

Psychosocial impact of the Covid-19 pandemic: Identification of most vulnerable populations.

Judith Farrés¹, José Luis Ruiz¹, José Manuel Mas¹, Lilibeth Arias^{2,3}, Maria-Rosa Sarrias^{4,5}, Carolina Armengol^{5,6}, Pere-Joan Cardona^{2,3}, José A. Muñoz-Moreno^{7,8}, Miriam Vilaplana⁹, Belén Arranz^{9,10,11}, Judith Usall^{9,11}, Antoni Serrano-Blanco^{9,11,12}, Cristina Vilaplana^{2,3,*}

1. Anaxomics Biotech SL. C/ Diputació, 237, 1r 1a, 08007 Barcelona.

2. Experimental Tuberculosis Unit (UTE). Fundació Institut Germans Trias i Pujol (IGTP). Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB). Edifici Mar. Can Ruti Campus. Ctra. de Can Ruti, camí de les Escoles, s/n, 08916 Badalona, Catalunya, Espanya.

3. Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Respiratorias (CIBERES). Av. Monforte de Lemos, 3-5, pavelló 11, planta 0, 28029, Madrid, Espanya.

4. Innate Immunity Group. Fundació Institut Germans Trias i Pujol (IGTP). Can Ruti Campus. Edifici Muntanya. Ctra. de Can Ruti, camí de les Escoles, s/n, 08916 Badalona, Catalunya, Espanya.

5. Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBEREHD). Av. Monforte de Lemos, 3-5, pavelló 11, planta 0, 28029 Madrid, Espanya.

6. Childhood Liver Oncology Group, Germans Trias I Pujol Research Institute (IGTP), Program of Predictive and Personalized Medicine of Cancer (PMPCC), Badalona, Spain

7. Fundació Lluita contra la SIDA (FLS) - Servei de Malalties Infeccioses, Hospital Germans Trias, Badalona.

8. Facultat de Psicologia i Ciències de l'Educació, Universitat Oberta de Catalunya (UOC), Barcelona.

9. Parc Sanitari Sant Joan de Déu. C/Antoni Pujadas, 42, 08830 Sant Boi de Llobregat, Catalunya, Espanya.

10. Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Salud Mental (CIBERSAM). Av. Monforte de Lemos, 3-5, pavelló 11, planta 0, 28029 Madrid, Espanya.

11. Institut de Recerca Sant Joan de Déu. C/ Santa Rosa, 39-57, 3a planta, 08940 Esplugues de Llobregat, Catalunya, Espanya.

12. Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Epidemiología y Salud Pública (CIBERESP). Av. Monforte de Lemos, 3-5, 28029 Madrid, Espanya.

Corresponding author*:

Cristina Vilaplana, MD, PhD

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2808-7270>

Principal Investigator

Fundació Institut Germans Trias i Pujol (IGTP), Experimental Tuberculosis Unit (UTE), Campus Can Ruti. Ctra. de Can Ruti, Camí de les Escoles, s/n.

08916 Badalona, Catalonia, Spain

Telephone: +34 93 033 0527

cvilaplana@igtp.cat

Abstract

2 With the aim of analyzing the psychosocial impact of Covid-19 pandemic on society in
general and health care workers in particular, we developed a 74-question survey
4 questionnaire which was shared through social media. After analyzing 56,656 responses
obtained during the first pandemic peak, the results showed an early and important
6 negative impact on family finances, fear of working with Covid-19 patients and ethical
issues related to Covid-19 care among healthcare workers (HCW). We have identified 7
8 target groups at higher risk of impaired mental health and susceptible to benefiting from
an intervention: women, under 42 years of age, people with care burden, socio-
10 economically deprived groups, people with unskilled or unqualified jobs, Covid-19
patients, and HCW working with Covid-19 patients. These results should encourage the
12 active implementation of specific strategies to increase resilience in these groups and to
prepare an adequate organizational response.

14

Summary box

16 What is already known?

- Studies in small cohorts have reported an important impact of the Covid-19 pandemic
18 on the general population at several levels
- According to previous studies in small cohorts, approximately 20% of the population
20 suffered from impaired mental health status due to the pandemic

What are the new findings?

- We have studied 56,656 survey questionnaires to assess the impact of the Covid-19
outbreak on health status, family finances, habits, general health and mental health status,
24 and ethics, especially in health care workers

• We have identified 7 target groups susceptible to benefitting from an intervention, and
2 which should be taken into account when designing new contention measures against the
pandemic

4 What do the new findings imply?

• The design and active implementation of interventions to build individual resilience,
6 especially for the targeted populations described, and preparation of an appropriate
organizational response are key

8 • The results obtained in this project could help local and national Governments to
design or adjust coping measures against future outbreaks

10

1. Introduction

2 On 30 March 2020, 78,797 confirmed cases of SARS-CoV-2, 6,528 deaths and 14,709
patients who had recovered were reported in Spain [1]; 16,157 cases and 1,410 deaths
4 were recorded in Catalonia [2]. Case fatality (8%) was calculated for the registered cases,
although the mortality rate was uncertain and the total number of cases (including those
6 undiagnosed and with mild symptoms) were unknown. At that time, there was local
transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in the community. Everyone with a compatible respiratory
8 condition was considered likely to be a case of SARS-CoV-2 although the etiological
diagnosis could not be made for all suspected cases in the context of a health emergency
10 because of the lack of kits and the saturation of the health system [3,4].

Other major outbreaks of infectious diseases such as Ebola have demonstrated that there
12 is an important impact on individuals and communities. The psychological effects of the
disease itself as well as the traumatic experiences of loved ones are seen at individual
14 level. At community level, health services, social systems and economic productivity are
severely affected [5].

16 Two months after the first case reported in Spain and 2.5 weeks into the quarantine
and self-isolation of the region of Catalonia, the emotional burden of the general
18 community had increased. An important impact on mental health and emotional burden
by SARS-CoV-2 epidemics and mass quarantines which have been implemented in other
20 epidemics context has been reported [6–9]. Moreover, because a certain level of anxiety
is necessary for the adoption of recommended precautionary measures against infection
22 outbreaks [10], and for the successful implementation of public health interventions, a
better understanding of people’s attitudes and the assessment of psychological impact on
24 them should be mandatory.

