

1 **The UK Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme and changes in diet, physical activity and sleep during**  
2 **the COVID-19 pandemic: Evidence from eight longitudinal studies**

3 **Authors:** Bożena Wielgoszewska PhD <sup>1^</sup>, Jane Maddock PhD <sup>2^\*</sup>, Michael J. Green PhD <sup>3^</sup>, Giorgio Di  
4 Gessa PhD <sup>4^</sup>, Sam Parsons PhD <sup>1^</sup>, Gareth J Griffith PhD<sup>5</sup>, Jazz Croft PhD<sup>5</sup>, Anna J. Stevenson PhD <sup>6</sup>,  
5 Charlotte Booth PhD<sup>1</sup>, Richard J. Silverwood PhD<sup>1</sup>, David Bann PhD<sup>1</sup>, Praveetha Patalay PhD<sup>1,2</sup>, Alun D.  
6 Hughes PhD <sup>2</sup>, Nish Chaturvedi PhD<sup>2</sup>, Laura D Howe PhD <sup>4</sup>, Emla Fitzsimons PhD<sup>1</sup>, Srinivasa Vittal  
7 Katikireddi PhD <sup>3</sup>, George B. Ploubidis PhD <sup>1\*</sup>

8 ^joint first authors

9 <sup>1</sup> Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL Social Research Institute, University College  
10 London

11 <sup>2</sup> MRC Unit for Lifelong Health and Ageing, University College London

12 <sup>3</sup> MRC/CSO Social & Public Health Sciences Unit, University of Glasgow

13 <sup>4</sup> Institute of Epidemiology and Health Care, University College London

14 <sup>5</sup> MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit, University of Bristol

15 <sup>6</sup> Centre for Genomic and Experimental Medicine, University of Edinburgh

16

17 \* Correspondence to: Dr. Jane Maddock [jane.maddock@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:jane.maddock@ucl.ac.uk) or Professor George B.

18 Ploubidis [g.ploubidis@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:g.ploubidis@ucl.ac.uk), University College London, Gower St, Bloomsbury, London

19 WC1E 6BT

20

21 Word count: 3510

22 Key words: Diet, Physical Activity, Sleep, Furlough, COVID-19, Employment, Longitudinal

23

24

## Abstract

25 *Background:* In March 2020 the UK implemented the Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme (furlough) to  
26 minimize job losses. Our aim was to investigate associations between furlough and diet, physical activity,  
27 and sleep during the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic.

28 *Methods:* We analysed data from 25,092 participants aged 16 to 66 years from eight UK longitudinal  
29 studies. Changes in employment (including being furloughed) were defined by comparing employment  
30 status pre- and during the first lockdown. Health behaviours included fruit and vegetable consumption,  
31 physical activity, and sleeping patterns. Study-specific estimates obtained using modified Poisson  
32 regression, adjusting for socio-demographic characteristics and pre-pandemic health and health  
33 behaviours, were statistically pooled using random effects meta-analysis. Associations were also stratified  
34 by sex, age, and education.

35 *Results:* Across studies, between 8 and 25% of participants were furloughed. Compared to those who  
36 remained working, furloughed workers were slightly less likely to be physically inactive (RR:0.85, [0.75-  
37 0.97],  $I^2=59%$ ) and did not differ in diet and sleep behaviours, although findings for sleep were  
38 heterogenous ( $I^2=85%$ ). In stratified analyses, furlough was associated with low fruit and vegetable  
39 consumption among males (RR=1.11; 95%CI: 1.01-1.22;  $I^2: 0%$ ) but not females (RR=0.84; 95%CI:  
40 0.68-1.04;  $I^2: 65%$ ). Considering change in these health behaviours, furloughed workers were more likely  
41 than those who remained working to report increased fruit and vegetable consumption, exercise, and  
42 hours of sleep.

43 *Conclusions:* Those furloughed exhibited broadly similar levels of health behaviours to those who  
44 remained in employment during the initial stages of the pandemic. There was little evidence to suggest  
45 that such social protection policies if used in the post-pandemic recovery period and during future  
46 economic crises would have adverse impacts on population health behaviours.

47

## Introduction

48 COVID-19 disease, social distancing measures and a series of lockdowns have affected the economy and  
49 employment rates in the United Kingdom (UK) and worldwide (1,2). The current pandemic has also  
50 resulted in health care disruptions and closures of some sectors of the economy including exercise  
51 facilities. This unique situation makes it difficult to predict the short and long-term effects of pandemic-  
52 related unemployment on population health and health related behaviours.

53 Social protection policies introduced during the pandemic may modify the health consequences of the  
54 COVID-19-related economic downturn. The UK Government launched their Coronavirus Job Retention  
55 Scheme (CJRS) in March 2020. The CJRS, widely referred to as ‘furlough’, provides employees unable  
56 to work due to the pandemic with 80% of pay (capped at £2,500 per month) (3). By March 2021, 11.4  
57 million employees (approximately 34% of those over 16 years in employment) had been furloughed  
58 through the CJRS and the number of people claiming unemployment-related benefits had increased by 1.4  
59 million from March 2020 (4). These economic changes have not affected all groups equally. Younger  
60 workers, low earners and women, were more likely to work in disrupted sectors, and therefore become  
61 unemployed or be furloughed (4,5).

62 The relationship between government interventions, particularly those focused on mitigating the impact  
63 of lockdown and economic downturns via subsidised employment, and health is poorly understood. The  
64 CJRS may impact health through its influence on health behaviours. We aimed to investigate  
65 associations between changes in employment status (with a focus on the UK’s furlough scheme)  
66 during the early stages of the pandemic and health behaviours namely diet, physical activity and  
67 sleep by conducting coordinated analyses of data from more than 25,000 participants in eight  
68 longitudinal studies. We hypothesised that associations differ by participant characteristics,  
69 therefore we also examined associations stratified by sex, education, and age.

