medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Comparison of Mental Health Symptom Changes from pre-COVID-19 to COVID-19 by Sex or Gender: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Tiffany Dal Santo, BSc[1,2]; Ying Sun, MPH[1]; Yin Wu, PhD[1,3]; Chen He, MScPH[1]; Yutong Wang[1]; Xiaowen Jiang, BA[1]; Kexin Li, BSc[1]; Olivia Bonardi, BSc[1]; Ankur Krishnan, MSc[1]; Jill T. Boruff, MLIS[4]; Danielle B. Rice, MSc[1,2]; Sarah Markham, PhD[5]; Brooke Levis, PhD[1,6]; Marleine Azar, MSc[1]; Dipika Neupane, MSc[1]; Amina Tasleem[1,2]; Anneke Yao[1,2]; Ian Thombs-Vite[1]; Branka Agic, MD[7,8]; Christine Fahim, PhD[9]; Michael S. Martin, PhD[10,11]; Sanjeev Sockalingam, MD[7,12]; Gustavo Turecki, MD[2,13]; Andrea Benedetti, PhD[14-16]; Brett D. Thombs, PhD[1-3,14,15,17,18]

[1]Lady Davis Institute for Medical Research, Jewish General Hospital, Montréal, Québec, Canada; [2]Department of Psychology, McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Canada; [3]Department of Psychiatry, McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Canada; [4]Schulich Library of Physical Sciences, Life Sciences, and Engineering, McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Canada; [5]Department of Biostatistics and Health Informatics, King's College London, London, UK; [6]Centre for Prognosis Research, School of Medicine, Keele University, Staffordshire, UK; [7]Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, Toronto, Ontario, Canada; [8]Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada; [9]Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, Unity Health Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada; [10]School of Epidemiology and Public Health, University of Ottawa; Ontario, Canada; [11]Correctional Service of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada; [12]Department of Psychiatry, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada; [13]McGill Group for Suicide Studies, Douglas Mental Health University Institute, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada; [14]Department of Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Occupational Health, McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Canada; [15]Department of Medicine, McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Canada; [16]Respiratory Epidemiology and Clinical Research Unit, McGill University Health Centre, Montréal, Québec, Canada; [17]Department of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Mental Health Symptom Changes Following COVID-19 by Sex or Gender

Educational and Counselling Psychology, McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Canada;

[18]Biomedical Ethics Unit, McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Canada.

Corresponding author:

Brett D. Thombs, PhD; Jewish General Hospital; 3755 Cote Ste-Catherine, Pavilion H4.83, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, H3T 1E2; Tel (514) 340-8222 ext. 24244; E-mail: brett.thombs@mcgill.ca

ORCID: 0000-0002-5644-8432

Word count: 2,988

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

KEY MESSAGES

Question: Did mental health symptoms worsen more for females or women than males or men in COVID-19?

Findings: We reviewed almost 65,000 citations and identified 12 studies that provided data to directly compare mental health symptom changes from pre-COVID-19 to during COVID-19 for females or women versus males or men. Statistically significant, but small, sex- or gender-based differences were found in 2 of 8 mental health outcomes.

Meaning: Mental health changes among females or women were not significantly different from males or men for most outcomes, and differences that were identified were small and less than minimally important difference thresholds.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

ABSTRACT

Importance: Women and gender-diverse individuals have faced disproportionate socioeconomic burden during COVID-19. There have been reports that this has translated into greater negative changes in mental health, but this has been based on cross-sectional research that has not accounted for pre-COVID-19 differences.

Objective: To compare mental health symptom changes since pre-COVID-19 by sex or gender.

Data Sources: MEDLINE, PsycINFO, CINAHL, EMBASE, Web of Science, China National Knowledge Infrastructure, Wanfang, medRxiv, and Open Science Framework (December 31, 2019 to August 30, 2021).

Study Selection: Eligible studies compared mental health symptom changes from pre-COVID-19 to COVID-19 by sex or gender.

Data Extraction and Synthesis: Data was extracted by a single reviewer with validation by a second reviewer. Adequacy of study methods and reporting was assessed using an adapted version of the Joanna Briggs Institute Checklist for Prevalence Studies. A restricted maximum-likelihood random-effects meta-analyses was conducted.

Main Outcomes and Measures: Anxiety symptoms, depression symptoms, general mental health, and stress measured continuously or dichotomously.

Results: 12 studies (10 unique cohorts) were included. All compared females or women to males or men; none included gender-diverse individuals. Continuous symptom change differences were not statistically significant for depression (standardized mean difference [SMD]= 0.12, 95% CI -0.09 to 0.33; 4 studies, 4,475 participants; I^2=69.0%) and stress (SMD= -0.10, 95% CI -0.21 to 0.01; 4 studies, 1,533 participants; I^2=0.0%), but anxiety (SMD= 0.15, 95% CI 0.07 to 0.22; 4 studies, 4,344 participants; I^2=3.0%) and general mental health (SMD= 0.15, 95% CI 0.12 to 0.18; 3 studies, 15,692 participants; I^2=0.0%) worsened more among females or women than males or men during COVID-19. There were no significant differences in changes in proportion above a cut-off: anxiety (difference= -0.05, 95% CI -0.20 to 0.11; 1

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

study, 217 participants), depression (difference= 0.12, 95% CI -0.03 to 0.28; 1 study, 217 participants), general mental health (difference= -0.03, 95% CI -0.09 to 0.04; 3 studies, 18,985 participants; I^2=94.0%), stress (difference= 0.04, 95% CI -0.10 to 0.17; 1 study, 217 participants).

Conclusion and Relevance: Mental health outcomes did not differ or were worse by amounts below thresholds for clinical significance for women compared to men.

Registration: PROSPERO (CRD42020179703).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic has caused almost 6 million deaths and disrupted social and economic activities across the globe.[1,2] By sex, males infected with COVID-19 are at greater risk of intensive care admission and death than females,[3,4] but, by gender, socioeconomic burden has disproportionately impacted women.[5-12] Economically, most single parents are women, and women earn less, are more likely to live in poverty, and hold less secure jobs than men, which heightens vulnerability.[5,8-11] Women are overrepresented in health care jobs, which involves infection risk[5-10] and provide most childcare and family elder care.[5,8-10] Intimate partner violence has increased with the majority directed towards women.[5,7-10,12] In addition to women, sex and gender minority individuals may face heightened socioeconomic challenges during COVID-19.[13,14]

Many of the socioeconomic implications of the pandemic that disproportionately affected women are known to be associated with worse mental health, and there is concern that increased burden during COVID-19 on women and gender minorities may have translated into worse mental health outcomes for these groups.[15-17] Some researchers and prominent news media stories have reported that COVID-19 mental health effects have been greater for women than men.[18-28] These reports, however, have been cross-sectional studies that evaluated proportions of participants above cut-offs on self-report measures without consideration of pre-COVID-19 differences, even though mental health disorders and symptoms were more common among women prior to the pandemic.[29-33]

Evidence from longitudinal cohorts that compare mental health symptoms pre-COVID-19 to during COVID-19 is needed to determine if there are gender differences. We are conducting a series of living systematic reviews on COVID-19 mental health,[34-36] including mental health changes.[36] The objective of this study was to compare mental health changes by sex or gender. This study goes beyond analyses presented in our main living systematic review, which reports on symptom levels and changes in many different population groups by conducting direct

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

comparisons in the subset of studies that provide data on mental health changes by sex or gender.