On the other hand, 2,600 (16%) of the confirmed cases in our setting by March 30th 2020 affected healthcare workers (HCW). Besides their obvious increased risk of being infected, the HCW facing the SARS-CoV-2 epidemics on the frontline (emergency rooms, ICUs, and other depts.) were put under high levels of stress and anxiety. This worsened as the tension in the Health Systems increased, requiring them to face important ethical dilemmas including triage of patients. Additionally, the SARS epidemic proved that frontline healthcare workers not only suffered from chronic stress at the time, but that this lasted for at least one year after the epidemic wave was over [11].

In the face of all this, we decided to evaluate the impact of the first wave of the Covid-19 pandemic on both the general population and HCW, specifically on their socio-economic status and their psychological distress.

2. M&M

2.1.Ethics

The study was reviewed and approved by the corresponding Ethics Committee, the Comitè Ètic de l'Hospital Universitari Germans Trias i Pujol; and conformed to the principles embodied in the Declaration of Helsinki. The ethical clearance was obtained before starting the project. The survey was created and shared complying with the European General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), and all data was processed anonymously. The project is registered in ClinicalTrials.gov under the identifier NCT04378452.

2.2.Study procedures

An anonymous online survey was created with the Typeform software (Typeform SL, Barcelona, Spain). It included 74 questions on demographic data (12 questions), socio-economic sphere (8 questions), habits and health status related to Covid-19 during confinement (13 questions) and mental health dimension (through questions related to

depression, anxiety, stress and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder [PTSD] symptoms [41
2 questions]) (Supplementary Table 1). The survey was shared in 5 different languages
(Catalan, Spanish, English, Italian, and French) through social media using snowball
4 sampling. The data were downloaded as a spreadsheet file (Excel Microsoft Office) after
collection and deleted from the Typeform software.

6 **2.3. Analysis and Statistics**

Since there were no specific criteria for age stratification or the population density
8 (inhabitants / km²) of the municipality where the respondents lived that was significant
for all questions, it was decided to divide these categories in the cohort into groups
10 containing a similar sample size. Thus, and taking into account the volume of responses
obtained, age ranges have been determined statistically so that they are homogeneous in
12 terms of number of surveys completed by group.

The questions were grouped into indexes (socioeconomic precariousness index,
14 depression index, anxiety index, stress index, or PTSD). The scores of the socio-economic
precariousness index and population density by the respondents were segmented into 4
16 groups each. The criteria for segmentation were established in order to obtain balanced
groups in terms of the number of respondents in each category.

18 We determined 4 ranges of age: <42 years old, 42-52, 52-61 and >61 y.o. The 4 score
ranges of the 0-19 scale of socio-economic precariousness established were: low
20 precariousness ≤ 7 points, mid-low=7-8.5, mid-high=8.5-10 and high >10 points.

All results were obtained taking into account the fact that the respondents were part of
22 the totality of the cohort of respondents. Responses were also analyzed in total by
category and broken down into percentages according to conditional distributions taking
24 into account; on the one hand the gender of the respondents, and on the other their age
group.

We took the non-binary gender and those who preferred not to say which gender they
2 identify as into account when analyzing the results, as this enriches the conclusions.

However, statistical analysis, often does not take into account the minimum volumes of
4 responses and therefore only the groups of women and men were compared.

Response percentages were calculated based on the number of respondents for each
6 answer out of the total number of responses to each question. To assess whether the
categorical variables were significantly related or not, we applied the Chi-Square test
8 independently in the observed counts. We conducted a bivariate analysis between scores
and sociodemographic variables. Differences in score distribution between different
10 groups were assessed by comparing probability distributions using a two-band Wilcoxon-
signed rank test and collecting the p-value using Matlab's 'signrank' function [12,13].

12 All tests were applied bilaterally using a significance of 5% ($p < 0.05$).

3. Results

14 The complete dataset results generated is available at:

<https://zenodo.org/badge/DOI/10.5281/zenodo.4608502.svg>

16 3.1. Characteristics of the cohort

We analyzed 56,656 questionnaires. The characteristics of the cohort are described in
18 Table 1. Differences between categories by gender and age are described in
Supplementary Table 2. The majority of respondents were females (70.4%), and from
20 Catalonia. Those living most precariously were under 42 years old, with 18.43% sharing
an apartment/house. ($p < 0.01$). Most respondents had a degree (42.62%), and a qualified
22 job (36.13%). 9% of total respondents worked in the healthcare sector. Most unemployed
people were in the younger age range (7.6%) and in the non-binary/those who preferred
24 not to say groups (approximately 12% each).

Up to 60% of the total declared that they were taking care of someone: 24.81% caring for
2 children of <16 years and 15.11% caring for parents. Women were caregivers more
frequently than men ($p<0.01$). The burden of care was also higher for women and people
4 of 42-61 years old ($p<0.01$) and concerning high for 4.79% of total respondents.

3.2. Impact of the pandemic on the General population

6 The impact on general population according to the responses obtained to the questionnaire
is described in Table 2. Categories of responses by gender and group are described in
8 Supplementary Table 2. 85.32% of the cohort declared they were remaining at home.
Those working in essential services were mostly women or of non-binary gender, and the
10 percentage of women was also higher amongst those who were obliged to go to work on-
site ($p<0.01$).

12 Only 2 weeks after starting the lock-down, 25% of the cohort had already lost their job
or work. People under 52, as opposed to people over 52, and men, as opposed to women,
14 were the most affected ($p<0.01$). 20.67% of the respondents declared that they had no
savings at all (Table 1). After the start of measures announced by the authorities to cope
16 with the pandemic, 82.75% of respondents declared that they were being careful or had
decreased their expenses. Up to 8.78% of respondents declared that they had used social
18 services help or that would need to use it soon. Those under 52 and people identifying as
non-binary gender or preferring not to say were the most affected ($p<0.01$ and $p<0.05$,
20 respectively). Those under 42 years, followed by people over 61 and people identifying
as non-binary gender were the ones who showed higher precariousness index values
22 ($p<0.01$).

The 19.84% of respondents declared that they had had contact with someone infected by
24 SARS-CoV-2, half of them with a confirmed or probable case and this was more frequent
for women under 52 ($p<0.01$). 35.75% declared that during the previous 14 days they had

used at least one existing healthcare resource or one put in place by the authorities in the
2 context of the pandemic, and 64.25%, had used none. 73.82% declared to have had one
or more symptoms compatible with Covid-19. The most frequent symptoms were
4 headache (16.01%), sore throat and nasal congestion (9.85% and 9.17% respectively).
Only 1.76% of people with one symptom or more had received a PCR test and only 1.81%
6 of those declaring three symptoms or more. Women and under 42 said that they felt worse
at the moment they answered the survey than people in other groups ($p<0.01$).
8 The 42.05% of respondents said they had increased their consumption habits: in most
cases of food. Women under 42 showed the largest increase in consumption, except for
10 illegal drugs, compared with other groups ($p<0.01$).

