medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on mental health in the general population – a comparison between Germany and the UK

Franziska Knolle[1,2], Lisa Ronan[2], Graham K. Murray[2,3]

[1] Department of Neuroradiology, Klinikum rechts der Isar, TUM, München, Germany

[2] Department of Psychiatry, University of Cambridge, Cambridge UK

[3] Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust, Cambridge, United Kingdom

Acknowledgement

We thank the participants of the study who contributed their time and further circulated the survey.

Funding

FK received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 [Grant number 754462].

Conflict of Interest

All authors declare no competing financial interests.

Contributions

FK: administration of the project, conceptualisation, methodology, formal analysis and writing (original draft, review and editing), administration of the project. LR: formal analysis, editing of manuscript. GKM: methodology, and writing (review and editing).

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

In March 2020 the SARS-CoV-2infection (COVID-19) was declared a pandemic. In response to its world-wide outbreak radical measures were taken by governments across the world including curfew, quarantine, travel bans, social distancing, work place and school closures, etc, to reduce the transmission of the virus. These measures led to dramatic social and economic changes for the general population, in addition to the fears and worries related to the disease and its contraction. First studies report the impact of the pandemic on mental well-being of the general population showing increased levels of anxiety, stress and depression. In this study, we compare the impact of the pandemic on two European countries – the UK and Germany, which reported their first cases within a week. 241 residents of the UK and 541 residents of Germany filled in an online survey, including questions on COVID-19 exposure, impact on financial situation and work, substance and media consumption, self-reported mental and physical health, as well as including two clinical questionnaires, the general mental health Symptom Check List-27 (SCL-27) and the Schizotypal Personality Questionnaire. Data collection was completed between 27/04/20-31/05/20. We found distinct differences between the two countries. UK responders reported a stronger direct impact on their health, financial situation and their families. UK responders had higher clinical scores on the SCL-27, with a higher percentage being above cut-off. Interestingly, however, we found that German responders were less hopeful for an end of the pandemic and more concerned about their life-stability. Generally, we found that a younger age, being female, lower education, poorer mental and physical health before the pandemic, as well as more social media and substance consumption was associated with a higher clinical risk. As 25% of all responders report a subjective worsening of the general psychological symptoms and 20-50% of responders reaching the clinical cut-off for depressive, dysthymic and anxieties, future pandemics require a tailored intervention system to assist not only people vulnerable for mental health problems, but also large proportions of the general public.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

The world health organisation (WHO) declared the outbreak of the coronavirus disease 2019 SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) a pandemic on March 11, 2020. By that time, more than 118000 people had been confirmed to have conducted COVID-19 world-wide across 114 countries (WHO-Media-Briefing). China, where the virus was first discovered, had introduced a nationwide lockdown and curfew on January 23, 2020. With the rapid spread to Europe and other parts of the world, more countries introduced similar measures, including lockdown with school and work-place closures, self-isolation and social distancing, border closures, restrictions of travel, to reduce the transmission of the virus.

On March 18, 2020 the WHO published a statement presenting mental health and psychosocial considerations for the general public, acknowledging the potential impact of this public health emergency on mental health of the general population (WHO, 2020). As the COVID-19 outbreak compared to other recent pandemics or medical emergencies is larger in scale, its consequences are unpreceded and therefore more difficult to predict. It has however led to immediate and serious concerns on mental health of the whole society (Pfefferbaum and North, 2020) with calls for urgent and direct actions (Holmes et al., 2020). From former epidemics, as recently reviewed by Brooks and colleagues (Brooks et al., 2020), such as the 2003 epidemic of the severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) or the 2014 outbreak of Ebola, we know that quarantine, isolation and social distancing is related to anxiety, depression, stress, low mood, irritability, sleep disorders, etc. In the current pandemic, however, we have seen lock-down of entire countries for much longer periods of time. Increase of job insecurity and economic hardship (Evans-Lacko et al., 2013; Uutela, 2010), as well as domestic violence (Mazza et al., 2020; Usher et al., 2020), substance abuse (Volkow, 2020) and media consumption (Gao et al., 2020; Garfin et al., 2020) have been discussed as risk factors for worsening the impact on mental health. First studies provide findings on the impact of these stressors and dramatic changes in everyday life on the mental health of the general population (e.g. (Plomecka et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020, 2003)) reporting increased levels of stress, anxiety, depressive symptoms, sleep disorders as well as an increase in suicidal ideation, etc.

In response to the outbreak and spread of the pandemic, different countries even within Europe followed different strategies. Germany went into lockdown rapidly and managed to control the increase of infections effectively, whereas the UK due to a delayed lockdown faced a much higher plateau (see Figure 1)(Balmford et al., 2020) which also led to an increase in numbers of deaths that were at the end of April 2020 20% higher than predicted, whereas Germany was nearly 3% lower than expected. Balmford and colleagues (2020) used epidemiological models to estimate the “price of life” that various nation were willing to pay in order to protect their populations. They estimated

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

at the end of April that the German government was prepared to pay a factor of 10 more per life than the UK. It is to be expected that these different strategies and governmental responses have an impact on the nation's mental well-being. We were therefore interesting in comparing the mental health impact of the pandemic on the general population of the UK and Germany, using an online survey investigating the impact on life circumstances and assessing mental health with two different psychological questionnaires (Symptom Check List, SCL-27; Schizotypal Personality Questionnaire, SPQ). We hypothesised that responders of both nations, UK and Germany, would report an increase in psychological symptoms, but that the increase would be stronger in UK responders. We supplemented the general mental health questionnaire SCL-27 with the SPQ, as we reasoned that a potential increase in anxiety and distress could be accompanied by an increase in psychotic-like experiences (Murray and Jones, 2012) that could be captured in the SPQ.



Figure 1. National progression of COVID-19 cases, deaths and recoveries comparing Germany and the UK from Jan. 22,2020 – Jul. 11,2020. Recovery rate UK: after April 12., 2020 recovered cases are not reported for the UK. *Germany followed a state-wise lockdown, with the first state going in lock-down on Mar.13,2020 and the last state on the Mar. 16, 2020. UK announced nationwide lockdown on Mar.23, 2020. Data taken from 2019-nCoV Data Repository by JHU CSSE.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Methods

Study design and procedure

The questionnaire assessing mental and physical health and COVID-19 exposure was designed as an online survey using EvaSys (https://www.evasys.de, Electric Paper Evaluationssysteme GmbH, Luneburg, Germany), a software suitable for the generation of surveys with a highly secure data protection. The questionnaire was available in German and English. Initial advertisement for the study was made via social (facebook, twitter, newsletters, WhatsApp) and print media (Sueddeutsche Zeitung) following the snowball sampling strategy to reach the general public. Data collection took place from 27/04/2020 -31/05/2020. The completion of the survey took approximately 35 min. Participation was fully voluntary. Participants did not receive any compensation.

Ethical approval was obtained from the Ethical Commission Board of the Technical University Munich (250/20 S). All respondents included in the analyses provided informed consent.

Outcome

The survey consisted of three main parts. The first part, partially comprised of the Coronavirus Health Impact Survey (CRISIS, http://www.crisissurvey.org/), which assessed (a) demographics, (b) COVID-19 exposure (infection status, symptoms, contact), (c) mental and physical health questions. In the second part, we assessed the general mental health status using the Symptom Check List (SCL) with 27 items (Hardt et al., 2011; Hardt and Gerbershagen, 2001). Here, we assessed (d) depressive, dysthymic, vegetative, agoraphobic and socio-phobic symptoms, as well as symptoms of mistrust. For all SCL-symptom measures we recorded (e) a subjective rating of change during the pandemic compared to before the pandemic. Using the SCL-27, we furthermore measured (f) a global severity of symptom index (GSI-27). In the third part, we evaluated schizotypic symptoms using the Schizotypy Personality Questionnaire (SPQ, (Raine, 1991)) assessing (g) the subscales anomalous experiences and beliefs (AEB), social Anhedonia (SAnh), paranoid ideation (PI), social anxiety (SAnx), eccentricity (Ecc), and disorganised speech (DS) (Davies, 2017), as well as the total score (SPQ-total). As for the SCL-27, also for the SPQ we evaluated (h) a subjective measure for change during compared to before the pandemic.