METHODS

Our series of living systematic reviews was registered in PROSPERO (CRD42020179703) and a protocol was posted to the Open Science Framework prior to initiating searches (https://osf.io/96csg/). The present study is a sub-study of our main mental health changes review.[36] Results are reported per the PRISMA statement.[37]

Study Eligibility

For our main symptom changes review, studies on any population were included if they compared mental health outcomes assessed between January 1, 2018 and December 31, 2019, when China first reported COVID-19 to the World Health Organization,[38] to outcomes collected January 1, 2020 or later. We only included pre-COVID-19 data collected in the two years prior to COVID-19 to reduce comparisons of COVID-19 results with those collected during different developmental life stages. Compared samples had to include at least 90% of the same participants pre-COVID-19 and during COVID-19 or use statistical methods to account for missing follow-up data. Studies with < 100 participants were excluded for feasibility and due to their limited relative value. For the present analysis, studies had to report mental health outcomes separately by sex (assignment based on external genitalia, usually at birth; e.g., female, male, intersex) or gender (socially constructed characteristics of roles and behaviours; e.g., woman, man, trans woman, trans man, non-binary).[39]

Search Strategy

MEDLINE (Ovid), PsycINFO (Ovid), CINAHL (EBSCO), EMBASE (Ovid), Web of Science Core Collection: Citation Indexes, China National Knowledge Infrastructure, Wanfang, medRxiv (preprints), and Open Science Framework Preprints (preprint server aggregator) were searched using a strategy designed by an experienced health science librarian. The China National Knowledge Infrastructure and Wanfang databases were searched using Chinese terms

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

based on our English-language strategy. The rapid project launch did not allow for formal peer review, but COVID-19 terms were developed in collaboration with other librarians working on the topic. See Appendix 1 for search strategies. The initial search was conducted from December 31, 2019 to April 13, 2020 with automated daily updates. We converted to weekly updates on December 28, 2020 to increase processing efficiency.

Selection of Eligible Studies

Search results were uploaded into DistillerSR (Evidence Partners, Ottawa, Canada). Duplicate references were removed. Then two reviewers independently evaluated titles and abstracts in random order; if either reviewer believed a study was potentially eligible, it underwent full-text review by two independent reviewers. Discrepancies at the full-text level were resolved by consensus, with a third reviewer consulted if necessary. An inclusion and exclusion coding guide was developed, and team members were trained over several sessions. See Appendix 2.

Data Extraction

For each eligible study, data were extracted in DistillerSR by a single reviewer using a pre-specified form with validation by a second reviewer. Reviewers extracted (1) publication characteristics (e.g., first author, year, journal); (2) population characteristics and demographics, including eligibility criteria, recruitment method, number of participants, assessment timing, age; (3) mental health outcomes which included symptoms of anxiety, symptoms of depression, general mental health, and stress; (4) if studies reported outcomes by sex or gender or used these terms inconsistently (e.g., described using gender but reported results for females and males, which are sex terms); and (5) if sex or gender were treated as binary or categorical.

Adequacy of study methods and reporting was assessed using an adapted version of the Joanna Briggs Institute Checklist for Prevalence Studies, which assesses appropriateness of the sampling frame for the target population, appropriateness of recruiting methods, sample size, description of setting and participants, participation or response rate, outcome assessment

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

methods, standardization of assessments across participants, appropriateness of statistical analyses, and follow-up.[40] Each of the 9 items was coded as "yes" for meeting adequacy criteria, "no" for not meeting criteria, or "unclear" if incomplete reporting did not allow a judgment to be made. See Appendix 3.

For all data extraction, including adequacy of study methods and reporting, discrepancies were resolved between reviewers with a third reviewer consulted if necessary.

Statistical Analyses

For continuous outcomes, separately for each sex or gender group, we extracted a standardized mean difference (SMD) effect size with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for change from pre-COVID-19 to COVID-19. If not provided, we extracted pre-COVID-19 and COVID-19 means and standard deviations (SDs) for each group, calculated raw change scores (SD), and calculated SMD for change using Hedges' g for each group,[41] as described by Borenstein et al.[42] Raw change scores were presented in scale units and direction, whereas SMD change scores were presented as positive when mental health worsened from pre-COVID-19 to COVID-19 and negative when it improved. We then calculated a Hedges' g difference in change between sex or gender groups with 95% CI. Positive numbers represented greater negative change in females or women compared to males or men.

For studies that reported proportions of participants above a scale cut-off, for pre-COVID-19 and COVID-19 proportions, if not provided, we calculated a 95% CI using Agresti and Coull's approximate method for binomial proportions.[43] We then extracted or calculated the proportion change in participants above the cut-off, along with 95% CI, for each sex or gender group. Proportion changes were presented as positive when mental health worsened from pre-COVID-19 to COVID-19 and negative when it improved. If 95% CIs were not reported, we generated them using Newcombe's method for differences between binomial proportions based on paired data.[44] To do this, which requires the number of cases at both assessments, which is not typically available, we assumed that 50% of pre-COVID-19 cases continued to be cases

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

during COVID-19 and confirmed that results did not differ substantively if we used values from 30% to 70% (all 95% CI end points within 0.02; see Appendix 4). Finally, we calculated a difference of the proportion change between sex or gender groups with 95% CI.[45] Positive numbers reflected greater negative change in females or women compared to males or men.

Meta-analyses were done to synthesize differences between sex or gender groups in SMD change for continuous outcomes and in proportion change for dichotomous outcomes via restricted maximum-likelihood random-effects meta-analysis. Heterogeneity was assessed with the I^2 statistic. Meta-analysis was performed in R (R version 3.6.3, RStudio Version 1.2.5042), using the metacont and metagen functions in the meta package.[46] Forest plots were generated using the forest function in meta. Positive values indicated more relatively worse changes in mental health for females or women compared to males or men.

RESULTS

Search Results and Selection of Eligible Studies

As of August 30, 2021, there were 64,496 unique references identified and screened for potential eligibility, of which 63,534 were excluded after title and abstract review and 741 after full-text review. Of 221 remaining articles, 209 were excluded, leaving 12 included studies that reported data from 10 cohorts. Appendix 5 provides a figure that shows the flow of article review and reasons for exclusion.

Characteristics of Included Studies

Four publications[47-50] reported on 2 large, national, probability-based samples from the United Kingdom (N = 10,918 to 15,376)[47,48] and the Netherlands (N = 3,983 to 4,064),[49,50] and one publication[51] reported on a community sample from Spain (N = 102). Two studies[52,53] assessed young adults; one reported on a sample of twins from the United Kingdom (N = 3,563 to 3,694 depending on outcome)[52] and another on a sample from Switzerland (N = 786).[53] One study assessed adolescents from Australia (N = 248),[54] and 3 studies[55-57] assessed undergraduate students from China (N = 4,085 to 4,341),[55] India (N = 217),[56] and the United

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Kingdom (N = 214).[57] One study[58] assessed patients with systemic lupus erythematosus (N = 316). Four studies assessed anxiety symptoms,[52,54,56,58] 4 depression symptoms,[52,54,56,58] 7 (5 cohorts) general mental health,[47-51,55,57] and 4 stress.[53,56-58] Table 1 shows study characteristics. All studies compared women and men or females and males; none included other sex or gender groups. Use of sex and gender terms, however, was inconsistent in 5 of 12 included studies[48,52,54,56,57] (e.g., described assessing gender but reporting results for "females" and "males"). Results during COVID-19 were assessed between March and June 2020 for all studies. Two cohorts also reported results from September 2020[48] and November to December 2020.[50]

Adequacy of Study Methods and Reporting

Two studies (1 cohort)[49,50] were rated as "yes" for adequacy for all items. Other studies were rated "no" for 1-3 items (plus 0-3 unclear ratings)[48,51,53-57] or "no" on none but unclear on 2-4 items.[47,52,58] There were 6 studies[51,53-57] rated "no" or "unclear" for appropriate sampling frame (50.0%), 8 "no" or "unclear" for adequate response rate and coverage (66.7%),[47,48,51-54,57,58] and 7 "no" or "unclear" for follow-up response rate and management (58.3%).[47,48,51,52,54,57,58] See Appendix 6 for results for all studies.