Most people said TV was their source of information on the pandemic (36.77%), followed
12 by social media (29.23%). 30% of people only used one source, 37.84% 2 sources and
23.05% used 3. There was no difference across gender or age groups. 26.82% declared
14 that the information given did not accurately reflect reality (more frequent in women and
people over 52 ($p<0.01$), and another 20.92% said that it was too negative or too
16 sensationalist (more frequent in men and people under 42 ($p<0.01$)). 73.13% declared that
they were afraid or worried, these including more women, but a lower percentage of
18 people over 61 ($p<0.01$).

The 78.56% of the cohort declared that the pandemic had changed them, most of them
20 (50,41%) in the way that they see society/how we used to live. Those most affected were
women (more than men) and those under 42 vs the >61 ($p<0.01$ in both cases).

22 **3.3. Impact of pandemic on HCW**

A total of 5,104 people (9.05% of the total) identified themselves as workers in the
24 healthcare sector, most of them women. While the proportion women/men in the total
cohort is 70/30 in this subgroup the proportion is 85/15. The impact on this population is

detailed in Table 3. 41.65% of healthcare personnel declared that they had worked
2 directly with Covid-19 patients, 32% of them while on duty. The majority of healthcare
workers said that they were afraid to work with Covid-19 patients (75.87%). As it was a
4 multiple-choice question, we know that around the 42.90% were afraid of transmitting
the infection to their relatives/friends, 17.07% feared getting infected or transmitting it to
6 other patients, and 4.28% were afraid of dying. Surprisingly, fear of dying decreased with
age. In all cases it was higher percentages of younger HCW who said they were afraid
8 (p<0.01).

More than 6 percent of healthcare workers (6.27%) were worried of taking medical
10 decisions that represented an ethical problem for them. In fact, nearly 18.60% of them
said that they had ethical problems/dilemmas/issues while working. Of these, the younger
12 the respondents, the higher the percentage, especially with the patient triage and
obligatory protocols (p<0.01). As many as 437 of 5,104 healthcare workers decided to
14 explain to us which ethical problems they had had. We have grouped the problems and
issues that the professionals listed, and the results are found in Table 3.

16 **3.4. Impact of the pandemic on mental health status**

Table 4 summarizes the conditions found statistically significantly associated (p<0.05)
18 with the mental health symptoms evaluated. According to this table, we have identified 7
target groups susceptible to benefitting from an intervention, and which should be taken
20 into account when designing new contention measures to cope with the pandemic: 1)
women; 2) people under 42; 3) caregivers ; 4) people working in essential services or
22 non-qualified jobs; 5) people with a higher precariousness index; 6) Covid-19 patients
and 7) healthcare personnel, especially those working with Covid-19 patients.

4. Discussion

2 Researchers have already sounded the alarm about how the Covid-19 pandemic may
affect the mental health of the general population, and more specifically patients with
4 previous physical or mental conditions (including previous mental disorders) [14,15] and
people at risk due to their socio-economic conditions. The current study aimed to identify
6 the impacts of the covid-19 pandemia at several levels using a questionnaire.
Our survey was disseminated through social media, thus the sample of population studied
8 could not be controlled. However, this was a successful strategy to rapidly reach a large
number of people in different settings and different regions, without exposing
10 interviewers to infection. Even though this does not ensure representability, there is no
other study that has reached such a huge number of subjects, as more than 50,000
12 completed questionnaires were obtained from geographical regions hit by the pandemic
in different ways.
14 The criteria used to establish the age ranges, the population density and the
socioeconomic precariousness index were statistical, in order to obtain balanced groups
16 in terms of number of responses. This provides rigor but can be confusing because this
segmentation is unusual and can lead to a certain bias.
18 As for the impact on the socioeconomic sphere, the highest level of precariousness, which
according to what the results seem to reflect occurs in those under 42 years of age, is
20 striking. Of particular concern is the fact that 25% of the people who responded to the
survey in our study had decreased their workload due to the epidemic situation. According
22 to the International Labor Organization (ILO), the reduction in employment is greater
among women and younger and older people, who have all been particularly affected by
24 the Covid-19 crisis. In our study, men are the ones who had lost more jobs or assignments
previously contracted or hired, and we saw that higher percentages of those under 52

years old had been dismissed or submitted to a temporary labour force adjustment.

2 Overall, global labour incomes have been estimated to have fallen by 10.7% during the
first three quarters of 2020 (compared to the same period in 2019) [16], but we believe
4 this could be much worse given our results. In addition, in our study, a quarter of
respondents had no savings to deal with contingencies, and up to 8.78% stated that they
6 had applied for social benefits or that they would do so soon. All of this is important
because as we have demonstrated in our results, socioeconomic precariousness was
8 revealed to be one of the factors associated with higher scores on mental health indices,
and this is even more worrying given that the incidence of the epidemic was also more
10 pronounced in the poorest neighborhoods, at least in Barcelona [17]. We would also like
to mention that more studies should be carried out to analyze the socio-economic
12 precariousness of the group of non-binary people, as we have seen trends that have not
been statistically evident but would be worth confirming.

14 According to the literature, approximately 20% of the population affected seems
consistent [7,18,19], even if in some cases higher percentages have been found [20,21].

16 According to our results, we have identified up to 7 target groups at higher risk of
impaired mental health status and susceptible to benefitting from an intervention, and
18 which should be taken into account when designing new contention measures against the
pandemic. In our study we did find an association of worse symptoms scoring with the
20 presence of symptoms compatible with Covid-19 or having used all the healthcare
resources put in place. However, as a real intervention based on these assumptions would
22 be very costly and logistically difficult, we do consider instead that the target group for
an intervention should be confirmed Covid-19 patients.

