medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.24.21251565; this version posted February 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Heterogeneous Mental Health Development During the COVID-19 Pandemic in the United Kingdom*

Lea Ellwardt

Patrick Präg

February 11, 2021

Abstract

Aim The COVID-19 pandemic and the mitigation measures by governments have upended the economic and social lives of many, leading to widespread psychological distress. However, how distress developed during the pandemic and who was most affected is poorly understood. We explore heterogeneity in trajectories of psychological distress during the first six months of the pandemic in the United Kingdom and relate this heterogeneity to socio-demographic and health factors.

Subjects and Methods We analyze six waves of longitudinal, nationally representative survey data from the UK Household Longitudinal Study ($N = 15{,}218$), covering the first lockdown in 2020. First,

*Data availability statement: The data analyzed in this study are publicly available (University of Essex and Institute for Social and Economic Research, 2020) and a replication package can be found on-line (Ellwardt and Präg, 2021).

The Understanding Society COVID-19 study is funded by the Economic and Social Research Council and the Health Foundation. 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. The research data are distributed by the UK Data Service.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2021.02.24.21251565; this version posted February 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

latent class mixture modelling (LCCM) is used to identify trajectories of psychological distress. Second, associations of the trajectories with covariates are tested with multinomial logistic regressions.

Results We find four different trajectories of distress: continuously low, continuously moderate, temporarily elevated, and continuously elevated distress. One-fifth of the population experienced severely elevated risks of distress. Long-term exposure was highest among younger people, women, those who lost income, and those with previous health conditions or COVID-19 symptoms.

Conclusion Given the threat of persistent stress on health, policy measures should be sensitized to the unintended yet far-reaching consequences of non-pharmaceutical interventions.

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic has challenged the routines of everyday life on an unprecedented scale and for many caused worries about aspects such as threats to physical health and financial security, along with the distressing experience of social isolation. However, there is considerable variation in the prevalence of psychological distress (Fancourt *et al.*, 2021; Giuntella *et al.*, 2021; Holmes *et al.*, 2020; McGinty *et al.*, 2020; Niedzwiedz *et al.*, 2021; O'Connor *et al.*, 2021; Pierce *et al.*, 2020), both across social groups and across countries.

During the pandemic, average mental health deteriorated for the whole population, and research has examined variation in this deterioration across subpopulations (Chandola *et al.*, 2021; Niedzwiedz *et al.*, 2021; Proto and Quintana-Domeque, 2021). These subpopulations are typically segmented ex ante in line with theoretical expectations by discrete socio-demographic characteristics, such as social class, ethnicity, or gender. We argue that the development of the individuals' mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic was heterogeneous. Further, we argue that much of the socio-demographics predictors examined in previous research of this heterogeneity might not be as deterministic as that research assumes: Several distinct developments are feasible that do not unanimously pertain to specific socio-demographic

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.24.21251565; this version posted February 26, 2021. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

subpopulations and thereby remain hidden in explanatory analyses. We contribute to previous research by using data-driven exploration, in which we compare and classify individuals based on their mental health development over time, and inspect socio-demographic profiles ex post. The aim of the present study was, first, to detect the number and prevalence of psychological distress trajectories over the first six months of the COVID-19 pandemic, and second, to relate these trajectories to individuals' socio-demographic and health characteristics.

People vary both in their susceptibility to pandemic-induced stressors (Chandola *et al.*, 2021) and their ability to successfully cope with them. This results in different trajectories of psychological distress. For example, while some individuals suffer from increasing psychological distress from the onset (linear growth), others are affected at first and distress levels off again later (inverted u-curve), and others remain resilient to the external stressor altogether. Similarly, the economic recession associated with the pandemic was v-shaped for high-wage workers, and was much deeper and ongoing for low-wage workers (Chetty *et al.*, 2020; Witteveen and Velthorst, 2020). We expect mental health to follow heterogeneous developments which are associated with individual characteristics.