Mental Health Symptom Changes

There was a total of 15 comparisons of continuous score changes and 6 of proportion changes; in 15 out of 21 comparisons, females or women had worse mental health pre-COVID-19. Mental health scores and symptom changes for all outcome domains are reported separately by sex or gender groups in Table 2. Differences in continuous and dichotomous changes by sex or gender are shown in Figures 1 and 2. Estimates of difference in change by sex or gender were close to zero and not statistically significant for anxiety symptoms with dichotomous outcomes (Figure 2a; proportion change difference = -0.05, 95% CI -0.20 to 0.11; N = 1 study,[56] 217 participants), depression symptoms with continuous (Figure 1b; SMD change difference = 0.12, 95% CI -0.09 to 0.33; N = 4 studies,[52,54,56,58] 4,475 participants; I^2 = 69.0%)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

and dichotomous outcomes (Figure 2b; proportion change difference = 0.12, 95% CI -0.03 to 0.28; N = 1 study,[56] 217 participants), general mental health dichotomous outcomes (Figure 2c [all results from early 2020]; proportion change difference = -0.03, 95% CI -0.09 to 0.04; N = 3 studies,[48,49,55] 18,985 participants; I^2 = 94.0%), and stress with continuous (Figure 1d; SMD change difference = -0.10, 95% CI -0.21 to 0.01; N = 4 studies,[53,56-58] 1,533 participants; I^2 = 0.0%) and dichotomous outcomes (Figure 2d; proportion change difference = 0.04, 95% CI -0.10 to 0.17; N = 1 study,[56] 217 participants). Of the 4 studies[48-50,55] that reported dichotomous general mental health, 2 studies[48,50] also reported outcomes from late 2020; when those results were used, the null finding did not change (Figure 2e; proportion change difference = 0.00, 95% CI -0.03 to 0.03; N = 3 studies,[48,50,55] 19,067 participants; I^2 = 67.0%).

Anxiety, measured continuously, worsened significantly more for females or women than for males or men during COVID-19 (Figure 1a; SMD change difference = 0.15, 95% CI 0.07 to 0.22; N = 4 studies,[52,54,56,58] 4,344 participants; I^2= 3.0%). General mental health, measured continuously, also worsened more for females or women than for males or men in early COVID-19 (Figure 1c; SMD difference in change = 0.15, 95% CI 0.12 to 0.18; N = 3 studies,[47,51,57] 15,692 participants; I^2 = 0.0%). This was predominantly based on a large population-based study from the United Kingdom.[47] That study did not report results from fall 2020 for continuous outcomes, but as shown in Table 2 and Figures 2c and 2e, the difference in change between females or women and males or men decreased between early and late 2020 for dichotomous outcomes in the same cohort.[48] The magnitude of both statistically significant differences was small (see Figure 3).

DISCUSSION

The COVID-19 pandemic has affected women and gender minorities disproportionately.[5-14] There has been an assumption, seemingly confirmed by cross-sectional data collected during COVID-19, that this has translated into greater negative changes in mental health among women.[18-28] We reviewed evidence from 12 studies (10 cohorts) that reported

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

mental health changes from pre-COVID-19 to COVID-19 separately by sex or gender. We compared females or women with males or men; no studies compared gender minorities with any other group. Syntheses of continuously measured anxiety symptoms (SMD = 0.15, 95% CI 0.07 to 0.22) and general mental health (SMD = 0.15, 95% CI 0.12 to 0.18) found that mental health worsened more for females or women than males or men, but the magnitude was small and far below thresholds that are typically considered clinically important (e.g., SMD = 0.50).[59] None of the other 6 mental health outcomes that we examined (continuous depression symptoms and stress; dichotomous anxiety symptoms, depression symptoms, general mental health, and stress) differed by sex or gender.

Sex and gender differences in mental health disorder prevalence, symptoms, and risk factors are well-established.[60-63] Likely risk factors include gender inequities and discrimination, economic disadvantage and poverty, higher rates of interpersonal stressors, and violence,[64,65] and many of these risk factors have been exacerbated for women during COVID-19.[5-12] We did not identify any differences in mental health by sex or gender, however, that appeared to be substantive; all were 0.15 SMD or smaller, which is considered to be a small difference based on commonly used metrics (e.g., < 0.20 SMD)[66] and below thresholds for clinical meaningfulness.[59]

Based on our findings, it is possible that despite the challenges women have faced, many have been resilient and that the mental health disaster that has been predicted by many has not occurred.[67] This finding departs from what has been reported in some research and by the media. Three factors may feed this discrepancy. One is the publication of many cross-sectional studies that report proportions above cut-offs on self-report measures, which are not designed for that purpose,[68-72] and assume that what are perceived as high numbers, generally, or sex differences, comparatively, must not have been present pre-COVID-19.[36] A second is the use of surveys that ask questions about well-being with COVID-19 explicitly assigned as a cause; illustrating the pitfalls of this, a study of over 2,000 young Swiss adult men found

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

significant angst when questions were asked in this way, but no changes in validated measures of depression symptoms and stress from pre-COVID.[73] A third reason relates to news media reports that emphasize dramatic events and anecdotes without evidence that demonstrates changes.[67]

Strengths of our study include the use of rigorous systematic review methods. We searched 9 databases, including Chinese-language databases, without language restrictions and included studies that enabled the direct comparison of mental health changes by sex or gender. There are limitations to consider. First, this review only included 12 studies from 10 cohorts, and many had limitations related to study sampling frames and recruitment methods, follow-up rates, and management of missing data. Second, heterogeneity was high for some meta-analyses; it was low, however, for others, and results across 8 analyses did not differ substantively. Third, there were not enough studies to attempt sub-group analyses by additional sociodemographic or other factors. Fourth, we did not identify any studies that compared results from gender-diverse individuals to other gender groups. Fifth, in calculating 95% CIs for within-group changes in proportions with the information provided in publications (pre-COVID-19 and COVID-19 group proportions), we assumed that 50% of pre-COVID-19 cases continued to be cases during COVID-19. However, the maximum difference in any end point of a 95% CIs across analyses was 0.02 when we varied our assumption from 30% to 70%.