Statistical analysis

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Statistical analysis and visualisations were computed using R (RStudio Team (2020). RStudio: Integrated Development for R. RStudio, PBC, Boston, MA URL http://www.rstudio.com/.). We present a description of the whole sample, but concentrate in our statistical analysis on the comparison of Germany and the United Kingdom (UK) with regard to the outcome measure. We first describe demographics and COVID-19 exposure variables, using frequency analysis. For the country comparison we used a chi-square test to explore differences between the groups on the demographics and the COVID-19 exposure variables.

To further explore the differences between the UK and Germany, we generated a logistically normalised Poisson regression model with the between-subject factor country (UK, Germany) and time (before and during the pandemic) and the Crisis-mental and physical wellbeing questions as with-in subject factor. We organised the mental and physical health questions in five groups – sleep, mental health, exercise/outdoor activities, media consumption, and substance and alcohol consumption. The overall effects of each predictor within the model are analysed using an ANOVA Chi-square test.

To identify possible predictors for worse or better functioning, we furthermore applied multivariate Poisson regression models to assess the associations between the outcome and the predictor variables. Our outcome variables were continuous scores measured using the SCL-27 and the SPQ. We investigated total score (SPQ-total, GSI-27) as well as subscales for the SPQ and the SCL-27.

In order to generate the overview figure showing the progression of the COVID-19 cases, deaths and recoveries, we pulled the data from the 2019 Novel CoronaVirus CoViD-19 (2019-nCoV) Data Repository by Johns Hopkins University Center for Systems Science and Engineering (JHU CSSE) (https://github.com/CSSEGISandData/COVID-19) on Jul. 11, 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Results

Whole Sample Description

The survey was complete by 860 participants, two of which did not consent to the participation. They were excluded for further analysis. Furthermore, 6 participants did not consent to sharing the data publicly, and will be removed from the open access data set, but are included in the analysis of this study.

The majority of respondents were female (71.6%), 25.4% were male, 0.5% diverse and 2.5% did not provide the information. The age ranged from 18 to 92 years, with a mean 43.27 (SD 15.4) years and a median of 41 years. The majority of participants were well educated 60.1% had a master degree or higher, and 23.4% had completed a professional college or a bachelor degree. 47.3% reported to live in large cities, 12% in suburbs of large cities, 19.2% in small cities, 15.3% in towns or villages, and 5.7% in rural areas (0.5% NA). People from 21 countries of residence completed the questionnaire, with 27.9% living in the UK, 63.1% living Germany and 3.2% living in the USA, the remaining 5.8% were living in other countries Europe, in Latin American countries, Asian countries, Australia and Canada. Details are described in Table 1.



Figure 2. Distribution of age by gender for the UK and Germany separately.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Demographics of Germany and the UK

In this paper we focus on the comparison of respondents resident in the UK (N=239) and in Germany (N=541). All descriptive and statistical results are described in Table 1. The UK sample was younger (UK: 39.01yrs, GER: 45.36yrs; Figure 2). Both samples had more female responders (UK:73.6%, GER: 71.2%). The UK sample had fewer children at home than the German sample. The two samples differed in education (Supplementary Figure 1), with UK respondents having more bachelor degrees. The difference in education and children might possibly due to the age difference of the two samples as we found using Kruskal-Wallis Test that age significantly predicted both (children: Kruskal-Wallis chi-squared = 7.4601, df = 1, p-value = 0.006308; education: Kruskal-Wallis chi-squared = 100.04, df = 7, p-value < 2.2e-16).

COVID-19 Exposure, Impact and Personal Judgement

To explore differences between the countries we used chi-square tests. All results are presented in Table 1.

In our study, we found infection rates of 2.5% in the British sample and about 1 % in the German sample (Suppl. Fig. 2). Of those who had symptoms with and without a diagnosed infection, most participants suffered from *fatigue* (UK:28.5%; GER:27.7%) and *cough* (UK:21.3%; GER:15.5%)(Suppl. Fig. 3). 9.8% of the German responders compared the 3.3% of the UK responders had contact to people with a positive test, whereas 5.4% of UK responders compared to only 0.6% of German responders had contact to people with a positive diagnosis, without a test (Suppl. Fig. 4). All findings are presented in Table 1, COVID19 exposure.

The impact on the personal work situation was similar between the two countries. 50.6% of the UK and 46.8% respondents had been moved to work in home office. 2.9% of the UK responders and 3.6% of the German responders had lost their job; and 13.0% compared to 17.4% reported no impact on their work situation (Suppl. Fig. 5). The impact on the families of the responders was different between the two countries; only 49.9% of the UK responders reported no impact, compared to 71.9% of the German responders. 10.5% of the UK compared to 4.4% of the German responders reported infections in the family; 3.8% compared to 0.4% reported cases death, 26.4% to 12.6% reported cases reduced working hours, and 10.9% to 4.4% reported cases of family members losing jobs. UK responders reported a stronger financial impact, compared to German responders. For 46% of the UK responders compared the 58.8% of the German responders reported no impact,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

whereas 35.1% of the UK and 25.6% of the German responders reported a slight or moderate impact and 18.8% and 15% a big or extreme impact. All findings are presented in Table 1, Impact on work and financial situation.

In general the restrictions were rated similarly stressful between the two countries. 11.3% of the UK and 14.8% of the German responders considered them as not stressful at all; whereas 54.8% of the UK and 54.4% of the German responders found them slightly or moderately stressful; and 33.5% and 30.9% very or extremely stressful. UK responders were less concerned about their overall life stability with 46.4% compared to 30.5% of the German responders being not all concerned; 36.4% compared to 54.1% being slightly or moderately concerned; and 15.9% compared to 24% being very or extremely concerned. UK responders were also more hopeful that the pandemic in their region would soon be under control, with 32.7% compared to 17.1% of the German responders being very or extremely hopeful; 52.8% compared to 65% being slightly or moderately hopeful; and 14.2% compared to 17.9% being not at all hopeful. All findings are presented in Table 1, Personal judgement of the situation.

UK responders rated their mental health status differently compared to the German responders. 36% of the UK responders compared to 52.3% of the German responders reported very good or excellent mental health; 51.4% compared to 42.9% reported good or fair mental health; and 11.3% compared to 3.3.% reported poor mental health. Also more UK responders received regular treatment for their mental illnesses before the pandemic (17.6% compared to 10.1%). The treatment was continued similarly during the pandemic across the two countries. 3.6% of the UK responders compared to 1% of the German responders received more treatment, 13.6% compared to 11.5% less and 82.8% compared to 87.8% the same as before the pandemic. Physical health was judged similarly across the two countries. 45.2% of the UK responders and 44.6% of the German responders reported excellent of very good physical health. 49% of the UK and 51.2% of the German responders reported good or fair physical health; 3.8% compared to 3.3% reported poor physical health. Regular treatment for physical illnesses was similar between the two countries (UK:18.4%; Germany: 20.2%) and the treatment continued in a similar fashion, with 1.8% of UK responders compared to 0% of German reporting more, 14.3% compared to 14.4% reporting less, and 83.9% compared to 85.6% reporting about the same amount of treatment during the pandemic. All findings are presented in Table 1, Mental and physical health status.

Self-report on sleep, mental health, exercise/outdoor activities, media consumption, and substance/alcohol consumption before and during the pandemic

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

To explore the association between the outcome variables and the predictors (time point, i.e. before or during the pandemic, and country of residence, i.e. Germany and UK) we used a logistic regression model for a Poisson distribution and logistically normalised, all results are presented in Table 2.

For *exercise and time spent outside* there was an effect of the variable's levels (amount of exercise per week; amount of time spent outside per week) ($p<0.001$), effect of country of residence ($p=0.014$), variable's levels by country ($p<0.001$); and variable's levels by time point ($p=0.040$). Exercise and time spent outside varied by country of residence and is effect by the pandemic, but the countries do not change differently in response to the pandemic.

Regarding the variable *sleep*, sleeping patterns differ in weeks compared to weekends ($p<0.001$), but there were no significant effects of country or time point ($p > 0.05$).

Analysing *media consumption*, distinct types of media (levels: social media, print media, video games) were consumed differently ($p<0.001$), and there was an effect of time point ($p<0.001$), showing that overall media was consumed differently before and during the pandemic. Additionally we found the responders of the two countries used media differently($p<0.001$), though this difference was not affected by the time point.