The UK government announced on March 23, 2020 that residents must stay at home and some businesses have to close, one of the longest and harshest government measures of the pandemic. This lockdown was gradually eased until July 4 when most businesses were allowed to open again. Ignoring the existence of simultaneous yet distinct trajectories in coping with the lockdown likely obscures important differences across subpopulations. Previous research has shown, for example, that disadvantaged social groups are more vulnerable to stressors, have worse mental and physical health, and are less resilient to adverse life events than advantaged groups (Thoits, 2010). Likewise, the unique case of the lockdown imposed increased informal care responsibilities on women (Schmid *et al.*, 2021) and heightened risks of loneliness for people living alone (Elmer *et al.*, 2020; van Tilburg *et al.*, 2021).

Trajectories were retrieved from a time series of mental health data covering the period before, during, and after the first lockdown in the UK. In our analyses we, first, employed latent class mixture modelling (LCCM) (Collins

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.24.21251565; this version posted February 26, 2021. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

and Lanza, 2010) to estimate trajectories of change in psychological distress. This data-reduction technique classifies individuals within a population and probabilistically assigns them into latent classes. Each class represents a distinct subpopulation of individuals with highly similar trajectories. Second, using multinomial logistic regression, we examined factors associated with the different trajectories.

Data and Methods

We analyze data from the Understanding Society COVID-19 Study (Platt *et al.*, 2020; University of Essex and Institute for Social and Economic Research, 2020). The UK Household Longitudinal Study "Understanding Society" is a long-running, nationally representative panel survey that annually interviews those members 16 years or older of participating households. During the COVID-19 pandemic, additional monthly online and phone interviews were conducted in April, May, June, July, and September. The University of Essex Ethics Committee approved the data collection and informed consent was obtained from all participants. No ethics approval was necessary for this secondary data analysis. The analytical sample is restricted to 15,218 participants with information on psychological distress for a minimum of three waves. This is to ensure high certainty in the participants' assignment to the different trajectories.

Psychological distress is measured with the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-12) (Goldberg, 1972). Participants are presented with twelve questions (e.g. "Have you recently been feeling unhappy or depressed?"), and those who respond "Much more than usual" or "Rather more than usual" receive a score of 1, while those responding "No more than usual" or "Not at all" receive a score of 0 (the so-called "caseness" scoring). Summated scores of four or more (out of twelve) are usually considered as distressed. As done in previous research (Niedzwiedz *et al.*, 2021), we dichotomized scores accordingly into presence (1) versus absence (0) of psychological distress in every of the six measurement waves.

Covariates included dummy variables for the countries Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland (England was the reference category), age (24 years

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.24.21251565; this version posted February 26, 2021. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

and younger, 25–44 years, 45–64 years, 65 years and older), gender (female = 1 vs. male = 0), race (Non-White = 1 vs. White = 0), living with partner (yes = 1 vs. no = 0), socio-economic status (working class, intermediate, salariat), monthly earnings log-transformed and mean-imputed, a dummy variable indicating an income loss of 15 per cent or more during the pandemic, and two dummy variables to adjust for missing values in the previous earnings variables. Other socio-demographic covariates regarded sharing the household with one or more children aged under 19 years, being a single parent (composed from the aforementioned partner and child variables), being employed or self-employed (all: yes = 1 vs. no = 1). Health covariates concerned having had symptoms of COVID-19 and mentioning any diagnosed health conditions (both: yes = 1 vs. no = 0). All covariates stemmed from baseline of the COVID-19 study module, April 2020. Descriptive statistics of the covariates are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics

	Proportion/Mean	*SD*	Min.	Max.
Age groups:				
24 years and younger	0.04		0	1
25–44 years	0.25		0	1
45–64 years	0.45		0	1
65 years and older	0.26		0	1
Female (*ref.* male)	0.58		0	1
Non-white (*ref.* white)	0.1		0	1
Living with partner	0.75		0	1
Child(ren) in household	0.32		0	1
Single parent	0.05		0	1
Worked pre-COVID	0.65		0	1
Reported COVID-19 symptoms	0.17		0	1
No health conditions	0.49		0	1
Social class:				
Working class	0.27		0	1
Intermediate	0.24		0	1
Salariat	0.49		0	1
Earnings pre-COVID (log)[a]	7.28	1.81	0	10
Lost earnings[a]	0.33		0	1

Notes: Based on individuals with complete information on all covariates at baseline (N = 13,389). *SD*: Standard deviation. [a] Mean-imputed.