In sum, we identified small sex- or gender-based differences for anxiety symptoms and general mental health, continuously measured, but other outcomes (continuous depression symptoms and stress; dichotomous anxiety symptoms, depression symptoms, general mental health, and stress) did not differ by sex or gender. This finding diverges from what has been reported from cross-sectional studies. These are aggregate results, though, and many individuals have certainly experienced negative mental health changes related to increased socioeconomic burden. It seems plausible, given the divergent ways that the pandemic has affected different people that many people are experiencing improved mental health, whereas

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

large numbers of others may be experiencing worsened mental health, including new onset mental disorders among people without previous morbidity. Thus, mental health changes should continue to be monitored in COVID-19, taking into consideration sex and gender, and studies should examine reasons for what appears to be resilience among many women despite facing disproportionate hardships in the pandemic. Health care providers should be alert to life changes that may be associated with vulnerability and to physical and emotional or cognitive symptoms that may reflect worsening mental health so that they can assess, if appropriate, and provide mental health care to those in need.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Author Contributions: YS, YWu, DBR, AB, and BDT were responsible for the study conception and design. JTB was responsible for the design of the database searches. AK carried out the searches. TDS, YS, YWu, CH, YWang, XJ, KL, OB, AK, DBR, SM, MA, DN, AT, AY, ITV and BDT contributed to data extraction, coding, and evaluation of included studies. YS, CH, and OB were responsible for study coordination. TDS, YS, YWu, BL, AB, and BDT were involved in data analysis. BA, CF, MSM, SS, and GT contributed to interpretation of results as knowledge translation partners. TDS and BDT drafted the manuscript. All authors provided a critical review and approved the final manuscript. BDT is the guarantor; he had full access to all the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analyses. BDT is the corresponding author and attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

Declaration of Competing Interests: All authors have completed the ICJME uniform disclosure form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf and declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years. All authors declare no relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work. No funder had any role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Funding: The study was funded by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CMS-171703; GA4-177758; MS1-173070) and McGill Interdisciplinary Initiative in Infection and Immunity Emergency COVID-19 Research Fund (R2-42). YWu and BL were supported by Fonds de recherche du Québec – Santé (FRQS) Postdoctoral Training Fellowships. DBR was supported

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

by a Vanier Canada Graduate Scholarship. AB was supported by a FRQS senior researcher salary award. BDT was supported by a Tier 1 Canada Research Chair.

Data Sharing: All data used in the study are available in the manuscript and its tables or online at https://www.depressd.ca/covid-19-mental-health.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization. WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard. https://covid19.who.int/. Accessed February 6, 2022.
2. World Health Organization. Impact of COVID-19 on people's livelihoods, their health and our food systems: joint statement by ILO, FAO, IFAD and WHO. https://www.who.int/news/item/13-10-2020-impact-of-covid-19-on-people%27s-livelihoods-their-health-and-our-food-systems. Accessed February 6, 2022.
3. Peckham H, de Gruijter NM, Raine C, et al. Male sex identified by global COVID-19 meta-analysis as a risk factor for death and ITU admission. *Nat Commun*. 2020;11:6317.
4. Islam N, Shkolnikov VM, Acosta RJ, et al. Excess deaths associated with covid-19 pandemic in 2020: age and sex disaggregated time series analysis in 29 high income countries. *BMJ*. 2021;373:n1137.
5. Connor J, Madhavan S, Mokashi M, et al. Health risks and outcomes that disproportionately affect women during the Covid-19 pandemic: a review. *Soc Sci Med.* 2020;266:113354.
6. Ahmed SB, Dumanski SM. Sex, gender and COVID-19: a call to action. *Can J Public Health*. 2020;111:980-983.
7. World Health Organization. Gender and COVID-19: advocacy brief – 14 May 2020. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-Advocacy_brief-Gender-2020.1. Accessed February 6, 2022.
8. United Nations. Policy brief: the impact of COVID-19 on women – 9 April 2020. https://unsdg.un.org/resources/policy-brief-impact-covid-19-women. Accessed February 6, 2022.
9. UN Women 2020. From insight to action: gender inequality in the wake of COVID-19. https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2020/09/gender-equality-in-the-wake-of-covid-19. Accessed February 6, 2022.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

10. World Bank Group. Gender dimensions of the COVID-19 pandemic. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/33622#:~:text=With%20regards%20to%20health%20outcomes,health%20outcomes%20in%20several%20countries.Accessed February 6, 2022.
11. United States Census Bureau. Custodial Mothers and Fathers and Their Child Support:2015. https://www.census.gov/library/publications/2018/demo/p60-262.html. Accessed February 6, 2022.
12. Piquero AR, Jennings WG, Jemison E, et al. Domestic violence during the COVID-19 pandemic - evidence from a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Crim Justice*. 2021;74:101806.
13. Flentje A, Obedin-Maliver J, Lubensky ME, et al. Depression and anxiety changes among sexual and gender minority people coinciding with onset of COVID-19 pandemic. *J Gen Intern Med* 2020;35:2788-90.
14. The Lives and livelihoods of many in the LGBTQ community are at risk amidst the COVID-19 crisis. Human Rights Campaign Foundation; 2020. https://assets2.hrc.org/files/assets/resources/COVID19-IssueBrief-032020-FINAL.pdf. Accessed February 6, 2022.
15. Hassan MO, Hassan NO, Kassim ES, et al. Financial wellbeing and mental health: a systematic review. *St Appl Econ.* 2021;39.
16. Vizheh M, Qorbani M, Arzaghi SM, et al. The mental health of healthcare workers in the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review. *J Diabetes Metab Disord.* 2020;19:1967-1978.
17. Dillon G, Hussain R, Loxton D, et al. Mental and physical health and intimate partner violence against women: a review of the literature. *Int J Family Med.* 2013;2013:313909.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

18. Jaques-Aviñó C, López-Jiménez T, Medina-Perucha L, et al. Gender-based approach on the social impact and mental health in Spain during COVID-19 lockdown: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open.* 2020;10:e044617.
19. Kolakowsky-Hayner SA, Goldin Y, Kingsley K, et al. Psychosocial impacts of the COVID-19 quarantine: a study of gender differences in 59 countries. *Medicina.* 2021;57:789.
20. Liu S, Yang L, Zhang C, et al. Gender differences in mental health problems of healthcare workers during the coronavirus disease 2019 outbreak. *J Psychiatr Res.* 2021;137:393-400.
21. Seens H, Modarresi S, Fraser J, et al. The role of sex and gender in the changing levels of anxiety and depression during the COVID-19 pandemic: a cross-sectional study. *Women's Health.* 2021;17:1-9.
22. Gordon D. Mental health got worse during covid-19, especially for women, new survey shows. *Forbes.* May 28, 2021. https://www.forbes.com/sites/debgordon/2021/05/28/mental-health-got-worse-during-covid-19-especially-for-women-new-survey-shows/?sh=17e96a792d03. Accessed February 6, 2022.
23. Grose J. America's mothers are in crisis. Is anyone listening to them? *The New York Times.* February 4, 2021. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/02/04/parenting/working-moms-coronavirus.html. Accessed February 6, 2022.
24. Kluger J. The coronavirus pandemic's outsized effect on women's mental health around the world. *Time.* September 24, 2020. https://time.com/5892297/women-coronavirus-mental-health/. Accessed February 6, 2022.
25. Lindau ST, Makelarski JA, Boyd K, et al. Change in health-related socioeconomic risk factors and mental health during the early phase of the COVID-19 pandemic: a national survey of U.S. women. *J Womens Health*. 2021;30:502-513.
26. García-Fernández L, Romero-Ferreiro V, Padilla S, et al. Gender differences in emotional response to the COVID-19 outbreak in Spain. *Brain Behav*. 2021;11:e01934.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

