

1

2 Acute and longer-term psychological distress associated with testing positive for

3 COVID-19: longitudinal evidence from a population-based study of US adults

4

5

6 Michael Daly*¹ PhD & Eric Robinson² PhD

7 ¹Department of Psychology, Maynooth University, Co. Kildare, Ireland

8 ² Institute of Population Health Sciences, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United

9 Kingdom

10

11 * Corresponding author: Michael Daly

12 Address correspondence to:

13 Michael Daly Ph.D.

14 Department of Psychology

15 1.1.7 Education House

16 Maynooth University

17 Maynooth

18 Ireland

19 Tel: (01) 474 7742

20 Email: Michael.A.Daly@mu.ie

21

22 **Funding Statement:** This research received no specific grant from any funding agency,

23 commercial or not-for-profit sector.

24 **Word count:** 4435

25

Abstract

26 **Background:** The novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) has produced a considerable public
27 health burden but the impact that contracting the disease has on mental health is unclear. In
28 this observational population-based cohort study, we examined longitudinal changes in
29 psychological distress associated with testing positive for COVID-19.

30 **Methods:** Participants (N = 8,002; Observations = 139,035) were drawn from 23 waves of
31 the Understanding America Study, a nationally representative survey of American adults
32 followed-up every two weeks from April 1 2020 to February 15 2021. Psychological distress
33 was assessed using the standardized total score on the Patient Health Questionnaire-4 (PHQ-
34 4).

35 **Results:** Over the course of the study 576 participants reported testing positive for COVID-
36 19. Using regression analysis including individual and time fixed effects we found that
37 psychological distress increased by 0.29 standard deviations ($p < .001$) during the two-week
38 period when participants first tested positive for COVID-19. Distress levels remained
39 significantly elevated ($d = 0.16, p < .01$) for a further two weeks, before returning to baseline
40 levels. Coronavirus symptom severity explained changes in distress attributable to COVID-
41 19, whereby distress was more pronounced among those whose symptoms were more severe
42 and were slower to subside.

43 **Conclusions:** This study indicates that testing positive for COVID-19 is associated with an
44 initial increase in psychological distress that diminishes quickly as symptoms subside. While
45 COVID-19 may not produce lasting psychological distress among the majority of the general
46 population it remains possible that a minority may suffer longer-term mental health
47 consequences.

48

49

Introduction

50 The COVID-19 pandemic radically changed daily life for much of the world's
51 population and by March 2021 had led to 122 million confirmed infections worldwide
52 including almost 30 million in the United States (WHO, 2021). While there has been a surge
53 in research examining the potential population mental health consequences of living through
54 the pandemic (Robinson, Sutin, Daly, & Jones, 2021; Salari et al., 2020), few studies have
55 specifically examined the mental health impact of contracting the novel coronavirus (SARS-
56 CoV-2). A review of studies examining severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) and
57 Middle East respiratory syndrome (MERS) concluded that severe coronavirus infections are
58 linked to elevated depression and anxiety disorder in the months following infection (Rogers
59 et al., 2020). In the context of COVID-19, there is growing concern that the disease may lead
60 to prolonged effects after recovery including headaches, muscle and body ache, and persistent
61 tiredness (Sudre et al., 2021) and that these post-acute COVID-19 symptoms (often termed
62 “long COVID”) may result in prolonged mental health problems (Del Rio, Collins, & Malani,
63 2020). However, there is currently a dearth of evidence on the mental health impacts of
64 contracting COVID-19 and the present study aimed to address this gap by examining
65 longitudinal data on US adults to estimate changes in psychological distress in response to
66 contracting COVID-19.

67 Research to date suggests that reporting a positive test or symptoms consistent with
68 COVID-19 is associated with raised anxiety and depression levels in cross-sectional samples
69 of the general population in the UK and Ireland (Hyland et al., 2020; Shevlin et al., 2020).
70 Similarly, reporting symptoms compatible with COVID-19 has been linked to worse mental
71 health in a large-scale study (N = 69,054) of university students in France (Wathelet et al.,
72 2020). A large-scale cross-sectional study of UK adults (N = 44,775) has shown that
73 reporting a diagnosis of COVID-19 is associated with raised levels of self-harm and suicidal

74 ideation (Iob, Steptoe, & Fancourt, 2020). Although these studies link potential COVID
75 symptoms or diagnosis with increased mental health problems, the cross-sectional nature of
76 study means that it is plausible that findings are explained by confounding bias or reverse
77 causality. For example, individuals with existing mental health problems may be more likely
78 to report experiencing COVID-19 symptoms or to contract COVID-19 (van der Meer et al.,
79 2020).

80 In line with this, a large-scale record linkage study of 61 million US adults found that
81 those with a recent diagnosis of a mental disorder were at increased risk of COVID-19
82 infection (Wang, Xu, & Volkow, 2021). This finding was confirmed by a subsequent study of
83 the health records of almost 70 million patients in the US (Taquet, Luciano, Geddes, &
84 Harrison, 2021). Within the same study, 62,354 patients contracted COVID-19 between
85 January and August 2020 and this group were at an increased risk of first-time diagnosis of
86 psychiatric disorder (particularly anxiety disorder and insomnia), within 3-months relative to
87 those experiencing other health events such as influenza (Taquet et al., 2021). This finding
88 suggests that contracting COVID-19 may increase risk of mental health problems.