Because we had no a priori expectations of specific distributions, we opted

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.24.21251565; this version posted February 26, 2021. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

for an explorative approach to determine number and prevalence of trajectories, using the six repeated measurements of psychological distress. Mixture models for the clustering of longitudinal data series identify latent subpopulations that share similar trajectories (Van der Nest *et al.*, 2020). These trajectories, which are highly comparable within subpopulations, are deemed mutually exclusive between subpopulations. To determine the number of distinct trajectories, we first estimated a set of models for a varying number of k trajectories, starting with $k = 1$, and sequentially increasing k by one, until the model fit leveled off or deteriorated.

Second, we proceeded with the model with the best fit to investigate associations of covariates with each of the k trajectories. Specifically, a participant's trajectory with the highest probability served as the categorical outcome in a multinomial logit model. The sample in this model was reduced to participants with complete covariates. We show average marginal effects (AME's), which reflect the average change in a trajectory's probability when a covariate increases by one unit. The statistical analysis was performed in Stata 16.1 using the plugin 'traj' (version May 17, 2020) for estimating group-based trajectory models (Jones and Nagin, 2013).

Data availability

The data analyzed in this study are available from the UK Data Service (University of Essex and Institute for Social and Economic Research, 2020) and a replication package for all analyses shown is available online (Ellwardt and Präg, 2021).

Results

Development of psychological distress followed four distinct trajectories, as revealed by the latent class mixture models. The four-trajectory solution yielded the best model fit to the data according to the log-likelihood based statistics (Van der Nest *et al.*, 2020), i.e. the lowest value for the Bayes Information Criterion, as seen in Table 2. The five-trajectory solution was also well-fitted, but split the largest class further into two mostly overlapping tra-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.24.21251565; this version posted February 26, 2021. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

jectories. The model with four trajectories was therefore more parsimonious and plausible in its interpretation.

Table 2: Fit statistics and class prevalence for models with k latent trajectories

No. trajectories (k)	BIC	AIC	LL	% trajectory 1	% trajectory 2	% trajectory 3	% trajectory 4	% trajectory 5
1	-43576.5	-43561.3	-43557.3	100				
2	-35392.4	-35369.5	-35363.5	72	28			
3	-34840.9	-34798.9	-34787.9	46	35	18		
4	-34628.5	-34567.5	-34551.5	22	58	6	13	
5	-34643.6	-34563.5	-34542.5	38	22	7	19	14

Notes: AIC, BIC: Akaike, Bayesian Information Criterion. LL: Log-Likelihood. Based on individuals with at least three completed waves on psychological distress (N = 15,218).

The four psychological distress trajectories are visualized in Figure 1. *Continuously low* (trajectory 2): The largest class included 57.9% of the participants whose likelihood of psychological distress was permanently low and mostly close to zero. *Continuously moderate* (trajectory 1): The second-largest class comprised 22.4% of participants. Their likelihood of psychological distress was roughly one third at the start and hardly changed throughout the entire observation period. *Continuously elevated* (trajectory 4): The third-largest group comprised of 13.4% of the participants, who had a high likelihood of psychological distress at all times, with half or more of the individuals reporting distress. Yet, in this trajectory, mental health covaried with the lockdown of society. The likelihood of distress reached a near-maximum and slowly declined at the end of the observation period, however, without returning to its initial level.

