

The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on an aging population

27 The COVID-19 pandemic took a heavy toll on older adults. For example in Belgium,
28 approximately 41% of the cases were aged 60 or older, but 93% of deaths due to COVID-19 were aged
29 65 or older (Sciensano, 2020). Similar trends were observed in other countries (e.g., Guterres, 2020).
30 This implied that older adults became a specific focus of several governmental COVID-19 regulations.
31 For example, in Belgium they were no longer allowed to look after their grandchildren, visitors and
32 external services (e.g., meal delivery, cleaning) were not allowed in assisted living facilities and nursing
33 homes for a long time, and people were regularly warned when measures were introduced or relaxed
34 to pay specific attention to older and vulnerable people.

35 Hence, during the COVID-19 pandemic, older adults were considered as a group at risk. As a
36 response, concerns have risen about the mental health of older adults. The World Health
37 Organization (WHO) has warned that the impact on mental and psychosocial wellbeing of vulnerable
38 groups, such as older adults, will be large and enduring (WHO, 2020). The United Nations (UN)
39 stressed that, although COVID-19 is in the first place a physical health crisis, it has the seeds of a
40 major mental health crisis as well, especially for specific populations such as older adults, if action is
41 not taken (UN, 2020). It has been suggested that the measures taken by governance regarding social
42 distancing and isolation, especially targeting groups at risk, can result in social isolation and
43 loneliness (Banerjee, 2020; Vahia, 2020). The latter variables are known to decrease *wellbeing* and
44 increase the risk for depression and cognitive dysfunction (Brooke & Jackson, 2020). Brooke &
45 Jackson (2020) pointed out that a decline in *activity* and mobility in older adults during lockdown can
46 also lead to more frailty and a lower wellbeing in older adults. Moreover, in response to stress, *sleep*
47 *quality* can decline and increase the risk for depression (Stanton et al., 2020). Finally, as older adults
48 already face cognitive decline as part of normal aging (Bherer, Erickson, & Liu-Ambrose, 2013;
49 Murman, 2015), which is moderated by several lifestyle variables such as physical activity,
50 engagement in stimulating activities and social network (e.g., Clare et al., 2017), the COVID-19
51 pandemic causing social isolation and loss of activity, might also impact *cognitive functioning*.

52 These concerns warrant a thorough assessment of how older adults are currently doing.
53 However, little is hitherto known about the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the general
54 population of older adults. A few first studies are being published now, and seem to indicate that
55 older adults' wellbeing was not severely impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. However, as the
56 authors indicated, these studies were either conducted in the very early stages of the pandemic
57 when social distancing was recommended by the government but no lockdown was yet installed (Kivi
58 et al., in press; Lopez et al., in press) or in countries such as the Netherlands where at the time of the
59 study the lockdown was not restrictive (van Tilburg et al., in press). Findings of disaster studies might
60 be relevant in this respect. For example, studies on the effect of natural disasters on older adults
61 showed a disaster-related decline in cognitive function (Hikichi et al., 2016). Results on the effect on
62 wellbeing are mixed, and indicated that being older did not necessarily increase psychological
63 vulnerability (Rafiey et al., 2016; see also the "wellbeing paradox"; Hansen & Slagsvold, 2012).
64 However, socialising and social participation were found to be crucial to reduce the risk of cognitive
65 decline and decrease in wellbeing after such disasters (Hikichi et al., 2017), which is precisely what
66 has been severely limited during the COVID-19 pandemic, especially for risk groups such as older
67 adults.

68 Given these concerns and the lack of studies focused on older adults during the peak of the
69 COVID-19 pandemic, the goal of this study was to establish how adults aged 65 years or older are
70 responding to the COVID-19 pandemic. Using self-report measures in an online survey, the impact of
71 the COVID-19 period on wellbeing, activity level, sleep quality and cognitive functioning was studied.
72 Based on the raised concerns and previous studies on the impact of disasters on older adults, we
73 hypothesised that the COVID-19 pandemic had a detrimental effect on the wellbeing, activity level,
74 sleep quality and cognitive functioning of older adults. Furthermore, we examined possible
75 vulnerability and protective factors that might have influenced the impact of the COVID-19 period on
76 the wellbeing and cognitive functioning of older adults.

77

78

RESULTS

79 *Participant characteristics and Pearson correlations*

80 Supplementary Table 1 provides a more detailed overview of the participant characteristics.
81 Participants were on average 73 years old ($SD=6.99$, range 65-97). Figure 1 displays the frequency
82 distribution of age. Two hundred sixty-two were male, 377 were female, and one identified
83 themselves with another gender. Geographically, participants were spread across Flanders (i.e., the
84 northern, Dutch-speaking part of Belgium), as can be seen on Figure 2. The majority of the
85 participants (81%) lived in their own home and 19% lived in an assisted living facility or nursing home
86 (jointly referred to as care facility). 28% lived alone, 54% with one cohabitant and 18% with two or
87 more cohabitants. Most participants (respectively 29%, 41%, 32% and 25%) reported that during the
88 past week they had 3 to 4 contacts (not taking into account cohabitants) in real life outside, no
89 contact in real life inside, 3 to 4 contacts by telephone and more than 9 contacts via the internet
90 (e.g., skype, whatsapp). Most participants (52%) had a university or high school degree and received
91 a monthly individual net income between 1001 and 1500 euro (25%), 1501 and 2000 euro (30%) or
92 2001 and 2500 euro (17%). The majority of participants (88%) did not suffer from Parkinson's
93 disease, dementia, stroke, diabetes and/or epilepsy. Only 4% reported that they had been
94 contaminated with COVID-19. 15% reported that at least one of their close relatives or friends had
95 been contaminated with COVID-19.

96 The means (SD) of the total scores of the questionnaires and the Pearson correlations
97 between age and the total scores of the questionnaires in the survey can be found in Table 1 (see
98 also Supplementary Figure 1 for a matrix scatterplot containing all two-by-two scatter plots).

99

100 *Comparison before and during the COVID-19 period*

101 Table 2 reports the number of participants who reported a decrease, no change or an
102 increase with regards to wellbeing, activity level, sleep quality and cognitive functioning during the
103 COVID-19 period.

104 With regards to wellbeing, the most prominent decreases were reported for general life
105 satisfaction, safety, community connectedness and future security (see Table 2). The subjective
106 wellbeing score indicated that the majority of the participants (76%) reported a decrease in
107 wellbeing in one or more domains. Half of the participants reported that their activity level had
108 decreased and 19% reported a decreased sleep quality during the COVID-19 period. A minority of the
109 participants (8%) reported that their cognitive functioning in general had decreased during the
110 COVID-19 period, with 8%, 12%, 6%, 10% and 10% indicating increases in problems with
111 remembering things, concentrating on something, doing two things at the same time, recalling things
112 or forgetfulness, respectively.