27. Statistics Canada. Gender differences in mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic. https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/45-28-0001/2020001/article/00047-eng.htm. Accessed February 6, 2022.
28. Centre for Addiction and Mental Health. COVID-19 pandemic adversely affecting mental health of women and people with children. https://www.camh.ca/en/camh-news-and-stories/covid-19-pandemic-adversely-affecting-mental-health-of-women-and-people-with-children. Accessed February 6, 2022.
29. Kessler RC, McGonagle KA, Zhao S, et al. Lifetime and 12-month prevalence of DSM-III-R psychiatric disorders in the United States. Results from the National Comorbidity Survey. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 1994;51:8-19.
30. Salk RH, Hyde JS, Abramson LY. Gender differences in depression in representative national samples: meta-analysis of diagnosis and symptoms. *Psychol Bull*. 2017;143:783-822.
31. Patil PA, Porche MV, Shippen NA, et al. Which girls, which boys? The intersectional risk for depression by race and ethnicity, and gender in the U.S. *Clin Psychol Rev.* 2018;66:51-68.
32. McLean CP, Anderson ER. Brave men and timid women? A review of the gender differences in fear and anxiety. *Clin Psychol Rev.* 2009;29:496-505.
33. McLean CP, Asnaani A, Litz BT, et al. Gender differences in anxiety disorders: prevalence, course of illness, comorbidity and burden of illness. *J Psychiatr Res.* 2011;45:1027-1035.
34. Thombs BD, Bonardi O, Rice DB, et al. Curating evidence on mental health during COVID-19: a living systematic review. *J Psychosom Res* 2020;133;110113.
35. Living systematic review of mental health in COVID-19. https://www.depressd.ca/covid-19-mental-health**.** Accessed February 6, 2022.
36. Sun Y, Wu Y, Bonardi O, et al. Comparison of mental health symptoms prior to and during COVID-19: evidence from a living systematic review and meta-analysis. *MedRxiv*. https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.10.21256920.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

37. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ.* 2021;372:n71.

38. World Health Organization. Rolling updates on coronavirus disease (COVID-19) 2020. https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/events-as-they-happen. Accessed February 6, 2022.

39. World Health Organization. Gender and health. https://www.who.int/health-topics/gender#tab=tab_1. Accessed February 6, 2022.

40. Joanna Briggs Institute. The Joanna Briggs Institute Critical Appraisal tools for use in JBI Systematic Reviews: Checklist for Prevalence Studies. https://jbi.global/critical-appraisal-tools. Accessed February 6, 2022.

41. Hedges LV. Estimation of effect from a series of independent experiments. *Pyschol Bull*. 1982;92:490-499.

42. Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JPT, et al. Chapter 4: Effect sizes based on means. In Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JPT, Rothstein HR (editors). Introduction to meta-analysis. Wiley & Sons: West Sussex, UK. 2009.

43. Agresti A, Coull BA. Approximate is better than “exact” for interval estimation of binomial proportions. *Am Stat* 1998;52:119-26.

44. Newcombe RG. Improved confidence intervals for the difference between binomial proportions based on paired data. *Stat Med* 1998;17:2635-2650.

45. Newcombe RG. Estimating the difference between differences: measurement of additive scale interaction for proportions. *Stat Med.* 2001;20:2885-2893.

46. Schwarzer G. meta: An R package for meta-analysis. *R News*. 2007;7:40-45.

47. Pierce M, Hope H, Ford T, et al. Mental health before and during the COVID-19 pandemic: a longitudinal probability sample survey of the UK population. *Lancet Psychiatry.* 2020;7:883-892

48. Daly M, Robinson E. Longitudinal changes in psychological distress in the UK from 2019 to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

September 2020 during the COVID-19 pandemic: Evidence from a large nationally representative study. *Psychiatry Res.* 2021;300:113920.

49. Van der Velden PG, Contino C, Das M, et al. Anxiety and depression symptoms, and lack of emotional support among the general population before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. a prospective national study on prevalence and risk factors. *J Affect Disord.* 2020;277:540-548.
50. Van der Velden PG, Marchand M, Das M, et al. The prevalence, incidence and risk factors of mental health problems and mental health services use before and 9 months after the COVID-19 outbreak among the general Dutch population. A 3-wave prospective study. *MedRixv.* 2021. https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.27.21251952\.
51. Megías-Robles A, Gutiérrez-Cobo MJ, Cabello R, et al. A longitudinal study of the influence of concerns about contagion on negative affect during the COVID-19 lockdown in adults: the moderating effect of gender and resilience. *J Health Psychol.* 2021.
52. Rimfeld K, Malanchini M, Allegrini AG, et al. Genetic correlates of psychological responses to the COVID-19 crisis in young adult twins in Great Britain. *Behav Genet.* 2021;51(2):110-124.
53. Shanahan L, Steinhoff A, Bechtiger L, et al. Emotional distress in young adults during the COVID-19 pandemic: evidence of risk and resilience from a longitudinal cohort study. *Psychol Med.* 2020;1-10.
54. Magson NR, Freeman JUA, Rapee RM, et al. Risk and protective factors for prospective changes in adolescent mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Youth Adolesc.* 2021;50:44-57.
55. Dong XL. 新型冠状病毒肺炎疫情对师范类大学生心理健康的影响研究 [Influence study of COVID-2019 on mental health of normal college students]. *Xin Li Yue Kan*. 2020;20:15.
56. Saraswathi I, Saikarthik J, Kumar KS, et al. Impact of COVID-19 outbreak on the mental

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

health status of undergraduate medical students in a COVID-19 treating medical college: a prospective longitudinal study. *PeerJ.* 2020;8:e10164.

57. Savage MJ, James R, Magistro D, et al. Mental health and movement behaviour during the COVID-19 pandemic in UK university students: Prospective cohort study. *Ment Health Phy Act*. 2020;19:100357.
58. Lim SS, Theis K, Dunlop-Thomas C, et al. Unexpected changes in physical and psychological measures among Georgia lupus patients during the early weeks of the COVID-19 pandemic in the United States, March 30–April 21, 2020. *Arthritis Rheumatol.* 2020;72 (suppl 10). https://acrabstracts.org/abstract/unexpected-changes-in-physical-and-psychological-measures-among-georgia-lupus-patients-during-the-early-weeks-of-the-covid-19-pandemic-in-the-united-states-march-30-april-21-2020/. Accessed February 6, 2022.
59. Norman GR, Sloan JA, Wyrwich KW. Interpretation of changes in health-related quality of life: the remarkable universality of half a standard deviation. *Med Care*. 2003;41:582-592.
60. Riecher-Rössler A. Prospects for the classification of mental disorders in women. *Eur Psychiatry.* 2010;25:189-196.
61. Boyd A, van de Velde S, Vilagut G, et al. Gender differences in mental disorders and suicidality in Europe: results from a large cross-sectional population-based study. *J Affect Disord*. 2015;173:245-254.
62. Seedat S, Scott KM, Angermeyer MC, et al. Cross-national associations between gender and mental disorders in the World Health Organization World Mental Health Surveys. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2009;66:785-795.
63. Wittchen HU, Jacobi F, Rehm J, et al. The size and burden of mental disorders and other disorders of the brain in Europe 2010. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol*. 2011;21:655-679.
64. Kuehner C. Why is depression more common among women than men? *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2016;4:146-158.
65. Riecher-Rössler A. Sex and gender differences in mental disorders. *Lancet Psychiatry*.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

2016;4:8-9.