70

## Methods:

### 71 *Participants*

72 The UK National Core Studies Longitudinal Health and Wellbeing initiative is drawing together data  
73 from multiple UK population-based longitudinal studies using coordinated analysis to answer priority  
74 pandemic-related questions. By conducting similar analyses within each study and pooling results in a  
75 meta-analysis, we can provide robust evidence to understand how the pandemic has impacted population  
76 health and support efforts to mitigate its effects going forward. Data here were from eight long running  
77 UK population-based longitudinal studies which conducted surveys during the pandemic. Details of the  
78 design, sample frames, current age range, timing of the most recent pre-pandemic and COVID surveys,  
79 response rates, and sample size are in Supplementary Table S1.

80 Five studies were age homogenous birth cohorts (where all individuals within each study were similar  
81 age): the Millennium Cohort Study (MCS); the index children from the Avon Longitudinal Study of  
82 Parents and Children (ALSPAC-G1); Next Steps (NS, formerly the Longitudinal Study of Young People  
83 in England); the 1970 British Cohort Study (BCS70); and the 1958 National Child Development Study  
84 (NCDS). Three age heterogeneous studies (each covering a range of age groups) were included:  
85 Understanding Society (USOC); the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA); and Generation  
86 Scotland: the Scottish Family Health Study (GS). Finally, the parents of the ALSPAC-G1 cohort were  
87 treated as a fourth age heterogeneous study population (ALSPAC-G0).

88 Analytical samples were restricted to working age participants, defined as those aged 16 to 66 (the current  
89 state pension age in the UK(6)), who had recorded at least one health behaviour outcome in a COVID-19  
90 survey and had valid data on all covariates. Most studies were weighted to restore representativeness to  
91 their target populations, accounting for sampling design where appropriate and differential non-response  
92 to pre-pandemic and COVID surveys (7). Weights were not available for GS. Details of the weighting  
93 applied within each study are in Supplementary Table S1.

94 ***Measures***

95 Below we describe all variables in the analysis. Full details of the questions and coding used within each  
96 cohort are in Supplementary File 2.

97 ***Exposure: Employment status change***

98 Employment status change (or stability) was coded in six categories based on the status both prior to the  
99 pandemic and at their first COVID-19 survey: stable employed (reference group); furloughed (i.e. from  
100 work to furlough); no longer employed (i.e. from employed to non-employed); became employed (i.e.  
101 from non-employed to employed); stable unemployed (i.e. unemployed at both points); and stable non-  
102 employed (i.e. not available for employment at either point, including in education, early retirement,  
103 caring responsibilities, sick or disabled).

104 ***Outcomes: Health behaviours***

105 We examined diet, physical activity, and sleep. Participants self-reported fruit and vegetable consumption  
106 ( $\leq 2$  portions per day vs more portions (8)), time spent exercising ( $< 3$  days a week for 30 minutes or more  
107 vs more frequent exercise within recommended levels (9)), and hours of sleep (outside the typical range  
108 of 6-9 hours vs within that range (10)) both during and pre-pandemic. However, this information, used for  
109 our main analyses, was only available in some studies (MCS, NS, BCS, NCDS, USOC), whereas others  
110 (ALSPAC, GS, ELSA) only had information on change since the start of the pandemic (see  
111 Supplementary File 2). Based on these levels *or* on the information on changes in health behaviours since  
112 the start of the pandemic, we additionally created dichotomous outcomes indicating change from before  
113 to during the pandemic (in comparison to no change or change in the other direction): more portions of  
114 fruit/vegetables; fewer portions of fruit/vegetables; more time spent exercising; less time spent exercising;  
115 more hours of sleep; fewer hours of sleep; a shift from outside to within the typical sleep range of 6-9

116 hours; and a shift from within to outside the typical sleep range of 6-9 hours. All information on  
117 behaviours during the pandemic was from surveys conducted between April and July 2020 (inclusive).

### 118 *Confounders and Moderators:*

119 Potential confounders included: sex; ethnicity (non-white ethnic minority vs white -including white ethnic  
120 minorities); age; education (degree vs no degree); UK nation (i.e. England, Wales, Scotland, Northern  
121 Ireland or other); household composition (based on presence of a spouse/partner and presence of  
122 children); pre-pandemic psychological distress; pre-pandemic self-rated health (excellent-good vs fair-  
123 poor); and pre-pandemic health behaviour measures, where available.

124 We examined modification of the associations by sex, education, and age in three categories: 16-29; 30-  
125 49; and 50 years or more (with age-homogeneous cohorts included in the relevant band).

### 126 *Analysis*

127 Within each study, each outcome was regressed on employment status change, using a modified Poisson  
128 model with robust standard errors that returns risk ratios for ease of interpretation and to avoid issues  
129 related to non-collapsibility of odds ratios (11,12). After estimating unadjusted associations, confounder  
130 adjustment was performed in two steps. First, a “basic” adjustment including socio-demographic  
131 characteristics: age (only in age-heterogeneous studies), sex, ethnicity (except the BCS and NCDS  
132 cohorts which were nearly entirely white), education, UK nation (except ALSPAC, GS and ELSA which  
133 only had participants from a single country), and household composition. Second, a “full” adjustment  
134 additionally including pre-pandemic measures of: psychological distress, self-rated health, and health  
135 behaviours. Moderation by sex, age, and education was assessed with stratified regressions using “full”  
136 adjustment.

137 Both stages of adjustment are relevant because our exposure, employment change, incorporates pre-  
138 pandemic employment status, which may have influenced other pre-pandemic characteristics such as

139 mental health, self-rated health, and health behaviours (see supplementary Figure S8). By not controlling  
140 for these pre-pandemic characteristics, the basic adjusted risk ratios may represent both newly acquired  
141 behaviour and/or continuation of established (pre-pandemic) behaviour. In contrast, the full adjustment  
142 risk ratios block effects via these pre-pandemic characteristics and can therefore be interpreted as  
143 representing the differential change in health behaviour between exposure groups which is independent of  
144 these pre-pandemic characteristics. For the outcomes that directly capture changes in health behaviour,  
145 the full adjustment did not include pre-pandemic levels of the behaviour in question, as pre-pandemic  
146 levels of that behaviour are incorporated within the change outcome. This means that even full adjustment  
147 risk ratios estimated for these outcomes may partially reflect associations with pre-pandemic behaviour.