113 Paired-samples *t*-tests with Bonferroni correction ($\alpha=.0045$) indicated that participants
114 reported that they had been significantly less active during the past week (i.e., during the COVID-19
115 period) compared to before the COVID-19 period ($M_{\text{current}}=6.65$; $M_{\text{before}}=7.58$), $t(639)=-14.69$, $p<.001$,
116 $d=.58$. They also reported that their quality of sleep had been poorer during the past week compared
117 to before COVID-19 ($M_{\text{current}}=6.88$; $M_{\text{before}}=7.16$), $t(639)=-5.87$, $p<.001$, $d=.23$. Furthermore, life
118 satisfaction in all seven domains, general life satisfaction and subjective wellbeing were significantly
119 lower currently compared to before COVID-19: $t(639)=8.84$, $p<.001$, $d=.35$ for standard of living
120 ($M_{\text{current}}=76$; $M_{\text{before}}=80$), $t(639)=7.75$, $p<.001$, $d=.31$ for health ($M_{\text{current}}=73$; $M_{\text{before}}=76$), $t(639)=8.84$,
121 $p<.001$, $d=.35$ for achieving in life ($M_{\text{current}}=75$; $M_{\text{before}}=78$), $t(638)=11.88$, $p<.001$, $d=.47$ for
122 relationships ($M_{\text{current}}=71$; $M_{\text{before}}=79$), $t(639)=16.33$, $p<.001$, $d=.64$ for safety ($M_{\text{current}}=70$; $M_{\text{before}}=81$),
123 $t(639)=15.57$, $p<.001$, $d=.61$ for community connectedness ($M_{\text{current}}=66$; $M_{\text{before}}=77$), $t(639)=17.90$,
124 $p<.001$, $d=.71$ for future security ($M_{\text{current}}=66$; $M_{\text{before}}=76$), $t(639)=15.88$, $p<.001$, $d=.63$ for general life
125 satisfaction ($M_{\text{current}}=69$; $M_{\text{before}}=78$) and $t(639)=18.66$, $p<.001$, $d=.74$ for the subjective wellbeing
126 index ($M_{\text{current}}=71$; $M_{\text{before}}=78$). Note that when participants filled in the survey (i.e., week 1 to 5; see
127 also Supplementary Table 1) did not lead to significant systematic fluctuations with regards to the
128 reported changes in wellbeing, activity level, sleep quality and cognitive functioning.

129

130 *Linear and ordinal logistic regression analyses*

131 Supplementary Tables 2 and 3 report the Pearson correlations between the difference scores
132 and subjective cognitive change questions and potential continuous vulnerability and protective
133 variables, as well as the means (*SD*) for the difference scores and subjective cognitive change
134 questions for each level of the potential categorical vulnerability and protective variables. Linear and
135 ordinal logistic regression analyses were conducted to study possible vulnerability and protective
136 factors. Table 3 provides the model fit of all models and the statistics for the predictors who made a
137 significant contribution to the models. No problems of multicollinearity arose (all VIF<1.78).

138 *Changes in wellbeing* ($\alpha=.0055$). With regards to general life satisfaction, the model indicated
139 that at least one predictor significantly contributed to explaining changes in this wellbeing item.
140 Changes in general life satisfaction showed a significant negative linear relation with depression. This
141 implies that an increase in depression was associated with a (stronger) decrease in satisfaction with
142 standard of living during the COVID-19 period. Changes in general life satisfaction also showed a
143 significant negative linear relation with resilience. However, as this association is contrary to the
144 positive correlation coefficient observed between these two variables ($r=.11$, see Supplementary
145 Table 2), this could rather indicate a suppressor situation (see Darlington, 1968; Paulhus, Robins,
146 Trzesniewski, & Tracy, 2004), leading us to be cautious about this effect. With regards to satisfaction
147 with standard of living, the model indicated that at least one predictor significantly contributed to
148 explaining changes in this wellbeing item. Changes in satisfaction with standard of living showed a
149 significant negative linear relation with both depression and whether the participant lived in a care
150 facility or not. This implies that an increase in depression and living in a care facility as compared to
151 not living in a care facility (as “not living in a care facility” was set as the reference category of our
152 dummy variable) were associated with a (stronger) decrease in satisfaction with standard of living
153 during the COVID-19 period. For all other PWI-A items and total score, models always indicated that
154 at least one predictor significantly contributed to explaining changes in these items or total score. For
155 all these models, there was only a significant negative linear relation between depression and

156 changes in these wellbeing items and total score. This implies that an increase in depression was
157 associated with a decrease in satisfaction with all domains and in subjective wellbeing during COVID-
158 19. None of the other predictors contributed significantly to the models (all $p > .007$).

159 *Changes in activity and sleep* ($\alpha = .025$). The model indicated that at least one predictor
160 significantly contributed to explaining changes in activity level. There was a significant negative linear
161 relation between depression and changes in activity. This implies that an increase in depression was
162 associated with a decrease in activity level during the COVID-19 period. None of the other predictors
163 contributed significantly to the model (all $p \geq .12$). With regards to *sleep quality*, the model indicated
164 that at least one predictor significantly contributed to explaining changes in sleep quality. There was
165 a significant negative linear relation between depression and changes in sleep quality and a positive
166 relation between gender and changes in sleep quality. This implies that an increase in depression and
167 being male as compared to female (as “male” was set as the reference category of our dummy
168 variable) were associated with a (stronger) decrease in sleep quality during COVID-19. None of the
169 other predictors contributed significantly to the model (all $p > .12$).

170 *Changes in cognitive functioning*. For all six subjective cognitive change questions, the ordinal
171 logistic models had a significantly better fit compared to the null model. In all models, two predictors
172 always contributed significantly to explaining the changes in cognitive functioning. When depression
173 increased with 1 unit, the ordered log-odds of being in a higher category of the response scale of the
174 subjective cognitive change questions (with a higher category indicating fewer problems, see
175 Methods section) decreased by 0.28 for general cognitive functioning and by 0.24, 0.24, 0.20, 0.14
176 and 0.22 for remembering, concentration, doing two things at the same time, recalling and
177 forgetfulness, respectively, while the other variables in the model are held constant. When the
178 susceptibility to cognitive failures (i.e., CFQ total score) increased with 1 unit, the ordered log-odds of
179 being in a higher category of the response scale of the subjective cognitive change questions
180 decreased by 0.061 for general cognitive functioning and by 0.076, 0.049, 0.048, 0.061 and 0.065 for
181 remembering, concentration, doing two things at the same time, recalling and forgetfulness, while

182 the other variables in the model are held constant. None of the other predictors contributed
183 significantly to the models (all $p > .015$).