66. Cohen J. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioural Sciences*. New York, NY: Academic Press; 1988.
67. Bentall R. Has the pandemic really cause a 'tsunami' of mental health problems? *The Guardian*. February 9, 2021. https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2021/feb/09/pandemic-mental-health-problems-research-coronavirus. Accessed February 6, 2022.
68. Thombs BD, Kwakkenbos L, Levis AW, et al. Addressing overestimation of the prevalence of depression based on self-report screening questionnaires. *CMAJ* 2018;190:E44-E49.
69. Levis B, Yan XW, He C, et al. Comparison of depression prevalence estimates in meta-analyses based on screening tools and rating scales versus diagnostic interviews: a meta-research review. *BMC Med* 2019;17:65.
70. Levis B, Benedetti A, Ioannidis JPA, et al. Patient Health Questionnaire-9 scores do not accurately estimate depression prevalence: individual participant data meta-analysis. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2020;122:115-128.
71. Lyubenova A, Neupane D, Levis B, et al. Depression prevalence based on the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale compared to Structured Clinical Interview for DSM Disorders classification: Systematic review and individual participant data meta-analysis. *Int J Methods Psychiatr Res* 2021;30:e1860.
72. Brehaut E, Neupane D, Levis B, et al. Depression prevalence using the HADS-D compared to SCID major depression classification: An individual participant data meta-analysis. *J Psychosom Res* 2020;139:110256.
73. Marmet S, Wicki M, Gmel G, et al. The psychological impact of the COVID-19 crisis on young Swiss men participating in a cohort study. *PsyArXiv* 2020. Preprint. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/kwxhd.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figurea 1a-1d. Forest plots of standardized mean difference of the difference in change in continuous anxiety symptom scores (1a), depression symptom scores (1b), general mental health scores (1c), and stress scores (1d) between females or women and males or men. Positive numbers indicate greater negative change in mental health in females or women compared to males or men.

Figures 2a-2e. Forest plots of standardized mean difference of the difference in change in proportion above a cut-off for anxiety (2a), depression (2b), general mental health (2c), and stress (2d) between females or women and males or men. Positive numbers indicate greater negative change in mental health in females or women compared to males or men. Figure 2c reflects dichotomous COVID-19 mental health measured in early 2020, whereas 2e reflects measurements from late 2020 for Daly[48] and van der Velden.[50]

Figure 3. Illustration of the magnitude of change for SMD = 0.15 assuming a normal distribution. The hypothetical blue distribution represents pre-COVID-19 scores, and the grey distribution represents post-COVID-19 scores with a mean symptom increase of SMD = 0.15.

Table 1. Characteristics of Included Studies (N=12)

First Author	Outcome Domains				Description of Study Design and Participants	Country	Pre- and Post-COVID-19 Dates of Data Collection	N (%) Females or Women (F/W) and Males or Men (M/M)	Mean (SD) Participant Age or Age Range (%)	Use of Sex or Gender
	Anxiety Symptoms	Depression Symptoms	General Mental Health	Stress						
Dong[55]			SCL-90-R		First-year undergraduate students from a single university recruited online who completed two assessments (one prior to COVID-19 and one during)	China	09/2019 NR/2020	F/W: 3,162-3,277 (75.5-77.4) M/M: 923-1,064 (22.6-24.5)	19 (1)	Gender
Lim[58]	PROMIS Anxiety	PROMIS Depression		PSS	Patients with systemic lupus erythematosus from the Georgians Organized Against Lupus cohort who complete annual surveys	United States	NR/2018-2019 03-04/2020	F/W: 295 (93.4) M/M: 21 (6.6)	47 (13)	Sex
Magson[54]	SCAS-C	SMFQ-C			Adolescents aged 13-16 years who complete annual assessments as part of an ongoing longitudinal cohort that began 4 years prior	Australia	NR/2019 05/2020	Girls: 126 (50.8) Boys: 122 (49.2)	14 (1)	Inconsistent
Megías-Robles[51]			PANAS-NA		Community sample aged 19-67 years who completed two assessments (one prior to COVID-19 and one during)	Spain	11/2019 04/2020	F/W: 67 (65.7) M/M: 35 (34.3)	30 (13)	Gender
Pierce[47] Daly[48]			GHQ-12		National probability-based sample of adults aged ≥ 18 years who are part of the United Kingdom Household Longitudinal Study; an ongoing longitudinal study which has been collecting data continuously since 2009	United Kingdom	Pre-COVID-19 waves[a] 04-09/2020	F/W: 7,181[b] (46.7) M/M: 8,195[b] (53.3) F/W: 6,380 (58.4) M/M: 4,538 (41.6)	18-34 (11.5)[c] 35-49 (22.4)[c] 50-64 (34.5)[c] 65+ (31.6)[c]	Gender Inconsistent
Rimfeld[52]	GAD-7	SMFQ			Adult twins born between 1994-1996 who, at age 18 months, were enrolled in the Twins Early Development Study; a longitudinal study which has collected over 14 waves of assessment in 20 years of data collection	United Kingdom	NR/2018 04-05/2020	F/W: 2,513-2,578[d] (69.8-70.5) M/M: 1,050-1,116[d] (29.5-30.2)	24-26 (100.0)	Inconsistent
Saraswathi[56]	DASS-21 Anxiety	DASS-21 Depression		DASS-21 Stress	Convenience sample of undergraduate university medical students who completed two assessments (one prior to COVID-19 and one during)	India	12/2019 06/2020	F/W: 139 (64.1) M/M: 78 (35.9)	20 (2)	Inconsistent
Savage[57]			WEMWBS	PSS	Undergraduate students from a single university recruited by email invitation and completed three or more assessments as part of the Student Health Study, a longitudinal cohort study	United Kingdom	10/2019 04/2020	F/W: 154 (72.0) M/M: 60 (28.0)	18-21 (64.5) 22-25 (22.0) 26-35 (7.5) 35+ (6.1)	Inconsistent
Shanahan[53]				PSS	Young adults who completed 9 assessments since 2004 as part of the Zurich Project on the Social Development from Childhood to Adulthood, a longitudinal cohort study	Switzerland	NR/2018 04/2020	F/W: 378 (48.1) M/M: 408 (51.9)	22 (0)	Sex
van der Velden[49] van der Velden[50]			MHI-5		National probability-based sample of adults aged ≥ 18 years who were enrolled and completed assessments for the Longitudinal Internet Studies for the Social Sciences since 2007	The Netherlands	03/2019 11-12/2019 03/2020 11-12/2020	F/W: 2,020 (50.7) M/M: 1,963 (49.3) F/W: 2, 062 (50.7) M/M: 2,002 (49.3)	18-34 (24.9)[e] 35-49 (22.9)[e] 50-64 (26.1)[e] 65+(26.1)[e]	Gender Sex

DASS-21 Anxiety = Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Scale - Anxiety subscale; DASS-21 Depression = Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Scale - Depression subscale; DASS-21 Stress = Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Scale - Stress subscale; GAD-7 = Generalized Anxiety Disorder-7; GHQ-12 = General Health Questionnaire-12; MHI-5 = Mental Health Index-5; PANAS-NA = Positive and Negative Affect Schedule – Negative affect subscale; PROMIS Anxiety = Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System – Anxiety subscale; PROMIS Depression = Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information

Mental Health Symptom Changes Following COVID-19 by Sex or Gender

System – Depression subscale; PSS = Perceived Stress Scale; SCAS-C = Spence Children's Anxiety Scale - Child; SCL-90-R = Symptom Check List-90 Revised; SMFQ = Short Mood and Feelings Questionnaire; SMFQ-C = Short Mood and Feelings Questionnaire – Child Version; WEMWBS = Warwick Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale.