89 However, in the absence of longitudinal data on mental health symptoms prior to infection
90 and data on the background characteristics of patients it is unclear whether this association
91 could be attributed to pre-illness factors, such as subclinical mental health symptoms or
92 confounding lifestyle factors that predispose individuals towards more severe COVID-19
93 outcomes and poorer mental health (Popkin et al., 2020; Wang, Kaelber, Xu, & Volkow,
94 2021). It is also not clear whether the increased risk of psychiatric problems identified may be
95 representative of the impact of COVID-19 in the general population. For instance, a follow-
96 up study drawing on the same health records showed that the onset of mood and anxiety
97 disorders at six months was increased only among a subset of COVID-19 patients

98 experiencing brain dysfunction as a result of severe infection (Taquet, Geddes, & Harrison,
99 2021).

100 To understand the potential impact of COVID-19 infection on mental health in the
101 general population there is a need for representative longitudinal data which assesses whether
102 pre-COVID-19 mental health symptoms change sequentially as a result of infection. The
103 objective of the current study was therefore to examine longitudinal changes in psychological
104 distress both during infection and after recovery in large nationally representative cohort of
105 US adults. We also examined if results were consistent across population demographics and
106 the extent to which changes in psychological distress were explained by the severity and
107 duration of COVID-19 symptoms (e.g. respiratory difficulties) experienced as a result of
108 infection.

109

110

Methods

111 Sample

112 Participants were drawn from the Understanding America Study (UAS), a nationally
113 representative probability-based longitudinal study of 9063 individuals (Alattar Messel, &
114 Rogofsky, 2018; Kapteyn et al., 2020). The sample was recruited via address-based sampling
115 from the US Postal Service Computerized Delivery Sequence file (Alattar et al., 2018). The
116 UAS surveys are administered via the internet and eligible participants without computers or
117 internet access are provided with internet-connected tablets. From April 1 2020, respondents
118 were invited to take part in a continuous tracking study where participants completed surveys
119 every two weeks during the COVID-19 pandemic. The survey has been used to examine
120 changes in mental health (Daly & Robinson, 2020) and COVID-19 related perceptions and
121 protective behaviors (Crane, Shermock, Omer, & Romley, 2021; Robinson & Daly, 2020).

122 From a total number of 8,129 participants and 142,573 observations across 23 waves
123 of data collection we excluded 127 participants and 3,534 observations with missing data on
124 the PHQ-4 (Obs. = 2,131) and reported demographic characteristics and COVID-19 test
125 results and symptoms (Obs. = 1,407). We utilize data from the remaining 8,002 UAS panel
126 members who provided a total of 139,035 observations from April 1 2020 to February 15
127 2021. The average number of participants in each survey wave was 6,045 and participants
128 completed 17.4 out of 23 possible surveys on average. The dates of data collection and
129 number of participants in each survey wave can be seen in Table S1.

130 Further details of the UAS survey administration and sampling methodology can
131 found elsewhere (Alattar et al., 2018; Kapteyn et al., 2020). The UAS was approved by the
132 University of Southern California human subjects committee internal review board (IRB) and
133 informed consent was obtained from all participants.

134

135 **Measures**

136 **Psychological distress**

137 Psychological distress was gauged using the validated four-item Patient Health
138 Questionnaire (PHQ-4), which has been shown to be reliable and responsive to changes in
139 mental health (Kroenke, Baye & Lourens, 2019; Kroenke, Spitzer, Williams, & Löwe, 2009;
140 Löwe et al., 2010). The scale is comprised of two items from the PHQ-9 and two items from
141 the Generalized Anxiety Disorder-7 (GAD-7). The items selected assess core symptoms of
142 anxiety (i.e. “feeling nervous, anxious, or on edge” and “not being able to stop or control
143 worrying”) and depression (i.e. “little interest of pleasure in doing things” and “feeling down,
144 depressed, or hopeless”). Participants were asked how often over the last 2 weeks they have
145 been bothered by these problems and reported their answers on a four-point scale with
146 response options *not at all* = 0, *several days* = 1, *more than half of days* = 2, and

147 *nearly every day* $\alpha = .93$. Total scores on the scale range from 0 to 12 with higher scores
148 indicating greater distress (mean Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.92$, range = 0.88 - 0.93). Total PHQ-4
149 scores were standardized to have a mean of zero and standard deviation of one.

150

151 **COVID-19 testing**

152 As part of each survey wave participants reported whether they had been tested for
153 coronavirus since they last completed the UAS continuous tracking survey and were
154 reminded of the date of their most recent survey. Participants reported the result of the
155 coronavirus test using four options: (1) "I have been tested and I tested positive (I had
156 coronavirus)", (2) "I have been tested and I tested negative (I did not have coronavirus)", (3)
157 "I have been tested and I do not know the result", and (4) "I have not been tested". Those
158 who tested positive were classified as having COVID-19 and others were classified as not
159 testing positive. Where participants reported testing positive in more than one survey wave
160 (typically in waves directly following the first positive COVID-19 test) we examined the first
161 positive test only.

162 **COVID-19 symptoms**

163 In each survey wave participants indicated whether or not they had experienced
164 common symptoms of COVID-19 in the past 7 days. In line with a recent large-scale
165 assessment of the clinical spectrum of COVID-19 symptoms (Eythorsson et al., 2020) we
166 included assessments of upper respiratory (i.e. runny or stuffy nose, sore throat, sneezing, lost
167 sense of smell), lower respiratory (i.e. chest congestion, cough, shortness of breath),
168 gastrointestinal (i.e. vomiting, diarrhea, abdominal discomfort), and generalized symptoms
169 (i.e. fever or chills or body temperature higher than 100.4 F or 38.0 C, headache, muscle or
170 body aches). The percentage of all symptoms reported in the past 7 days was examined as our
171 primary indicator of participant experiences of COVID-19 (ranging from 0 = no symptoms

172 experienced, to 100 = all symptoms experienced). The composite score of the percentage of
173 symptoms reported demonstrated adequate reliability across survey waves (mean Cronbach's
174 $\alpha = 0.76$, range 0.72 – 0.79).