184 We note that including the four variables describing the number of contacts participants had
185 had during the past week (see Supplementary Table 1) as additional predictors in the models, did not
186 lead to significant effects (all $p \geq .045$) and did not change the pattern of results, except that the
187 association between resilience and changes in general life satisfaction was no longer significant with
188 the set α ($p = .008$). For reasons of parsimony we therefore opted not to include these additional
189 predictors.

190

191 DISCUSSION

192 The COVID-19 pandemic had an enormous impact on older adults aged 65 years or older. The
193 risk of social isolation and loneliness due to governmental regulations raises concerns about the
194 mental health and cognitive functioning of this population. Based on recent editorials about the
195 impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on older adults and literature on the impact of disasters, we
196 hypothesised that wellbeing, level of activity, quality of sleep and cognitive functioning would be
197 severely impacted. To address this, we assessed how older adults are currently doing. Using an
198 online survey with self-report measures, we studied the impact of the COVID-19 period on wellbeing,
199 level of activity, quality of sleep and cognitive functioning of a general population of older adults
200 aged 65 years or older. In addition, vulnerability and protective factors were examined that might
201 have influenced the impact of the COVID-19 period.

202 In line with our hypothesis, it became clear that the COVID-19 period had a significant impact
203 on older adults. We observed a significant decrease in wellbeing, activity level and sleep quality
204 during the COVID-19 period as compared to before COVID-19. This is not in line with the first studies
205 being published on how older adults responded to the pandemic, which did not observe a severe
206 impact on older adults' wellbeing (Kivi et al., in press; Lopez et al., in press; van Tilburg et al., in
207 press). But as these studies were completed during the early onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, this

208 might highlight that the severity of the impact increased when the pandemic (and the imposed
209 restrictions) further progressed. Most older adults indicated that their cognitive functioning had not
210 changed during the COVID-19 period, although a subgroup of 8% indicated a decrease.

211 When examining possible vulnerability and protective factors, reported changes in wellbeing,
212 activity level, sleep quality and cognitive functioning were especially related to depression. These
213 findings suggest that depression might be a vulnerability factor that influenced the impact of the
214 COVID-19 period on older adults. However, given the cross-sectional nature of our data, it is not clear
215 if depression was a precursor, already present before the COVID-19 period, or if depression was
216 triggered and/or intensified during the COVID-19 period. Previous studies showed that depression in
217 itself is negatively correlated with wellbeing, activity and sleep (Maglione et al., 2012; Malone &
218 Wachholtz, 2017; Roshanaei-Moghaddam, Katon, & Russo, 2009). However, the socioemotional
219 selectivity theory (Carstensen, 1995) could also explain why depression increased as a consequence
220 of the COVID-19 period. This theory proposes that older adults use their social network as a buffer
221 against negative experiences (Swift et al., 2014). As the COVID-19 pandemic led to a decrease of
222 older adults' social network and contacts, this emotional buffer might have disappeared, which in
223 turn could have paved the way for depression. In order to shed more light on the exact role of
224 depression in the observed COVID-19 changes, we aim to longitudinally follow a substantial
225 subsample of these older adults to study how their reported changes in wellbeing, activity level,
226 sleep quality and cognitive functioning, and the role of depression therein, evolve with the
227 fluctuating COVID-19 situation over time.

228 Next to depression, other variables such as living in a care facility or not and gender were
229 related to changes in one specific domain of wellbeing and sleep quality, respectively. Susceptibility
230 to cognitive failures was related to changes in cognitive functioning during the COVID-19 period.

231 Some limitations of this study need to be addressed. First of all, the sample of older adults in
232 this study is rather homogenous in some respects. Participants were all Dutch-speaking older adults
233 living in Flanders. Moreover, most were in good health and their socioeconomic status was high, as

234 indexed by educational level and income. Therefore, the results of this study might be difficult to
235 generalise to the whole population of older adults and additional studies in different countries, and
236 more heterogeneous samples of older adults are needed. Moreover, since this study was
237 administered online, a part of this older adult population could probably not be reached. Third, the
238 design of this study was cross-sectional and administered during the COVID-19 period. Questions
239 regarding the period before COVID-19 were therefore necessarily retrospective, which might lead to
240 biased self-reports (Sato & Kawahara, 2011). In addition, this study relied on subjective self-report
241 which can differ from objective states (e.g. Burmester, Leathem, & Merrick, 2016). For example, it
242 has already been shown that cognitive ability tends to be overestimated with increasing age (van der
243 Ham, van der Kuil, & Claessen, 2019). During the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, experimental studies
244 administered to a sample of older adults repeatedly over time (e.g., when the pandemic activity
245 decreases or flares up again in new waves) could shed more light on the actual effect of the COVID-
246 19 period on cognitive functioning.

247 To summarize, the COVID-19 pandemic had a severe impact on the wellbeing, activity level
248 and sleep quality of older adults. Only a small group of participants reported a decline in cognitive
249 functioning. All changes reported during the COVID-19 period were strongly related to depression.
250 Findings of this study are important because they give a first, thorough assessment of the mental
251 health of older adults during this COVID-19 pandemic. This study showed that the concerns raised
252 about the wellbeing of older adults are justified, and that this group at risk requires the attention of
253 governments and healthcare. Furthermore, this study exposed that when we are faced with extreme
254 stressors, such as COVID-19, in the future, prevention and intervention strategies are needed to aid
255 older adults to prepare for and cope with them, especially for those at risk of depression (see also
256 suggestions by Armitage & Nellums, 2020; Tian et al., 2020). As COVID-19 has complicated the
257 accessibility of this population through social distancing, nursing home restrictions, and an
258 overwhelmed health system, we are urged to explore novel ways to reach older adults (Chong,
259 Curran, Ames, Lautenschlager, & Castle, 2020).

260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285

METHODS

Participants

Participants were recruited through social media, radio news, targeted newsletters and discussion fora and electronic mailings to all directors of assisted living facilities and nursing homes in Flanders. Only adults aged 65 years or older with a thorough knowledge of Dutch and living in Belgium could participate in the study. Only data of participants who filled in at least 50% of the survey were retained for analysis to ensure sufficient data quality. If a participant completed the survey more than once (N= 5), only the most complete, or, in case all entries were equally complete, the first entry was retained for analyses. In total, 640 participants meeting these criteria took part in the survey study.

We have complied with all relevant ethical regulations. All participants provided written informed consent. This study was approved by the Social and Societal Ethics Committee (SMEC) from KU Leuven (G-2020-1987). For their participation, participants could win one of 16 gift certificates via a random draft.