Temporarily elevated (trajectory 3): The last and smallest group with 6.4% of participants started out with a moderate likelihood of distress, comparable to those in trajectory 1. Crucially, nearly everyone in this trajectory experienced a rapid increase of psychological distress at the beginning of the pandemic, indicated by the near-maximum prevalence close to 100%. This extreme elevation was of temporal nature, as the prevalence of distress quickly dropped back to original levels after the lockdown. Taking trajectories 3 and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.24.21251565; this version posted February 26, 2021. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 1: Four latent trajectories of psychological distress

Notes: (1) continuously moderate, (2) continuously low, (3) temporarily elevated, and (4) continuously elevated. Error bounds represent 95% CIs. $N = 15{,}218$.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.24.21251565; this version posted February 26, 2021. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

4 together, about one fifth of the population experienced a significant and severe elevation of psychological distress during lockdown.



Figure 2: Average marginal effects of following the four trajectories

Notes: Average change in a trajectory's probability when a covariate increases by one unit, from multinomial model with the trajectories of psychological distress as the outcome: (1) continuously moderate, (2) continuously low, (3) temporarily elevated, and (4) continuously elevated. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals. N =13,389.

Socio-demographic and health variables are associated with being on the four trajectories. For this part of the analysis, individuals were discretely assigned to the latent trajectory with the highest posterior probability. Higher means of this probability in a trajectory indicate greater certainty in the assignment procedure. Mean probabilities ranged from .64 for trajectory 3 to .88 for trajectory 2. The assigned trajectories served as the outcome in a multinomial logistic regression model. The association of the covariates with each of the four trajectories are expressed as average marginal effects (AMEs) shown in Figure 2. AME's reflect the average change in a trajectory's probability when a covariate increases by one unit.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.24.21251565; this version posted February 26, 2021. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The following focuses on changes in mental health, thus on individuals with temporarily and continuously elevated stress levels in trajectories 3 and 4. Female and younger (under 65 years of age) individuals were exposed to significantly heightened risks of experiencing both temporarily and continuously elevated distress. Furthermore, the risk for continued distress was highest for individuals who lived without a partner, had work before the lockdown, reported COVID-19 symptoms, mentioned pre-pandemic health conditions, and lost substantial income during the course of the pandemic. For the latter sub-populations, the initial probability of 13.4% in trajectory 4 shifted upwards by another 2.9 to 5.7 percentage points (e.g. income loss was associated with a total risk of 19.1%). This implied a moderate to strong impact of these covariates on developing continuously elevated psychological distress.

Discussion

The unparalleled shock of the COVID-19 pandemic has provoked a natural stress test for entire societies. We took a perspective similar to those of policy makers and stakeholders by describing which trajectories of psychological distress occurred in the United Kingdom. We next described the most affected subpopulation in terms of socio-demographic profiles, rather than single out presumably vulnerable subpopulations for inspection a priori.

In contrast to Proto and Quintana-Domeque (2021), we did not find an average increase in psychological distress for the whole UK sample. However, their study covered changes between pre-COVID-19 and April 2020 only, i.e. the first two measurements in our study design. This snapshot could not capture short-term hiccups in distress that smoothed out after the lockdown, as identified in trajectory 3. But even though in our study the majority proved resilient, one out of five individuals suffered from psychological distress. For two thirds of these cases, distress endured until after the lifting of the lockdown. This vulnerable group was not solely defined by the usual risk factors of poor health. These findings closely resemble previous findings from the UK, where one out of four individuals reported depressive symptoms and one out of five individuals suffered from anxiety (O'Connor *et al.*, 2021). Using

