	% Change (95% CI)	% Change (95% CI)
Age group (comparison group is 65+ years)				
18 – 34	3.8 (-0.2, 7.8)	2.8 (-0.7, 6.3)	0.2 (-3.3, 3.8)	-2.1 (-5.5, 1.2)
35 – 49	3.2 (0.0, 6.5)	3.9* (0.8, 7.0)	2.6 (-0.7, 5.9)	1.4 (-1.7, 4.6)
50 – 64	2.2 (-0.9, 5.4)	1.6 (-1.3, 4.5)	-0.1 (-3, 2.8)	0.6 (-2.3, 3.5)
Male vs. female	1.4 (-1.2, 4.1)	1.9 (-0.5, 4.4)	2.2 (-0.2, 4.6)	3.1* (0.7, 5.5)
White vs. non-white	3.0 (0.0, 5.9)	2.2 (-0.5, 4.9)	0.7 (-2.0, 3.5)	1.6 (-1.1, 4.3)
Married vs. not married	-2.5 (-5.3, 0.3)	-1.1 (-3.7, 1.6)	-1.9 (-4.5, 0.7)	-2.2 (-4.8, 4.4)
Income level <sup>a</sup>				
Middle vs. low	4.5** (1.7, 7.4)	3.1* (0.3, 5.8)	2.1 (-0.5, 4.7)	4.5** (1.8, 7.2)

High vs. low	7.9***(3.9, 11.9)	6.3** (2.7, 10)	6.7***(3.1, 10.3)	7.7***(4.3, 11.1)
--------------	-------------------	-----------------	-------------------	-------------------

16 *Note:* Estimates are from marginal effects calculated after a logistic regression clustered by the individual participant identifier  
17 and controlling for all characteristics presented. Coefficients indicate the difference in the percentage point increase in  
18 drinking problems across survey ways between the groups examined.  
19 \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ . \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

20 **Table 4.**

21 Sample characteristics and the prevalence of problem drinking in the 2017-2019 and April,  
 22 2020 Waves of the UK Household Longitudinal Study (UKHLS; N = 12,594).

Variable	Sample characteristics	Alcohol consumed		Heavy episodic drinking at least weekly	
		4+ times per week		drinking at least weekly	
		2017-2019	April, 2020	2017-2019	April, 2020
	%	%	%	%	%
Overall sample	–	14.2	23.0	9.7	16.6
Age group <sup>a</sup>					
18 – 34	20.4	4.0	13.2	8.9	16.2
35 – 49	23.9	10.3	22.2	10.2	21.2
50 – 64	30.2	17.0	25.9	12.0	18.5
65+	25.6	22.5	28.2	7.1	10.5
Male	46.3	18.7	27.2	13.1	19.2
Female	53.7	10.2	19.3	6.7	14.4
White	93.2	14.9	24.1	10.2	17.3
Non-white	6.8	4.9	7.5	3.0	6.9
Married	54.4	17.6	27.2	9.3	16.3
Not married	45.6	10.1	18.0	10.2	17.0
Income level <sup>b</sup>					
Low income	33.5	12.8	18.3	10.1	14.7
Middle income	31.4	12.9	23.4	8.6	16.2
High income	32.6	17.2	27.8	10.5	19.0

23 Note: Estimates are derived from weighted data.

24 <sup>a</sup> Age groups are based on age reported in April, 2020.

25 <sup>b</sup> Households earning less than £2,500 a month (net) are classified as low income, those earning  
 26 £2,500–£4,000 middle income, and those above this threshold as high-income households.

27 **Table 5.**

28 Regression estimates of percentage point changes in problem drinking levels in the UKHLS  
 29 from 2017-2019 to April, 2020 by population subgroups (N = 12,594; Obs. = 25,188).

	Alcohol consumed		Heavy episodic	
	4+ times per week		drinking at least weekly	
	% Change	95% CI	% Change	95% CI
Overall sample	8.8***	(8.0, 9.6)	6.9***	(6.1, 7.8)
Age group <sup>a</sup>				
18 – 34	10.0***	(7.8, 12.2)	7.1***	(4.8, 9.4)
35 – 49	11.7***	(10.0, 13.4)	11.1***	(9.3, 12.8)
50 – 64	8.5***	(7.1, 9.8)	6.4***	(5.0, 7.8)
65+	5.6***	(4.1, 7.2)	3.6***	(2.3, 4.9)
Male	8.4***	(7.1, 9.7)	6.1***	(4.7, 7.4)
Female	9.2***	(8.2, 10.2)	7.7***	(6.7, 8.6)
White	9.4***	(8.5, 10.2)	7.3***	(6.4, 8.1)
Non-white	2.0	(-0.4, 4.3)	3.4***	(1.5, 5.3)
Married	7.8***	(6.4, 9.2)	6.9***	(5.6, 8.3)
Not married	9.7***	(8.5, 10.6)	6.9***	(5.9, 8.0)
Income level <sup>a</sup>				
Low income	6.2***	(4.8, 7.5)	5.0***	(3.5, 6.4)
Middle income	10.1***	(8.7, 11.5)	7.4***	(6.0, 8.8)
High income	10.2***	(8.7, 11.7)	8.3***	(6.9, 9.7)

30 *Note:* Estimates are from marginal effects calculated after a multivariate logistic regression

31 clustered by the individual participant identifier and controlling for all characteristics presented.

32 \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ . \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

33 **Table 6.**

34 Regression estimates of percentage point changes in problem drinking levels from 2017-2019  
 35 to April, 2020 comparing differences between population subgroups (N = 12,594; Obs. =  
 36 25,188).

Variable	Alcohol consumed 4+ times per week	Heavy episodic drinking at least weekly
	% Change (95% CI)	% Change (95% CI)
Age group (comparison is 65+)		
18 – 34	4.4** (1.6, 7.1)	3.5** (0.9, 6.1)
35 – 49	6.1*** (3.8, 8.4)	7.5*** (5.3, 9.6)
50 – 64	2.9** (0.8, 4.9)	2.8** (0.9, 4.6)
Male vs. female	-0.8 (-2.4, 0.9)	-1.6 (-3.0, 0.0)
White vs. non-white	7.4*** (4.9, 10.0)	3.8*** (1.8, 6.0)
Married vs. not married	1.7 (-0.1, 3.6)	0.0 (-1.8, 1.8)
Income level <sup>b</sup> (comparison is low)		
Middle vs. low	3.9*** (1.9, 5.9)	2.4* (0.4, 4.5)
High vs. low	4.1*** (2.0, 6.1)	3.3** (1.3, 5.4)

37 *Note:* Estimates are from marginal effects calculated after a multivariate logistic regression  
 38 clustered by the individual participant identifier and controlling for all characteristics  
 39 presented. Coefficients indicate the difference in the percentage point increase in drinking  
 40 problems across survey ways between the groups examined.

41 \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ . \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

42

43