Material

The online survey was created and data were generated using Qualtrics software (Qualtrics, Provo, UT). The language of the survey was Dutch. The survey consisted of several general and demographic questions and questionnaires.

General and demographic questions. We asked participants several general questions assessing their year of birth, gender, country of residence, nationality, postal code, living situation, educational level, current and previous work situation, monthly individual net income, age-related diseases and whether the participant and/or any of their close relatives or friends had been infected with the corona virus.

Subjective cognitive functioning. To assess subjective cognitive functioning, the Dutch version of the *Cognitive Failures Questionnaire* (CFQ; Broadbent, Cooper, Fitzgerald, & Parkes, 1982;

286 Merckelbach, Muris, Nijman, & de Jong, 1996) was used. The CFQ exists of 25 items assessing self-
287 reported frequency of failures in several cognitive domains (e.g., perception, attention, memory and
288 action). In our study, participants indicated how often these failures occurred during the past month
289 (i.e., during the COVID-19 period) on a 5-point scale ranging from “very often” (=4) to “never” (=0).
290 We added a response option “not applicable”, since some situations described in the questionnaire
291 might not have occurred during the COVID-19 period for some participants (e.g., “Do you fail to see
292 what you want in a supermarket (although it’s there)?”). A total score across all items, varying
293 between 0 and 100, provides a measure of the general susceptibility to cognitive failures with a
294 higher score indicating a higher susceptibility. The “not applicable” scores were not included to
295 calculate the total score. For participants who indicated “not applicable” on more than 50% of the
296 items (N=15), no CFQ total score was computed. The Dutch version of the CFQ has been validated
297 across the adult life span, including older adults (Rast, Zimprich, Van Boxtel, & Jolles, 2009). The
298 internal consistency of the CFQ in the current study was high with Cronbach’s $\alpha=.92$.

299 *Subjective cognitive change.* Additionally, we assessed whether participants felt that their
300 general cognitive functioning had changed during the COVID-19 period using a 3-point scale: Yes, it
301 has decreased (=1); No, it has not changed (=2); Yes, it has improved (=3). We also asked them
302 whether they had experienced the following cognitive problems during the COVID-19 period:
303 problems to remember things, to concentrate on something, to do two things at the same time, to
304 recall things and forgetfulness. They indicated the frequency of these problems in comparison to the
305 period before the COVID-19 period on a 5-point scale with labels “a lot more than before” (=1),
306 “more than before” (=2), “not more or less than before” (=3), “less than before” (=4), “a lot less than
307 before” (=5). The internal consistency of these six subjective cognitive change questions was high
308 with Cronbach’s $\alpha=.86$.

309 *Depression.* To assess self-reported depression, the *Geriatric Depression Scale-15* (GDS-15;
310 Sheikh & Yesavage, 1986; Bleeker, Frohn de Winter, & Cornelissen, 1985) was used. This scale exists
311 of 15 Yes/No items and is designed to assess depressive symptoms in older populations. Using a

312 score key, each item receives a score of 0 or 1 and these scores are then summed leading to a total
313 score between 0 and 15, with higher scores indicating more depressive symptoms. The psychometric
314 qualities of the GDS-15 have been supported by numerous studies, also in Dutch older populations
315 (e.g., de Craen, Heeren, & Gussekloo, 2003). The internal consistency of the GDS-15 in the current
316 study was high with Cronbach's $\alpha=.81$.

317 *Activity and sleep.* Participants were asked to evaluate their activity level and quality of sleep
318 both before the COVID-19 period (retrospectively), and during the past week (i.e., during the COVID-
319 19 period). These four questions were answered on an 11-point scale ranging from 0 (i.e., "not active
320 at all" and "very poor quality of sleep" respectively) to 10 (i.e., "extremely active" and "very good
321 quality of sleep" respectively).

322 *Wellbeing.* Wellbeing was assessed using the Dutch version of the *Personal Wellbeing Index –*
323 *Adults* (PWI-A; International Wellbeing Group, 2013; Van Beuningen & de Jonge, 2011). The PWI-A is
324 a multidimensional scale measuring life satisfaction in seven different domains (standard of living,
325 health, achieving in life, relationships, safety, community connectedness and future security). An
326 additional item assessing general life satisfaction can also be administered. All eight items are scored
327 on an 11-point scale ranging from "no satisfaction at all" (=0) to "completely satisfied" (=10). The raw
328 scores are converted to a 0-100 scale, with higher scores indicating more satisfaction. The scores for
329 each domain can be studied individually, and the seven domain items (excluding the general life
330 satisfaction item) can be summed to provide an index of "subjective wellbeing". The psychometric
331 properties of the PWI-A have been reported as satisfactory for older adults (Forjaz et al., 2011) and
332 for a Dutch sample (Van Beuningen & de Jonge, 2011). In the current study, participants filled in the
333 PWI-A twice: they indicated their satisfaction for each domain once (retrospectively) for the period
334 before COVID-19 and once for the past month (i.e., during the COVID-19 period). The internal
335 consistency in the current study was high for the PWI-A total score (i.e., 7 items) relating to the pre-
336 COVID-19 period (Cronbach's $\alpha=.91$) and to the past month (Cronbach's $\alpha=.91$).

337 *Social network.* The *Lubben Social Network Scale-6* (LSNS-6; Lubben et al., 2006), specifically
338 constructed for older adults, was used to assess social network, support and isolation. It consists of
339 six items: three items evaluating family ties and three comparable items evaluating non-family ties.
340 These items are scored on a 6-point scale where participants indicate the number of ties (i.e., 0, 1, 2,
341 3 or 4, 5 to 8, 9 or more). A sum score can be calculated, ranging between 0 and 30, with a higher
342 score indicating more social engagement. The psychometric properties of the LSNS-6 are good
343 (Lubben et al., 2006), although we were unable to obtain data for the Dutch version specifically. The
344 internal consistency of the LSNS-6 in the current study was high with Cronbach's $\alpha=.82$. Next to the
345 LSNS-6, we also asked participants how many contacts they had (not taking into account cohabitants)
346 during the past week in real life outside, in real life inside, by telephone and via the internet (e.g.,
347 skype, whatsapp), using the same response scale of the LSNS-6.

348 *Resilience.* Resilience, or the ability to bounce back or recover from stress, was assessed
349 using the Dutch version of the *Brief Resilience Scale* (BRS; Smith et al.; 2008; Soer, Bieleman, &
350 Schreurs, 2019). The BRS exists of six items measuring the degree of individual resilience. The items
351 are scored on a 5-point scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". After reversing
352 items 2, 4 and 6, a mean score is calculated which ranges between 1 and 5, with a higher score
353 indicating more resilience. The validity of the BRS has been confirmed in older adults (da Silva-Sauer
354 et al., 2020) and for the Dutch version (Soer et al., 2019). The internal consistency of the BRS in the
355 current study was high with Cronbach's $\alpha=.81$.

356

357 *Procedure*

358 The survey existed of a first page providing participants with information about the study
359 and an informed consent form. After participants had read the instructions and informed consent,
360 they were asked to explicitly check a box if they agreed to participate and to confirm that they were
361 65 years or older.

362 Afterwards, participants first completed the general and demographics questions. Next, the
363 questionnaires were administered in the following order: CFQ, subjective cognitive change questions,
364 GDS-15, questions regarding activity level and sleep quality, PWI-A, additional social network
365 question, LSNS-6 and BRS. Finally, participants could provide their contact details to contact them for
366 follow-up surveys or in case they had won a gift certificate. After completing the survey, we provided
367 participants with web links and a telephone number where they could obtain more information
368 about COVID-19 and psychological care if needed. The median number of minutes it took
369 participants to complete the survey was 20. The survey was launched on May 19 2020 and closed on
370 June 22 2020.

371

372 *Statistical analyses*

373 First, we summarized the participant characteristics and the Pearson correlations between
374 the main constructs. We considered correlations as small, medium or strong when the correlation
375 coefficient was below .30, between .30 and .50 and above .50, respectively (based on Cohen, 1988).

376 Second, we compared participants' report of their current wellbeing, activity level, sleep
377 quality and cognitive functioning (i.e., *during* the COVID-19 period) with their retrospective report of
378 these variables *before* COVID-19. We calculated difference scores between the reports during and
379 before the COVID-19 period for activity level, sleep quality and the PWI-A items and total score (i.e.,
380 $\text{report}_{\text{during}} - \text{report}_{\text{before}}$, where negative scores indicate a decrease in the report during the COVID-19
381 period compared to before). From now on, we will refer to these as the *difference scores*. We
382 reported the descriptive statistics for the difference scores and the subjective cognitive change
383 questions. Furthermore, we conducted two-sided paired-samples *t*-tests with Bonferroni correction
384 to compare the reports during and before the COVID-19 period. As 11 comparisons were conducted
385 (i.e., for the eight PWI-A items and total score, activity level and sleep quality). Cohen's *d* (calculated
386 as the difference between the means divided by the standard deviation) were reported. We

387 considered effect sizes as small, medium or strong when the Cohen's d was around .20, .50 and .80,
388 respectively (based on Cohen, 1988).

389 Finally, we conducted linear or ordinal logistic regression analyses to determine the
390 contribution of potential vulnerability and protective factors, in explaining changes in wellbeing,
391 activity level and sleep quality (i.e., the 11 difference scores) and cognitive functioning (i.e., the six
392 subjective cognitive change questions). This led to a total of 17 dependent variables and hence 17
393 separate regression analyses. These analyses were grouped in three parts focused on changes in
394 wellbeing (i.e., nine analyses), changes in activity and sleep (two analyses) and changes in cognitive
395 functioning (i.e., six analyses). Bonferroni correction was applied for each group of analyses, leading
396 to α being set at .0055 for wellbeing, .025 for activity and sleep and .0083 for cognitive functioning.
397 For changes in wellbeing, activity level and sleep quality, linear regression analyses were performed.
398 Given the ordinal nature of the subjective cognitive change questions, we conducted ordinal linear
399 regression analyses for changes in cognitive functioning. The following variables were included in
400 each regression analysis as predictors: gender, age, whether the participant lived alone or not
401 (derived based on the reported number of cohabitants, see Supplementary Table 1), whether the
402 participant lived in a care facility or not (derived based on the reported living situation, see
403 Supplementary Table 1), the reported monthly individual net income (to index socio-economic
404 status), depression (i.e., GDS-15 total score), social network (i.e., LSNS-6 total score), general
405 susceptibility to cognitive failures (i.e., CFQ total score) and resilience (i.e. BRS total score).
406 Categorical predictors were dummy recoded. The presence of multicollinearity was examined using a
407 cut-off of <5 for the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF; Sheather, 2009).

408

409

410

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

411 The anonymized, raw data that support the findings of this study are available in the Open Science

412 Framework (OSF, <https://osf.io/re7sm/>) with the identifier “doi: 10.17605/OSF.IO/RE7SM”.

413

414

CODE AVAILABILITY

415 The SPSS code used to generate results that are reported in the paper is available upon request.

416

417

REFERENCES

- 418 Armitage, R., & Nellums, L.B. (2020). COVID-19 and the consequences of isolating the elderly. *The*
419 *Lancet Public Health*, 5(5), e256.
- 420 Banerjee, D. (2020). The impact of Covid-19 pandemic on elderly mental health. *International Journal*
421 *of Geriatric Psychiatry*, 1-2.
- 422 Bherer, L., Erickson, K.I., & Liu-Ambrose, T. (2013). A review of the effects of physical activity and
423 exercise on cognitive and brain functions in older adults. *Journal of Aging Research*, 2013, 1-8.
- 424 Bleeker, J.A.C., Frohn de Winter, M.L., & Cornelissen, E. (1985). Dutch translation of the Geriatric
425 Depression Scale. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 33, 77-82.
- 426 Broadbent, D.E., Cooper, P.F., Fitzgerald, P., & Parkes, L.R. (1982). The cognitive failures
427 questionnaire (CFQ) and its correlates. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 21, 1-16.
- 428 Brooke, J., & Jackson, D. (2020). Older people and COVID-19: Isolation, risk and ageism. *Journal of*
429 *Clinical Nursing*, 29(13-14), 2044-2046.
- 430 Burmester, B., Leathem, J., & Merrick, P. (2016). Subjective Cognitive Complaints and Objective
431 Cognitive Function in Aging: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Recent Cross-Sectional
432 Findings. *Neuropsychology Review*, 26(4), 376–393.
- 433 Carstensen, L.L. (1995). Evidence for a life-span theory of socioemotional selectivity. *Current*
434 *Directions in Psychological Science*, 4, 151–156.
- 435 Chong, T. W. H., Curran, E., Ames, D., Lautenschlager, N. T., & Castle, D. J. (2020). Mental health of
436 older adults during the COVID-19 pandemic: lessons from history to guide our future.
437 *International Psychogeriatrics*, 1–2.
- 438 Clare, L., Wu, Y.-T., Teale, J.C., MacLeod, C., Matthews, F.,.... Brayne, C. (2017). Potentially modifiable
439 lifestyle factors, cognitive reserve, and cognitive function in later life: A cross-sectional study.
440 *PLOS Medicine*, 14(3), e1002259.
- 441 Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.). L. Erlbaum
442 Associates: Hillsdale, N.J..

- 443 Darlington, R. B. (1968). Multiple regression in psychological research and practice. *Psychological*
444 *Bulletin, 69*, 161-182.
- 445 da Silva-Sauer, L., de la Torre-Luque, A., Smith, B.W., Lins, M.C.M.C., Andrade, S., & Fernández-Calvo,
446 B. (2020). Brief Resilience Scale (BRS) Portuguese Version: validity and metrics for the older adult
447 population, *Aging & Mental Health, 1-10*.
- 448 de Craen, A.J.M., Heeren, T.J., & Gussekloo, J. (2003). Accuracy of the 15-item Geriatric Depression
449 Scale (GDS-15) in a community sample of the oldest old. *International Journal of Geriatric*
450 *Psychiatry, 18*(1), 63-66.
- 451 Forjaz, M.J., Prieto-Flores, M.E., Ayala, A., Rodriguez-Blazquez, C., Fernandez-Mayoralas, G., Rojo-
452 Perez, F., et al. (2011). Measurement properties of the community wellbeing index in older
453 adults. *Quality of Life Research, 20*, 733–743.
- 454 Guterres, A. (2020, May). *Secretary-General’s Policy Brief: The Impact of COVID-19 on older persons*.
455 United Nations.
- 456 Hansen, T., & Slagsvold, B. (2012). The age and subjective well-being paradox revisited: A
457 multidimensional perspective. *Norsk Epidemiologi, 22*(2).
- 458 Hikichi, H., Aida, J., Kondo, K., Tsuboya, T., Matsuyama, Y., Subramanian, S. V., & Kawachi, I. (2016).
459 Increased risk of dementia in the aftermath of the 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake and
460 Tsunami. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 113*(45), E6911–E6918.
- 461 Hikichi, H., Tsuboya, T., Aida, J., Matsuyama, Y., Kondo, K., Subramanian, S.V., & Kawachi, I. (2017).
462 Social capital and cognitive decline in the aftermath of a natural disaster: a natural experiment
463 from the 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake and Tsunami. *The Lancet Planetary Health, 1*(3),
464 e105–e113.
- 465 International Wellbeing Group (2013). *Personal wellbeing index*. 5th ed. Melbourne: Australian
466 Centre on Quality of Life, Deakin University.
- 467 Kivi, M.K., Hansson, I., & Bjälkebring, P. (2020). Up and About: Older Adults’ Well-being During the
468 COVID-19 Pandemic in a Swedish Longitudinal Study. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B*,

- 469 gbaa084.
- 470 López, J., Perez-Rojo, G., Noriega, C., Carretero, I., Velasco, C., Martinez-Huertas, J.,... Galarraga, L.
471 (2020). Psychological well-being among older adults during the COVID-19 outbreak: A
472 comparative study of the young–old and the old–old adults. *International Psychogeriatrics*, 1-6.
- 473 Lubben, J., Blozik, E., Gillmann, G., Iliffe, S., von Renteln Kruse, W., Beck, J.C., & Stuck, A.E. (2006).
474 Performance of an abbreviated version of the Lubben Social Network Scale among three
475 European Community–dwelling older adult populations. *The Gerontologist*, 46(4), 503–513.
- 476 Maglione, J.E., Ancoli-Israel, S., Peters, K.W., Paudel, M.L., Yaffe, K., Ensrud, K.E., & Stone, K.L. (2012).
477 Depressive Symptoms and Subjective and Objective Sleep in Community-Dwelling Older Women.
478 *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 60(4), 635–643.
- 479 Malone, C. & Wachholtz, A. (2017). The Relationship of Anxiety and Depression to Subjective Well-
480 Being in a Mainland Chinese Sample. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 57(1), 266–278.
- 481 Merckelbach, H., Muris, P., Nijman, H.L.I., & de Jong, P.J. (1996). Self-reported cognitive failures and
482 neurotic symptomatology. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 20(6), 715-724.
- 483 Murman, D. (2015). The Impact of Age on Cognition. *Seminars in Hearing*, 36(03), 111–121.
- 484 Paulhus, D.L., Robins, R.W., Trzesniewski, K.H., & Tracy, J.L. (2004). Two Replicable Suppressor
485 Situations in Personality Research. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 39(2), 301-326.
- 486 Qualtrics Version May-June 2020. Copyright © 2019 Qualtrics. Qualtrics and all other Qualtrics
487 product or service names are registered trademarks or trademarks of Qualtrics, Provo, UT, USA.
488 <https://www.qualtrics.com>
- 489 Rafiey, H., Momtaz, Y., Alipour, F., Khankeh, H., Ahmadi, S., Sabzi Khoshnami, M., & Haron, S.A.
490 (2016). Are older people more vulnerable to long-term impacts of disasters? *Clinical Interventions*
491 *in Aging*, 11, 1791–1795.
- 492 Rast, P., Zimprich, D., Van Boxtel, M., & Jolles, J. (2009). Factor Structure and Measurement
493 Invariance of the Cognitive Failures Questionnaire Across the Adult Life Span. *Assessment*, 16(2),
494 145-158.