[a]Analyses compared COVID-19 symptom levels to preceding trends across multiple assessments. [b]Number included in fixed effects regression analysis from where the majority of data were extracted. [c]Age groups reported for Daly[48]; for Pierce,[47] 16-24 = 8.8%, 25-34 = 11.2%, 35-44 = 16.0%, 45-54 = 20.1%, 55-69 = 28.9%, 70+ =15.1%. [d]Number of participants differed by outcome. [e]Based on van der Velden.[49]

Table 2. Outcomes From Included Studies by Sex or Gender[a]

First Author	Pre- and Post-COVID-19 Data Collection	Sex or Gender	N	Continuous Outcome Measure	Pre-COVID-19 Mean (SD)	Post-COVID-19 Mean (SD)	Mean (SD) Change	Hedges' g Standardized Mean Difference (95% CI)	Dichotomous Outcome Measure	% Pre-COVID-19 (95% CI)	% Post-COVID-19 (95% CI)	% Change (95%CI)
Anxiety Symptoms												
Lim[58]	NR/2018-2019	Females/Women	295	PROMIS Anxiety	50.20 (11.50)	50.40 (11.10)	0.20 (10.10)	0.02 (-0.14, 0.18)	----------	----------	----------	----------
	03-04/2020	Males/Men	21		50.50 (9.90)	48.60 (11.00)	-1.90 (12.10)	-0.17 (-0.80, 0.45)				
Magson[54]	NR/2019 05/2020	Females/Women	126	SCAS-C	5.55 (4.05)	6.52 (4.31)	0.97 (4.18)	0.23 (-0.02, 0.48)	----------	----------	----------	----------
		Males/Men	122		3.63 (3.13)	3.64 (3.16)	0.01 (3.15)	0.00 (-0.25, 0.26)				
Rimfeld[52]	NR/2018 04-05/2020	Females/Women	2,513	GAD-7	8.15 (7.53)	9.69 (7.69)	1.54 (7.61)	0.20 (0.15, 0.26)	----------	----------	----------	----------
		Males/Men	1,050		5.88 (6.66)	6.30 (6.58)	0.42 (6.62)	0.06 (-0.02, 0.15)				
Saraswathi[56]	12/2019 06/2020	Females/Women	139	DASS-21 Anxiety	4.59 (6.29)	5.94 (6.93)	1.35 (6.62)	0.20 (-0.03, 0.44)	DASS-21 Anxiety > 7	18.7 (13.1, 26.0)	32.4 (25.2, 40.5)	13.7 (4.4, 22.7)
		Males/Men	78		4.62 (6.04)	6.41 (7.50)	1.79 (6.81)	0.26 (-0.06, 0.58)		25.6 (17.3, 36.3)	34.6 (25.0, 45.7)	9.0 (-4.0, 21.5)
Depression Symptoms												
Lim[58]	NR/2018-2019	Females/Women	295	PROMIS Depression	50.80 (10.70)	49.30 (9.80)	-1.50 (9.30)	-0.15 (-0.31, 0.02)	----------	----------	----------	----------
	03-04/2020	Males/Men	21		50.70 (8.60)	49.90 (9.70)	-0.80 (8.20)	-0.08 (-0.70, 0.54)				
Magson[54]	NR/2019 05/2020	Females/Women	126	SMFQ-C	4.77 (5.00)	8.16 (6.46)	3.39 (5.78)	0.58 (0.33, 0.84)	----------	----------	----------	----------
		Males/Men	122		2.81 (3.18)	4.02 (4.76)	1.21 (4.05)	0.30 (0.04, 0.55)				
Rimfeld[52]	NR/2018 04-05/2020	Females/Women	2,578	SMFQ	4.65 (4.20)	4.81 (4.07)	0.16 (4.14)	0.04 (-0.02, 0.09)	----------	----------	----------	----------
		Males/Men	1,116		3.71 (3.70)	3.33 (3.40)	-0.38 (3.55)	-0.11 (-0.19, -0.02)				
Saraswathi[56]	12/2019 06/2020	Females/Women	139	DASS-21 Depression	7.71 (7.57)	7.94 (8.77)	0.23 (8.19)	0.03 (-0.21, 0.26)	DASS-21 Depression > 9	36.7 (29.1, 45.0)	34.5 (27.1, 42.8)	-2.2 (-11.7, 7.4)
		Males/Men	78		7.28 (8.40)	8.54 (9.17)	1.26 (8.79)	0.14 (-0.17, 0.45)		26.9 (18.3, 37.7)	37.2 (27.3, 48.3)	10.3 (-2.9, 22.9)
General Mental Health												
Dong[55]	09/2019 NR/2020	Females/Women	3,162-3,277	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	SCL-90-R ≥ 160	19.7 (18.4, 21.1)	27.9 (26.4, 29.5)	8.2 (6.3, 10.0)

		Males/Men	923-1,064							14.3 (12.3, 16.5)	21.2 (18.7, 24.0)	6.9 (4.0, 9.9)
Megías-Robles[51]	11/2019 04/2020	Females/Women	67	PANAS-NA	1.93 (0.65)	2.28 (0.79)	0.34 (0.86)	0.46 (0.12, 0.81)	----------	----------	----------	----------
		Males/Men	35		1.88 (0.67)	2.11 (0.66)	0.23 (0.66)	0.34 (-0.14, 0.82)				
Pierce[47] Daly[48]	Pre-COVID-19 Waves	Females/Women	7,181[2,b]	GHQ-12	12.00 (5.91)	13.60 (7.14)	1.60 (6.55)[c] 0.88 (NR)[d]	0.24 (0.21, 0.28) 0.13 (0.10, 0.17)	GHQ-12 ≥ 4	24.5 (22.5, 26.4)[e]	36.8 (34.8, 38.9)[e]	12.4 (9.9, 14.9)[e]
			6,380							24.5 (22.5, 26.4)[e]	25.0 (23.3, 26.8)[e]	0.5 (-1.8, 2.9)[e]
	04/2020 09/2020	Males/Men	8,195[2,2]		10.80 (4.99)	11.50 (5.75)	0.70 (5.38)[c] 0.03 (NR)[d]	0.13 (0.10, 0.16) 0.01 (-0.03, 0.04)		16.7 (14.6, 18.7)[e]	21.1 (19.0, 23.3)[e]	4.5 (2.0, 7.0)[e]
			4,538							16.7 (14.6, 18.7)[e]	16.0 (14.0, 17.9)[e]	-0.7 (-2.9, 1.5)[e]
Savage[57]	10/2019 04/2020	Females/Women	154	WEMWBS[f]	43.00 (9.00)	40.00 (10.00)	-3.00 (9.51)	0.31 (0.09, 0.54)	----------	----------	----------	----------
		Males/Men	60		47.00 (9.00)	44.00 (10.00)	-3.00 (9.51)	0.31 (-0.05, 0.67)				
van der Velden[49]	03/2019 11-12/2019	Females/Women	2,020 2,062	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	MHI-5 ≤ 59	18.9 (17.3, 20.7) 19.1 (17.4, 20.8)	18.3 (16.7, 20.1) 17.8 (16.2, 19.5)	-0.6 (-2.5, 1.3) -1.3 (-3.1, 0.6)
van der Velden[50]	03/2020 11-12/2020	Males/Men	1,962-1,963 2,002							14.6 (13.1, 16.3) 14.7 (13.2, 16.3)	15.6 (14.1, 17.3) 15.9 (14.4, 17.6)	1.0 (-0.8, 2.7) 1.2 (-0.5, 3.0)
Stress												
Lim[58]	NR/2018-2019 03-04/2020	Females/Women	295	PSS	17.50 (8.00)	16.40 (8.20)	-1.10 (6.60)	-0.14 (-0.30, 0.03)	----------	----------	----------	----------
		Males/Men	21		17.70 (6.60)	18.10 (6.80)	0.40 (8.00)	0.06 (-0.56, 0.68)				
Saraswathi[56]	12/2019 06/2020	Females/Women	139	DASS-21 Stress	6.95 (7.22)	8.88 (7.99)	1.93 (7.61)	0.25 (0.02, 0.49)	DASS-21 Stress > 14	19.4 (13.7, 26.8)	22.3 (16.2, 29.9)	2.9 (-4.9, 10.6)
		Males/Men	78		7.95 (7.54)	10.08 (8.50)	2.13 (8.03)	0.26 (-0.05, 0.58)		23.1 (15.1, 33.6)	29.5 (20.5, 40.4)	6.4 (-5.6, 18.2)
Savage[57]	10/2019 04/2020	Females/Women	154	PSS	21.00 (7.00)	24.00 (7.00)	3.00 (7.00)	0.43 (0.20, 0.65)	----------	----------	----------	----------
		Males/Men	60		17.00 (6.00)	21.00 (7.00)	4.00 (6.52)	0.61 (0.24, 0.97)				
Shanahan[53]	NR/2018 04/2020	Females/Women	378	PSS	3.02 (0.98)	3.10 (0.94)	0.08 (0.96)	0.08 (-0.06, 0.23)	----------	----------	----------	----------
		Males/Men	408		2.57 (0.86)	2.74 (0.86)	0.17 (0.86)	0.20 (0.06, 0.34)				