24 Other studies have also shown that being female, young, and having unstable work or
income to be significant correlators of psychological negative impact [20–23]. Women

are especially vulnerable as they bear the heavier burden of childcare and care of the
2 elderly, suffer gender violence and have more precarious jobs. This effect, which is
generalized in society, is even more obvious if the female sex is combined with
4 characteristics of vulnerable groups [24]. Sex and gender biases have been identified as
linked to Covid-19 outbreaks. In many settings, women appear to be slightly more likely
6 to be diagnosed with Covid-19, which may in part be due to the fact that women account
for the majority of health care workers around the world. Moreover, several studies have
8 highlighted that fact that health staff who are women, younger or parents of dependent
children are more vulnerable to psychological distress [25]. We also know that crises
10 exacerbate gender inequalities: gender-based violence increased during confinement
[26]; women were doing 3-10 times more care work than men; women faced significant
12 barriers to healthcare due to lack of autonomy over their own sexual and reproductive
health, inadequate access to health services, and insufficient financial resources [27]. In
14 this sense, it is anticipated that the Covid-19 crisis will trigger an economic recession
which will disproportionately impact the income and employment of the most vulnerable,
16 particularly women [28]. In our setting it was mostly women who were responsible for
caring for others. Caregiver adults with higher perception of the difficulty of quarantine
18 for children and the whole family suffered more psychological distress than the other
groups. This was previously identified in a cohort of parents in Italy, showing that their
20 individual perception was associated with their stress levels and a negative behavioural
and emotional impact on their children. As this study points out, some of the causes for
22 this could be the impact of the situation itself both on the adults and the children, plus the
effects of the school closure together with the need for working from home with a lot of
24 new inputs. It not only has a negative effect on the adults, but on the children both
indirectly [29] and directly [30]. Schools provide not only education, but also counselling

and promote and imply healthy habits (healthy diet, physical exercise, social interaction),
2 that might not be continued at home [30].

On the other hand, people over 60 years old were the vast majority of the total number of
4 deaths all over the world [31]. While their frailty and an increased risk of suffering Covid-
19 if living in nursing homes or similar facilities is true/undeniable, the elderly are key in
6 Mediterranean countries, such as ours, as they take care of grandchildren when their
parents go to work, so to quarantine and isolate them can be very disturbing for the whole
8 of society. Moreover, Covid-19 and the consequences of isolating the elderly can be
devastating, not only for their mental health but also as it contributes to a greater risk of
10 morbidity, and this can be even worse in the more disadvantaged populations [32,33]. In
this perspective, older people had more difficulties than younger people in adjusting to
12 lockdown and social distancing rules. On the other hand, older people have proved that
they have more resilience than younger people in other outbreaks and major hazards [34],
14 something that our results also support by showing that older people were less afraid of
dying than younger ones. All seniors showed anxiety and depression issues in China, and
16 results were worse for females [35]. A Spanish study reported that up to 25.6% of a
sample of adults with a mean age of 65 had symptoms of depression and 32.1% symptoms
18 of avoidant coping style, and that having a current or past history of mental disorders
highly influenced this, while the main protective factor was the ability to enjoy free time
20 [36]. However, we found that younger people coped worse than older people with the
mental burden due to the Covid-19 pandemic and the measures dictated to combat it.
22 Differences between younger and older adults in emotional responses and recovery have
been previously described, and several reasons for it have been hypothesized, including
24 the fact that the elderly have a higher sense of meaning of life and that for them perceiving
time as finite determines their priorities in terms of goals and behaviours [37]. In the

context of the Covid-19 outbreak's first wave, others have reported an increased negative
2 impact on younger people compared with the elderly. A study in France after 2 weeks of
confinement reported sleep problems and increased consumption of sleeping pills, with
4 both more frequent in people under 35 compared to older people[38]. Young adults
already face life changes which are stressful and the pandemic has worsened this, even if
6 one out of five young adults might have been better off because of being removed from
external pressures such as work and education and/or to having more time for close
8 relationships [39]. A nice study in Switzerland concluded that for this specific population
the distress related to lifestyle disruptions and hopelessness was higher than the perceived
10 virus-related health risk [39], which others have already shown to be was relatively low
[40]. Shanahan et al also showed that a good group to be selected for intervention could
12 be females, migrants and young adults with higher pre-pandemic emotional distress
including social exclusion [39]. Another factor which has been related to distress is the
14 decrease of physical and social activity due to lockdown and other restriction measures
decreed by Governments, which had a negative impact on psychological wellbeing of
16 individuals including the elderly [41], but especially on the group of adolescents and
young adults [40,42].
18 A non-negligible proportion of our respondents were HCW, who in Europe are mostly
women [43]. Besides their obvious increased risk of being infected [44], facing the
20 SARS-CoV-2 epidemics at the frontline may have put them under a lot of pressure,
increasing levels of anxiety and chronic stress (as they faced tremendous overwork and
22 suboptimal working conditions), which can last to up to a year afterwards [11,45,46].
A study carried out in a cohort of 9,138 HCW showed that 45.7% were at risk of suffering
24 from a mental disorder [47], and another, which included 5,450, showed that 8.4% had
suicidal ideation and behaviour [48]. In our study, being a HCW has been revealed as a

positive factor for impaired mental health, especially for those working with Covid-19 patients and afraid of infecting others, which has proved to have an impact on outcomes [49].

This becomes worse as the tension in health systems increases, as front-line professionals work in a complex environment given the ethical challenges of the Covid-19, eliciting different dimensions of ethical dilemmas related to the situation itself and the measures dictated by the Government [50]. The shortage of hospital beds — and especially ICU beds — was also an important problem, contributing to the case fatality rate and implying a triage of patients in order to preserve the beds for those with an increased potential to survive [51–53]. The management of end-of-life situations was particularly worrying, as banning the support of relatives at the bedside had a very disturbing impact on patients and their families, but also on HCW mental health, workload, challenges and professional outcomes [54]. According to our results, nearly 8 out of 10 HCW declared that they were afraid of working with COVID patients, especially because of infecting others. Being obliged to work with lack of appropriate or sufficient personal protective equipment was one of the most frequent complaints of HCW who shared their narratives on the ethical concerns they suffered. This low sense of security had been previously pointed out in a small HCW cohort in Spain [55], in nurses in Poland [56] and in Latin America [57]. We found differences between women and men in terms of the fear of transmitting the infection to others, and this could be related to women’s jobs implying more exposure (as is the case for nurses, that in our cohort were mostly women). In our study those working in essential services also had higher psychological distress and this could be for the same reason, the low sense of security, plus the fear of being at higher risk of contracting the infection.