For the *consumption of substances* including alcohol, different substances (levels: alcohol, tobacco, vaping, marihuana) were differently consumed ($p<0.001$) and that this consumption differed between the two countries ($p<0.001$). However, we did not find an effect of time point.

Regarding self-reported *mental well-being*, we found a difference between the individual levels of mental well-being (levels: happy-sad, concerned, anxious, lonely, agitated, tired/fatigued, negative thoughts, etc.) ($p<0.001$). There was an overall effect of time point ($p<0.001$) and these levels were differently affected by the time point ($p<0.001$). Responders from the two countries responded differently to the different levels of mental well-being ($p<0.001$). But we did not find that this difference was affected by the time point.

Effects of the pandemic on psychological symptoms using the Symptom Check List – 27-Point (SCL-27)

General Symptom Index

A Wilcox-test for non-parametric data, showed that the distribution of the GSI was different between the two countries ($W=84062$, p-value = 1.515e-11, 95%-confidence interval: 0.148-0.296; sample estimate for location difference: 0.222). See Figure 3.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 3. Histogram of distribution of the global severity index based on 27 items (GSI-27) for psychological symptoms, separately shown for countries.

Clinical cut-off for SLC sub-dimensions and subjective change

In the general population (Hardt et al., 2004), 10-15% of the screened population reach the clinical cut-off on the different sub-dimensions, and require additional investigation. As shown in Figure 4, for the sub-dimension of dysthymic symptoms (DYS) 68.5% of the UK responders and 37.6% of the German responders lay above the clinical cut-off; for depressive symptoms it was 48.7% for the UK and 33.5% for the German responders; for symptoms of social phobia 37.1% for the UK and 24.9% for German responders; for symptoms of mistrust 28.9% for the UK and 26.6% for the German sample; for agoraphobic symptoms 43.5% UK and 19.3% for the German responders; and for the vegetative symptoms 19.8% for the UK and 9.6% for the German responders.

We furthermore recorded a subjective rating of change by asking responders on each question of the SCL-27, whether or not this feeling has stay the same, has increased or decreased during the pandemic. In the UK sample 27.0% of the responders reported an increase of symptoms, 3.6% a decrease and 64.1% reported that symptoms stayed the same; whereas in the German sample 22.8% reported more symptoms, 2.5% less and 71.7% the same amount of symptoms (Figure 5).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 4. Percentage of responders above clinical cut-off separately for UK and Germany. Dotted lines represent the percentage of the norm population above threshold. DYS: dysthymic symptoms, DEP: depressive symptoms, SOP: symptoms of social phobia, MIS: symptoms of mistrust, AGO: agoraphobic symptoms, VEG: vegetative symptoms.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 5. Boxplot shows the subjective change of global symptom index during the pandemic measured with the SCL, separately for Germany and the UK.

Effects of the pandemic on the schizotypal personality traits using the Schizotypal Personality Questionnaire (SPQ)

Total SPQ and subject change during the pandemic

Using a Wilcox-test for non-parametric data, we found that the distribution of the total SPQ-score was not different between the two countries (W=68110, p-value = 0.23). See Figure 6.

Also for the SPQ, we recorded a subjective rating of change by asking responders on each question, whether or not this feeling/situation has stay the same, has increased or decreased, or has occurred the first time during the pandemic. In the UK sample, 14.7% of the responders reported symptoms as before, 4.8% reported an increase, 1.2% a decrease and 4.4% an occurrence for the first time; similarly, in the German sample, 14.2% reported that symptoms stayed the same, 4.1% reported an increase, 1% a decrease and 3.5% an occurrence for the first time. See Figure 7.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



311

312 Figure 6. Histogram of distribution of the total schizotypal personality score (SPQ_total), separately

313 shown for countries.

314



315

316 Figure 7. Boxplot shows the subjective change of schizotypy symptoms during the pandemic

317 measured with the SPQ-scale, separately for Germany and the UK.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Association between demographic variables, variables of substance use, media use, sleep, and clinical scores

In order to investigate predictive factors among demographic variables, variables describing exercise, sleep, etc, contributing to clinical scores we conducted two sets of logarithmically normalised multivariate Poisson regression analysis – one set using the GSI and the SCL-subdimensions as outcome variables, and the second set using total SPQ score and the subdimensions as outcome variables. All associations are described in Table 3A and Table4A. In summary for the GSI, we found that responders from Germany have a significantly lower GSI score; female responders are more strongly affected, as well as people with higher consumption rates of marihuana; people who use more social media. Interestingly, people who sleep more (>8h) during week nights have lower GSI scores as well as people who spend more time outside. The predictors and risk factors shift slightly depending on the different subdimensions, but the overall picture is similar.

Interestingly, for the total SPQ score, there was no association with country or gender, instead we saw a protective association with being older, as well as with having a better education. Apart from alcohol consumption, which has a protective association, increased use of tobacco, vaping and marihuana was associated with a higher SPQ scores, and so was the use of social media and video games. The increased use of print media however was associated with lower SPQ scores. Similarly to the associations with GSI, more sleep during the week and the weekend and more time spent outside had a protective association with the total SPQ.

Association between COVID-19 impact measures, judgement as well as health, and clinical scores

Again we conducted two sets of logarithmically normalised multivariate Poisson regression analyses – one set using the GSI and the SCL-subdimensions as outcome variables, and the second set using total SPQ score and the subdimensions as outcome variables. All associations are described in Table 3B and Table4B respectively. People who were more concerned about their life stability showed a higher GSI. Unsurprising, but with a very strong effect, people who report poor mental health prior to the pandemic were more strongly affected; interestingly the same is true for people who reported low physical health. A protective association is seen for people whose quality of social relationships had not been affected much by the pandemic. Again a similar picture with some variations becomes apparent for the subdimensions. See Table3B.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

For the total SPQ score, in this analysis, as opposed to the previous statistical model, female gender was associated with a higher risk. Whereas increased hopefulness for the pandemic to end in the near future was protective, the concern about life stability was a risk factor. People who have been more strongly financially impacted showed higher SPQ-total scores. As also seen for the GSI, people who reported poor mental health prior to the pandemic were more strongly affected; the same is true for people who reported low physical health. Interestingly, whereas working in a home office or being on unpaid leave has a protective effect on the SPQ-total, people who did not see any change in their workplace were also associated with higher total SPQ scores. See Table 4B.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Discussion

This study investigated the difference between the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the UK and Germany. The impact was assessed using an online survey including questions on the impact on life circumstances, as well as two psychological questionnaires, the Symptom Check List (SCL-27) and the Schizotypal Personality Questionnaire (SPQ). The data was collected over five weeks from April 27, 2020 to Mai 31, 2020. We found that UK responders reported more infections and symptoms, a stronger financial hardship, and a stronger impact on health and the financial situation of family members. We found that responders of both countries reported an increase in psychological symptoms, especially depressive symptoms and anxieties. The global severity index (GSI) of the SCL was higher in UK responders compared to German responders. An alarming finding was that the percentage of people above clinical cut-off on the SCL-27 compared to a norm population had more than doubled for depressive, dysthymic and agoraphobic symptoms as well as for social phobias, and this increase was stronger in UK responders compared to German responders. We did not find differences in the SPQ or its subscales between the two countries. However, and similar to the SCL-27, even on this highly specified questionnaire, responders reported an increase of symptoms in about 9% with half of those reporting symptoms for the first time. Interestingly, despite the differences between the two countries UK responders were still more hopeful for a sooner end of the pandemic in their region, were less concerned about overall life stability and reported more positive changes due to the pandemic (e.g., time with the family, no commute, time for one-self).

In simple associative prediction models, we furthermore identified risk factors for the psychological impact of the pandemic. Being UK resident, female, younger, having a lower education, a worse pre-pandemic mental or physical health, as well as being more concerned about life stability, spending less time outside and reporting a stronger negative impact of the pandemic on the qualities of social contacts predicted higher scores of the GSI, as well as depressive, dysthymic symptoms as well as symptoms of anxiety. Higher scores on the SPQ total-score and its subdimensions were predicted by younger age, lower education, more substance (tobacco, vaping, marihuana) and media (social and video games), less sleep, less time spent outside, worse quality of social contacts, and a worse pre-pandemic mental and physical health.