DASS-21 Anxiety = Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Scale - Anxiety subscale; DASS-21 Depression = Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Scale - Depression subscale; DASS-21 Stress = Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Scale - Stress subscale; GAD-7 = Generalized Anxiety Disorder-7; GHQ-12 = General Health Questionnaire-12; MHI-5 = Mental Health Index-5; PANAS-NA = Positive and Negative Affect Schedule – Negative affect subscale; PROMIS Anxiety = Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System – Anxiety subscale; PROMIS Depression = Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System – Depression subscale; PSS = Perceived Stress Scale; SCAS-C = Spence Children's Anxiety Scale - Child; SCL-90-R = Symptom Check List-90 Revised; SMFQ = Short Mood and Feelings Questionnaire; SMFQ-C = Short Mood and Feelings Questionnaire – Child Version; WEMWBS = Warwick Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale.

[a]Positive Hedge's g sizes and increases in proportions above a threshold indicate worse mental health in COVID-19 compared to pre-COVID-19. Effects for measures where high scores = positive outcomes were reversed to reflect this. [b] Number included in fixed effects regression analysis from where majority of data were extracted. [c]Based on difference between 2020 and 2019 outcomes. [d]Based on estimate from fixes effects regression model that estimates within-person change accounting for pre-COVID-19 trends.[e]Included proportion outcomes from Daly[48] since they reported for two time points. [f] Higher scale scores reflect better mental health; thus, direction of effect sizes reversed.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Figure 1a: Continuous anxiety symptoms

Study	Females/Women Total	Mean Change	SD	Males/Men Total	Mean Change	SD	SMD	95% CI
Lim, 2020	295	0.20	10.10	21	-1.90	12.10	0.20	[-0.24; 0.65]
Magson, 2021	126	0.97	4.18	122	0.01	3.15	0.26	[0.01; 0.51]
Rimfeld, 2021	2513	1.54	7.61	1050	0.42	6.62	0.15	[0.08; 0.22]
Saraswathi, 2020	139	1.35	6.62	78	1.79	6.81	-0.07	[-0.34; 0.21]
Random effects model	**3073**			**1271**			**0.15**	**[0.07; 0.22]**

Heterogeneity: I^2 = 3%



Figure 1b: Continuous depressive symptoms

Study	Females/Women Total	Mean Change	SD	Males/Men Total	Mean Change	SD	SMD	95% CI
Lim, 2020	295	-1.50	9.30	21	-0.80	8.20	-0.08	[-0.52; 0.37]
Magson, 2021	126	3.39	5.78	122	1.21	4.05	0.43	[0.18; 0.69]
Rimfeld, 2021	2578	0.16	4.14	1116	-0.38	3.55	0.14	[0.07; 0.21]
Saraswathi, 2020	139	0.23	8.19	78	1.26	8.79	-0.12	[-0.40; 0.16]
Random effects model	**3138**			**1337**			**0.12**	**[-0.09; 0.33]**

Heterogeneity: I^2 = 69%



Figure 1c: Continuous general mental health

Study	Females/Women Total	Mean Change	SD	Males/Men Total	Mean Change	SD	SMD	95% CI
Megias-Robles, 2021	67	0.34	0.86	35	0.23	0.66	0.14	[-0.27; 0.55]
Pierce, 2020	7181	1.60	6.55	8195	0.70	5.38	0.15	[0.12; 0.18]
Savage, 2020	154	-3.00	9.51	60	-3.00	9.51	0.00	[-0.30; 0.30]
Random effects model	**7402**			**8290**			**0.15**	**[0.12; 0.18]**

Heterogeneity: I^2 = 0%



Figure 1d: Continuous stress

Study	Females/Women Total	Mean Change	SD	Males/Men Total	Mean Change	SD	SMD	95% CI
Lim, 2020	295	-1.10	6.60	21	0.40	8.00	-0.22	[-0.67; 0.22]
Saraswathi, 2020	139	1.93	7.61	78	2.13	8.03	-0.03	[-0.30; 0.25]
Savage, 2020	154	3.00	7.00	60	4.00	6.52	-0.15	[-0.44; 0.15]
Shanahan, 2020	378	0.08	0.96	408	0.17	0.86	-0.10	[-0.24; 0.04]
Random effects model	**966**			**567**			**-0.10**	**[-0.21; 0.01]**

Heterogeneity: I^2 = 0%



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Figure 2a: Dichotomous anxiety symptoms

Study	Females/Women N	% Change	Males/Men N	% Change	Difference	95% CI
Saraswathi, 2020	139	13.7	78	9	-0.047	[-0.204; 0.11]



Figure 2b: Dichotomous depression symptoms

Study	Females/Women N	% Change	Males/Men N	% Change	Difference	95% CI
Saraswathi, 2020	139	-2.2	78	10.3	0.124	[-0.032; 0.281]



Figure 2c: Dichotomous general mental health

Study	Females/Women N	% Change	Males/Men N	% Change	Difference	95% CI
Daly, 2021	6380	12.4	4538	4.5	-0.079	[-0.099; -0.059]
Dong, 2020	3162	8.2	923	6.9	-0.012	[-0.047; 0.022]
van der Velden, 2020	2020	-0.6	1962	1.0	0.016	[-0.010; 0.041]
Random effects model	**11562**		**7423**		**-0.026**	**[-0.089; 0.037]**

Heterogeneity: I^2 = 94%



Figure 2d: Dichotomous stress

Study	Females/Women N	% Change	Males/Men N	% Change	Difference	95% CI
Saraswathi, 2020	139	2.9	78	6.4	0.035	[-0.101; 0.171]



Figure 2e: Dichotomous general mental health (Sensitivity analysis)

Study	Females/Women N	% Change	Males/Men N	% Change	Difference	95% CI
Daly, 2021	6380	0.5	4538	-0.7	-0.012	[-0.029; 0.005]
Dong, 2020	3162	8.2	923	6.9	-0.013	[-0.047; 0.022]
van der Velden, 2021	2062	-1.3	2002	1.2	0.025	[0.000; 0.050]
Random effects model	**11604**		**7463**		**0.000**	**[-0.025; 0.025]**

Heterogeneity: I^2 = 67%



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259384; this version posted February 23, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .