Psychological distress among people with probable COVID-19 infection: analysis of the UK Household Longitudinal Study

Authors

Claire L Niedzwiedz* [1]

Michaela Benzeval [2]

Kirsten Hainey [3]

Alastair H Leyland [3]

Srinivasa Vittal Katikireddi [3]

*Corresponding author. Email: Claire.niedzwiedz@glasgow.ac.uk

[1] Institute of Health & Wellbeing, University of Glasgow, 1 Lilybank Gardens, Glasgow G12 8RZ, UK

[2] Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex, Colchester CO4 3SQ, UK

[3] MRC/CSO Social & Public Health Sciences Unit, University of Glasgow, Berkeley Square, 99 Berkeley Street, Glasgow G3 7HR, UK

Summary

Studies exploring the longer-term effects of experiencing COVID-19 infection on mental health are lacking. We explored the relationship between reporting probable COVID-19 symptoms in April 2020 and psychological distress (measured using the General Health Questionnaire) one, two and three months later. Data were taken from the UK Household Longitudinal Study, a nationally representative household panel survey of UK adults. Elevated levels of psychological distress were found up to three months after probable COVID-19, compared to participants with no likely infection. Associations were stronger among younger age groups and men. Further research into the psychological sequalae of COVID-19 is urgently needed.

Introduction

Considerable concerns exist about persistent and debilitating symptoms experienced by people who have had COVID-19 infection, often referred to as 'long-COVID'.(1) However, population-based data remain rare, with the majority of COVID-19 research focused on severe adverse physical consequences of acute disease. There is growing evidence that a substantial number of people experience persisting symptoms such as fatigue and chest pain months after infection.(2) While the mental health consequences of societal changes during the pandemic (including lockdown) have been studied,(3, 4) the impact of COVID-19 infection on mental health and the role of psychiatric symptoms in long-COVID remain unclear.

Research from previous coronavirus outbreaks demonstrates potential for psychiatric consequences of infection.(5) An initial study using administrative data from the US demonstrates a COVID-19 diagnosis was associated with an increased incidence of psychiatric diagnoses (particularly anxiety and insomnia) in the following 14 to 90 days.(6) However, electronic health records may not capture more minor initial COVID-19 symptoms and people with less severe psychological problems that do not present to health services. Changes in healthcare seeking and treatment may lead to substantial potential bias in the context of a pandemic, where disruptions to health systems have been widespread. Data from surveys may therefore be better placed to capture impacts on mental health and need for intervention. To explore the relationship between COVID-19 infection and mental health in the UK context, we assessed associations between experiencing COVID-19 symptoms and changes in psychological distress in a representative longitudinal survey of adults.

Methods

The UK Household Longitudinal Study (also referred to as Understanding Society) is a nationally representative longitudinal household panel survey, based on a clustered stratified probability sample of UK households, described in detail previously.(7) All adults (aged 16+ years) in chosen households are invited to participate. Data collection for each wave usually takes place over 24 months, with participants re-interviewed every year by online, face-to-face or telephone survey. We used pre-pandemic data from wave 9 (2017-19), which achieved a household response rate of over 80%.(7, 8) In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, additional waves of data were collected via online survey during April (24th to 30th April), May (27th May to 2nd June), June (25th to 1st July) and July (24th to 31st July).(9) The response rate for the first COVID wave was 48.6% of those who took part at wave 9.(10)

Psychological distress was measured at each wave (pre-pandemic in 2017-19 and during the pandemic in April, May, June and July 2020) via the General Health Questionnaire 12 item instrument (GHQ-12). GHQ-12 assesses psychological distress and respondents reporting a score of four or more are likely experiencing symptoms to a clinically significant level.(3) Self-reported symptoms of cough, fever and anosmia allowed identification of individuals with probable COVID-19 infection in April 2020 (Supplementary Material). Of 28 people reporting hospitalisation for COVID-19 in April 2020, 23 were classified as probable COVID-19 according to our definition. We assessed associations between probable COVID-19 infection and psychological distress at one, two and three months later using logistic regression, with models adjusted to account for pre-pandemic psychological distress (GHQ score) and other covariates (gender, age, ethnicity and longstanding illness or disability). We also conducted subgroup analyses by age group (under 45, 45-64, 65+ years) and gender (men, women). Analyses used inverse probability weights to adjust for non-response and standard errors were adjusted for the complex survey design. Statistical analyses were performed in Stata/MP 15.1.

The University of Essex Ethics Committee approved all data collection for the Understanding Society main survey and COVID waves, which were performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. All survey participants provided fully informed consent. No additional ethical approval was necessary for this secondary data analysis.

Results

The characteristics of participants are described in Supplementary Table S1. In total, 9.0% experienced probable COVID-19 symptoms in April 2020 (N=12,561). Psychological distress was more prevalent in May (27.5%), but reduced over time to 21.0% in July. In comparison to participants without probable COVID-19 infection, psychological distress was more common at one (OR 1.40, 95% CI 1.10-1.76), two (OR 1.41, 95% CI 1.08-1.86), and three (OR 1.31, 95% CI 0.99-1.73) months after reporting COVID-19 symptoms during April 2020 in May, June and July, respectively in adjusted analyses (Table 1, Supplementary Table S2-S4). Subgroup analyses demonstrated greater associations in men (OR=1.54 in May, 95% CI: 1.04-2.29) and younger adults (OR=1.50 in May, 95% CI: 1.02-2.20). Overall, women, younger age groups and those with a limiting illness or disability also had consistently higher levels of psychological distress across the first few months of the pandemic.

Discussion

Our study suggests that COVID-19 infection could lead to an increase in clinically significant psychological distress which persists months after infection and is additional to the mental health impacts of societal changes during the pandemic. Younger people and men with probable COVID-19 infection were more likely to report clinical levels of psychological distress compared to older age groups and women. Study strengths include the longitudinal data over multiple points of follow-up during the pandemic, representative study population and accounting for pre-pandemic mental health to limit reverse causation. An important limitation is the ascertainment of COVID-19 infection which was based on self-report and the classification of probable COVID-19 infection at only one time point. However, misclassification may be more likely to result in under-estimation of any underlying association. Further research based on confirmed infection is required and that takes into account any change in the symptoms of long-COVID. Triangulation of survey and

administrative data (e.g. primary care and psychotropic prescribing records) would also be helpful to disentangle the discrepancy between likely clinical need and service use.

The potential adverse impacts of COVID-19 infection on mental health reinforces the benefits of minimising COVID-19 infection among the general population, not only in those at greatest risk of mortality. When considered alongside the mental health impacts generated by mitigation measures, there is potential for a high demand for mental health services resulting from the pandemic. Further research to examine the longer-term psychological sequelae of COVID-19 infection is urgently required.

Table 1: Associations between probable COVID-19 infection in April 2020 and psychological distress at one, two and three months later stratified by age group and gender

	May 2020		**June 2020**		**July 2020**	
	OR	**95% CI**	**OR**	**95% CI**	**OR**	**95% CI**
All	1.40**	1.10,1.76	1.41*	1.08,1.86	1.31	0.99,1.73
By gender						
Men	1.54*	1.04,2.29	1.54	0.99,2.39	1.38	0.84,2.27
Women	1.29	0.97,1.72	1.36	0.99,1.87	1.27	0.88,1.84
By age group						
16-44 years	1.50*	1.02,2.20	1.48	0.90,2.42	1.21	0.76,1.91
45-64 years	1.25	0.84,1.86	1.39	0.88,2.19	1.38	0.85,2.23
65+ years	1.21	0.56,2.64	1.15	0.62,2.13	1.25	0.62,2.53

Adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, limiting long-standing illness, GHQ-12 at wave 9 (2017-19). CI=confidence interval; OR=odds ratio. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Results for May 2020 include people who participated in Wave 9, COVID Wave A (April 2020) and B (May 2020)

Results for June 2020 include people who participated in Wave 9, COVID Wave A (April 2020) and C (June 2020)

Results for July 2020 include people who participated in Wave 9, COVID Wave A (April 2020) and D (July 2020)

References

1. Yelin D, Wirtheim E, Vetter P, Kalil AC, Bruchfeld J, Runold M, et al. Long-term consequences of COVID-19: research needs. The Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2020; 20(10): 1115-7.
2. Kingstone T, Taylor AK, Donnell CA, Atherton H, Blane DN, Chew-Graham CA. Finding the 'right' GP: a qualitative study of the experiences of people with long-COVID. BJGP Open. 2020: bjgpopen20X101143.
3. Niedzwiedz CL, Green MJ, Benzeval M, Campbell D, Craig P, Demou E, et al. Mental health and health behaviours before and during the initial phase of the COVID-19 lockdown: longitudinal analyses of the UK Household Longitudinal Study. Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health. 2020: jech-2020-215060.
4. O'Connor RC, Wetherall K, Cleare S, McClelland H, Melson AJ, Niedzwiedz CL, et al. Mental health and wellbeing during the COVID-19 pandemic: longitudinal analyses of adults in the UK COVID-19 Mental Health & Wellbeing study. The British Journal of Psychiatry. 2020: 1-17.
5. Rogers JP, Chesney E, Oliver D, Pollak TA, McGuire P, Fusar-Poli P, et al. Psychiatric and neuropsychiatric presentations associated with severe coronavirus infections: a systematic review and meta-analysis with comparison to the COVID-19 pandemic. The Lancet Psychiatry. 2020; 7(7): 611-27.
6. Taquet M, Luciano S, Geddes JR, Harrison PJ. Bidirectional associations between COVID-19 and psychiatric disorder: retrospective cohort studies of 62 354 COVID-19 cases in the USA. The Lancet Psychiatry.
7. University of Essex, Institute for Social and Economic Research (2019). Understanding Society: Waves 1-9, 2009-2018 and Harmonised BHPS: Waves 1-18, 1991-2009, User Guide.
8. University of Essex, Institute for Social and Economic Research, NatCen Social Research, Kantar Public. (2019). Understanding Society: Waves 1-9, 2009-2018 and Harmonised BHPS: Waves 1-18, 1991-2009. [data collection]. 12th Edition. UK Data Service. SN: 6614, http://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-6614-13.
9. University of Essex Institute for Social and Economic Research. Understanding Society: COVID-19 Study, 2020. [data collection]. 2020.
10. Benzeval M, Burton J, Crossley TF, Fisher P, Jäckle A, Low H, et al. The Idiosyncratic Impact of an Aggregate Shock: The Distributional Consequences of COVID-19. Available at SSRN 3615691. 2020.

Contributions:

SVK and CLN conceived the idea for the study. CLN and SVK led the study design, with input from AHL. CLN and SVK conducted the analysis, with assistance from KH. SVK and CLN drafted the paper, with all authors critically revising the manuscript.

Funding

We received the following funding: The National Core Studies Health & Wellbeing initiative was funded by the Medical Research Council (MC_PC_20030). AHL and SVK acknowledge funding from the Medical Research Council (MC_UU_12017/13) and Scottish Government Chief Scientist Office (SPHSU13). CLN acknowledges funding from a Medical Research Council Fellowship (MR/R024774/1) and SVK acknowledges funding from a NRS Senior Clinical Fellowship (SCAF/15/02). MB acknowledges funding from the Economic and Social Research Council (ES/N00812X/1). The funders had no role in the study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report.

Declaration of interest

SVK is a member of the UK Government's Scientific Advisory Group on Emergencies (SAGE) subgroup on ethnicity and COVID-19. SVK is co-chair of the Scottish Government's Expert Reference Group on ethnicity and COVID-19. MB is director of the Understanding Society Study. All authors write in an independent capacity and the views expressed do not necessarily represent any government or funding organisation.

Data availability

Understanding Society deidentified survey participant data are available through the UK Data Service (http://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-6614-13; http://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-8644-4). Researchers who would like to use Understanding Society need to register with the UK Data Service (https://ukdataservice.ac.uk/) before being allowed to download datasets.

Acknowledgements

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