To the best of our knowledge this is the first study showing a direct comparison of the psychological impact of the pandemic between two countries. There is one large scale study (N=13,332) reporting a world-wide assessment of the psychological impact of COVID-19 (Plomecka et al., 2020). This study identified prevalence and risk factors globally, but does not draw direct comparisons between different WHO-regions. Interestingly, however, Plomecka and colleagues (2020) report similar

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

overall risk factors as we report in out study, such as being female, younger, less optimistic, and having worse social relationships and pre-pandemic.

Other studies investigate the psychological impact of the pandemic with a national focus. Two longitudinal studies conducted in UK populations (Kwong et al., 2020; Pierce et al., 2020) show a general deterioration of mental health in April compared to before the pandemic. Both studies identify similar risk factors such as being female, younger of age and having pre-pandemic mental health conditions. The same is true for research conducted on German populations. A study by Bäuerle and colleagues (Bäuerle et al., 2020) reports an increase in anxiety, depression and psychological distress with females and younger adults reported a stronger impact. The same is being reported in a description of preliminary results in a second German cohort study (Jung et al., 2020).

Our study does not contain true pre-pandemic data. However, we assessed subjective measures of change questions on life circumstance and mental health question including the psychological questionnaires, asking participants to either report on that particular question three month ago or report whether the situation had changed compared to before the pandemic and whether symptoms had increased, decrease or stayed the same. In the UK population, we found a tripling of the percentage of people lying above cut-off compared to a norm population for depressive, dysthymic and agoraphobic symptoms, and a doubling on symptoms of social phobia and symptoms of mistrust. Similarly, Kwong and colleagues (2020) report a doubling of symptoms of anxiety in a UK sample. In the cohort of German responders in our study, we found a doubling for depressive and dysthymic symptoms, as well as for symptoms of social phobia and symptoms of mistrust. The increase in our study compared to Kwong et al (2020) might be due to the fact that the SCL-27 aims at a high sensitivity, but a low specificity on the individual symptoms. However, the higher rates compared to population norms is alarming, which is even higher in UK compared to German responders. Around 25% of the German and UK responders reported a subjective increase in symptoms on the SCL-27.

Overall, our results match those of countries in a global comparison (Plomecka et al., 2020) as well as to compared to individual countries such as China (Qian et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020), Japan (Ueda et al., 2020), India (Kene, 2020; Kochhar et al., 2020), Italy (Rossi et al., 2020) or Spain (González-Sanguino et al., 2020; Ozamiz-Etxebarria et al., 2020). The comparison of the two countries is difficult, as we did not assess any pre-baseline characteristics of the two countries, and both countries vary on a large number of factors not accounted for in this study. However, the governments of both countries followed different strategies in responding to the pandemic, whereas

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

the German government implemented a prompt lock-down (Balmford et al., 2020), the British government first discussed herd-immunity (Sibony, 2020), causing a significant delay to implement the lock-down, which according to different predictive models has significantly increased the number of death in the UK (Balmford et al., 2020). It is likely that the burden of higher death rates and hospitalisations has increased the impact on mental well-being described in this study.

Interestingly, we find this dichotomy between a stronger financial and health impact of the pandemic on UK residents compared to German residents, and still a more optimistic judgment of the overall situation of the UK compared to the German residents. Further research would be needed to further investigate how pre-existing cultural attitudes contribute to these differences. We speculate there could be cultural differences in how likely people are to complain about their personal situation in a questionnaire, also there could be some linguistic difference in how these questions are understood by participants of the two countries. Another line of future enquiry could examine the role of such attitudes as the stereotypes of the British 'Keep calm and carry on' way of life (Storry and Childs, 2016) compared to the German stereotype of criticism and pessimism (Cliffe, 2018).

Although the WHO provided general guidelines for countries to respond to the pandemic, different countries implemented measures at different time points according to regional differences in cases, but also following different strategies due to the novelty of the situation. Comparing Germany and the United Kingdom (UK), the first cases in both countries were reported only four days apart, in Germany on January 27, 2020 and in the UK on January 31, 2020. Germany, however, started to introduce a state-wise lockdown on March 13, with all states to be in lockdown on March 16, whereas, the UK went into lockdown on March 23. Both countries showed an exponential rise in cases. At the time when we started the data collection the rise in cases in Germany was slowing down, whereas the cases in the UK were still increasing quickly, which may have influenced the results. The convenience sample nature of the participants is a limitation as it could also contribute to the observed results. Although our study does include participants with pre-existing mental illness (overall: 14.22%; UK:20.29%; Germany: 11.59%), it was not designed to specifically address mental health impact of the pandemic on those with severe and enduring mental illness, as this would require a more targeted study design.

In conclusion, we find increased levels of depressive, dysthymic, vegetative symptoms, symptoms of anxiety and mistrust in both countries. Furthermore we find that 20-50% reach the clinical cut-off for further psychological interventions compared to 10-15% in the norm population. UK responders

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

report a stronger health and financial impact, as well as a stronger impact on their families. Both countries require a tailored response to this mental health emergency.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

Balmford, B., Annan, J.D., Hargreaves, J.C., Altoè, M., Bateman, I.J., 2020. Cross-Country Comparisons of Covid-19: Policy, Politics and the Price of Life. Environ. Resour. Econ. 1–27.

Bäuerle, A., Teufel, M., Musche, V., Weismüller, B., Kohler, H., Hetkamp, M., Dörrie, N., Schweda, A., Skoda, E.-M., 2020. Increased generalized anxiety, depression and distress during the COVID-19 pandemic: a cross-sectional study in Germany. J. Public Health (Bangkok).

Brooks, S.K., Webster, R.K., Smith, L.E., Woodland, L., Wessely, S., Greenberg, N., Rubin, G.J., 2020. The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. Lancet.

Cliffe, J., 2018. Cheer up, Deutschland [WWW Document]. Economist. URL https://www.economist.com/europe/2018/08/02/cheer-up-deutschland (accessed 8.27.20).

Davies, D.J., 2017. Psychotic experiences beyond psychotic disorders: from measurement to computational mechanisms. University of Cambridge.

Evans-Lacko, S., Knapp, M., McCrone, P., Thornicroft, G., Mojtabai, R., 2013. The mental health consequences of the recession: economic hardship and employment of people with mental health problems in 27 European countries. PLoS One 8, e69792.

Gao, J., Zheng, P., Jia, Y., Chen, H., Mao, Y., Chen, S., Wang, Y., Fu, H., Dai, J., 2020. Mental health problems and social media exposure during COVID-19 outbreak. PLoS One 15, e0231924.

Garfin, D.R., Silver, R.C., Holman, E.A., 2020. The novel coronavirus (COVID-2019) outbreak: Amplification of public health consequences by media exposure. Heal. Psychol.

González-Sanguino, C., Ausín, B., ÁngelCastellanos, M., Saiz, J., López-Gómez, A., Ugidos, C., Muñoz, M., 2020. Mental health consequences during the initial stage of the 2020 Coronavirus pandemic (COVID-19) in Spain. Brain. Behav. Immun.

Hardt, J., Dragan, M., Kappis, B., 2011. A short screening instrument for mental health problems: The Symptom Checklist-27 (SCL-27) in Poland and Germany. Int. J. Psychiatry Clin. Pract. 15, 42–49.

Hardt, J., Egle, U.T., Kappis, B., Hessel, A., Brähler, E., 2004. Die Symptom-Checkliste SCL-27. PPmP-Psychotherapie· Psychosom. Medizinische Psychol. 54, 214–223.

Hardt, J., Gerbershagen, H.U., 2001. Cross-validation of the SCL-27: A short psychometric screening instrument for chronic pain patients. Eur. J. Pain 5, 187–197.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Holmes, E.A., O'Connor, R.C., Perry, V.H., Tracey, I., Wessely, S., Arseneault, L., Ballard, C., Christensen, H., Silver, R.C., Everall, I., 2020. Multidisciplinary research priorities for the COVID-19 pandemic: a call for action for mental health science. The Lancet Psychiatry.

Jung, S., Kneer, J., Krueger, T., 2020. The German COVID-19 Survey on Mental Health: Primary Results. medRxiv.