175

176

177 **Demographic characteristics and other potential moderating factors**

178 We examined a set of demographic factors that may moderate the association between
179 COVID-19 and psychological distress: participant age (18-39, 40-59, 60+ years), gender
180 (male, female), race/ethnicity (White, Hispanic, Black, Other race/ethnicity), and annual
181 household income levels (\leq \$40,00, \$40,000–\$100,000 \geq \$100,000 per annum). In addition,
182 we tested whether the potential association between COVID-19 and distress levels was
183 moderated by the presence of a pre-existing diagnosis of a chronic physical health condition
184 (i.e. diabetes, cancer, heart disease, kidney disease, asthma, chronic lung disease,
185 autoimmune disease) or a mental health condition (i.e. anxiety disorder, attention deficit
186 hyperactivity disorder, bipolar disorder, eating disorders, depressive disorders, obsessive
187 compulsive disorder, posttraumatic stress disorder, or schizophrenia/psychotic disorder).

188

189 **Statistical analysis**

190 All analyses were carried out in Stata version 15 using survey weights to generate
191 nationally representative estimates. In the UAS sampling weights adjust for differential
192 probabilities of selection into the UAS and post-stratification is used to adjust the weights so
193 that each survey matches the distribution of demographic characteristics of the US
194 population. Further details of the UAS weighting methodology can be found in Angrisani
195 Kapteyn, Meijer, and Saw (2019).

196 In preliminary analyses, to test the validity of the self-reported COVID-19 positive
197 test data we compared the estimated population prevalence of positive tests in each wave of

198 the UAS and in the US adult population over the same two-week periods from April 1 2020
199 to February 15 2021. Total case numbers per day were drawn from the Centers for Disease
200 Control and Prevention COVID Data Tracker (CDC, 2021) and an adjustment was applied to
201 correct for the presence of those under 18 in the daily case figures (see Supplementary
202 Materials Section 1). We also compared the prevalence of each COVID-19 symptom
203 examined in this study with the symptoms identified in two large-scale studies examining the
204 symptoms of those with confirmed positive COVID-19 tests (Eythorsson et al., 2020; Wohl
205 et al., 2021). Finally, we tested whether testing positive for COVID-19 was linked to
206 subsequent drop-out or a reduced level of participation in the UAS continuous tracking
207 survey.

208 Our main analysis used fixed effects regression to estimate the link between reported
209 coronavirus disease and changes in psychological distress within the same individuals across
210 multiple time-points. The basic fixed effects model estimating the association between testing
211 positive for COVID-19 ($\beta_1 COVID_{it}$) and psychological distress (PHQ_{it}) experienced by
212 individuals i across survey waves t can be expressed as:

213

$$214 \quad PHQ_{it} = \alpha_i + \beta_1 COVID_{it} + wave_t + \varepsilon_{it}$$

215

216 The inclusion of individual fixed effects (α_i) provides a control for all stable
217 individual characteristics that could influence susceptibility to COVID-19 or psychological
218 distress (e.g. gender, race, family background). Although individual fixed effects adjust for
219 all unchanging characteristics that could impact this relationship, it remains possible that the
220 link between COVID-19 and distress could be impacted by seasonal and other calendar
221 effects associated with the pandemic (e.g. changing macroeconomic conditions). For this
222 reason, we also included survey wave fixed effects ($wave_t$) for each two-week period during

223 which the study surveys were completed. By including individual and time fixed effects, we
224 eliminated bias from all factors that are fixed over time for individuals and factors that vary
225 over time but are constant across individuals.

226 The fixed effects approach employed in this study compares the distress levels of an
227 individual when they have tested positive for COVID-19 (and in waves before/after testing
228 positive where examined) with their distress level in other waves and pools this information
229 across the sample. In this way the increase in distress associated with testing positive for
230 COVID-19 can be estimated relative to a “baseline” level (Clark, Diener, Georgellis, &
231 Lucas, 2008), which is the predicted level of distress at other time-points experienced by
232 those who at some stage test positive for COVID-19. For modelling purposes, the sample
233 included both those who were and were not diagnosed with COVID-19 over the course of the
234 study. We also adopted this approach to examine changes in mental health experienced by
235 those who went for a COVID-19 test and tested negative for the disease.

236 Lags and leads in the effect of COVID-19 were examined to identify whether distress
237 increased before or after testing positive for the disease. Lead effects identified whether
238 distress increased from baseline levels in advance of a positive test. Lag effects identified
239 whether there was a residual effect of COVID-19 on psychological distress in subsequent
240 survey waves after the participant tested positive for the disease. Lag and lead analyses relied
241 on survey waves completed immediately before and after the wave where participants tested
242 positive for COVID-19. In addition, we tested whether the association between COVID-19
243 and psychological distress was moderated by participant sociodemographic characteristics
244 and the presence of chronic physical or mental health conditions.

245 Finally, we utilized the fixed effects model outlined above to examine the association
246 between testing positive for COVID-19 and experiencing symptoms of the disease, and the
247 association between COVID-19 symptoms and psychological distress. Drawing on this

248 information we conducted mediation analysis using the *khb* command in Stata to estimate the
249 indirect effect of COVID-19 on psychological distress via COVID-19 symptoms (Karlson,
250 Holm, & Breen, 2012).