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.24.21251565; this version posted February 26, 2021. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

the same data as in our study and group-based latent growth mixture models on depressive symptoms, an outcome closely related to our measure of psychological distress, Iob *et al.* (2020) found three latent trajectories. These included low (60%), moderate (29%) and severe (11%) depressive symptoms during lockdown. As in previous research, in our study risks were greater for those younger, female (Banks and Xu, 2020), individuals living without a partner (Fancourt *et al.*, 2021; Pierce *et al.*, 2020), individuals with COVID-19-related symptoms (Chandola *et al.*, 2021; Niedzwiedz *et al.*, 2020; Li and Wang, 2020), and those who lost income (Bu *et al.*, 2020b,a; Wright *et al.*, 2021). Crucially, individuals who fail to buffer the long-term exposure of distress are vulnerable to a variety of negative health outcomes, including poor physical health, morbidity, and mortality (Barry *et al.*, 2020; Thoits, 2010). More dramatically, chronic psychological stress has been related to lower immunity and, as a result, higher susceptibility of the common cold, influenza, infectious diseases and upper respiratory illness (Cohen *et al.*, 1991). This means that measures aimed at mitigating the COVID-19 pandemic might promote risk factors for catching the coronavirus, if these measures trigger stress among the broader public, and thereby backfire on a large scale. Reducing distress should therefore be key in policy-making aiming to safeguard public health, and even more so during repeated lockdowns that change temporarily elevated into continued stressors.

A limitation of the present study was the use of self-reported psychological distress and the coverage of the first lockdown only. Future research could investigate the course of mental health for a longer time period, preferably spanning over several lockdowns. It would be interesting to see whether individuals from the lowly and moderately stressed group eventually experience disaster fatigue with a delayed onset of severe distress, or whether continuously distressed individuals undergo adaptive processes during the pandemic. Moreover, the development of psychological distress may be investigated in combination with correlated health variables, such as drinking behavior, through modelling joint trajectories.

The heterogeneity in the development of mental health during the pandemic emphasizes peoples' idiosyncrasy in responses to extreme changes. Likewise, policy-makers will need to be careful in identifying and supporting

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.24.21251565; this version posted February 26, 2021. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

groups at risk. Addressed health risks should not merely prioritize physical outcomes directly related to the COVID-19 disease, but include longer-term consequences in the domain of mental and social well-being of the general public (Holmes *et al.*, 2020).

References

Banks, James and Xiaowei Xu, 2020. 'The Mental Health Effects of the First Two Months of Lockdown during the COVID-19 Pandemic in the UK.' *Fiscal Studies* 41(3): 685–708. doi: 10.1111/1475-5890.12239.

Barry, Vaughn, Mary E. Stout, Mary Ellen Lynch, Shanna Mattis, Duc Q. Tran, Ana Antun, Maria J. A. Ribeiro, Sidney F. Stein, and Christine L. Kempton, 2020. 'The Effect of Psychological Distress on Health Outcomes. A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Prospective Studies.' *Journal of Health Psychology* 25(2): 227–239. doi: 10.1177/1359105319842931.

Bu, Feifei, Andrew Steptoe, and Daisy Fancourt, 2020a. 'Loneliness During a Strict Lockdown. Trajectories and Predictors During the COVID-19 Pandemic in 38,217 United Kingdom Adults.' *Social Science and Medicine* 265(113521): 1–6. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113521.

——, 2020b. 'Who Is Lonely in Lockdown? Cross-Cohort Analyses of Predictors of Loneliness Before and During the COVID-19 Pandemic.' *Public Health* 186: 31–34. doi: 10.1016/j.puhe.2020.06.036.

Chandola, Tarani, Meena Kumari, Cara L. Booker, and Michaela Benzeval, 2021. 'The Mental Health Impact of COVID-19 and Lockdown-Related Stressors among Adults in the UK.' *Psychological Medicine* pp. 1–10. doi: 10.1017/S0033291720005048.

Chetty, Raj, John N. Friedman, Nathaniel Hendren, Michael Stepner, and The Opportunity Insights Team, 2020. 'The Economic Impacts of COVID-19. Evidence from a New Public Database Built Using Private Sector Data.' *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper Series* 27431: 1–64. doi: 10.3386/w27431.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.24.21251565; this version posted February 26, 2021. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Cohen, Sheldon, David A. J. Tyrrell, and Andrew P. Smith, 1991. 'Psychological Stress and Susceptibility to the Common Cold.' *New England Journal of Medicine* 325(9): 606–612. doi: 10.1056/NEJM199108293250903.