Kene, P., 2020. Mental health implications of the COVID-19 pandemic in India. Psychol. Trauma Theory, Res. Pract. Policy 12, 585.

Kochhar, A.S., Bhasin, R., Kochhar, G.K., Dadlani, H., Mehta, V.V., Kaur, R., Bhasin, C.K., 2020. Lockdown of 1.3 billion people in India during Covid-19 pandemic: A survey of its impact on mental health. Asian J. Psychiatr.

Kwong, A.S.F., Pearson, R.M., Adams, M.J., Northstone, K., Tilling, K., Smith, D., Fawns-Ritchie, C., Bould, H., Warne, N., Zammit, S., 2020. Mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic in two longitudinal UK population cohorts. medRxiv.

Mazza, M., Marano, G., Lai, C., Janiri, L., Sani, G., 2020. Danger in danger: Interpersonal violence during COVID-19 quarantine. Psychiatry Res. 113046.

Murray, G.K., Jones, P.B., 2012. Psychotic symptoms in young people without psychotic illness: Mechanisms and meaning. Br. J. Psychiatry. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.111.107789

Ozamiz-Etxebarria, N., Dosil-Santamaria, M., Picaza-Gorrochategui, M., Idoiaga-Mondragon, N., 2020. Stress, anxiety, and depression levels in the initial stage of the COVID-19 outbreak in a population sample in the northern Spain. Cad. Saude Publica 36, e00054020.

Pfefferbaum, B., North, C.S., 2020. Mental health and the Covid-19 pandemic. N. Engl. J. Med.

Pierce, M., Hope, H., Ford, T., Hatch, S., Hotopf, M., John, A., Kontopantelis, E., Webb, R., Wessely, S., McManus, S., 2020. Mental health before and during the COVID-19 pandemic: a longitudinal probability sample survey of the UK population. The Lancet Psychiatry.

Plomecka, M.B., Gobbi, S., Neckels, R., Radziński, P., Skórko, B., Lazerri, S., Almazidou, K., Dedić, A., Bakalović, A., Hrustić, L., 2020. Mental Health Impact of COVID-19: A global study of risk and resilience factors. medRxiv.

Qian, M., Wu, Q., Wu, P., Hou, Z., Liang, Y., Cowling, B.J., Yu, H., 2020. Psychological responses, behavioral changes and public perceptions during the early phase of the COVID-19 outbreak in China: a population based cross-sectional survey. medRxiv.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Raine, A., 1991. The SPQ: A Scale for the Assessment of Schizotypal Personality Based on DSM-III-R Criteria. Schizophr. Bull. 17, 555–564. https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/17.4.555

Rossi, R., Socci, V., Talevi, D., Mensi, S., Niolu, C., Pacitti, F., Di Marco, A., Rossi, A., Siracusano, A., Di Lorenzo, G., 2020. COVID-19 pandemic and lockdown measures impact on mental health among the general population in Italy. An N= 18147 web-based survey. MedRxiv.

Sibony, A.-L., 2020. The UK COVID-19 Response: A Behavioural Irony? Eur. J. Risk Regul. 1–8.

Storry, M., Childs, P., 2016. British cultural identities. Taylor & Francis.

Ueda, M., Stickley, A., Sueki, H., Matsubayashi, T., 2020. Mental Health Status of the General Population during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Cross-sectional National Survey in Japan. medRxiv.

Usher, K., Bhullar, N., Durkin, J., Gyamfi, N., Jackson, D., 2020. Family violence and COVID-19: Increased vulnerability and reduced options for support. Int. J. Ment. Health Nurs.

Uutela, A., 2010. Economic crisis and mental health. Curr. Opin. Psychiatry 23, 127–130.

Volkow, N.D., 2020. Collision of the COVID-19 and addiction epidemics.

Wang, C., Pan, R., Wan, X., Tan, Y., Xu, L., McIntyre, R.S., Choo, F.N., Tran, B., Ho, R., Sharma, V.K., 2020. A longitudinal study on the mental health of general population during the COVID-19 epidemic in China. Brain. Behav. Immun.

Wang, J., Alsop, D.C., Song, H.K., Maldjian, J.A., Tang, K., Salvucci, A.E., Detre, J.A., 2003. Arterial transit time imaging with flow encoding arterial spin tagging (FEAST). Magn. Reson. Med. https://doi.org/10.1002/mrm.10559

WHO-Media-Briefing, n.d. WHO-Media-Briefing [WWW Document]. URL https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020

WHO, 2020. Mental health and psychosocial considerations during the COVID-19 outbreak, 18 March 2020. World Health Organization.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1. Cohort demographics and COVID-19 exposure including impact on life; and differences between Germany and the UK.

		Whole sample	UK	Germany	Chi^2 for country comparison: UK vs. GER
N		858	239	541	
Age		43.27yrs (SD15.4)	39.01yrs (SD16.0)	45.36yrs (SD14.8)	
Gender	Female	71.6%	73.6%	71.2%	X-squared = 0.36042, df = 2, p-value = 0.8351
	Male	25.4%	24.3%	25.9%	
	Diverse	0.5%	0.4%	0.6%	
	Missing	2.5%	1.7%	2.4%	
Education	School leavers	0.1%	0.4%	-	X-squared = 69.309, df = 7, p-value = 2.038e-12 ***
	8years – A-Levels	14.3%	19.2%	13.1%	
	Professional college or Bachelor	24.3%	31.8%	21.6%	
	Masters or higher	60.1%	47.3%	64.9%	
	Missing	1.2%	1.3%	0.4%	
Children at home (max.18years)	Yes	28.1%	21.1%	30.7%	X-squared = 7.8323, df = 1, p-value = 0.005132 **
	Missing	2.0%	1.6%	2.6%	
COVID19 exposure					
Suspected infection	Positive Test	0.1%	-	0.2%	X-squared = 7.2523, df = 3, p-value = 0.06428
	Diagnosis	1.3%	2.5%	0.7%	
	Symptoms	15.6%	18.8%	14.2%	
	No infection	82.2%	78.7%	83.9%	
	Missing	0.8%	-	0.9%	
Symptoms	Fever	8.5%	10.0%	8.0%	X-squared = 1.038, df = 1, p-value = 0.3083 (based on 'no symptoms')
	Cough	17.1%	21.3%	15.5%	
	Shortness of breath	9.4%	10.0%	9.8%	
	Sore throat	21.2%	23.4%	19.9%	
	Fatigue	27.4%	28.5%	27.7%	
	Lost smell/taste	2.9%	4.2%	2.2%	
	Infected eyes	3.7%	3.8%	3.5%	
	Other symptoms	6.3%	6.3%	6.7%	
	No symptoms	55.2%	51.9%	55.8%	
Contact to people with potential infection	Positive test	7.8%	3.3%	9.8%	X-squared = 1.143, df = 1, p-value = 0.285 (based on 'no contact')
	Diagnosis	2.1%	5.4%	0.6%	
	Symptoms	12.8%	17.2%	11.7%	
	No contact	78.1%	74.9%	78.4%	
Impact on work and financial situation					
Impact on work	Home office	48.7%	50.6%	46.8%	X-squared = 2.3897, df = 1, p-value = 0.1221
	Reductions of hours	7.1%	6.7%	7.4%	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