251

252 **Results**

253 **Sample characteristics**

254 The demographic characteristics and symptoms experienced by those who tested
255 positive for COVID-19 and the remaining UAS participants are shown in Table 1. Those who
256 tested positive were more likely to be aged 40-59 years compared to the remainder of the
257 sample. Those reporting a positive test were also more likely to be of Hispanic race/ethnicity.
258 We found that those who tested positive for COVID-19 did not complete a significantly
259 different number of surveys ($M = 17.85$ waves completed, $SD = 6.5$) to participants who did
260 not test positive for COVID-19 ($M = 17.34$ waves completed, $SD = 7.24$) ($B = 0.51$, $SE =$
261 0.31 , $p = .10$). Those who tested positive for COVID-19 at any stage in 2020 ($N = 426$) were
262 significantly more likely than other participants to take part in the UAS survey in 2021 ($OR =$
263 1.82 , [95% CI: 1.28- 2.61], $p < .01$), though retention was very high for both groups (92% vs.
264 86.3%).

265 **COVID-19 positive tests**

266 Between April 1 2020 and February 15 2021 576 participants from the UAS sample
267 reported that they had tested positive for COVID-19. On average 39.5% of symptoms were
268 experienced in the past 7 days among those testing positive for COVID-19. The most
269 common reported symptoms among those who tested positive were cough (59%), headache
270 (58.9%), nose congestion (53.2%), muscle or body aches (52.6%), fever or high temperature
271 (41.8%), and loss of smell (40.6%), as shown in Table 1. The prevalence of COVID-19
272 symptoms identified in the current study was comparable to that identified in high-quality

273 studies where a positive COVID-19 test was confirmed via laboratory tests, as shown in
274 Table S2.

275 The total estimated prevalence of COVID-19 across all survey waves of the UAS
276 examined was 9.39% and the estimated prevalence of the disease in the US adult population
277 over the same period was 9.42%. For further details of how prevalence estimates were
278 derived see Section 1 of the Supplemental Materials. There was also a high degree of overlap
279 in the time trend of COVID-19 cases in the UAS sample and the US adult population, as can
280 be seen in Figure S1. The prevalence of COVID-19 across all UAS survey waves correlated
281 strongly with the prevalence in the US population over the same two-week periods ($r(21) =$
282 $0.93, p < .001$), as shown in Figures S2 and S3.

283 **Fixed effects regression analysis**

284 An initial examination of the descriptive trends in psychological distress tracked from
285 before to after reporting a positive COVID-19 test indicated that distress rose and peaked in
286 the wave when a positive COVID-19 test was initially reported and declined in the weeks that
287 followed. This trend was observed in males and females, as illustrated in the unadjusted
288 trends presented in Figure 1.

289 We found that testing positive for COVID-19 was associated with a 0.29 standard
290 deviation (SD) increase in psychological distress in the same survey wave ($B = 0.29, SE =$
291 $0.04, p < .001$). This increase reflected a change from a predicted level of distress of -0.03
292 (95% CI: -0.03, -0.02) in non-COVID-19 waves to 0.26 (95% CI: 0.18, 0.35) within the
293 survey wave where participants tested positive for COVID-19. In contrast, those who tested
294 negative for COVID-19 experienced a very small 0.03 SD increase in distress ($B = 0.03, SE$
295 $= 0.01, p < .01$). Lead effects of testing positive for coronavirus were non-significant
296 indicating that distress did not increase substantially in advance of testing positive, as shown
297 in Table 2. In contrast, there was evidence for a lag effect where testing positive for COVID-

298 19 was associated with a 0.16 SD increase in distress in the next survey wave ($B = 0.16$, $SE =$
299 0.06 , $p < .01$) two-weeks later. There was no evidence of significant associations between
300 COVID-19 and distress beyond two weeks (lags of up to eight weeks / four survey waves
301 tested). Further, the association between testing positive for COVID-19 and psychological
302 distress was not moderated by sociodemographic factors or the presence of mental health
303 conditions (see Table S3).

304 Testing positive for COVID-19 was associated with a 31.2 percentage point ($p < .001$)
305 increase in the percentage of COVID-19 symptoms from 8.1% (non-COVID-19 waves) to
306 39.3% (COVID-19 wave), as shown in Table 2. The percentage of symptoms reported
307 increased by 8.5% ($p < .001$) from baseline levels in the two-week period prior to testing
308 positive for COVID-19 and remained 8.7% ($p < .001$) above baseline levels in the two-week
309 period after testing positive for the disease. There was no evidence of increases in symptom
310 prevalence more than two weeks before or after the survey wave where the participant
311 reported testing positive for COVID-19 (lags and leads of up to eight weeks / four survey
312 waves tested).

313 **Mediation analysis**

314 Changes in symptoms of COVID-19 were positively associated with changes in
315 psychological distress in a fixed effects regression model. A change from experiencing no
316 symptoms of COVID-19 to experiencing all symptoms assessed was associated with a 0.48
317 standard deviation increase in distress ($B = 0.48$, $SE = 0.03$, $p < .001$). In our mediation
318 model, the indirect effect of COVID-19 symptoms ($B = 0.15$, $SE = 0.01$, $p < .001$) accounted
319 for 52% of the association between testing positive for the disease and the increase in
320 psychological distress (see Table 3). The direct effect of testing positive remained significant
321 after adjustment for symptom levels ($B = 0.14$, $SE = 0.04$, $p < .01$). The indirect effect of
322 symptoms ($B = 0.08$, $SE = 0.02$, $p < .001$) accounted for over half (52.8%) of the lagged

323 effect of COVID-19 on distress two weeks later, and after accounting for symptom levels the
324 relationship between infection and lagged increase in distress was non-significant. This
325 finding indicates that once symptoms subsided, testing positive for COVID-19 was no longer
326 significantly associated with increased distress.