- 495 Roshanaei-Moghaddam, B., Katon, W.J., & Russo, J. (2009). The longitudinal effects of depression on
496 physical activity. *General Hospital Psychiatry, 31*(4), 306–315.
- 497 Sato, H., & Kawahara, J. (2011). Selective bias in retrospective self-reports of negative mood states.
498 *Anxiety, Stress & Coping, 24*(4), 359–367.
- 499 Sciensano (2020). COVID-19. Retrieved August 24, from <https://epistat.wiv-isp.be/covid/>
- 500 Sheather, S. (2009). *A modern approach to regression with R*. New York, NY: Springer.
- 501 Sheikh, J.I., & Yesavage, J.A. (1986). Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS): Recent evidence and
502 development of a shorter version. *Clinical Gerontologist, 5*, 165-173.
- 503 Smith, B.W., Dalen, J., Wiggins, K., Tooley, E., Christopher, P., & Bernard, J. (2008). The brief
504 resilience scale: assessing the ability to bounce back. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine,*
505 *15*(3), 194-200.
- 506 Soer, R., Bieleman, H.J.A., & Schreurs, K.M.G. (2019). Measurement properties and implications of
507 the Brief Resilience Scale in healthy workers. *Journal of Occupational Health, 61*(3), 242-250.
- 508 Stanton, R., To, Q.G., Khalesi, S., Williams, S.L., Alley, S.J., Thwaite, T.L.,... Vandelanotte, C. (2020).
509 Depression, Anxiety and Stress during COVID-19: Associations with Changes in Physical Activity,
510 Sleep, Tobacco and Alcohol Use in Australian Adults. *International Journal of Environmental*
511 *Research and Public Health, 17*(11), 4065.
- 512 Swift, H.J., Vauclair, C.-M., Abrams, D., Bratt, C., Marques, S., & Lima, M.-L. (2014). Revisiting the
513 Paradox of Well-being: The Importance of National Context. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B,*
514 *69*(6), 920–929.
- 515 Tian, F., Li, H., Tian, S., Yang, J., Shao, J., & Tian, C. (2020). Psychological symptoms of ordinary
516 Chinese citizens based on SCL-90 during the level I emergency response to COVID-19. *Psychiatry*
517 *Research, 288*, 112992.
- 518 United Nations (UN) (2020). *Policy Brief: COVID-19 and the Need for Action on Mental Health.*
519 Consulted via [https://unsdg.un.org/sites/default/files/2020-05/UN-Policy-Brief-COVID-19-and-](https://unsdg.un.org/sites/default/files/2020-05/UN-Policy-Brief-COVID-19-and-mental-health.pdf)
520 [mental-health.pdf](https://unsdg.un.org/sites/default/files/2020-05/UN-Policy-Brief-COVID-19-and-mental-health.pdf) on August 26 2020.

- 521 Vahia, I.V. (2020). COVID-19, Aging, and Mental Health: Lessons From the First Six Months. The
522 *American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, 28(7), 691–694.
- 523 Van Beuningen, J. & de Jonge, T. (2011). *The Personal Wellbeing Index. Construct Validity for the*
524 *Netherlands*. Discussion paper. CBS: Den Haag/Heerlen.
- 525 van der Ham, I.J.M., van der Kuil, M.N.A., & Claessen, M.H.G. (2020). Quality of self-reported
526 cognition: effects of age and gender on spatial navigation self-reports. *Aging & Mental Health*, 1–
527 6.
- 528 van Tilburg, T.G., Steinmetz, S., Stolte, E., van der Roest, H., & de Vries, D. (2020). Loneliness and
529 mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic: A study among Dutch older adults. *The Journals of*
530 *Gerontology: Series B*, gbaa111.
- 531 World Health Organization (Who) (2020). *Health care considerations for older people during COVID-*
532 *19 pandemic*. Consulted via [https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-](https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-emergencies/coronavirus-covid-19/technical-guidance/health-care-considerations-for-older-people-during-covid-19-pandemic)
533 [emergencies/coronavirus-covid-19/technical-guidance/health-care-considerations-for-older-](https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-emergencies/coronavirus-covid-19/technical-guidance/health-care-considerations-for-older-people-during-covid-19-pandemic)
534 [people-during-covid-19-pandemic](https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-emergencies/coronavirus-covid-19/technical-guidance/health-care-considerations-for-older-people-during-covid-19-pandemic) on August 26 2020.
- 535

536

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

537 The authors wish to thank all participants for completing the survey and all nursing staff who
538 helped participants to complete the survey.

539

540

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

541 S.D.P., C.G. and E.V.D.B. designed the study; S.D.P. and E.V.D.B. created the survey; S.D.P.,
542 C.G. and E.V.D.B. recruited the participants; S.D.P. and E.V.D.B. analyzed the data and wrote the
543 manuscript; C.G., E.D., M.-A.V and R.D.R provided feedback on previous drafts of the manuscript, and
544 provided suggestions for the analysis strategy.

545

546

COMPETING INTERESTS STATEMENT

547 No competing interests exist.

548

549

550 **Table 1**551 *Means (standard deviations) and Pearson correlations between age and the total scores of the questionnaires in the survey.*

	Valid N	Mean (SD)	Age	CFQ	GDS-15	PWI-A_pre	PWI-A_current	LSNS-6	BRS
Age	640	73 (6.99)	-	-.19***	-0.005	-.045	.020	-.17***	-.009
CFQ	623	22.43 (12.02)		-	.28***	-.29***	-.31***	-.035	-.29***
GDS-15	640	3.00 (3.01)			-	-.47***	-.70***	-.32***	-.45***
PWI-A_pre	640	78.05 (11.20)				-	.74***	.33***	.42***
PWI-A_current	640	70.67 (14.84)					-	.35***	.43***
LSNS-6	636	16.52 (5.65)						-	.20***
BRS	633	3.33 (0.67)							-

552 *Note.* CFQ = Cognitive Failures Questionnaire total score; GDS-15 = Geriatric Depression Scale-15 total score; PWI-A_pre = Personal Wellbeing Index – Adults
553 total score retrospectively assessed for the period before COVID-19; PWI-A_current = Personal Wellbeing Index – Adults total score assessed for the current
554 month (i.e., during the COVID-19 period); LSNS-6 = Lubben Social Network Scale-6 total score; BRS = Brief Resilience Scale mean score; *** $p < .001$.

555 **Table 2**

556 *Mean (SD) of the reported changes in wellbeing, activity level and sleep quality (all based on the calculated difference scores) and cognitive functioning*
 557 *(based on the subjective cognitive change questions) and the number of participants who reported a decrease ($N_{decrease}$), no change ($N_{nochange}$) or an increase*
 558 *($N_{increase}$) in wellbeing, activity level, sleep quality and cognitive functioning based on the difference scores and the subjective cognitive change questions.*
 559

		<i>M(SD)</i>	$N_{decrease}$	$N_{nochange}$	$N_{increase}$
Change in wellbeing (PWI-A)	General life satisfaction	-9.63 (15.34)	317	299	24
	Standard of living	-3.98 (11.41)	140	479	21
	Health	-2.88 (9.39)	130	484	26
	Achieving in life	-3.88 (11.09)	131	491	18
	Relationships	-7.09 (15.09)	213	398	29
	Safety	-10.39 (16.10)	291	340	9
	Community connectedness	-10.89 (17.70)	290	323	27
	Future security	-10.39 (14.69)	306	328	6
	Subjective wellbeing (PWI-A total score)	-7.39 (10.02)	483	113	44
Change in activity level		-0.94 (1.61)	321	276	43
Change in sleep quality		-0.28 (1.19)	122	472	46
Change in cognitive functioning	Cognitive functioning	1.94 (0.31)	50	576	14
	Remembering	2.93 (0.40)	53	575	12
	Concentration	2.91 (0.44)	78	539	23
	Doing two things at the same time	2.97 (0.35)	37	584	19
	Recalling	2.92 (0.41)	63	560	17
	forgetfulness	2.92 (0.40)	63	560	17

560 *Note.* For the subjective cognitive change questions assessing problems with remembering, concentration, doing two things at the same time, recalling and
 561 forgetfulness, the response options 1="a lot more problems than before" and 2="more problems than before" were grouped together and the response
 562 options 4="less problems than before" and 5="a lot less problems than before" were grouped together in the reported numbers of participants.
 563

564 **Table 3**


565 *Statistical results of the 17 linear and ordinal logistic regression analyses conducted for changes in wellbeing, activity level and sleep quality (all based on the*
 566 *calculated difference scores) and cognitive functioning (based on the subjective cognitive change questions) with gender, age, whether the participant lived*
 567 *alone or not, whether the participant lived in a care facility or not, monthly individual net income, depression (i.e., GDS-15 total score), social network (i.e.,*
 568 *LSNS-6 total score), general susceptibility to cognitive failures (i.e., CFQ total score) and resilience (i.e. BRS total score) as predictors. Both the fit of the full*
 569 *model (Model fit) and the test statistics for the significant predictors are reported.*

Group of analyses	Dependent variable	Model fit	Predictor	Test statistics		
Changes in wellbeing ($\alpha=.0055$)	General life satisfaction	$F(9,605)=21.76, p<.001, R^2_{Adj}=.25$	Depression	$\beta=-2.77, 95\% CI=[-3.20,-2.34], t(605)=-12.66^{***}$		
			Resilience	$\beta=-2.70, 95\% CI=[-4.56,-0.85], t(605)=-2.86^{**}$		
	Standard of living	$F(9,605)=13.09, p<.001, R^2_{Adj}=.15$	Depression	$\beta=-1.29, 95\% CI=[-1.62,-0.95], t(605)=-7.48^{***}$		
			Living in a care facility or not	$\beta=-7.07, 95\% CI=[-10.02,-4.12], t(605)=-4.70^{***}$		
			Health	$F(9,605)=8.00, p<.001, R^2_{Adj}=.093$	Depression	$\beta=-0.87, 95\% CI=[-1.16,-0.59], t(605)=-5.99^{***}$
			Achieving in life	$F(9,605)=12.41, p<.001, R^2_{Adj}=.14$	Depression	$\beta=-1.43, 95\% CI=[-1.76,-1.10], t(605)=-8.55^{***}$
			Relationships	$F(9,604)=10.38, p<.001, R^2_{Adj}=.12$	Depression	$\beta=-1.72, 95\% CI=[-2.17,-1.27], t(604)=-7.47^{***}$
			Safety	$F(9,605)=13.38, p<.001, R^2_{Adj}=.15$	Depression	$\beta=1.83, 95\% CI=[-2.30,-1.36], t(605)=-7.62^{***}$
			Community connectedness	$F(9,605)=13.24, p<.001, R^2_{Adj}=.15$	Depression	$\beta=-2.53, 95\% CI=[-3.05,-2.01], t(605)=-9.50^{***}$
Future security	$F(9,605)=15.46, p<.001, R^2_{Adj}=.18$	Depression	$\beta=-1.87, 95\% CI=[-2.29,-1.44], t(605)=-8.70^{***}$			
Subjective wellbeing	$F(9,605)=25.27, p<.001, R^2_{Adj}=.26$	Depression	$\beta=-1.79, 95\% CI=[-2.06,-1.51], t(605)=-12.78^{***}$			
Changes in activity level and sleep quality ($\alpha=.025$)	Activity level	$F(9,605)=12.54, p<.001, R^2_{Adj}=.15$	Depression	$\beta=-0.22, 95\% CI=[-0.27,-0.17], t(605)=-9.02^{***}$		
	Sleep Quality	$F(9,605)=8.39, p<.001, R^2_{Adj}=.098$	Depression	$\beta=-0.12, 95\% CI=[-0.16,-0.084], t(605)=-6.60^{***}$		
			Gender	$\beta=0.25, 95\% CI=[0.055,0.45], t(598)=2.52^*$		
Changes in cognitive functioning ($\alpha=.0083$)	Cognitive functioning	$\chi^2(9)=94.49, p<.001, Nagelkerke R^2=.27$	Depression	$\beta=-0.28, 95\% CI=[-0.38,-0.18]; OR=0.76; Wald(1)=30.03^{***}$		
			CFQ	$\beta=-0.061, 95\% CI=[-0.086,-0.035]; OR=0.94; Wald(1)=22.06^{***}$		
	Remembering	$\chi^2(9)=94.10, p<.001, Nagelkerke R^2=.25$	Depression	$\beta=-0.24, 95\% CI=[-0.34,-0.14]; OR=0.79; Wald(1)=22.19^{***}$		
			CFQ	$\beta=-0.076, 95\% CI=[-0.10,-0.050]; OR=0.93; Wald(1)=32.66^{***}$		
	Concentration	$\chi^2(9)=96.92, p<.001, Nagelkerke R^2=.22$	Depression	$\beta=-0.24, 95\% CI=[-0.33,-0.16]; OR=0.79; Wald(1)=32.83^{***}$		
			CFQ	$\beta=-0.049, 95\% CI=[-0.069,-0.028]; OR=0.95; Wald(1)=22.13^{***}$		
	Doing two things at the same time	$\chi^2(9)=49.50, p<.001, Nagelkerke R^2=.15$	Depression	$\beta=-0.20, 95\% CI=[-0.31,-0.09]; OR=0.82; Wald(1)=12.94^{***}$		
			CFQ	$\beta=-0.048, 95\% CI=[-0.074,-0.022]; OR=0.95; Wald(1)=12.75^{***}$		
	Recalling	$\chi^2(9)=74.79, p<.001, Nagelkerke R^2=.19$	Depression	$\beta=-0.14, 95\% CI=[-0.23,-0.049]; OR=0.87; Wald(1)=9.30^{**}$		
			CFQ	$\beta=-0.062, 95\% CI=[-0.084,-0.039]; OR=0.94; Wald(1)=29.74^{***}$		
	forgetfulness	$\chi^2(9)=96.24, p<.001, Nagelkerke R^2=.24$	Depression	$\beta=-0.22, 95\% CI=[-0.31,-0.13]; OR=0.80; Wald(1)=21.94^{***}$		
				CFQ	$\beta=-0.065, 95\% CI=[-0.088,-0.041]; OR=0.94; Wald(1)=30.09^{***}$	

570 *Note.* Only predictors that contributed significantly to the model are reported; OR = odds-ratio; * $p<.02$; ** $p<.005$; *** $p<.001$.

571 **Figure 1**

572 *Frequency distribution of age.*



573

574 **Figure 2**

575 *Spreading of participants across Flanders.*