	Unpaid leave	2.6%	3.4%	2.4%	(based on 'no change')
	Overtime/negative hours¥	7.7%	1.3%	11.3%	
	Lost job	3.9%	2.9%	3.7%	
	No change	16.1%	13.0%	17.4%	
Impact on family	Infected	5.8	10.5%	4.4%	X-squared = 38.313, df = 1, p-value = 6.025e-10 *** (based on 'no impact')
	Hospitalised	1.8%	1.7%	2.0%	
	Death	1.3%	3.8%	0.4%	
	Quarantine, symptoms	15.3%	23.9%	12.2%	
	Quarantine, no symptoms	7.5%	14.6%	4.6%	
	Reduced working hours	16.7%	26.4%	12.6%	
	Lost job	6.8%	10.9%	4.4%	
	No impact	65.9%	49.0%	71.9%	
Financial impact of COVID-19	No impact	54.0%	46.0%	58.8%	X-squared = 19.185, df = 4, p-value = 0.0007227 ***
	Slight	16.4%	23.4%	12.8%	
	Moderate	13.3%	11.7%	12.8%	
	Big	12.6%	15.9%	11.7%	
	Extreme	3.3%	2.9%	3.3%	
	Missing	0.5%	-	0.7%	
Not enough money for food	Yes	2.9%	2.9%	3.1%	X-squared = 0.025974, df = 1, p-value = 0.872
	Missing	1.1%	1.0%	1.0%	
Personal judgement of the situation					
Are the restrictions stressful?	Not at all	13.5%	11.3%	14.8%	X-squared = 6.312, df = 4, p-value = 0.177
	Slightly	26.8%	29.3%	26.3%	
	Moderately	27.6%	25.5%	28.1%	
	Very	20.5%	24.3%	18.7%	
	Extremely	11.3%	9.2%	12.2%	
	Missing	0.2%	0.4%	-	
How concerned are you about your life stability?	Not at all	34.6%	46.4%	30.5%	X-squared = 21.661,df = 4, p-value = 0.0002341***
	Slightly	23.4%	22.2%	23.8%	
	Moderately	19.1%	14.2%	21.3%	
	Very	15.4%	10.9%	17.2%	
	Extremely	6.8%	5.0%	6.8%	
	Missing	0.7%	1.3%	0.4%	
How hopeful are you of a soon end of the pandemic in your region of residence?	Not at all	17.1%	14.2%	17.9%	X-squared = 28.824, df = 4, p-value = 8.489e-06 ***
	Slightly	32.1%	27.6%	34.9%	
	Moderately	28.6%	25.2%	30.1%	
	Very	14.7%	19.7%	12.8%	
	Extremely	7.6%	13.0%	4.3%	
Does the pandemic have any positive impact on	No	35.0%	31.0%	36.4%	X-squared = 14.225, df = 2, p-value = 0.0008147***
	Few	35.6%	29.3%	37.7%	
	Some	29.1%	38.9%	25.9%	
	Missing	0.4%	0.8%	-	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

your personal life?					
Mental and physical health status					
Self-rated mental health, before COVID-19	Excellent	15.0%	14.2%	15.3%	X-squared = 34.938, df = 4, p-value = 4.783e-07 ***
	Very good	32.4%	21.8%	37.0%	
	Good	28.7%	30.1%	28.3%	
	Fair	16.4%	21.3%	14.6%	
	Poor	5.8%	11.3%	3.3%	
	Missing	1.6%	1.3%	1.5%	
Regular treatment for mental illness, before pandemic	Yes	13.3%	17.6%	10.1%	X-squared = 8.7436, df = 1, p-value = 0.003107 **
	Missing	11.4%	13.4%	7.2%	
Continuation of treatment during pandemic	More	2.3%	3.6%	1.0%	X-squared = 5.3799, df = 2, p-value = 0.06789
	Less	12.5%	13.6%	11.5%	
	Same	85.3%	82.8%	87.8%	
Self-rated physical health, before pandemic	Excellent	12.1%	13.0%	11.3%	X-squared = 1.5322, df = 4, p-value = 0.8209
	Very good	33.1%	32.2%	33.3%	
	Good	33.9%	31.8%	35.7%	
	Fair	16.3%	17.2%	15.5%	
	Poor	3.2%	3.8%	3.3%	
	Missing	1.4%	2.1%	1.0%	
Regular treatment for physical illness, before pandemic	Yes	19.5%	18.4%	20.2%	X-squared = 0.0008792, df = 1, p-value = 0.9763
	Missing	11.6%	14.6%	7.0%	
Continuation of treatment during pandemic	More	1.0%	1.8%	-	X-squared = 5.7522, df = 2, p-value = 0.05635
	Less	14.1%	14.3%	14.4%	
	Same	85.0%	83.9%	85.6%	
*<.05, **<.01, ***<.001; ¥Overtime/negative hours , is a concept uncommon in the UK.					

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2. Results from Analysis of Deviance on Poisson regression model showing the effects of differences between countries (UK and Germany) and time points (before and during the pandemic) on a set of different variables.

	Df	Deviance	Resid. Df	Resid. Dev	Pr(>Chi)
Exercise and time spent outside					
NULL			3103	1856.4	
Exercise/Time spent outside	1	331.95	3102	1524.4	**2.20E-16**
Country	1	6.02	3101	1518.4	**0.01413**
Time Point	1	0.12	3100	1518.3	0.72653
Country x Time Point	1	0.49	3099	1517.8	0.48265
Exercise/Time spent outside x Country	1	16.03	3098	1501.7	**6.24E-05**
Exercise/Time spent outside x Time Point	1	4.21	3097	1497.5	**0.04024**
Exercise/Time spent outside x Country x Time Point	1	0.60	3096	1496.9	0.43926
Sleep during the week and the weekend					
NULL			3097	562.64	
Sleep	1	27.53	3096	535.11	**1.55E-07**
Country	1	0.25	3095	534.85	0.6158
Time Point	1	0.11	3094	534.74	0.7401
Country x Time Point	1	0.02	3093	534.73	0.8995
Sleep x Country	1	0.02	3092	534.71	0.8959
Sleep x Time Point	1	0.53	3091	534.18	0.4678
Sleep x Country x Time Point	1	0.20	3090	533.99	0.6569
Media consumption					
NULL			6173	2934.8	
Media consumption	3	1069.36	6170	1865.4	**2.20E-16**
Country	1	2.22	6169	1863.2	0.1366
Time Point	1	41.55	6168	1821.7	**1.15E-10**
Country x Time Point	1	0.99	6167	1820.7	0.3195
Media consumption x Country	3	52.80	6164	1767.9	**2.02E-11**
Media consumption x Time Point	3	2.09	6161	1765.8	0.5544
Media consumption x Country x Time Point	3	2.60	6158	1763.2	0.4572
Substance consumption					
NULL			6174	9353.8	
Substance consumption	3	4047.50	6171	5306.2	**2.20E-16**
Country	1	0.20	6170	5306.1	0.6889
Time Point	1	1.20	6169	5304.9	0.2667
Country x Time Point	1	0.40	6168	5304.4	0.5126
Substance consumption x Country	3	33.70	6165	5270.8	**2.33E-07**
Substance consumption x Time Point	3	2.00	6162	5268.8	0.5734
Substance consumption x Country x Time Point	3	0.30	6159	5268.4	0.9569
Mental well-being					
NULL			15452	8116.7	
Mental well-being	9	919.78	15443	7196.9	**2.20E-16**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Country	1	0.17	15442	7196.7	0.6817
Time Point	1	59.39	15441	7137.3	**1.29E-14**
Country x Time Point	1	0.04	15440	7137.3	0.835
Mental well-being x Country	9	63.10	15431	7074.2	**3.37E-10**
Mental well-being x Time Point	9	397.26	15422	6676.9	**2.20E-16**
Mental well-being x Country x Time Point	9	7.77	15413	6669.1	0.5575

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Table 3. Results for two different logistic regression models, investigating the association between demographic variables, variables of substance use, media use and sleep (A) as well as COVID19 impact (B) and the psychological symptoms (SCL dimensions) as well as global mental health status (GSI).