1 The 6.27% declared that that their fear was of making medical decisions that represented
2 an ethical problem for them (patient selection or application of protocols), and this
percentage was higher in younger people.

4 In fact, in our sample, one in five of the HCW declared that they had had ethical problems
during those first weeks of the peak of the first wave, which is in line with other studies
6 [54,58]; and approximately half of these had to do with patient selection or patient triage
protocols/therapeutic indications. In our opinion, this fact should also be explored more
8 thoroughly and actively followed up to prevent health professionals from being put into
similar situations in the future.

10

5. Conclusion

12 Our study represents a photograph of the impact of the Covid-19 outbreak on the general
wellbeing of the population and HCW, which should open the door for the elaboration of
14 strategy proposals with the full participation of institutional leaders who are in a position
to adapt policy to the real needs of the people. Previous work in smaller, selected cohorts
16 (seniors, youth, etc.) has described the significant impact of the pandemic in a number of
areas, including mental health problems in 20% of the population. In this project we have
18 studied 56,656 completed surveys and analyzed the effects of Covid-19 on family
finances, habits and attitudes, general health and mental health, and the day to day of
20 health professionals. We were able to confirm the results noted by other smaller studies
and to identify up to seven populations likely to benefit from an intervention: women;
22 those under 42 years old; caregivers; people in a situation of socio-economic
precariousness; essential workers or those with unskilled jobs; Covid-19 patients, and
24 HCW, especially those working with COVID-patients. This data should be used to design
and implement interventions to increase the resilience of these identified groups, as well

as to prepare an appropriate organizational response. In this sense, some authors have
2 published specific strategies that could be used to alleviate this suffering, especially in
terms of increasing the adaptability of caregivers by providing tools for recognizing risk
4 factors for emotional distress and managing mental health hygiene, but also response
actions by public and private organizations aimed at identifying the employees most at-
6 risk and establishing active mitigating and corrective measures [52,54,59–62]. We think
it would be worthwhile studying how to actively implement and adapt these measures to
8 our environment, not only in the health field but also by extending them to the groups we
have identified. The results obtained could help local and national Governments and
10 Public Health Services to design or adjust coping measures in the face of potential future
outbreaks or other major hazards that might be difficult for society.

12 **6. Funding**

This work was supported by the Spanish Government-FEDER Funds through CV
14 [CPII18/00031], and funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and
innovation programme under grant agreement No 847762 through LAC contract.

16 **7. Acknowledgements**

We thank the people that answered the survey questionnaire online, as well as Jérôme
18 Nigou, Valeria Bergalli, Paolo Salieri, Chiara Bertoldini and Harvey Evans, who kindly
volunteered to translate/edit the questionnaire and website information to French, Italian
20 and English languages.

8. References

- 22 1. Ministerio de Sanidad Servicios Sociales e Igualdad; Ministerio de Economía y
Competitividad; Instituto de Salud Carlos III. Situación del COVID-19 en España.
24 Available at: <https://covid19.isciii.es/>.
2. Catalunya D de S de la G de. Comunicat del Departament de Salut, 29 de març de

2020. Available at: <http://canalsalut.gencat.cat/ca/salut-a-z/c/coronavirus-2019-ncov/nota-premsa/?id=384272>.
- 2
3. CDC. Patients with COVID-19 . CDC website. 2020. Available at:
4 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/disposition-hospitalized-patients.html%0D%0A%0D%0A%0D%0A>. Accessed 20 March 2020.
- 6 4. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Novel coronavirus disease
2019 (COVID-19) pandemic : increased transmission in the EU / EEA and the
8 UK – sixth update. 2020. Available at:
[https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/RRA-sixth-update-](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/RRA-sixth-update-Outbreak-of-novel-coronavirus-disease-2019-COVID-19.pdf)
10 [Outbreak-of-novel-coronavirus-disease-2019-COVID-19 .pdf](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/RRA-sixth-update-Outbreak-of-novel-coronavirus-disease-2019-COVID-19.pdf).
- 12 5. Van Bortel T, Basnayake A, Wurie F, et al. Psychosocial effects of an Ebola
outbreak at individual, community and international levels. *Bull World Health Organ* **2016**; 94:210–214.
- 14 6. Rubin GJ, Wessely S. The psychological effects of quarantining a city. *BMJ* **2020**;
368:1–2. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1136/bmj.m313>.
- 16 7. Wang C, Pan R, Wan X, et al. Immediate psychological responses and associated
factors during the initial stage of the 2019 coronavirus disease (COVID-19)
18 epidemic among the general population in China. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*
2020; 17.
- 20 8. Sim K, Huak Chan Y, Chong PN, Chua HC, Wen Soon S. Psychosocial and coping
responses within the community health care setting towards a national outbreak of
22 an infectious disease. *J Psychosom Res* **2010**; 68:195–202.
- 24 9. Brooks SK, Webster RK, Smith LE, et al. The psychological impact of quarantine
and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. *Lancet* **2020**; 395:912–920.
Available at: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30460-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30460-8).

10. Leung GM, Lam TH, Ho LM, et al. The impact of community psychological responses on outbreak control for severe acute respiratory syndrome in Hong Kong. *J Epidemiol Community Health* **2003**; 57:857–863.
11. McAlonan GM, Lee AM, Cheung V, et al. Immediate and sustained psychological impact of an emerging infectious disease outbreak on health care workers. *Can J Psychiatry* **2007**; 52:241–247.
12. Gibbons JD, Chakraborti S. *Nonparametric Statistical Inference*. 5th ed. Boca Raton: Chapman & Hall/CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group, 2011.
13. Hollander M, Wolfe D. *Nonparametric Statistical Methods*, 2nd Edition. 1999.
14. Yao H, Chen JH, Xu YF. Patients with mental health disorders in the COVID-19 epidemic. *The Lancet Psychiatry* **2020**; 7:e21. Available at: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366\(20\)30090-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30090-0).
15. Cullen W, Gulati G, Kelly BD. Mental health in the COVID-19 pandemic. *QJM* **2020**; 113:311–312.
16. International Labour Organization. *ILO Monitor: COVID-19 and the world of work*. Second edition. Updated estimates and analysis. 2020. Available at: https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/@dgreports/@dcomm/documents/briefingnote/wcms_740877.pdf.
17. Marí-Dell’olmo M, Gotsens M, Pasarín MI, et al. Socioeconomic inequalities in COVID-19 in a European urban area: Two waves, two patterns. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* **2021**;
18. González-Sanguino C, Ausín B, Castellanos MÁ, et al. Mental health consequences during the initial stage of the 2020 Coronavirus pandemic (COVID-19) in Spain. *Brain Behav Immun* **2020**;
19. Wang C, Pan R, Wan X, et al. A longitudinal study on the mental health of general

- population during the COVID-19 epidemic in China. *Brain Behav Immun* **2020**;
- 2 20. Rodríguez-Rey R, Garrido-Hernansaiz H, Collado S. Psychological Impact and
Associated Factors During the Initial Stage of the Coronavirus (COVID-19)
4 Pandemic Among the General Population in Spain. *Front Psychol* **2020**;
- 6 21. Jacques-Avinõ C, López-Jiménez T, Medina-Perucha L, et al. Gender-based
approach on the social impact and mental health in Spain during COVID-19
lockdown: A cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open* **2020**;
- 8 22. Ramírez LPG, Arriaga RJM, Hernández-Gonzalez MA, De la Roca-Chiapas JM.
Psychological distress and signs of post-traumatic stress in response to the
10 COVID-19 health emergency in a Mexican sample. *Psychol Res Behav Manag*
2020;
- 12 23. Cao W, Fang Z, Hou G, et al. The psychological impact of the COVID-19
epidemic on college students in China. *Psychiatry Res* **2020**;
- 14 24. Walter LA, McGregor AJ. Sex- and Gender-specific Observations and
Implications for COVID-19 . *West J Emerg Med* **2020**; :507–509.
- 16 25. Kisely S, Warren N, McMahon L, Dalais C, Henry I, Siskind D. Occurrence,
prevention, and management of the psychological effects of emerging virus
18 outbreaks on healthcare workers: rapid review and meta-analysis. *BMJ* **2020**; 369.
- 20 26. Peterman A, Potts A, Donnell MO, et al. Working Paper 528 April 2020 Pandemics
and Violence Against Women and Children. *Cent Glob Dev* **2020**; :43.
- 22 27. Davies SE, Bennett B. A gendered human rights analysis of Ebola and Zika:
Locating gender in global health emergencies. *Int Aff* **2016**;
- 24 28. Mollona E, Aivazidou E, Barberio V, Cunico G, Pareschi L. A policy framework
for tackling the economic and social impact of the COVID-19 crisis. 2019.
29. Spinelli M, Lionetti F, Pastore M, Fasolo M. Parents’ Stress and Children’s

- Psychological Problems in Families Facing the COVID-19 Outbreak in Italy.
2 Front Psychol **2020**;
30. Wang G, Zhang Y, Zhao J, Zhang J, Jiang F. Mitigate the effects of home
4 confinement on children during the COVID-19 outbreak. *Lancet* **2020**; 395:945–
947.
- 6 31. Kang SJ, Jung SI. Age-Related Morbidity and Mortality among Patients with
COVID-19 . *Infect Chemother* **2020**;
- 8 32. Armitage R, Nellums LB. COVID-19 and the consequences of isolating the
elderly. *Lancet Public Heal* **2020**; 5:e256. Available at:
10 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(20\)30061-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30061-X).
33. Petretto DR, Pili R. Ageing and COVID-19 : What is the Role for Elderly People?
12 *Geriatrics* **2020**; 5:25.
34. Cohen O, Geva D, Lahad M, et al. Community Resilience throughout the Lifespan
14 the Potential Contribution of Healthy Elders. *PLoS One* **2016**; 11:1–14.
35. Meng H, Xu Y, Dai J, Zhang Y, Liu B, Yang H. Analyze the psychological impact
16 of COVID-19 among the elderly population in China and make corresponding
suggestions. *Psychiatry Res.* 2020;
- 18 36. Bobes-Bascarán T, Sáiz PA, Velasco A, et al. Early psychological correlates
associated with COVID-19 in a Spanish older adult sample. *Am J Geriatr*
20 *Psychiatry* **2020**; :1–12. Available at:
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1064748120304759>.
- 22 37. Fernández-Aguilar L, Ricarte J, Ros L, Latorre JM. Emotional differences in
young and older adults: Films as mood induction procedure. *Front Psychol* **2018**;
- 24 38. Beck F, Léger D, Fressard L, Peretti-Watel P, Verger P. Covid-19 health crisis
and lockdown associated with high level of sleep complaints and hypnotic uptake

- at the population level. *J. Sleep Res.* 2020;
- 2 39. Shanahan L, Steinhoff A, Bechtiger L, et al. Emotional Distress in Young Adults
During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Evidence of Risk and Resilience From a
4 Longitudinal Cohort Study. *Psychol Med* **2020**;
- 6 40. Commodari E, La Rosa VL. Adolescents in quarantine during COVID-19
pandemic in Italy: Perceived health risk, beliefs, psychological experiences and
expectations for the future. *Front Psychol* **2020**; 11:2480.
- 8 41. Suzuki Y, Maeda N, Hirado D, Shirakawa T, Urabe Y. Physical activity changes
and its risk factors among community-dwelling Japanese older adults during the
10 COVID-19 epidemic: Associations with subjective well-being and health-related
quality of life. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* **2020**; 17:1–12.
- 12 42. Maugeri G, Castrogiovanni P, Battaglia G, et al. The impact of physical activity
on psychological health during Covid-19 pandemic in Italy. *Heliyon* **2020**;
- 14 43. Rossi R, Soggi V, Pacitti F, et al. Mental Health Outcomes Among Frontline and
Second-Line Health Care Workers During the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-
16 19) Pandemic in Italy. *JAMA Netw open* **2020**; 3:e2010185. Available at:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32463467>.
- 18 44. Xiao J, Fang M, Chen Q, He B. SARS, MERS and COVID-19 among healthcare
workers: A narrative review. *J Infect Public Health* **2020**; 13:843–848. Available
20 at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jiph.2020.05.019>.
- 22 45. Simone L, Gnagnarella C. Differences Between Health Workers and General
Population in Risk Perception, Behaviors, and Psychological Distress Related to
COVID-19 Spread in Italy. *Front Psychol* **2020**; 11.
- 24 46. Pappa S, Ntella V, Giannakas T, Giannakoulis VG, Papoutsis E, Katsaounou P.
Prevalence of depression, anxiety, and insomnia among healthcare workers during

- the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Brain. Behav. Immun.* 2020;
- 2
47. Alonso J, Vilagut G, Mortier P, et al. Mental health impact of the first wave of
4 COVID-19 pandemic on Spanish healthcare workers: A large cross-sectional
survey. *Rev Psiquiatr Salud Ment* **2021**;
- 6 48. Mortier P, Vilagut G, Ferrer M, et al. Thirty-day suicidal thoughts and behaviors
among hospital workers during the first wave of the Spain COVID-19 outbreak.
8 *Depress Anxiety* **2021**;
49. Ramaci T, Barattucci M, Ledda C, Rapisarda V. Social stigma during COVID-19
10 and its impact on HCWs outcomes. *Sustain* **2020**;
50. Robert R, Kentish-Barnes N, Boyer A, Laurent A, Azoulay E, Reignier J. Ethical
12 dilemmas due to the Covid-19 pandemic. *Ann. Intensive Care.* 2020;
51. Zanin M, Xiao C, Liang T, et al. The public health response to the COVID-19
14 outbreak in mainland China: a narrative review. *J Thorac Dis* **2020**;
52. Verweij M, van de Vathorst S, Schermer M, Willems D, de Vries M. Ethical
16 Advice for an Intensive Care Triage Protocol in the COVID-19 Pandemic: Lessons
Learned from The Netherlands. *Public Health Ethics* **2020**;
- 18 53. Vincent JL, Creteur J. Ethical aspects of the COVID-19 crisis: How to deal with
an overwhelming shortage of acute beds. *Eur Hear journal Acute Cardiovasc care*
20 **2020**;
54. Owens IT. Supporting nurses' mental health during the pandemic. *Nursing (Lond)*
22 **2020**; 50:54–57.
55. Martínez-López JÁ, Lázaro-Pérez C, Gómez-Galán J, Fernández-Martínez M del
24 M. Psychological Impact of COVID-19 Emergency on Health Professionals:
Burnout Incidence at the Most Critical Period in Spain. *J Clin Med* **2020**;

56. Nowicki GJ, Ślusarska B, Tucholska K, Naylor K, Chrzan-Rodak A, Niedorys B.
2 The severity of traumatic stress associated with Covid-19 pandemic, perception
of support, sense of security, and sense of meaning in life among nurses: Research
4 protocol and preliminary results from poland. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*
2020;
- 6 57. Delgado D, Quintana FW, Perez G, et al. Personal safety during the Covid-19
pandemic: Realities and perspectives of healthcare workers in latin America. *Int J*
8 *Environ Res Public Health* **2020**;
58. Epstein EG, Delgado S. Understanding and addressing moral distress. *Online J*
10 *Issues Nurs* **2010**;
59. Tomlin J, Dagleish-Warburton B, Lamph G. Psychosocial Support for Healthcare
12 Workers During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Front Psychol* **2020**;
60. Heath C, Sommerfield A, von Ungern-Sternberg BS. Resilience strategies to
14 manage psychological distress among healthcare workers during the COVID-19
pandemic: a narrative review. *Anaesthesia*. 2020;
- 16 61. Johns Hopkins Berman Institute of Bioethics. Resources for Frontline Clinicians.
2020.
- 18 62. Maves RC, Downar J, Dichter JR, et al. Triage of Scarce Critical Care Resources
in COVID-19 An Implementation Guide for Regional Allocation: An Expert Panel
20 Report of the Task Force for Mass Critical Care and the American College of Chest
Physicians. *Chest*. 2020;

22

24 **9. Tables**

Table 1: Characteristics of the cohort.

ANSWER CATEGORIES		TOTAL %	ANSWER CATEGORIES		TOTAL %
Gender	Female	70.4	Care of someone	No	39.75
	Male	29.22		Yes, of people of <16	24.81
	Non binary	0.15		Yes, of people of >16	12.24
	Not saying	0.12		Yes, siblings	1.26
Origin	Catalonia region	52.80	Yes, parents	15.11	
	Other Spanish regions	46.00	Yes, others	6.82	
	Other countries	1.20	none	43.80	
Civil status	Married	53.65	1	24.81	
	Divorced	10.64	2	26.60	
	In couple	18.19	3	4.36	
	Single	14.1	4	0.38	
	Widow	3.4	5	0.03	
Housing	Owned apartment/house	90.95	>2	7.77	
	Shared apartment/house	7.81	2	66.9	
	Rented room	1.07	1	25.31	
	Centre/institution	0.12	No	20.67	
	Homeless	0.03	Yes	35.73	
Maximum Education Degree	Primary Education	3.85	Some	43.58	
	Secondary Education	5.46	No	59.01	
	High School	31.53	Mortgage to pay	Yes, one	35.61
	Degree	42.62	Yes, more than one	5.37	
	Master	13.29	Yes, more than one	5.37	
Employment	PhD	3.23	Yes, more than one	5.37	
	Qualified job	36.13	No	75.83	
	Non qualified job	3.59	Yes	24.16	
	Job in Healthcare	9.06	Nurse	30.64	
	Home/people care	4.82	Physician	21,70	
Care of someone	Self-employed	9.02	Others (including working on a private pharmacy)	12,88	
	Company owner	4.27	Technician	11,50	
	Unemployed	5.09	Administrative personnel	9,99	
	Other	27.97	Nurse assistant	9,60	
	Other	27.97	Researcher	2,52	
Burden of care (in n options selected)	No	39.75	Caretaker	0,55	
	Yes, of people of <16 y.o.	24.81	Cleaning personnel	0,29	
	Yes, of people of >16 y.o.	12.24	Kitchen personnel	0,25	
	Yes, siblings	1.26	Laundry personnel	0,08	
	Yes, parents	15.11	Laundry personnel	0,08	
Burden of care (in n options selected)	Yes, others	6.82	none	43.80	
	1	24.81	1	24.81	
	2	26.60	2	26.60	
	3	4.36	3	4.36	
	4	0.38	4	0.38	
Occupation of HCW	5	0.03	5	0.03	
	5	0.03	5	0.03	
	5	0.03	5	0.03	
	5	0.03	5	0.03	
	5	0.03	5	0.03	

2

4

6

Table 2: Impact of the pandemic on the General population.

ANSWER CATEGORIES		TOTAL %	ANSWER CATEGORIES		TOTAL %		
Loss of job	No	75.12	Staying home	No, I am forced to go to work	0.40		
	Yes, the company made a labour force adjustment plan	0.18		No, I need to work	0.94		
	Yes, the company made a temporary labour force adjustment plan	9.78		No, I work on essential services	13.32		
	Yes, I have lost some jobs previously contracted/arranged	5.75		Yes	55.19		
	Yes, I was fired	0.88		Yes, teleworking	30.13		
	Yes, others	8.29		No	26.86		
Spending less	Yes	60.66	Afraid	Yes, going shopping	17.30		
	A little	22.09		Yes, to infect others	22.12		
	No	17.23		Yes, to get infected	33.70		
Seek for social assistance/or any other assistance	No	91.00	Afraid to infect	Elders	35.76		
	Not yet, but will need to	5.00		Anyone	49.28		
	Yes	4.00		Children	13.20		
Index of socio-economic deprivation -score	<7		Colleagues at work	1.74			
	7-8.5		No	57.94			
	8.5-10		Yes, alcohol	5.92			
	>10		Yes, food	24.26			
Contact with someone infected by SARS-CoV-2	I do not know	80.15	Increased substance use	Yes, illegal drugs	0.40		
	yes, with a probable non-confirmed	9.83		Yes, drugs to calm down	4.15		
	Yes, with a confirmed case	10.01		Yes, tobacco	7.29		
Presence of symptoms (since February)	No	26.18	Media to get information about the pandemic	Social media	29.23		
	Headache	16.01		TV	36.77		
	Sore throat	9.85		Radio	15.45		
	Nasal congestion/running nose	9.17		Newspapers	13.54		
	Extreme fatigue/tiredness	6.91		Other	4.99		
	Persistent cough (for one week or more)	6.84	Thoughts about the information received	It's ok	18.98		
	Muscle pain	6.20		The Government explains too much	3.23		
	Diarrhea	5.36		The Government explains too less	8.93		
	Dizziness	2.85		Media explain too much	12.78		
	Shortness of breath	2.19		Media explain too less	2.91		
Chest pain	1.90	Too negative	20.92				
Loss of smell, smell blindness	1.86	Poorly adjusted to the reality	26.82				
Persistent fever (for one week or more)	1.63	I do not think anything about it	5.41				
Loss of appetite/weight	1.31	No	21.43				
Loss of taste	1.66	Impact of the pandemic on people (subjective)	Yes, my personality	4.78			
N of symptoms	1		40.03	Yes, my vision of the society/ how we lived	50.41		
	2		23.76	Yes, my life	23.36		
	3	14.68	Scores results per percentiles	Score	50%	90%	95%
	4	8.34		Anxiety	2	≥10	≥16
	How did they feel when answering the questionnaire	Well		66.50	Stress	8	≥24
Normal		22.50		Depression	4	≥16	≥20
Not at 100%		10.60		PSTD	17	≥46	≥54
Bad		0.42					
None		64.25					
Use of healthcare resources put in place in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic	Have used an app set up for management of COVID cases	21.51					
	Have called a telephone number set up for the management of COVID cases	5.60					
	Have been to a public healthcare center (including GP)	3.77					
	Have been tested	1.82					
	Have been to private doctor/healthcare center	1.60					
	Have gone to the emergency room	1.42					
For those tested, result of the test	Negative	57.76					
	Positive	42.23					

Table 3: Impact of the pandemic on the General population

ANSWER CATEGORIES		TOTAL %	ANSWER CATEGORIES		TOTAL %
Having worked directly with COVID-19 patients	No	58.34	No		56.29
	Yes	41.65	No, I follow protocols		25.09
Fear of working with COVID-19 patients	No	24.13	Ethical concerns	Yes, with selection of patients and/or protocols for selection of patients or therapeutic indications	9.41
	Yes	75.87		Yes, others	9.19
Fear of working with COVID-19 patients	No fear	14.58	Having worked without sufficient protection		25.68
	Scared of transmitting the virus to other non-COVID patients	14.95	With patients triage or protocols for patients triage or therapeutic indication		16.28
	Scared of transmitting the virus to own people (family, colleagues)	42.90	With the protocol for case management.		11.46
	Scared of being obliged to take medical decisions representing an ethical dilemma for me (patient selection, application of protocols)	6.26	With the protocol for End-of-Life management		8.94
	Scared of being infected	17.01	With institution management or orders from superiors.		8.02
	Afraid of dying	4.27	With the disjunctive of having to/wanting to go to work at first line and not being able/wanting to do it.		6.88
		Problems faced by healthcare professionals, grouped	With the prioritization of dispensing protective material (facial masks, EPIs) or tests.		5.27
			With the impact of the outbreak and/or lockdown on some populations (chronic or mental health patients, elders, etc.)		3.89
			Others (non-specified)		3.89
			With problems due to the organizational changes.		3.66
			With management of information given to patients/their families, and related problems (including confidentiality issues).		3.44
			With colleagues attitudes		2.52

2

Table 4: *Conditions statistically associated to the mental-health scores results.*

Factors:	Statistically association to:						
	Depression Index	Anxiety Index	Stress Index	PSTD Index	Evitation Index	Intrusion Index	Hyperarousal Index
Risk	p	p	p	p	p	p	p
Women	0.019	0.003		0.000	0.007	0.034	0.027
<42 y.o.		0.008					
Caregivers		0.002	0.039	0.006		0.050	
Adults with higher perception of the difficulty of quarantine for children and the whole family (score in a 10-points scale) vs 0				0.041		0.032	0.022
Living in a middle-high density population town		0.031					
Living in a shared apartment/house		0.006					
Living in a rented room		0.039					
Declaring to be homeless				0.044			
High deprivation index (>10)		0.015					
Going to work because job on essential services		0.011					
Being a healthcare worker and to be afraid of attending COVID-19 patients	0.017				0.023		
To have been in contact with a COVID-19 patient		0.006		0.038			
Having had symptoms compatible with COVID-19	0.021	0.002		0.008			
Having used all healthcare resources put in place in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic			0.039	8641,000	0.007		0.011
To be afraid (of getting infected, to infect others, to go shopping)		0.000	0.036	0.000	0.003	0.012	0.006
To have increased the consume of at least one substance		0.006		0.008			
To use 3 media to get information about COVID-19		0.033					
Protection	p	p	p	p	p	p	p
>61 y.o.		0.006		0.05			
To be married		0.007					
Being a widow				0.020	0.011		
To have a qualified job		0.008					
To have a PhD	0.019	0.010			0.031		
Feeling well		0.045		0.037			

2

4