327

328

Discussion

329 In this longitudinal population-based study, we used 23 biweekly waves of nationally
330 representative longitudinal data to uncover evidence of changes in psychological distress in
331 response to testing positive for COVID-19. Over the course of almost a full year of the
332 pandemic 576 participants reported a positive COVID-19. We found that testing positive for
333 COVID-19 was associated with an acute increase in distress levels (0.29 SD increase) after
334 accounting for time-invariant unobserved heterogeneity using a fixed effects model. This
335 spike in distress declined substantially within two weeks and was not significantly different
336 to baseline levels after this point. The increase and then partial recovery in psychological
337 distress after two weeks did not vary markedly across sociodemographic groups and was
338 similar for those with/without a pre-existing mental health condition. Findings are consistent
339 with proposals that those who contract COVID-19 may be at a greater risk of increased
340 mental health symptoms compared to others living through the pandemic but not directly
341 affected (Aknin et al., 2021). However, consistent with studies on mental health in the
342 general population during the pandemic (Prati & Mancini, 2021; Robinson & Daly, 2020;
343 Robinson et al., 2021), the present findings indicate that increases in distress attributable to
344 infection are likely to be relatively transient and short-lived. Even after contracting a
345 potentially deadly virus, the majority of the population appear to show resilience in mental
346 health (van der Velden et al., 2021).

347 Because there have been concerns about the mental health consequences and long-
348 term persistence of COVID-19 symptoms (e.g. Del Rio et al., 2020; Mahase, 2020) we
349 examined changes in symptoms as a potential explanation for raised distress levels. In line
350 with the overall results, symptoms increased during the wave of data collection when a
351 positive COVID-19 test was first reported and declined rapidly thereafter. Further, those
352 experiencing a greater number of COVID-19 symptoms showed the largest increases in
353 distress and COVID-19 symptoms explained over half of the prospective association between
354 testing positive for COVID-19 and experiencing raised distress.

355 The short-term increase in distress observed may be explained by the likely
356 combination of physical symptoms (i.e. the direct effects of ill health on mental health) and
357 initial worry over health having tested positive, the latter which presumably dissipates once
358 symptoms have subsided (Taquet et al., 2021). Overall, our findings are consistent with
359 cross-sectional studies linking COVID-19 symptoms to measures of mental health (Hyland et
360 al., 2020; Wathelet et al., 2020). However, unlike previous research which relied on between-
361 person estimates, the present research confirms that within-person changes in distress occur
362 in response to a self-reported positive test for COVID-19. In the present study, once COVID-
363 19 symptoms had dissipated at around two weeks from reporting a positive test, levels of
364 distress returned to baseline levels. Although we found no evidence of long-term mental
365 health consequences of COVID-19 in the present study, recent findings suggest that if a
366 severe infection occurs (Taquet et al., 2021) or if physical symptoms are maintained over
367 time (i.e. “long COVID”), there may be elevated levels of distress in this minority of the
368 population (Del Rio et al., 2020; Sudre et al., 2021).

369 A key strength of the current study was the repeated longitudinal assessment which
370 allowed the point at which a positive COVID-19 test was reported and associated changes in
371 distress to be identified within a narrow time window in a large nationally representative

372 sample of US adults. However, this study is limited in several respects. We relied on
373 participant reports of a positive COVID-19 test rather than verified test results and self-
374 reports are known to be vulnerable to bias. However, we conducted a number of analyses to
375 estimate the likely accuracy of self-reports. First, the prevalence of COVID-19 symptoms
376 among those reporting having tested positive for COVID-19 in the current study was
377 comparable to that from large-scale studies that have used both self-report and objective
378 verification of infection (Eythorsson et al., 2020; Wohl et al., 2021). The estimated cumulative
379 prevalence of COVID-19 cases in the US population and the UAS sample were closely
380 aligned (9.4% in each) and we observed strong concordance between the time trend of
381 positive cases in the population and the UAS sample. In addition, we found that those who
382 sought a COVID-19 test (presumably due to concerns about being infected) but tested
383 negative showed minimal adverse change in their distress levels, which indicates that
384 findings are unlikely to be explained by general concerns or worries about health as opposed
385 to an actual COVID-19 infection. We also found no evidence that testing positive for
386 COVID-19 predicted increased attrition or number of surveys completed in the present study.
387 This suggests that bias in our assessment of confirmed cases may have been minimal.

388 Although we do not find evidence that testing positive for COVID-19 increases risk
389 of dropout, it is likely that participants with the most severe infections were not included in
390 the present study. Recent evidence suggest that an increased risk of common psychiatric
391 disorders may be experienced chiefly by a subset of hospitalized patients experiencing
392 encephalopathy (brain disorder, disease, or dysfunction) as a result of severe COVID-19
393 infection (Taquet et al., 2021; Taylor, Landry, Paluszek, Rachor, & Asmundson, 2020).

394 Therefore, the present findings provide information on the mental health consequences of
395 testing positive for COVID-19 among the overall general population and not among those
396 who developed COVID-19 and become critically ill or have suffered major adverse effects. It

397 will therefore be important to continue to monitor long-term mental health outcomes on the
398 population level and among those experiencing severe COVID-19 infections.

399 We examined a range of population demographics, including sub-groups who are at
400 increased risk of becoming seriously ill after testing positive for COVID-19 (e.g. pre-existing
401 physical health conditions, ethnic minorities) but found no evidence that changes in distress
402 differed across demographics. Yet, while we utilized a large sample and a substantial portion
403 of participants tested positive for the coronavirus, it remains possible that we were not well
404 powered to detect small changes in long-term mental health among the population sub-groups
405 examined. Furthermore, it may be the case that some population sub-groups experience worse
406 mental health outcomes as a result of infection (e.g. those who become financially insecure
407 due to being unable to work) and further examination of trends in mental health symptoms as
408 a result of contracting COVID-19 is needed.

409

410 **Conclusions**

411 Among a nationally representative sample of US adults, testing positive for COVID-19 is
412 associated with an initial increase in psychological distress that diminishes quickly as
413 symptoms subside. While COVID-19 may not produce lasting psychological distress among
414 the majority of the general population it remains possible that a minority may suffer longer-
415 term mental health consequences.

416

417

418

419

420

421 **Data Sharing:** The research data are distributed by the USC Dornsife Center for Economic
422 and Social Research and available at <https://uasdata.usc.edu/index.php>

423

424 **Competing interests:** ER has been a named investigator on research projects funded by the
425 American Beverage Association and Unilever, but does not consider this funding a conflict of
426 interest.

427

428 **Acknowledgements and Contribution**

429 MD and ER designed research, MD analyzed data, & MR and ER performed research and
430 wrote the paper.

431 **Acknowledgements:** The project described in this paper relies on data from survey(s)
432 administered by the Understanding America Study, which is maintained by the Center for
433 Economic and Social Research (CESR) at the University of Southern California. The content
434 of this paper is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the
435 official views of USC or UAS. The collection of the UAS COVID-19 tracking data is
436 supported in part by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and by grant U01AG054580 from
437 the National Institute on Aging. However, these organizations bear no responsibility for the
438 analysis or interpretation of the data.

439 **Ethical Approval**

440 The UAS was approved by the University of Southern California human subjects committee
441 internal review board (IRB) and informed consent was obtained from all participants.

442

443

444

445 **References**

- 446 Aknin, L. B., De Neve, J. E., Dunn, E. W., Fancourt, D., Goldberg, E., Helliwell, J., ...
447 Amor, Y. B. (2021). A review and response to the early mental health and
448 neurological consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic. *PsyArXiv*,
449 <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/zw93g>
- 450 Alattar, L., Messel, M., & Rogofsky, D. (2018). An introduction to the understanding
451 America study Internet panel. *Social Security Bulletin*, 78, 13-28.
452 <https://www.ssa.gov/policy/docs/ssb/v78n2/v78n2p13.html>.
- 453 Angrisani, M., Kapteyn, A., Meijer, E., & Saw, H.-W. (2019). Sampling and weighting the
454 Understanding America Study. *Working Paper No. 2019-004*. University of
455 Southern California, Center for Economic and Social Research. Retrieved from
456 <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3502405>
- 457 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2021). COVID Data Tracker.
458 <https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#datatracker-home>. Accessed 24 March
459 2021.
- 460 Clark, A. E., Diener, E., Georgellis, Y., & Lucas, R. E. (2008). Lags and leads in life
461 satisfaction: A test of the baseline hypothesis. *The Economic Journal*, 118, F222-
462 F243.
- 463 Crane, M. A., Shermock, K. M., Omer, S. B., & Romley, J. A. (2021). Change in reported
464 adherence to nonpharmaceutical interventions during the COVID-19 pandemic, April-
465 November 2020. *Journal of the American Medical Association*.
466 [doi:10.1001/jama.2021.0286](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2021.0286)
- 467

- 468 Daly, M., & Robinson, E. (2020). Psychological distress and adaptation to the COVID-19
469 crisis in the United States. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*.
470 doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2020.10.035
- 471 Del Rio, C., Collins, L. F., & Malani, P. (2020). Long-term health consequences of COVID-
472 19. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 324, 1723-1724.
- 473 Eythorsson, E., Helgason, D., Ingvarsson, R. F., Bjornsson, H. K., Olafsdottir, L. B.,
474 Bjarnadottir, V., ... Palsson, R. (2020). Clinical spectrum of coronavirus disease 2019
475 in Iceland: population based cohort study. *British Medical Journal*, 371, m4529.
- 476 Hyland, P., Shevlin, M., McBride, O., Murphy, J., Karatzias, T., Bentall, R. P., ...
477 Vallières, F. (2020). Anxiety and depression in the Republic of Ireland during the
478 COVID-19 pandemic. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 142, 249-256.
- 479 Job, E., Steptoe, A., & Fancourt, D. (2020). Abuse, self-harm and suicidal ideation in the UK
480 during the COVID-19 pandemic. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 217, 543-546.
- 481 Kapteyn, A., Angrisani, M., Bennett, D., de Bruin, W. B., Darling, J., Gutsche, T., ...
482 Thomas, K. (2020). Tracking the Effect of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the Lives of
483 American Households. *Survey Research Methods*, 14, 179-186.
- 484 Karlson, K.B., Holm, A., Breen, R. (2012). Comparing regression coefficients between same-
485 sample nested models using logit and probit: A new method. *Sociological*
486 *Methodology*, 42, 286-313.
- 487 Kroenke, K., Baye, F., & Lourens, S. G. (2019). Comparative validity and responsiveness of
488 PHQ-ADS and other composite anxiety-depression measures. *Journal of Affective*
489 *Disorders*, 246, 437-443.
- 490 Kroenke, K., Spitzer, R.L., Williams, J.B., & Löwe, B. (2009). An ultra-brief screening scale
491 for anxiety and depression: the PHQ-4. *Psychosomatics*, 50, 613-621.
- 492