148 The overall and stratified results from each study were pooled using a random effects meta-analysis with  
149 restricted maximum likelihood in Stata 16. For stratified results, a test of group differences was  
150 performed using the subgroup meta-analysis command. Some studies could not contribute estimates for  
151 every comparison due to differences in the ages sampled, measures used, and sparsity of data. For a small  
152 number of exposure-outcome comparisons, reliable estimates could not be computed because the outcome  
153 prevalence was low ( $\leq 2$ ). While such selective exclusion could potentially lead to bias, the low numbers  
154 of events mean that the corresponding within-study estimates would be so imprecise that their exclusion  
155 is unlikely to lead to considerable bias (see Supplementary File 3 for more details and sensitivity analyses  
156 showing that results were robust to different low cell count exclusion thresholds). We report  
157 heterogeneity using the  $I^2$  statistic: 0% indicates estimates were similar across studies, while values closer  
158 to 100% represent greater heterogeneity. While we could have undertaken multivariate meta-analysis of  
159 all exposure categories simultaneously, for ease of interpretation we instead conducted a series of  
160 univariate meta-analyses, bearing in mind the consistency of results from these approaches generally  
161 observed elsewhere (13,14). We performed a multivariate meta-analysis with one outcome in a subset of  
162 the studies as a sensitivity analysis, and differences from the individual univariate meta-analyses were  
163 negligible (results not shown).

164

## Results

165 [Figure 1 about here]

166 Analyses included 25,092 individuals from eight studies (see Supplementary Table S3 for demographic  
167 characteristics). Figure 1 shows employment status change during the first lockdown of the pandemic.

168 Around six in 10 participants in NS, BCS, GS, USOC, and ALSPAC were employed prior to and during  
169 the initial stages of the pandemic, with the younger (MCS) and older studies (ELSA and NCDS) showing  
170 lower levels of stable employment. Prevalence of furlough ranged between 8% (GS) and 25% (NS).

171 Across most studies approximately 3% of participants were no longer employed during the pandemic (8%  
172 in ALSPAC G0). Stable unemployment ranged in prevalence between 1% (GS) and 9% (ALSPAC G0).

173 Supplementary Table S4 shows how economic activity was patterned by education, sex, and age-groups,  
174 with furlough generally more common among younger, female and less educated participants and stable  
175 employment especially common among male, higher educated and middle-aged participants. There were  
176 no clear patterns across studies with regard to who was no longer employed during the pandemic.

177 [Table 1 about here]

178 Table 1 shows the prevalence of health behaviours and changes in behaviour by study. Proportions

179 reporting eating no more than 2 portions of fruit or vegetables per day and reporting three or less days a

180 week with at least 30 minutes of exercise were similar both pre- and during the pandemic, whereas sleep

181 outside of the typical range of 6-9 hours was more common during the pandemic in most studies (USOC

182 was an exception). Nevertheless, changes in all three behaviours were common in both directions. In the

183 four national birth cohorts (which used identical questions), more participants reported increasing their

184 fruit and vegetable consumption and exercise than those who reported decreases, while reporting more

185 hours of sleep and shifts to sleep outside the typical range, were more common than reporting fewer hours

186 of sleep, or shifts from outside to within the typical range.



187 ***Pooled Analysis***

188 [Figure 2 about here]

189 Figure 2 shows meta-analysis estimates from unadjusted, basic adjusted, and fully adjusted models for  
190 levels of fruit and vegetable consumption, physical activity, and sleep during the pandemic. Given our  
191 primary interest in investigating health behaviours of those furloughed, no longer employed and stable  
192 unemployed compared to those in stable employment, we only present results for these groups (omitting  
193 those who became employed or were in stable non-employment). Figure 3 shows pooled estimates from  
194 fully adjusted models stratified by sex, education and age. Stratified estimates were largely consistent  
195 with the main results, though we highlight some differences below. Full details of the meta-analysis  
196 including overall and stratified estimates from each study are available in Supplementary File 3.

197 [Figure 3 about here]

198 *Fruit and vegetable consumption*

199 Unadjusted estimates suggest lower fruit and vegetable consumption during the pandemic among those  
200 furloughed or in stable unemployment compared to those who remained employed. These differences  
201 were robust to the basic adjustment, but were attenuated with full adjustment for pre-pandemic  
202 characteristics, suggesting that these associations are attributable to differences in dietary habits  
203 established prior to the pandemic. We observed moderate heterogeneity in the fully adjusted furlough  
204 model ( $I^2=42\%$ ). When looking at individual studies, only associations in MCS, where participants were  
205 18-19 years old, remained after full adjustment (RR=0.68; 95%CI: 0.49 to 0.69, 9% of the overall  
206 estimate, Supplementary File 3). There were no clear overall differences in fruit and vegetable  
207 consumption between those in stable employment and those who were no longer employed during the  
208 pandemic.

209 The association between furlough and fruit and vegetable consumption differed by gender ( $p=0.02$ ).  
210 Males who were furloughed were more likely to consume less fruit and vegetables during the pandemic  
211 than males who remained employed (RR=1.11; 95%CI: 1.01-1.22;  $I^2$ : 0%). This association was not  
212 observed among furloughed females (RR=0.84; 95%CI: 0.68-1.04), although there was heterogeneity  
213 ( $I^2=65\%$ ) and furloughed females from MCS (again, the clearest outlier) were less likely to have low fruit  
214 and vegetable consumption than MCS females remaining employed (RR=0.51; 95%CI: 0.34-0.77). We  
215 did not observe differences by education or age.

### 216 *Physical Activity*

217 Compared to stable employment, furlough was associated with lower risk of infrequent physical activity  
218 in fully adjusted models. In contrast, estimates for those no longer employed or in stable unemployment  
219 were in the opposite direction, although confidence intervals included the null. There was little evidence  
220 of subgroup differences in these associations.