Collins, Linda M. and Stephanie T. Lanza, 2010. *Latent Class and Latent Transition Analysis. With Applications in the Social, Behavioral, and Health Sciences.* Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. New York: Wiley. doi: 10.1002/9780470567333.

Ellwardt, Lea and Patrick Präg, 2021. 'Heterogeneous Mental Health Development During the Covid-19 Pandemic in the United Kingdom.' *Open Science Framework* doi: 10.17605/OSF.IO/ZXQE6.

Elmer, Timon, Kieran Mepham, and Christoph Stadtfeld, 2020. 'Students under Lockdown. Comparisons of Students' Social Networks and Mental Health Before and During the COVID-19 Crisis in Switzerland.' *Plos One* 15(7): e0236337. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0236337.

Fancourt, Daisy, Andrew Steptoe, and Feifei Bu, 2021. 'Trajectories of Anxiety and Depressive Symptoms During Enforced Isolation Due to COVID-19 in England. A Longitudinal Observational Study.' *Lancet Psychiatry* 8(2): 141–149. doi: 10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30482-X.

Giuntella, Osea, Kelly Hyde, Silvia Saccardo, and Sally Sadoff, 2021. 'Lifestyle and Mental Health Disruptions During COVID-19.' *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 118(9): e2016632118. doi: 10.1073/pnas.2016632118.

Goldberg, David P., 1972. *The Detection of Psychiatric Illness by Questionnaire.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holmes, Emily A., Rory C. O'Connor, V. Hugh Perry, Irene Tracey, Simon Wessely, Louise Arseneault, Clive Ballard, Helen Christensen, Roxane Cohen Silver, Ian Everall, Tamsin Ford, Ann John, Thomas Kabir, Kate King, Ira Madan, Susan Michie, Andrew K. Przybylski, Roz Shafran, Angela Sweeney, Carol M. Worthman, Lucy Yardley, Katherine Cowan, Claire

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.24.21251565; this version posted February 26, 2021. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Cope, Matthew Hotopf, and Ed Bullmore, 2020. 'Multidisciplinary Research Priorities for the COVID-19 Pandemic. A Call for Action for Mental Health Science.' *Lancet Psychiatry* 7(6): 547–560. doi: 10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30168-1.

Iob, Eleonora, Philipp Frank, Andrew Steptoe, and Daisy Fancourt, 2020. 'Levels of Severity of Depressive Symptoms Among At-Risk Groups in the UK During the COVID-19 Pandemic.' *JAMA Network Open* 3(10): e2026064–e2026064. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.26064.

Jones, Bobby L. and Daniel S. Nagin, 2013. 'A Note on a Stata Plugin for Estimating Group-Based Trajectory Models.' *Sociological Methods & Research* 42(4): 608–613. doi: 10.1177/0049124113503141.

Li, Lambert Zixin and Senhu Wang, 2020. 'Prevalence and Predictors of General Psychiatric Disorders and Loneliness During COVID-19 in the United Kingdom.' *Psychiatry Research* 291(113267): 1–6. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113267.

McGinty, Emma E., Rachel Presskreischer, Hahrie Han, and Colleen L. Barry, 2020. 'Psychological Distress and Loneliness Reported by US Adults in 2018 and April 2020.' *JAMA* 324(1): 93–94. doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.9740.

Niedzwiedz, Claire L., Michaela Benzeval, Kirsten Hainey, Alastair H. Leyland, and Srinivasa Vittal Katikireddi, 2020. 'Psychological Distress Among People with Probable COVID-19 Infection. Analysis of the UK Household Longitudinal Study.' *Medrxiv* pp. 1–7. doi: 10.1101/2020.11.24.20237909.

Niedzwiedz, Claire L., Michael James Green, Michaela Benzeval, Desmond Campbell, Peter Craig, Evangelia Demou, Alastair Leyland, Anna Pearce, Rachel Thomson, Elise Whitley, and Srinivasa Vittal Katikireddi, 2021. 'Mental Health and Health Behaviors 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* doi: 10.1136/jech-2020-215060.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.24.21251565; this version posted February 26, 2021. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

O'Connor, Rory C., Karen Wetherall, Seonaid Cleare, Heather McClelland, Ambrose J. Melson, Claire L. Niedzwiedz, Ronan E. O'Carroll, Daryl B. O'Connor, Steve Platt, Elizabeth Scowcroft, Billy Watson, Tiago Zortea, Eamonn Ferguson, and Kathryn A. Robb, 2021. 'Mental Health and Wellbeing During the COVID-19 Pandemic. Longitudinal Analyses of Adults in the UK COVID-19 Mental Health and Wellbeing Study.' *British Journal of Psychiatry* doi: 10.1192/bjp.2020.212.

Pierce, Matthias, Holly Hope, Tamsin Ford, Stephani Hatch, Matthew Hotopf, Ann John, Evangelos Kontopantelis, Roger Webb, Simon Wessely, Sally McManus, and Kathryn M. Abel, 2020. 'Mental Health Before and During the COVID-19 Pandemic. A Longitudinal Probability Sample Survey of the UK Population.' *Lancet Psychiatry* 7(10): 883–892. doi: 10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30308-4.

Platt, Lucinda, Gundi Knies, Renee Luthra, Alita Nandi, and Michaela Benzeval, 2020. 'Understanding Society at Ten Years.' *European Sociological Review* 36(6): 976–988. doi: 10.1093/esr/jcaa031.

Proto, Eugenio and Climent Quintana-Domeque, 2021. 'COVID-19 and Mental Health Deterioration by Ethnicity and Gender in the UK.' *Plos One* 16(1): e0244419. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0244419.

Schmid, Lisa, Jonathan Wörn, Karsten Hank, Barbara Sawatzki, and Sabine Walper, 2021. 'Changes in Employment and Relationship Satisfaction in Times of the COVID-19 Pandemic. Evidence from the German Family Panel.' *European Societies* doi: 10.1080/14616696.2020.1836385.

Thoits, Peggy A., 2010. 'Stress and Health. Major Findings and Policy Implications.' *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 51(Supplement): S41–S53. doi: 10.1177/0022146510383498.

University of Essex and Institute for Social and Economic Research, 2020. *Understanding Society. COVID-19 Study 2020*. Colchester: UK Data Service, 4th edition. doi: 10.5255/UKDA-SN-8644-4.

van der Nest, Gavin, Valéria Lima Passos, Math J. J. M. Candel, and Gerard J. P. van Breukelen, 2020. 'An Overview of Mixture Modeling for

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.24.21251565; this version posted February 26, 2021. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Latent Evolutions in Longitudinal Data. Modeling Approaches, Fit Statistics, and Software.' *Advances in Life Course Research* 43(100323): 1–17. doi: 10.1016/j.alcr.2019.100323.

van Tilburg, Theo G., Stephanie Steinmetz, Elske Stolte, Henriëtte van der Roest, and Daniel H. de Vries, 2021. 'Loneliness and Mental Health During the COVID-19 Pandemic. A Study Among Dutch Older Adults.' *Journals of Gerontology B* doi: 10.1093/geronb/gbaa111.

Witteveen, Dirk and Eva Velthorst, 2020. 'Economic Hardship and Mental Health Complaints during COVID-19.' *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 117(44): 27277–27284. doi: 10.1073/pnas.2009609117.

Wright, Liam, Andrew Steptoe, and Daisy Fancourt, 2021. 'How Are Adversities During COVID-19 Affecting Mental Health? Differential Associations for Worries and Experiences and Implications for Policy.' *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* doi: 10.1101/2020.05.14.20101717.