- 493 Löwe, B., Wahl, I., Rose, M., Spitzer, C., Glaesmer, H., Wingenfeld, K., ... Brähler, E.
494 (2010). A 4-item measure of depression and anxiety: validation and standardization of
495 the Patient Health Questionnaire-4 (PHQ-4) in the general population. *Journal of*
496 *Affective Disorders*, 122, 86-95.
- 497 Mahase, E. (2020). Covid-19: What do we know about “long covid”? *British Medical*
498 *Journal*, 370, m2815.
- 499 Popkin, B. M., Du, S., Green, W. D., Beck, M. A., Algaith, T., Herbst, C. H., ... & Shekar, M.
500 (2020). Individuals with obesity and COVID-19: A global perspective on the
501 epidemiology and biological relationships. *Obesity Reviews*, 21, e13128.
- 502 Prati, G., & Mancini, A. D. (2021). The psychological impact of COVID-19 pandemic
503 lockdowns: A review and meta-analysis of longitudinal studies and natural
504 experiments. *Psychological Medicine*. doi: 10.1017/S0033291721000015
- 505 Robinson, E., & Daly, M. (2020). Explaining the rise and fall of psychological distress during
506 the COVID-19 crisis in the United States: Longitudinal evidence from the
507 Understanding America Study. *British Journal of Health Psychology*,
508 doi.org/10.1111/bjhp.12493
- 509 Robinson, E., Sutin, A. R., Daly, M., & Jones, A. (2021). A systematic review and meta-
510 analysis of longitudinal cohort studies comparing mental health before versus during
511 the COVID-19 pandemic. *medRxiv*. doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252921
- 512 Rogers, J. P., Chesney, E., Oliver, D., Pollak, T. A., McGuire, P., Fusar-Poli, P., ... David,
513 A. S. (2020). Psychiatric and neuropsychiatric presentations associated with severe
514 coronavirus infections: a systematic review and meta-analysis with comparison to the
515 COVID-19 pandemic. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 7, 611-627.
- 516
517

- 518 Salari, N., Hosseini-Far, A., Jalali, R., Vaisi-Raygani, A., Rasoulpoor, S., Mohammadi, M.,
519 ... Khaledi-Paveh, B. (2020). Prevalence of stress, anxiety, depression among the
520 general population during the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review and meta-
521 analysis. *Globalization and Health*, 16, 1-11.
- 522 Shevlin, M., McBride, O., Murphy, J., Miller, J., Hartman, T., Levita, L., . . . Bentall, R.
523 (2020). Anxiety, depression, traumatic stress and COVID-19-related anxiety in the
524 UK general population during the COVID-19 pandemic. *BJPsych Open*, 6, E125.
525 doi:10.1192/bjo.2020.109
- 526 Sudre, C. H., Murray, B., Varsavsky, T., Graham, M. S., Penfold, R. S., Bowyer, R. C., ... &
527 Steves, C. J. (2021). Attributes and predictors of long COVID. *Nature Medicine*.
528 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01292-y>.
- 529 Taquet, M., Geddes, J. R., & Harrison, P. J. (2021). Six-month neurological and psychiatric
530 outcomes in 236,379 survivors of COVID-19. *medRxiv*.
531 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.16.21249950>
- 532 Taquet, M., Luciano, S., Geddes, J. R., & Harrison, P. J. (2021). Bidirectional associations
533 between COVID-19 and psychiatric disorder: retrospective cohort studies of 62 354
534 COVID-19 cases in the USA. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 8, 130-140.
- 535 Taylor, S., Landry, C. A., Paluszek, M. M., Rachor, G. S., & Asmundson, G. J. (2020).
536 Worry, avoidance, and coping during the COVID-19 pandemic: A comprehensive
537 network analysis. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 76, 102327.
- 538 van der Meer, D., Pinzón-Espinosa, J., Lin, B. D., Tjebk, J. K., Vinkers, C. H., Guloksuz,
539 S., & Luyckx, J. J. (2020). Associations between psychiatric disorders, COVID-19
540 testing probability and COVID-19 testing results: findings from a population-based
541 study. *BJPsych Open*, 6(5). doi: 10.1192/bjo.2020.119
542

- 543 van der Velden, P. G., Hyland, P., Contino, C., von Gaudecker, H. M., Muffels, R., & Das,
544 M. (2021). Anxiety and depression symptoms, the recovery from symptoms, and
545 loneliness before and after the COVID-19 outbreak among the general population:
546 Findings from a Dutch population-based longitudinal study. *PLOS ONE*, *16*,
547 e0245057.
- 548 Wang, Q.Q., Kaelber, D. C., Xu, R., & Volkow, N. D. (2021). COVID-19 risk and outcomes
549 in patients with substance use disorders: analyses from electronic health records in the
550 United States. *Molecular Psychiatry*, *26*, 30-39.
- 551 Wang, Q.Q, Xu, R., Volkow, N. D. (2021). Increased risk of COVID-19 infection and
552 mortality in people with mental disorders: analysis from electronic health records in
553 the United States. *World Psychiatry*, *20*, 124-130.
- 554 Wathélet, M., Duhem, S., Vaiva, G., Baubet, T., Habran, E., Veerapa, E., ... D'Hondt, F.
555 (2020). Factors associated with mental health disorders among university students in
556 France confined during the COVID-19 pandemic. *JAMA Network Open*, *3*, e2025591-
557 e2025591.
- 558 Wohl, D.A., Barzin, A.H., Napravnik, S. Davy-Mendez, T., Smedberg, J.R., Thompson, C.M.
559 ... Miller, M.B. (2021). COVID-19 *Symptoms at presentation and association with*
560 *positivity among outpatients tested for SARS-CoV-2*. Available at SSRN:
561 <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3746924> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3746924>
- 562 World Health Organization (WHO). *Weekly epidemiological update - 23 March 2021*.
563 [https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/weekly-epidemiological-update-on-covid-](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/weekly-epidemiological-update-on-covid-19---23-march-2021)
564 [19---23-march-2021](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/weekly-epidemiological-update-on-covid-19---23-march-2021) Accessed 24 March 2021.
- 565
- 566
- 567

568 Table 1.
 569 Demographic characteristics and symptoms experienced by participants reporting a positive
 570 COVID-19 test (N = 576) and remaining participants (N = 7,428) in the Understanding
 571 America Study.

	COVID-19 reported ^a (N = 576)	No COVID-19 reported ^b (N = 7,428)
	%	%
Age group, y		
18 – 39	38.8	42.9
40 – 59	39.4	30.6**
60+	21.8	26.5
Female	51.5	51.9
Hispanic	25.8	17.6**
Black	9.1	12.2
Other race/ethnicity	4.6	6.1
White	60.5	64.2
Low income (\leq \$40,000)	34.7	38.4
Medium income (\$40,000–\$100,000)	46.3	39.8*
High income (\geq \$100,000 per annum)	19.0	21.8
Physical health condition reported	36.7	32.1
Mental health condition reported	32.8	29.6
Symptoms reported in past 7 days		
Fever / raised temperature	41.8	1.7***
Headache	58.9	16.3***

Muscle or body ache	52.6	13.9***
Runny or stuffy nose	53.2	18.0***
Sore throat	31.9	5.0***
Sneezing	41.3	17.8***
Lost sense of smell	40.6	0.9***
Chest congestion	32.4	3.5***
Cough	59.0	9.9***
Shortness of breath	37.0	5.5***
Vomiting	9.2	0.9***
Diarrhea	31.1	5.5***
Abdominal discomfort	24.8	6.3***

572 *Note:* Weighted values are reported. Binary logistic regression analyses was used to test for
573 differences between those reporting vs. not reporting COVID-19.

574 ^a Symptoms are assessed during the wave where positive COVID-19 test was reported (N =
575 576).

576 ^b Symptoms are assessed across all available survey waves (N = 7,428, Observations =
577 128,761).

578 * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 2.

Fixed effects regression estimates of the association between testing positive for COVID-19 and changes in reported symptoms and psychological distress in the Understanding America Study.

Outcome	Symptoms (%)			Psychological distress (z-score)		
	N	7,199	6,594	8,002	7,199	6,594
Obs.	139,035	110,980	92,747	139,035	110,980	92,747
	B	B	B	B	B	B
	[95% CI]	[95% CI]	[95% CI]	[95% CI]	[95% CI]	[95% CI]
COVID-19 in current wave	31.19*** [28.20, 34.18]	31.78*** [28.27, 35.30]	31.74*** [27.84, 35.64]	0.29*** [0.21, 0.37]	0.28*** [0.18, 0.37]	0.27*** [0.17, 0.37]
Two weeks prior to COVID-19 (one wave lead effect) ^a		8.48*** [5.80, 11.17]	8.97*** [5.86, 12.08]		0.03 [-0.06, 0.12]	0.07 [-0.03, 0.16]
COVID-19 two weeks ago (one wave lag effect) ^a		8.72*** [6.03, 11.41]	9.14*** [6.17, 12.11]		0.16** [0.04, 0.27]	0.17* [0.04, 0.29]

Four weeks prior to COVID-19 <i>(two wave lead effect)^a</i>	-0.70 [-2.36, 0.83]	-0.02 [-0.09, 0.05]
COVID-19 four weeks ago <i>(two wave lag effect)^a</i>	2.05 [-0.95, 5.06]	0.09 [-.03, 0.22]

^a Association between COVID-19 and distress among those completing surveys immediately before and after reporting a positive test.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 3.

The role of COVID-19 symptoms as mediators of the association between testing positive for COVID-19 and psychological distress in the United States.

Timing of positive COVID-19 test	Psychological distress (z-score)			
	Current wave		Previous wave	
	B	SE	B	SE
Total effect of COVID-19 ^a	0.29***	0.04	0.16**	0.06
Direct effect of COVID-19 ^b	0.14**	0.04	0.07	0.06
Indirect effect via COVID-19 symptoms ^c	0.15***	0.01	0.08***	0.02

Note: Psychological distress is standardized to have a mean of zero and standard deviation of one.

^a Total increase in psychological distress associated with testing positive for COVID-19.

^b Increase in psychological distress associated with testing positive for COVID-19 not explained by COVID-19 symptoms.

^c Increase in psychological distress associated with testing positive for COVID-19 explained by COVID-19 symptoms.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

Figure 1.

Trends in psychological distress as gauged by the PHQ-4 (range = 0-12) in the weeks before and after testing positive for COVID-19.