### 221 *Sleep*

222 All three groups, furloughed, no longer employed, and stable unemployment, were more likely than those  
223 in stable employment to have atypical sleep. These associations were partly attenuated in the basic  
224 adjustment and further attenuated in the full adjustment models, so were at least partially accounted for by  
225 pre-pandemic characteristics and behaviours. Estimates for sleep exhibited high heterogeneity with  $I^2$   
226 values largely over 80%, perhaps partly due to age differences between the samples (see below).

227 The heightened risk of atypical sleep for those not in stable employment appeared to be largely  
228 concentrated at younger ages. For example, stable unemployment was associated with an RR of 2.75  
229 (95%CI: 1.63-4.63;  $I^2$ : 0%) in the 16-29 year age group, compared with 0.98 (95%CI: 0.53-1.80;  $I^2$ : 61%)  
230 in the 50+ age group ( $p=0.04$ ). Age patterning was similar for those no longer employed ( $p<0.01$ ), but  
231 considerably less pronounced for furlough ( $p=0.96$ ). Thus, in this youngest age group, even after  
232 adjusting for pre-pandemic characteristics, there was evidence that atypical sleep was associated with

233 stable unemployment (see above for RR) or being no longer employed (RR=3.80; 95% CI: 2.35-6.15;  
234 single estimate from MCS), but there was not a clear association with furlough (RR=1.39; 95% CI: 0.31-  
235 6.16;  $I^2$ : 91%). The two studies that had provided estimates for furlough in this age group had shown very  
236 different findings (raised risk in MCS but lower risk in USOC).

### 237 *Changes in Behaviour*

238 Pooled estimates for the outcomes indicating change in behaviour are presented in Supplementary Tables  
239 S5, S6 and S7. These analyses indicated that furlough was associated with increases in fruit and vegetable  
240 consumption (RR=1.22; 95% CI: 1.04-1.43;  $I^2$ : 52%), time spent exercising (RR=1.18; 95% CI: 1.04-1.35;  
241  $I^2$ : 75%) and hours of sleep (RR=1.62; 95% CI: 1.39-1.90;  $I^2$ : 80%) relative to stable employment.  
242 Furlough was also associated with a higher likelihood of shifts both into and out of the typical 6-9 hour  
243 sleep range, which is probably due to the strong association with increased hours of sleep (which was  
244 present in all stratified analyses). These associations were robust to adjustment for other pre-pandemic  
245 characteristics, though, by the nature of change outcomes, may still partially represent pre-pandemic  
246 differences in each behaviour. Largely similar patterns were seen for: sleep among those no longer  
247 employed or in stable employment; and for physical activity among those no longer employed.

## 248 **Discussion**

249 We find little evidence that furlough was associated with worse health behaviours. Those who were  
250 furloughed did not differ in fruit and vegetable consumption or sleep and had a lower likelihood of  
251 infrequent exercise compared to those who remained employed. Stratified analyses showed that  
252 furloughed men, but not women, had a higher likelihood of low fruit and vegetable consumption than  
253 those who remained employed. Those who remained unemployed had worse health behaviours relative to  
254 the stable employed, although these differences were largely due to pre-pandemic behaviours. Among 16-  
255 29 year olds, who were no longer employed or remained unemployed, there was a higher risk of atypical  
256 asleep.

257 Previous studies on subsidised employment policies have shown beneficial effects (15). Evidence from  
258 Sweden (16) shows that individuals in subsidised employment occupied an intermediate position in terms  
259 of subjective well-being; they were better-off than unemployed individuals, but worse-off than those in  
260 regular employment. Here, we have only observed minor differences between those furloughed and those  
261 in stable employment, which may be due to the nature of the CJRS scheme and/or differences in the  
262 outcomes studied. Studies conducted since the COVID-19 pandemic have shown that for some, health  
263 behaviours improved while for others they declined (17,18), and our findings offer little evidence of  
264 furlough contributing to declines in healthy behaviour.

265 Unemployment has been shown to have detrimental effects on population health through various  
266 pathways including health-related behaviours (19–21). These health effects may be modified by the type  
267 of welfare state regime in place and related social protection policies (22). Employment is generally  
268 associated with good health (23), while job loss or unemployment are associated with deleterious health  
269 outcomes (24), especially among men and those in their early and middle careers (23). While we observed  
270 similar findings for those unemployed prior and during the pandemic, we did not replicate the detrimental  
271 impact of job loss. However, participation in the furlough scheme was common, while participants who  
272 were no longer working during the initial stages of the pandemic were rare (~3%) leading to low  
273 precision in estimates for this group. Nevertheless, we did not find strong evidence for the detrimental  
274 impacts on health behaviours that are normally associated with job loss, which may suggest these impacts  
275 are lessened or non-existent in the unique context of a pandemic.

276 While research combining results from several UK prospective studies makes a clear contribution to  
277 understanding the impact of the furlough scheme, there are limitations that should be taken into account  
278 while interpreting our findings. Firstly, we were not able to achieve full harmonisation of measures across  
279 studies. By focusing on comparable measures we also limited our scope to explore other aspects of diet,  
280 physical activity or sleep (such as frequency of snacking, specific kinds of physical activity, or sleep  
281 quality). Furthermore, outcomes were only analysed during the initial stages of the pandemic (April-July

282 2020) and relationships may change with subsequent changes to restrictions and growing economic  
283 uncertainty. Further research is needed to examine this as well as heterogeneity in the stable employed  
284 and furloughed groups in greater detail. The MCS cohort particularly, who were the youngest cohort  
285 studied, often had considerably different estimates from the older aged respondents in other cohorts, so  
286 there may be different mechanisms affecting this age group.

287 Despite being embedded in long standing studies, surveys during the pandemic were selective. We  
288 corrected most studies to being representative of their target population using weights derived for each  
289 study based on pre-pandemic information (and the GS study which did not have weights available  
290 exhibited similar estimates to the more nationally representative studies). Nevertheless, bias due to  
291 selective non-response cannot be excluded (25), especially as most studies (USOC being the exception)  
292 were weighted for non-response to COVID surveys but not for any residual non-response to the outcomes  
293 in question (among those who did participate in the overall COVID surveys). Similarly, bias due to  
294 unmeasured confounding cannot be ruled out and could be influential considering the small magnitude of  
295 the risk ratios observed. For example, there may be unobserved differences between participants whose  
296 jobs were retained, versus those who experienced furlough or job loss. Our fully adjusted models account  
297 for differences in some key pre-pandemic characteristics among employment groups. However, it is  
298 possible that our results reflect other traits of these employment groups, for example, how workers in  
299 different industries or occupational classes were responding to the pandemic, rather than being effects of  
300 furlough specifically. Adjustment for pre-pandemic characteristics may also have induced bias if there  
301 were unobserved determinants of both pre-pandemic characteristics and behaviour during the pandemic.  
302 However, we observed only minor differences between those furloughed and those who remained  
303 employed, therefore any bias due to unmeasured confounding is unlikely to change the interpretation of  
304 our findings.

305 Our analyses on outcomes of change in behaviour during the pandemic showed some differences from the  
306 main analyses. Specifically, they indicated that being furloughed was associated with increased fruit and

307 vegetable consumption, hours of sleep and time spent exercising relative to maintaining stable  
308 employment. There may be several reasons for this: the change analyses included more studies, which  
309 implies a greater variability in measurement; these outcomes could have been picking up relatively minor  
310 changes in behaviour above or below the thresholds used in the main analyses and could still partially be  
311 reflecting effects of initial employment status on pre-pandemic diet, physical activity or sleep.

## 312 **Conclusions**

313 Despite the economic disruption of the pandemic and lockdown, participants who were no longer  
314 working during the initial stages of the pandemic were rare, while much higher proportions participated in  
315 the UK CJR furlough scheme. We found that those who were furloughed exhibited broadly similar levels  
316 of health behaviours to those who remained in employment and there was some evidence of less risk for  
317 infrequent exercise. Continuation of the UK CJR furlough scheme has the potential to mitigate some of  
318 the adverse consequences of the pandemic and there was little evidence for detrimental impacts on  
319 population health behaviours. Our evidence suggests that the UK furlough scheme may be an important  
320 component of policies aiming to mitigate the determinantal effects of economic downturns and prevent  
321 exacerbation of inequalities.

## 322 **List of abbreviations**

323 ALSPAC-G1: Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children.

324 ALSPAC-G0: Parents of ALSPAC-G1.

325 BCS70: 1970 British Cohort Study.

326 CI: Confidence interval

327 CJRS: Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme.

328 ELSA: English Longitudinal Study of Ageing.

329 GS: Generation Scotland: the Scottish Family Health Study.

330 MCS: Millennium Cohort Study.

331 NCDS: 1958 National Child Development Study.

332 NS: Next Steps (formerly the Longitudinal Study of Young People in England).

333 RR: Risk Ratio.

334 UK: United Kingdom

335 USOC: Understanding Society.

336 **Additional Files**

337 **Supplementary File 1: Supplementary Tables and Figures**

338 Format: docx

339 Contents : File includes supplementary information S1-S9.

340 **Supplementary File 2: Variable Coding**

341 Format: xlsx

342 Contents : Details of coding of variables within each study.

343 **Supplementary File 3: Meta-Analysis**

344 Format: xlsx

345 Contents : Full details of the meta-analytic results including study-specific estimates and weights.

346

347 **Declarations**

348 *Ethics approval and consent to participate*

349 We have detailed the ethical approval for each study in Supplementary Table S2.

350 *Consent for publication*

351 Not applicable.

352 *Availability of data and materials*

353 All datasets included in this analysis have established data sharing processes, and for most included

354 studies the anonymised datasets with corresponding documentation can be downloaded for use by

355 researchers from the UK Data Service. We have detailed the processes for each dataset in Supplementary

356 Table S2.

357 *Competing interests*

358 No conflicts of interest were declared by BW, JM, MJG, GDG, SP, GJG, JC, AJS, CB, RJS, DB, PP,

359 LDH, EF, GBP. SVK is a member of the Scientific Advisory Group on Emergencies subgroup on

360 ethnicity and COVID-19 and is co-chair of the Scottish Government's Ethnicity Reference Group on

361 COVID-19. NC serves on a data safety monitoring board for trials sponsored by Astra-Zeneca. ADH

362 serves on the PHOSP COVID Cardiovascular Working group.

363 *Funding*

364 This work was supported by the National Core Studies, an initiative funded by UKRI, NIHR and the

365 Health and Safety Executive. The COVID-19 Longitudinal Health and Wellbeing National Core Study

366 was funded by the Medical Research Council (MC\_PC\_20030).

367 Understanding Society is an initiative funded by the Economic and Social Research Council and various

368 Government Departments, with scientific leadership by the Institute for Social and Economic Research,



369 University of Essex, and survey delivery by NatCen Social Research and Kantar Public. The  
370 Understanding Society COVID-19 study is funded by the Economic and Social Research Council  
371 (ES/K005146/1) and the Health Foundation (2076161). The research data are distributed by the UK Data  
372 Service.

373 The Millennium Cohort Study, Next Steps, British Cohort Study 1970 and National Child Development  
374 Study 1958 are supported by the Centre for Longitudinal Studies, Resource Centre 2015-20 grant  
375 (ES/M001660/1) and a host of other co-funders. . The COVID-19 data collections in these four cohorts  
376 were funded by the UKRI grant Understanding the economic, social and health impacts of COVID-19  
377 using lifetime data: evidence from 5 nationally representative UK cohorts (ES/V012789/1).

378 The English Longitudinal Study of Ageing was developed by a team of researchers based at University  
379 College London, NatCen Social Research, the Institute for Fiscal Studies, the University of Manchester  
380 and the University of East Anglia. The data were collected by NatCen Social Research. The funding is  
381 currently provided by the National Institute on Aging in the US, and a consortium of UK government  
382 departments coordinated by the National Institute for Health Research. Funding has also been received by  
383 the Economic and Social Research Council. The English Longitudinal Study of Ageing Covid-  
384 19 Substudy was supported by the UK Economic and Social Research Grant (ESRC) ES/V003941/1.

385

386 The UK Medical Research Council and Wellcome (Grant Ref: 217065/Z/19/Z) and the University of  
387 Bristol provide core support for ALSPAC. A comprehensive list of grants funding is available on the  
388 ALSPAC website (<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/external/documents/grant-acknowledgements.pdf>). We  
389 are extremely grateful to all the families who took part in this study, the midwives for their help in  
390 recruiting them, and the whole ALSPAC team, which includes interviewers, computer and laboratory  
391 technicians, clerical workers, research scientists, volunteers, managers, receptionists and nurses. The  
392 second COVID-19 data sweep was also supported by the Faculty Research Director's discretionary fund,  
393 University of Bristol.

394 Generation Scotland received core support from the Chief Scientist Office of the Scottish Government  
395 Health Directorates [CZD/16/6] and the Scottish Funding Council [HR03006]. Genotyping of  
396 the GS:SFHS samples was carried out by the Genetics Core Laboratory at the Wellcome Trust Clinical  
397 Research Facility, Edinburgh, Scotland and was funded by the Medical Research Council UK and  
398 the Wellcome Trust (Wellcome Trust Strategic Award “SStratifying Resilience and Depression  
399 Longitudinally” (STRADL) Reference 104036/Z/14/Z). Generation Scotland is funded by  
400 the Wellcome Trust (216767/Z/19/Z).

401  
402 SVK acknowledges funding from a NRS Senior Clinical Fellowship (SCAF/15/02), the Medical Research  
403 Council (MC\_UU\_00022/2) and the Scottish Government Chief Scientist Office (SPHSU17). GJG  
404 acknowledges funding from the ESRC (ES/T009101/1). DB acknowledges funding from the Medical  
405 Research Council (MR/V002147/1).

406  
407 Role of funder. The funders had no role in the methodology, analysis or interpretation of the findings  
408 presented in this manuscript.

409  
410 *Author Contribution Statement*

411 Ploubidis, Katikireddi, Patalay and Chaturvedi conceptualised the study and design. Wielgoszewska.  
412 Maddock. Green, Di Gessa, Parsons, Ploubidis, Katikireddi, Griffith and Silverwood designed the  
413 methodology. Wielgoszewska. Maddock, Green, Di Gessa, Parsons, Croft, Stevenson, Booth and Griffith  
414 conducted the formal analysis. Maddock, Green, Di Gessa, Stevenson, Griffith, Chaturvedi, Howe and  
415 Fitzsimons were responsible for data curation. Wielgoszewska, Maddock. Green, Di Gessa, and Parsons  
416 wrote the original draft of the manuscript. All authors contributed to critical revision of the manuscript.  
417 Green and Di Gessa contributed to data visualisation. The project was supervised

418 by Ploubidis and Katikireddi. Funding was acquired by Patalay, Katikireddi, Ploubidis, Silverwood, and  
419 Chaturvedi.

420

#### 421 *Acknowledgements*

422 The contributing studies have been made possible because of the tireless dedication, commitment and  
423 enthusiasm of the many people who have taken part. We would like to thank the participants and the  
424 numerous team members involved in the studies including interviewers, technicians, researchers,  
425 administrators, managers, health professionals and volunteers. We are additionally grateful to our funders  
426 for their financial input and support in making this research happen.

427 GS: Drew Altschul, Chloe Fawns-Ritchie, Archie Campbell, Robin Flaig.

428 ALSPAC: Daniel J Smith, Nicholas J Timpson, Kate Northstone

429 Understanding Society: Michaela Benzeval

430 MCS, NS, BCS70, NCDS: Colleagues in survey, data and cohort maintenance teams

431

432

#### 433 **References**

434 1. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and the latest indicators for the UK economy and  
435 society: 18 February 2021 [Internet]. [cited 2021 Feb 19]. Available from:  
436 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseas](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/coronavirusandtheukconomyandsocietyfasterindicators/18february2021)  
437 [es/bulletins/coronavirusandtheukconomyandsocietyfasterindicators/18february2021](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/coronavirusandtheukconomyandsocietyfasterindicators/18february2021)

438 2. International Monetary Fund. The Great Lockdown: Worst Economic Downturn Since the Great  
439 Depression [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 May 19]. Available from:

440 <https://blogs.imf.org/2020/04/14/the-great-lockdown-worst-economic-downturn-since-the-great->

- 441 depression/
- 442 3. Dias MC, Joyce R, Postel-Vinay F, Xu X. The challenges for labour market policy during the  
443 Covid-19 pandemic [Internet]. The IFS; [cited 2021 Apr 16]. Available from:  
444 <https://www.ifs.org.uk/publications/14767>
- 445 4. Powell A, Francis-Devine B, Foley N. Coronavirus: Impact on the labour market [Internet]. House  
446 of Commons Library; 2021 [cited 2021 May 19]. Available from:  
447 <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-8898/>
- 448 5. Adams-Prassl A, Boneva T, Golin M, Rauh C. Furloughing\*. *Fisc Stud* [Internet]. 2020 Sep 1  
449 [cited 2021 Jun 3];41(3):591–622. Available from:  
450 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/1475-5890.12242>
- 451 6. Moizer J, Farrar S, Hyde M. UK state pension deferral incentives and sustainability. *Appl Econ*  
452 [Internet]. 2018 May 3 [cited 2021 May 19];50(21):2356–68. Available from:  
453 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00036846.2017.1397850>
- 454 7. Brown M, Goodman A, Peters, A., Ploubidis, G.B., Sanchez A, Silverwood R, Smith K. COVID-  
455 19 Survey in Five National Longitudinal Studies: Waves 1 and 2 User Guide (Version 2)  
456 [Internet]. London; 2020 [cited 2021 May 19]. Available from: [https://cls.ucl.ac.uk/covid-19-](https://cls.ucl.ac.uk/covid-19-survey/content-and-data/)  
457 [survey/content-and-data/](https://cls.ucl.ac.uk/covid-19-survey/content-and-data/)
- 458 8. Aune D, Giovannucci E, Boffetta P, Fadnes LT, Keum NN, Norat T, et al. Fruit and vegetable  
459 intake and the risk of cardiovascular disease, total cancer and all-cause mortality-A systematic  
460 review and dose-response meta-analysis of prospective studies. *Int J Epidemiol* [Internet]. 2017  
461 Jun 1 [cited 2021 May 19];46(3):1029–56. Available from:  
462 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28338764/>
- 463 9. Department of Health and Social Care. UK Chief Medical Officers’ Physical Activity Guidelines.