	Global Symptom Index			Depressive Symptoms			Dysthymic Symptoms			Agoraphobic Symptoms			Vegetative Symptoms			Symptoms of Mistrust			Sociophobic symptoms		
A	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.
(Intercept)	0.020	0.026	0.979	0.610	1.156	0.248	0.501	1.084	0.278	-0.024	-0.033	0.973	0.279	0.297	0.767	0.316	0.527	0.598	0.965	1.619	0.105
Country of residence: Germany	-0.362	-2.033	**0.042**	-0.346	-2.803	**0.005**	-0.562	-5.269	**0.000**	-0.928	-5.391	**0.000**	-0.115	-0.509	0.611	0.223	1.513	0.130	-0.297	-2.122	**0.034**
Gender: Female	0.468	2.179	**0.029**	0.344	2.444	**0.015**	0.314	2.504	**0.012**	0.527	2.408	**0.016**	0.638	2.223	**0.026**	-0.043	-0.295	0.768	0.497	2.891	**0.004**
Age	-0.008	-1.186	0.235	-0.002	-0.373	0.709	-0.006	-1.371	0.170	-0.006	-0.943	0.346	-0.015	-1.730	0.084	-0.002	-0.327	0.744	-0.025	-4.423	**0.000**
Highest education	-0.089	-1.569	0.117	-0.121	-3.142	**0.002**	0.001	0.016	0.987	-0.113	-2.087	**0.037**	-0.190	-2.829	**0.005**	-0.094	-2.117	**0.034**	-0.071	-1.573	0.116
Alcohol consumpt.	-0.003	-0.092	0.927	0.049	1.922	0.055	0.006	0.266	0.790	0.027	0.748	0.454	-0.006	-0.126	0.900	0.005	0.168	0.867	-0.011	-0.397	0.691
Tobacco consumpt.	-0.017	-0.386	0.700	-0.004	-0.138	0.890	0.015	0.624	0.533	-0.010	-0.245	0.807	-0.069	-1.217	0.224	-0.028	-0.832	0.406	-0.007	-0.207	0.836
Vaping consumpt.	0.076	1.237	0.216	0.037	0.753	0.451	0.048	1.166	0.244	-0.024	-0.300	0.764	0.049	0.615	0.538	0.045	0.777	0.437	0.044	0.791	0.429
Marihuana consumpt.	0.125	2.018	**0.044**	0.083	1.737	0.082	0.076	1.827	0.068	0.067	0.975	0.330	0.128	1.625	0.104	0.085	1.544	0.123	0.060	1.098	0.272
Social media usage	0.173	1.975	**0.048**	0.053	0.874	0.382	0.081	1.521	0.128	0.132	1.559	0.119	0.133	1.241	0.215	0.089	1.280	0.201	-0.038	-0.529	0.597
Video Games	0.138	1.536	0.125	0.127	2.015	**0.044**	0.087	1.516	0.130	0.033	0.371	0.711	0.081	0.680	0.497	0.091	1.187	0.235	0.138	1.920	0.055
Print media usage	-0.122	-1.392	0.164	0.013	0.216	0.829	-0.096	-1.734	0.083	-0.024	-0.286	0.775	-0.092	-0.823	0.411	-0.103	-1.422	0.155	-0.027	-0.393	0.695

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Sleep during the week	-0.547	-3.207	**0.001**	-0.503	-4.264	**0.000**	-0.201	-1.855	0.064	0.006	0.034	0.973	-0.324	-1.432	0.152	-0.308	-2.247	**0.025**	-0.474	-3.648	**0.000**
Sleep during the weekend	0.065	0.421	0.674	0.101	0.936	0.349	-0.051	-0.499	0.618	-0.126	-0.759	0.448	-0.350	-1.713	0.087	-0.047	-0.369	0.712	0.157	1.305	0.192
Exercise	0.051	0.692	0.489	-0.048	-0.961	0.336	-0.058	-1.300	0.194	-0.007	-0.099	0.921	-0.021	-0.236	0.813	0.054	0.964	0.335	0.033	0.578	0.563
Time spent outside	-0.163	-2.210	**0.027**	-0.113	-2.257	**0.024**	-0.088	-1.981	**0.048**	-0.159	-2.199	**0.028**	0.064	0.702	0.483	-0.133	-2.353	**0.019**	-0.096	-1.659	0.097
B	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.
(Intercept)	-1.930	-2.665	**0.008**	-0.500	-1.040	0.298	-0.861	-1.973	**0.048**	-1.326	-1.886	0.059	-2.160	-2.521	**0.012**	-1.092	-2.034	**0.042**	-1.688	-2.902	**0.004**
Country of residence: Germany	-0.588	-3.134	**0.002**	-0.521	-4.047	**0.000**	-0.608	-5.534	**0.000**	-1.115	-6.274	**0.000**	-0.452	-1.995	**0.046**	0.006	0.040	0.968	-0.169	-1.129	0.259
Gender: Female	0.144	0.692	0.489	0.090	0.659	0.510	0.178	1.455	0.146	0.445	2.048	**0.041**	0.431	1.609	0.108	-0.271	-1.928	0.054	0.268	1.575	0.115
Age	-0.014	-2.019	**0.044**	-0.002	-0.395	0.693	-0.010	-2.786	**0.005**	-0.008	-1.291	0.197	-0.014	-1.819	0.069	-0.002	-0.499	0.618	-0.025	-4.555	**0.000**
Highest education	0.003	0.056	0.955	-0.061	-1.503	0.133	0.051	1.332	0.183	-0.050	-0.846	0.397	-0.073	-1.019	0.308	-0.067	-1.436	0.151	0.023	0.471	0.638
Concerned about life stability	0.134	2.021	**0.043**	0.201	4.365	**0.000**	0.142	3.553	**0.000**	0.087	1.330	0.183	0.215	2.786	**0.005**	0.148	2.795	**0.005**	0.092	1.726	0.084
Hopeful for an end of COVID19	-0.093	-1.309	0.190	-0.116	-2.297	**0.022**	-0.058	-1.350	0.177	-0.207	-3.021	**0.003**	-0.066	-0.755	0.450	-0.041	-0.710	0.478	-0.025	-0.446	0.656
Financial impact: Yes	0.015	0.207	0.836	-0.075	-1.430	0.153	-0.010	-0.236	0.813	0.086	1.244	0.213	-0.074	-0.829	0.407	0.000	-0.006	0.995	-0.062	-1.029	0.303
Work-changes -	0.167	0.840	0.401	-0.080	-0.601	0.548	-0.126	-1.085	0.278	-0.130	-0.687	0.492	-0.026	-0.105	0.916	0.231	1.510	0.131	-0.003	-0.020	0.984

Home Office: Yes																					
Work-changes – Unpaid leave: Yes	0.819	2.158	**0.031**	0.255	0.845	0.398	0.128	0.445	0.657	0.240	0.597	0.551	0.342	0.649	0.517	0.634	2.064	**0.039**	0.258	0.697	0.486
Work-changes – Lost job: Yes	0.366	1.087	0.277	0.269	1.099	0.272	-0.059	-0.234	0.815	-0.778	-1.628	0.103	0.204	0.438	0.661	0.226	0.768	0.442	0.233	0.802	0.423
Work-changes – No change: Yes	0.294	1.223	0.221	-0.186	-1.067	0.286	0.112	0.793	0.428	-0.029	-0.126	0.899	0.552	2.138	**0.033**	0.334	1.852	0.064	0.289	1.594	0.111
Impact on quality of family relations	-0.145	-1.478	0.139	-0.211	-3.067	**0.002**	-0.159	-2.657	**0.008**	0.106	1.125	0.261	-0.177	-1.454	0.146	0.003	0.035	0.972	0.068	0.880	0.379
Impact on quality of social relations	-0.411	-3.968	**0.000**	-0.244	-3.420	**0.001**	-0.102	-1.666	0.096	-0.233	-2.409	**0.016**	-0.180	-1.418	0.156	-0.377	-4.762	**0.000**	-0.334	-4.082	**0.000**
Physical health status	0.187	2.101	**0.036**	0.109	1.758	0.079	0.149	2.737	**0.006**	0.189	2.214	**0.027**	0.287	2.620	**0.009**	0.078	1.095	0.273	0.059	0.834	0.404
Mental health status	0.567	6.257	**0.000**	0.441	7.174	**0.000**	0.298	5.608	**0.000**	0.246	2.936	**0.003**	0.336	3.167	**0.002**	0.356	5.247	**0.000**	0.562	7.979	**0.000**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 4. Results for two different logistic regression models, investigating the association between demographic variables, variables of substance use, media use and sleep (A) as well as COVID19 impact (B) and the total Schizotypal Personality Score (Total SPQ) as well as its dimensions.