- 464 2019.
- 465 10. United Kingdom National Health Service. How to get to sleep - NHS [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2021  
466 May 19]. Available from: <https://www.nhs.uk/live-well/sleep-and-tiredness/how-to-get-to-sleep/>
- 467 11. Zou G. A Modified Poisson Regression Approach to Prospective Studies with Binary Data. *Am J*  
468 *Epidemiol* [Internet]. 2004 Apr 1 [cited 2021 May 19];159(7):702–6. Available from:  
469 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15033648/>
- 470 12. Pang M, Kaufman JS, Platt RW. Studying noncollapsibility of the odds ratio with marginal  
471 structural and logistic regression models. *Stat Methods Med Res* [Internet]. 2016 Oct 1 [cited 2021  
472 May 19];25(5):1925–37. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24108272/>
- 473 13. Trikalinos TA, Hoaglin DC, Schmid CH. An empirical comparison of univariate and multivariate  
474 meta-analyses for categorical outcomes. *Stat Med* [Internet]. 2014 Apr 30 [cited 2021 May  
475 19];33(9):1441–59. Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/sim.6044>
- 476 14. Price MJ, Blake HA, Kenyon S, White IR, Jackson D, Kirkham JJ, et al. Empirical comparison of  
477 univariate and multivariate meta-analyses in Cochrane Pregnancy and Childbirth reviews with  
478 multiple binary outcomes. *Res Synth Methods* [Internet]. 2019 Sep 1 [cited 2021 May  
479 19];10(3):440–51. Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/jrsm.1353>
- 480 15. Puig-Barrachina V, Giró P, Artazcoz L, Bartoll X, Cortés-Franch I, Fernández A, et al. The impact  
481 of Active Labour Market Policies on health outcomes: A Scoping review [Internet]. Vol. 30,  
482 *European Journal of Public Health*. Oxford University Press; 2020 [cited 2021 May 19]. p. 36–42.  
483 Available from: <https://academic.oup.com/eurpub/article/30/1/36/5419277>
- 484 16. Korpi T. Is utility related to employment status? Employment, unemployment, labor market  
485 policies and subjective well-being among Swedish youth. *Labour Econ*. 1997 Jun 1;4(2):125–47.

- 486 17. Bann D, Villadsen A, Maddock J, Hughes A, Ploubidis GB, Silverwood R, et al. Changes in the  
487 behavioural determinants of health during the COVID-19 pandemic: gender, socioeconomic and  
488 ethnic inequalities in five British cohort studies. *J Epidemiol Community Health* [Internet]. 2021  
489 May 26 [cited 2021 May 27];0:jech-2020-215664. Available from:  
490 <https://jech.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/jech-2020-215664>
- 491 18. Niedzwiedz CL, Green MJ, Benzeval M, Campbell D, Craig P, Demou E, et al. Mental health and  
492 health behaviours before and during the initial phase of the COVID-19 lockdown: Longitudinal  
493 analyses of the UK Household Longitudinal Study. *J Epidemiol Community Health* [Internet].  
494 2021 Mar 1 [cited 2021 Jun 7];75(3):224–31. Available from: <http://jech.bmj.com/>
- 495 19. Dorling D. Unemployment and health [Internet]. Vol. 338, *BMJ (Online)*. British Medical Journal  
496 Publishing Group; 2009 [cited 2021 Jun 3]. p. 1091. Available from:  
497 <https://www.bmj.com/content/338/bmj.b829>
- 498 20. Bartley M. Unemployment and ill health: Understanding the relationship. *J Epidemiol Community*  
499 *Health*. 1994;48(4):333–7.
- 500 21. Kim TJ, Von Dem Knesebeck O. Is an insecure job better for health than having no job at all? A  
501 systematic review of studies investigating the health-related risks of both job insecurity and  
502 unemployment. *BMC Public Health* [Internet]. 2015 Sep 29 [cited 2021 Jun 3];15(1). Available  
503 from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26419739/>
- 504 22. Bambra C. Work, worklessness and the political economy of health inequalities. *J Epidemiol*  
505 *Community Health* [Internet]. 2011 Sep 1 [cited 2021 May 4];65(9):746–50. Available from:  
506 <https://jech.bmj.com/content/65/9/746>
- 507 23. Roelfs DJ, Shor E, Davidson KW, Schwartz JE. Losing life and livelihood: A systematic review  
508 and meta-analysis of unemployment and all-cause mortality. *Soc Sci Med* [Internet]. 2011 Mar

- 509 [cited 2021 May 19];72(6):840–54. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21330027/>
- 510 24. Nandi A, Charters TJ, Strumpf EC, Heymann J, Harper S. Economic conditions and health  
 511 behaviours during the “Great Recession.” J Epidemiol Community Health [Internet]. 2013 Dec 1  
 512 [cited 2021 May 19];67(12):1038–46. Available from: <https://jech.bmj.com/content/67/12/1038>
- 513 25. Mostafa T, Narayanan M, Pongiglione B, Dodgeon B, Goodman A, Silverwood RJ, et al. Missing  
 514 at random assumption made more plausible: evidence from the 1958 British birth cohort. J Clin  
 515 Epidemiol. 2021 Aug 1;136:44–54.

516

517

518

519 **Table 1: Percent (and N) distribution of health behaviours and changes**  
 520 **during the pandemic by study.**

	MCS	NS	BCS	NCDS	GS	USOC	ELSA	ALSPAC G0	ALSPAC G1
	% (N)	% (N)	% (N)	% (N)	% (N)	% (N)	% (N)	% (N)	% (N)
<b>Age range of participants</b>	<b>18-20</b>	<b>29-31</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>27-66</b>	<b>17-66</b>	<b>52-66</b>	<b>44-66</b>	<b>27-29</b>
<b>N participants</b>	<b>1924</b>	<b>1493</b>	<b>3050</b>	<b>4195</b>	<b>2618</b>	<b>6051</b>	<b>2417</b>	<b>2071</b>	<b>1273</b>
<b>Diet</b>									
Pre-pandemic: ≤ 2 portions of fruit & vegetables, % (n)	39 (657)	27.8 (384)	24.9 (673)	22.4 (853)	NA	26.5 (1070)	NA	NA	NA
During pandemic: ≤ 2 portions of fruit & vegetables, % (n)	33.3 (564)	26.1 (393)	25.3 (676)	21.9 (808)	NA	29.3 (1271)	NA	NA	NA
Eating fewer portions	17.1	15.2	14.9	10.9	NA	48.2	NA	NA	NA

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .

of fruit & vegetables, % (n)	(365)	(282)	(450)	(419)		(2823)			
Eating more portions of fruit & vegetables, % (n)	32 (651)	21.5 (344)	17.2 (528)	14.6 (655)	NA	42.2 (2596)	NA	NA	NA
<b>Physical Activity (PA)</b>									
Pre-pandemic: ≤ 3 days a week of at least 30m exercise, % (n)	43.4 (885)	46.9 (704)	43.5 (1319)	41.5 (1744)	22.7 (594)	21.2 (1181)	NA	NA	NA
During pandemic: ≤ 3 days a week of at least 30m exercise, % (n)	42.9 (803)	44.5 (677)	38.4 (1099)	39.9 (1588)	26.3 (608)	20.3 (994)	NA	NA	NA
Less PA/fewer days of +30m exercise	33.6 (622)	29.7 (445)	20.5 (624)	18.2 (787)	31.7 (804)	49.3 (2824)	36.0 (869)	33.5 (693)	38.5 (491)
More PA/days of at least 30m exercise, % (n)	37.8 (750)	35.4 (544)	31.6 (1074)	26.8 (1232)	23.4 (658)	47.4 (3056)	23.3 (563)	44.4 (919)	42.5 (542)
<b>Sleep</b>									
Pre-pandemic: # hours/day, mean [95% CI]	7.48 [7.38-7.58]	7.13 [7.04-7.21]	6.88 [6.82- 6.95]	6.93 [6.87-6.99]	7.09 [7.04-7.13]	6.82 [6.77-6.88]	NA	NA	NA
During pandemic: # hours/day, mean [95% CI]	8.12 [7.99-8.25]	7.41 [7.29-7.54]	6.98 [6.90-7.06]	6.99 [6.92-7.07]	7.10 [7.05-7.15]	7.01 [6.95-7.07]	NA	NA	NA
Pre-pandemic: <6 or 9+ hours a night, % (n)	12.0 (223)	6.8 (107)	10.3 (229)	10.2 (323)	9.3 (243)	14.6 (740)	NA	NA	NA
During pandemic: <6 or 9+ hours a night, % (n)	29.9 (569)	15.9 (231)	17.1 (430)	16.3 (540)	13.5 (347)	12.2 (673)	NA	NA	NA
From 6/9h a night to outside typical range,	24.6 (465)	12.0 (171)	9.6 (276)	7.8 (287)	9.0 (235)	5.4 (321)	NA	NA	NA



% (n)									
From outside typical range to 6/9h a night, % (n)	6.6 (118)	2.8 (47)	2.7 (74)	1.5 (68)	5.9 (171)	7.6 (370)	NA	NA	NA
Sleeps less than before, % (n)	23 (403)	22 (335)	19.6 (614)	16.7 (623)	21.4 (532)	30.8 (1903)	25.6 (618)	20.9 (432)	22.0 (280)
Sleeps more than before, % (n)	54.1 (1093)	36.3 (543)	27.6 (879)	21.7 (937)	22.1 (599)	44.6 (2482)	10.3 (249)	21.2 (439)	36.3 (462)

521 Supplementary Table 1 has details of each study’s sample design and weighting applied. Percentages and means are weighted (where weighting  
 522 was applied), but N are unweighted. Analysis for GS, USOC, and ELSA restricted to participants aged 66 and younger. For more information  
 523 about the questions asked in each dataset, please see Supplementary File 2.

524 **Figure legends:**

525 **Figure 1: Percent distribution of change in employment status during the pandemic by study.**

526 Supplementary Table 1 has details of each study’s sample design and weighting applied. Analysis for GS,  
 527 USOC, and ELSA restricted to participants aged 66 and younger. For more information about the  
 528 questions asked in each dataset to derive changes in economic activity, please see Supplementary File 2.


529 **Figure 2: Associations between economic activity and health behaviours in pooled analyses across  
 530 eight UK longitudinal studies**

531 ‘Basic’ adjustment includes age, sex, ethnicity, education, UK nation, and household composition. ‘Full’  
 532 adjustment additionally includes pre-pandemic measures of mental health, self-rated health, diet, exercise  
 533 and sleep.

534 **Figure 3: Associations between economic activity and health behaviours stratified by age, sex and  
 535 educational attainment**

536 \*No  $I^2$  value as only one study was able to provide an estimate.

537



■ Stable employed

■ Furloughed

■ No longer employed

■ Became employed

■ Stable unemployed

■ Stable non-employed