	Total SPQ			Eccentricity			Paranoid Ideation			Social Anhedonia			Anomalous Experiences & Beliefs			Distorted Speech			Social Anxiety		
A	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.
(Intercept)	3.354	33.588	**<2e-16**	1.155	3.831	**0.000**	1.631	6.174	**0.000**	2.585	12.295	**<2e-16**	0.415	1.648	0.099	1.129	4.317	**0.000**	1.865	8.615	**<2e-16**
Country of residence: Germany	0.026	1.077	0.282	0.001	0.017	0.986	0.370	5.506	**0.000**	-0.004	-0.087	0.931	0.350	5.462	**0.000**	-0.089	-1.415	0.157	-0.270	-5.281	**0.000**
Gender: Female	0.017	0.684	0.494	-0.335	-4.639	**0.000**	0.083	1.236	0.216	-0.273	-5.393	**0.000**	0.164	2.646	**0.008**	0.077	1.152	0.249	0.354	5.953	**0.000**
Age	-0.003	-3.875	**0.000**	-0.009	-3.219	**0.001**	-0.009	-3.909	**0.000**	0.001	0.397	0.692	0.006	3.126	**0.002**	-0.005	-2.008	**0.045**	-0.009	-4.598	**0.000**
Highest education	-0.077	-10.421	**<2e-16**	-0.042	-1.851	0.064	-0.114	-5.958	**0.000**	-0.090	-5.836	**0.000**	-0.093	-5.220	**0.000**	-0.052	-2.696	**0.007**	-0.048	-2.975	**0.003**
Alcohol consumpt.	-0.020	-4.154	**0.000**	-0.020	-1.370	0.171	-0.017	-1.370	0.171	-0.038	-3.712	**0.000**	0.000	-0.035	0.972	-0.003	-0.220	0.826	-0.031	-2.962	**0.003**
Tobacco consumpt.	0.014	2.652	**0.008**	0.020	1.236	0.217	0.031	2.429	**0.015**	-0.006	-0.524	0.600	0.043	3.763	**0.000**	0.009	0.692	0.489	-0.009	-0.695	0.487
Vaping consumpt.	0.045	4.716	**0.000**	0.121	5.057	**0.000**	0.035	1.334	0.182	0.027	1.216	0.224	0.008	0.299	0.765	0.066	2.830	**0.005**	0.039	1.852	0.064
Marihuana consumpt.	0.038	3.706	**0.000**	0.027	0.879	0.380	0.040	1.516	0.130	0.009	0.404	0.686	0.049	2.018	**0.044**	0.053	2.055	**0.040**	0.042	1.918	0.055
Social media usage	0.043	3.745	**0.000**	-0.013	-0.356	0.721	0.091	2.985	**0.003**	0.037	1.488	0.137	0.069	2.466	**0.014**	0.066	2.187	**0.029**	0.010	0.384	0.701
Video Games	0.143	11.585	**<2e-16**	0.260	7.429	**0.000**	0.143	4.380	**0.000**	0.147	5.730	**0.000**	0.026	0.755	0.450	0.133	4.097	**0.000**	0.154	5.892	**0.000**
Print media usage	-0.053	-4.416	**0.000**	-0.057	-1.542	0.123	-0.116	-3.669	**0.000**	-0.102	-3.931	**0.000**	0.049	1.666	0.096	-0.070	-2.203	**0.028**	-0.032	-1.259	0.208
Sleep during the week	-0.056	-2.391	**0.017**	-0.134	-1.895	0.058	-0.125	-2.047	**0.041**	-0.075	-1.485	0.137	0.002	0.034	0.973	0.041	0.653	0.514	-0.072	-1.455	0.146
Sleep during the weekend	-0.055	-2.526	**0.012**	-0.019	-0.289	0.773	-0.079	-1.388	0.165	-0.124	-2.637	**0.008**	-0.014	-0.261	0.794	-0.120	-2.038	**0.042**	0.018	0.380	0.704
Exercise	-0.013	-1.342	0.180	-0.004	-0.151	0.880	0.015	0.617	0.537	-0.040	-1.987	**0.047**	0.012	0.557	0.578	-0.014	-0.555	0.579	-0.020	-0.955	0.340

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Time spent outside	-0.048	-5.125	**0.000**	-0.005	-0.182	0.855	-0.034	-1.354	0.176	-0.062	-3.067	**0.002**	-0.052	-2.288	**0.022**	-0.029	-1.148	0.251	-0.073	-3.517	**0.000**
B	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.	E.S.	z-val.	p-val.
(Intercept)	2.196	23.994	**<2e-16**	-0.218	-0.775	0.438	0.426	1.779	0.075	1.034	5.365	**0.000**	-0.347	-1.560	0.119	0.424	1.755	0.079	0.529	2.605	**0.009**
Country of residence: Germany	0.034	1.390	0.164	0.017	0.230	0.818	0.380	5.518	**0.000**	0.002	0.033	0.974	0.327	5.163	**0.000**	-0.078	-1.240	0.215	-0.244	-4.709	**0.000**
Gender: Female	-0.087	-3.623	**0.000**	-0.535	-7.733	**0.000**	-0.009	-0.145	0.885	-0.373	-7.715	**0.000**	0.106	1.775	0.076	-0.035	-0.547	0.584	0.265	4.568	**0.000**
Age	-0.007	-8.805	**< 2e-16**	-0.010	-4.415	**0.000**	-0.014	-6.760	**0.000**	-0.004	-2.675	**0.007**	0.006	3.450	**0.001**	-0.008	-4.156	**0.000**	-0.013	-7.412	**0.000**
Highest education	-0.063	-7.982	**0.000**	-0.050	-2.027	**0.043**	-0.099	-4.839	**0.000**	-0.067	-3.989	**0.000**	-0.106	-5.727	**0.000**	-0.033	-1.555	0.120	-0.016	-0.913	0.361
Concerned about life stability	0.021	2.286	**0.022**	-0.005	-0.181	0.857	0.067	2.793	**0.005**	0.030	1.527	0.127	0.067	3.069	**0.002**	-0.045	-1.799	0.072	-0.001	-0.046	0.964
Hopeful for an end of COVID19	-0.029	-2.990	**0.003**	-0.053	-1.762	0.078	-0.003	-0.108	0.914	-0.030	-1.457	0.145	-0.025	-1.081	0.280	-0.024	-0.951	0.342	-0.036	-1.762	0.078
Financial impact: Yes	0.021	2.159	**0.031**	0.067	2.224	**0.026**	0.009	0.331	0.740	-0.029	-1.377	0.169	0.090	3.962	**0.000**	0.020	0.786	0.432	0.003	0.119	0.905
Work-changes - Home Office: Yes	-0.067	-2.703	**0.007**	0.009	0.118	0.906	-0.089	-1.347	0.178	-0.038	-0.707	0.479	-0.001	-0.019	0.985	-0.082	-1.258	0.208	-0.151	-2.792	**0.005**
Work-changes – Unpaid leave: Yes	-0.299	-4.071	**0.000**	-0.270	-1.138	0.255	-0.357	-1.835	0.066	-0.501	-2.805	**0.005**	-0.321	-1.884	0.060	-0.079	-0.457	0.648	-0.276	-1.788	0.074
Work-changes – Lost job: Yes	-0.045	-0.765	0.444	-0.119	-0.630	0.529	0.076	0.542	0.588	-0.041	-0.318	0.750	-0.041	-0.294	0.769	0.151	1.043	0.297	-0.260	-1.913	0.056
Work-changes – No change: Yes	0.080	2.690	**0.007**	0.139	1.502	0.133	0.036	0.453	0.650	0.144	2.306	**0.021**	0.115	1.643	0.100	-0.079	-0.963	0.335	0.096	1.497	0.134

Impact on quality of family relations	0.075	5.591	**0.000**	0.103	2.476	**0.013**	0.058	1.643	0.100	0.068	2.396	**0.017**	0.113	3.436	**0.001**	0.073	2.074	**0.038**	0.051	1.797	0.072
Impact on quality of social relations	-0.010	-0.736	0.462	0.028	0.682	0.495	-0.052	-1.434	0.152	-0.089	-3.107	**0.002**	0.033	1.020	0.308	0.015	0.426	0.670	0.023	0.797	0.426
Physical health status	0.131	10.834	**<2e-16**	0.188	5.049	**0.000**	0.090	2.800	**0.005**	0.146	5.660	**0.000**	0.107	3.553	**0.000**	0.115	3.608	**0.000**	0.148	5.703	**0.000**
Mental health status	0.174	15.139	**<2e-16**	0.234	6.603	**0.000**	0.232	7.650	**0.000**	0.188	7.719	**0.000**	0.068	2.409	**0.016**	0.142	4.731	**0.000**	0.194	7.859	**0.000**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182980; this version posted September 1, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .