medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.15.21262087; this version posted August 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

The impact of ongoing COVID-19 lockdown on family finances and mental health

*Anna M. H. Price[1,2,3], Diana Contreras-Suárez[4], Anna Zhu[5], Natalie Schreurs[1,2], Mary-Anne Measey[1], Sue Woolfenden[6,7,8], Jade Burley[6,7,8], Hannah Bryson[1,2], Daryl Efron[2,3,9], Anthea Rhodes[2,3,9,¶], Sharon Goldfeld[1,2,3,¶]

Affiliations^:

1. Centre for Community Child Health, The Royal Children's Hospital, Parkville, Vic
2. Population Health, Murdoch Children's Research Institute, Parkville, Vic
3. Department of Paediatrics, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, Vic
4. Melbourne Institute: Applied Economic & Social Research, University of Melbourne, Vic
5. School of Economics, Marketing and Finance, RMIT University, Melbourne, Vic
6. Sydney Children's Hospital Network, Sydney, NSW
7. Population Child Health Research Group, School of Women and Children's Health, University of NSW, Randwick, NSW
8. BestSTART-SW, Ingham Institute of Applied Medical Research, Liverpool, NSW
9. Department of General Medicine, The Royal Children's Hospital, Parkville, Vic

^All Australia

*Corresponding author

[¶] AR and SG are joint senior authors.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.15.21262087; this version posted August 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Objectives: Australia's public health restrictions ('lockdown') in 2020 successfully contained the spread of COVID-19. These included a national 'initial' lockdown (March-May), and 'ongoing' lockdown (July-November) for metropolitan Victorian residents only. Australia's experience offers an opportunity to assess impacts of lockdown on families with children, in the relative absence of disease morbidity and mortality. This study (1) described the experience of initial lockdown and (2) evaluated the impact of ongoing lockdown, on family finances and mental health.

Methods: Data were drawn from the June and September 2020 Royal Children's Hospital National Child Health Polls. Caregivers of children from the states of Victoria and New South Wales reported on job/income loss; material deprivation (inability to pay for essential items); income-poverty; mental health (Kessler-6); impact on caregiver/child mental health; and caregiver/child coping. Data from N=1207/902 caregivers in June/September were analyzed; Aim (1) with weighted descriptives; Aim (2) with Difference-in-Difference adjusted linear regression models (New South Wales provided the comparator).

Results: Following initial lockdown, one-quarter of families reported job/income loss; one-third reported material deprivation. Negative impacts on mental health were reported for half the caregivers and one-third of children. Few caregivers or children had difficulties coping. During Victoria's ongoing lockdown, job/income loss increased by 11% (95%CI: 3-18%); Kessler-6 poor mental health by 6% (95%CI: 0.3-12%) and negative mental health impacts by 12% for caregivers (95%CI: 6-23%) and 14% for children (95%CI: 4-20%). Female (versus male) caregivers, metropolitan (versus regional/rural) families, and families with elementary school-aged children (versus pre-/high-school) were most affected.

Conclusions: Ongoing lockdown had negative impacts on mental health, employment, and income, but not deprivation or poverty, likely because of the government income supplements introduced early in the pandemic. Balancing the benefits and harms of lockdown requires planned responses to outbreaks, and evidence-informed financial and mental health supports.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.15.21262087; this version posted August 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

The coronavirus SARS-COV-2 (COVID-19) was first identified in Australia in late January 2020. From March 2020 onwards, Australian governments at the federal and state levels implemented a range of public health restrictions. These included stay-at-home orders, which are also known as 'lockdown'. At the time, Australia's response was among the most stringent internationally.(1) By 31 December 2020, the measures successfully contained infection to an overall incidence rate of 111 cases and 3.5 deaths per 100,000 people.(2) In contrast, other high-income countries with more lenient public health restrictions, such as the United States (US) and United Kingdom (UK), recorded rates of 5895 and 3730 cases per 100,000 people, respectively.(2) Reviews of previous pandemics and the data emerging from COVID-19 show how quarantine and isolation can harm household finances and individuals' mental health.(3-9) This is particularly the case for families with children, where there are mixed views on the balance of harms versus benefits of lockdown.(6, 10-12) Unlike many high-income countries, Australia's low incidence of COVID-19 makes it possible to examine the effects of lockdown mostly independent of the compounding disease impacts. We aimed to contribute to this evidence base using nationally-representative survey data collected from Australian families in June and September 2020.

The evolution of Australia's COVID-19 public health restrictions is presented in S1 Fig. From 23 March to 1 June 2020, the national 'initial' lockdown included mandatory quarantine for returned travelers; travel bans; self-isolation for suspected/confirmed cases; stay-at-home orders; and closure of schools and 'non-essential' businesses.(13, 14) Five weeks after initial lockdown eased, a second wave of infections in the state of Victoria rapidly surpassed active cases in the first wave, with the national peak reaching 721 new cases (2.8 per 100,000) in 24 hours. From 8 July-23 November 2020, Victorian residents entered an 'ongoing' and more severe lockdown. The public health measures were strictest for metropolitan areas (in the state's capital city of Melbourne) compared with regional and rural Victoria. Previous lockdown measures were reinstated, the stay-at-home orders were further restricted, a night-time curfew was added, and early childhood education and care providers closed

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.15.21262087; this version posted August 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

(see S1 Fig.). Compliance with Australia's lockdown measures was driven by state enforcement, through police surveillance and fines.

To protect against the economic fallout of lockdown, the Australian federal government rapidly implemented a suite of short-term financial supports.(15, 16) Shown in S1 Fig., they included an unemployment supplement ('JobSeeker') which doubled recipients' social welfare benefits from $550 to $1,100 a fortnight;(15) a wage supplement for eligible businesses to retain their workforce ('JobKeeper');(16) allowing early access to superannuation;(17) and free childcare for working families.(18) Banks and creditors also allowed loan repayments to be deferred for up to 10 months. These social policy changes represent some of the largest (albeit temporary) in Australia's history. Indeed the JobKeeper and JobSeeker supplements were so significant that, by September 2020, levels of poverty and housing stress in Australia were substantially lower than the levels directly preceding COVID-19.(15)

While these social policies buffered Australians from poverty, global data emerging on COVID-19 show that lockdown has substantial and negative impacts on household finances and mental health. A cohort of over 70,000 UK adults surveyed from March to August 2020 found that anxiety and depression symptoms were highest in the first weeks of lockdown, and worse for women and young adults.(19) An Australian cross-sectional survey of 1200 adults repeated weekly from March 2020 found similar patterns for self-reported financial stress and material deprivation (unable to afford essential items).(20) The same survey data showed that mental distress tripled for parents from 8% pre-COVID-19 to 24% during the pandemic.(20) While children have been less affected by COVID-19 morbidity and mortality,(21, 22) they are more developmentally vulnerable to their socioeconomic environment than adults.(23, 24) Previous studies show that the stress and isolation of lockdown can negatively impact children's mental health for many months,(25) and school closures can compromise children's educational opportunities for years.(6, 10)

To our knowledge, no studies have investigated the impact of COVID-19 lockdown on both the financial and mental health experiences of families with children, in the relative absence of disease morbidity and mortality.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.15.21262087; this version posted August 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

This evidence can inform economic and population health responses to the current pandemic as well as future crises. This study uses the natural experiment that occurred in Australia, whereby the state of Victoria experienced ongoing and more severe lockdown, to address this evidence gap. Data are drawn from the Royal Children's Hospital (RCH) National Child Health Poll, the only nationally representative survey to measure COVID-19 impacts for caregivers with children aged 0-17 years. The Poll was conducted in June (when the initial lockdown had ended for all Australians) and in September 2020 (when only metropolitan Victorians were in ongoing, stricter lockdown). Data from the neighboring state of New South Wales (NSW), which experienced only the initial lockdown, provide the comparator. The two states are inherently similar in terms of their population, size, and geographic location.

The specific study aims were to (1) describe families' financial and mental health experiences directly after the initial lockdown and (2) evaluate the impact of ongoing lockdown on family finances and mental health (a) overall and (b) by caregiver gender (female versus male), child age (0-4, 5-12 and 13-17 years), and metropolitan (versus regional/rural) location. We hypothesized that the ongoing lockdown would be associated with increased financial hardship and worse mental health. We anticipated that these impacts would be worse for female caregivers and for metropolitan families.

Methods

Design: The RCH National Child Health Poll is conducted by the Royal Children's Hospital in Melbourne, Australia. It collects periodic, cross-sectional surveys of nationally representative samples of approximately 2000 Australian caregivers of children aged 0-17 years. Each survey explores a current or emerging public health issue of national relevance to child health. The process for selecting Poll topics is responsive to and informed by population health needs and the nation's social agenda. Research themes and questions are chosen via review of the scientific and grey literature in consultation with multidisciplinary experts across the country. Surveys are

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.15.21262087; this version posted August 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

administered in English equivalent to a sixth-grade (elementary school) level. Surveys reported in this paper were conducted during 15-23 June and 15-29 September 2020 with two different samples and focused on families' experience of financial hardship and mental health 3 and 6 months into the COVID-19 pandemic. The Royal Children's Hospital Human Research Ethics Committee approved the research (HREC 35254). After the Polls were conducted, we realized the opportunity to investigate the impact of ongoing lockdown relative to initial lockdown on families' financial and mental health experiences.

Sampling frame and data collection methods: The surveys were conducted using web-based survey technology provided by the private vendor, Online Research Unit (ORU), under contract to the RCH. ORU has an established research panel of more than 200,000 Australian residents, with approximately 30% caring for a child in the target range (less than 18 years of age). Recruitment involves offline and online methods to select a nationally representative distribution by jurisdiction, caregiver gender and age. Panel members have a unique identifying number that means they can only access and complete the Poll once. Only one person per household can join the panel. To be eligible for the RCH Poll, panel members must have internet access to complete the online surveys. They must be living in Australia and aged 18 years or older. The field period for each Poll is approximately two weeks. Respondents are remunerated for their participation with points that can be exchanged for department store gift vouchers. All responses are anonymous.

Measures: Both Polls analyzed in this study captured demographic information including caregiver and child age and gender, number of children in care, caring for a child with additional health needs (chronic illness, health condition, disability), partner status, Healthcare Card status (identifies low-income), caregiver education level, Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander status, country of birth, language spoken at home, living in metropolitan/regional/rural areas and postcode. Family finances were assessed using:

1. Nine items adapted from the CoRonavIruS Health Impact Survey (CRISIS) caregiver version (26): "What changes in employment or income have occurred in your household due to coronavirus/COVID-19?" (response options "yes" versus "no") including: "job loss by one caregiver"; "job loss by two caregivers",

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.15.21262087; this version posted August 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

"difficulty paying bills or for necessities", "working longer hours", "filing for unemployment"; "applying for Government assistance"; "reduced work hours"; "reduced total household income" or "none of the above". A binary variable describing any job loss (by one or two caregivers) or reduction in income due to COVID-19 (versus not) was created to enable comparison with other Australian studies, e.g. (27)

2. Eight items adapted from the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) Survey Wave 18 Household Questionnaire Material Deprivation Module (28) asking "In the last month, because of money pressure did you miss or put off" (response options: "yes" versus "no"): mortgage or rent repayments; electricity, gas, water bills; food; healthcare; prescription medicines; home or car insurance; mobile phone bills; and internet. Two summary variables were created: (a) a binary "any material deprivation" variable identifying inability to pay for one or more essential items (versus "none"), and (b) a "total material deprivation count" summing the number of essential items where payment was missed or put off (possible range 0-8).

3. Current total household income before tax, categorized into 10 options ranging from "less than $500 p/week" to "more than $3,000 p/week", plus "prefer not to say". A binary variable was created to summarize low income ("less than AU$1,000 p/week" versus more) based on Australian thresholds for HealthCare Card eligibility and definitions of income-poverty.(29)

Mental health was assessed using:

4. 6 items of the Kessler-6 (K6) assessing caregivers' self-reported anxiety and depressive symptoms encountered in the last 4 weeks. Scored on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 "none of the time" to 5 "all of the time". Summarized into (a) a continuous total score, and (b) a binary variable indicating "poor mental health" (total score 19 or more) versus not (total score 6-18).(30)

5. A 5-point item adapted from UK Young Minds Matter 31) describing the impact of COVID-19 on mental health, dichotomized into negative ("small negative/large negative") versus positive ("none/small positive/large positive"). Reported by caregivers for (a) themselves and (b) each child.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.15.21262087; this version posted August 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

6. A 4-point study-designed item reported by caregivers and dichotomized into "struggling or not coping" versus "coping or thriving". Reported by caregivers for (a) themselves and (b) each child.

Analysis methods:

Data preparation: Families living in the Australian states of Victoria and NSW were retained in the analytic sample. For each family, we assigned data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas (SEIFA) Index of Relative Disadvantage, a national area level index derived from census data for all individuals living in a postcode, with higher scores indicating greater advantage. To create a consistent analytic sample, the 41 families (comprising 63 children) who preferred not to report their country of birth, and the 1 family (comprising 2 children) without SEIFA, were excluded (see S2 Fig.). To reduce the effects of non-response and non-coverage, all demographics, financial hardship, and mental health experiences were weighted using national demographic distributions for gender, state/territory, and SEIFA, as per the most recent Australian Bureau of Statistics data.

Analysis: Demographics, family finances and mental health (Aim 1) were described using proportions for categorical data and mean and standard deviation (SD) for continuous data. The change in family finances and mental health as related to lockdown (Aim 2a) was estimated using Difference-in-Difference analyses implemented as an interaction term between time (September versus June) and treatment group dummy variables (Victoria versus NSW) using linear regression models. The Difference-in-Difference approach is appropriate given our aim (to examine potential causal impacts) and because of the policy set-up. The ongoing lockdown was introduced only for Victoria and not for NSW. This created a natural experiment that allowed comparison of a group of families who were affected by ongoing lockdown (Victoria) with an unaffected group (NSW). The Difference-in-Difference estimator compares families' outcomes before and after the policy implementation.

The Difference-in-Difference models were run unadjusted and adjusted for all potential confounding variables available in the dataset: child and caregiver age and gender (male/female; noting no other genders were reported); number of children; child with additional health needs (versus not); one-caregiver family (versus not); owns a

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.15.21262087; this version posted August 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Health Care Card (versus not); caregiver education (<Year 10/Year 10/Year 12/trade or apprenticeship/certificate or diploma/undergraduate/postgraduate); Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander (versus not); caregiver born outside of Australia (versus in Australia); Home language other than English (versus speaks English at home); lives regionally or rurally (versus metropolitan); and SEIFA quintile. Caregiver mental health (total K6 score) and effects of family cluster were accounted for in all child models using robust estimation. These models were repeated for three subgroups (Aim 2b): (i) caregiver gender (female/male); (ii) child age (grouped at 0-4 years (preschool), 5-12 years (elementary school), 13-17 years (secondary/high school); (iii) and metropolitan/regional/rural location as a proxy for severity of lockdown, noting that metropolitan Victorians endured a more severe and longer lockdown than their regional and rural counterparts but also that the whole state was affected. Subgroup models were adjusted for the same variables except the grouping variable, which provided the strata for analysis.

We chose to run linear regression models as interpretation is simpler than logistic regression and most of the predicted y-values were bounded within 0-1. To check the robustness of these models, we ran marginal effects probit models for the dichotomous outcomes for the whole sample (not presented), which confirmed the linear regression output. For all models, the adjusted analyses are presented as the main results (unadjusted analyses are not included). As 293 caregivers preferred not to disclose their income, these analyses should be interpreted with caution. Data were analyzed with Stata v13.

Results

Sample characteristics: S2 Fig. presents the respondent flowchart for the analytic sample. In June, after the initial lockdown ended, 2697 Australian caregivers were invited and 2020 (75%) completed the Poll. Of these, 1207 caregivers (604 Vic, 603 NSW) with 1992 children (985 Vic, 1008 NSW) were included in the analysis. In September, during Victoria's ongoing lockdown, 1769 caregivers were invited and 1434 (81%) completed the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.15.21262087; this version posted August 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Poll. Of these, 902 caregivers (460 Vic, 442 NSW) with 1584 children (786 Vic, 798 NSW) were included in the analysis.

Table 1 presents the weighted estimates for participant characteristics. Caregivers were an average of 40 years old, and three in five respondents were female. Each caregiver looked after an average of two children, and two in five cared for children with additional needs. One in five caregivers had a Health Care Card (an indicator of low income) and one-quarter were sole caregivers. One-quarter of respondents were born outside of Australia, and a similar proportion spoke a language other than English at home. One in six identified as living in regional or rural areas, compared with metropolitan capital cities. Ninety-five percent of respondents had completed high school (compared with around 85% nationally)(32) and less than 1% identified as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander (compared with 3% nationally).(33)

Experiences after initial lockdown (Aim 1): Table 2 and S1 Table describe families' financial and mental health experiences in June 2020, and Table 3 presents the adjusted mean differences (MDs) between NSW and Victoria ('Vic June' column). Twenty-nine percent of NSW caregivers reported job or income loss due to the COVID-19 pandemic, compared with 24% of Victorians (MD=5%; 95%CI: 0.1 to 10%). Tables 2-3 show that financial and mental health experiences were otherwise similar between states in June. Fifteen percent of families reported low income, and 30% reported material deprivation (unable to pay for essential items including mortgage or rent; electricity, gas, water bills; food; healthcare; prescription medicines; home or car insurance; mobile phone bills; and internet). Caregivers averaged one missed payment out of the eight essential items. One in five caregivers reported poor mental health according to the K6; half said the pandemic negatively impacted their mental health; and one-third said their child's mental health was negatively impacted. Thirteen percent of caregivers and 10% of children were struggling or not coping.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics (weighted) of New South Wales and Victorian families surveyed after initial lockdown (June 2020) and during Victoria's ongoing lockdown (September 2020) in proportions (95% confidence intervals) unless specified.

Demographic characteristics	New South Wales		Victoria	
	June	September	June	September
Caregiver	**N=603**	**N=442**	**N=604**	**N=460**
Age (years), mean (CI)	40.7 (39.9 – 41.5)	40.1 (39.3 – 40.9)	40.1 (39.4 – 40.8)	40.2 (39.5 – 41.0)
Female	57.4 (51.5 – 63.0)	61.5 (55.6 – 67.0)	57.0 (51.3 – 62.5)	57.8 (51.6 – 63.8)
Number of children in care, mean (CI)	1.8 (1.7 – 1.9)	1.9 (1.8 – 1.9)	1.8 (1.7 – 1.9)	1.8 (1.8 – 1.9)
Caregiver to child with additional health needs [a]	41.8 (36.0 – 47.8)	47.2 (41.2 – 53.3)	34.7 (29.5 – 40.3)	43.2 (37.0 – 49.6)
One-parent family	28.5 (23.0 – 34.7)	20.2 (15.7 – 25.6)	24.5 (19.5 – 30.1)	14.4 (10.5 – 19.4)
Health Care Card (identifies low income)	18.3 (13.8 – 24.0)	20.9 (16.3 – 26.3)	17.5 (13.4 – 22.5)	17.7 (13.3 –23.0)
Education				
Less than Year 10	0.9 (0.3 – 2.2)	1.2 (0.5 – 3.2)	0.5 (0.1 – 1.8)	1.2 (0.4 – 3.1)
Year 10	4.6 (2.7 – 7.9)	6.3 (3.9 – 9.9)	3.2 (1.4 – 7.1)	1.2 (0.5 – 2.6)
Year 12	8.9 (6.2 – 12.7)	11.1 (7.6 – 16.1)	12.9 (9.6 – 17.1)	11.5 (8.4 – 15.7)
Trade / apprenticeship	4.8 (2.7 – 8.5)	4.8 (3.0 – 7.5)	2.4 (1.1 – 4.9)	2.9 (1.4 – 6.0)
Certificate / diploma	21.1 (17.1 – 25.7)	24.2 (19.3 – 29.8)	23.4 (18.1 – 30.5)	20.1 (15.5 – 25.6)
Undergraduate	39.0 (33.6 – 44.6)	32.6 (27.2 – 38.6)	37.8 (32.4 – 43.5)	43.3 (37.2 – 49.7)
Postgraduate	19.6 (15.9 – 24.0)	19.8 (15.6 – 24.8)	21.1 (16.3 – 26.8)	19.8 (15.0 – 25.8)
Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander	0.2 (0.1 – 0.5)	0.3 (0.2 – 0.4)	0.2 (0.06 – 0.4)	0.3 (0.1 – 0.5)
Born in Australia	77.2 (72.6 – 81.2)	80.7 (75.8 – 84.7)	72.1 (66.5 – 77.1)	77.4 (71.9 – 82.1)
Home language other than English	22.1 (18.0 – 26.7)	31.1 (25.6 – 37.1)	27.0 (22.0 – 32.8)	20.2 (15.7 – 25.7)
Lives regionally or rurally (versus metropolitan)	18.8 (14.0 – 24.8)	12.8 (9.2 – 17.6)	20.1 (15.8 – 25.2)	14.2 (10.4 – 19.1)
SEIFA Index of Social Disadvantage Quintile				
1 (most disadvantage)	19.4 (14.7 – 25.1)	23.4 (18.1 – 29.8)	15.2 (11.0 – 20.7)	17.1 (12.5 – 23.0)
2	24.3 (18.7 – 30.8)	19.7 (15.4 – 24.9)	28.4 (22.8 – 34.7)	23.6 (18.6 – 29.4)
3	18.7 (14.9 – 23.2)	22.5 (17.7 – 28.3)	20.5 (16.5 – 25.2)	20.7 (15.3 – 27.3)
4	15.0 (11.8 – 18.9)	11.5 (8.5 – 15.4)	18.7 (15.2 – 22.6)	20.5 (16.3 – 25.5)
5 (least disadvantage)	22.6 (18.9 – 26.8)	22.8 (18.8 – 27.4)	17.3 (14.3 – 20.7)	18.1 (14.5 – 22.3)
Child	**N=1008**	**N=798**	**N=984**	**N=786**
Age (years), mean (CI)	9.6 (9.2 - 10.1)	8.6 (8.2 - 9.1)	8.9 (8.5 – 9.3)	8.8 (8.3 - 9.3)
Female	49.2 (44.9 – 53.6)	49.6 (45.0 – 54.1)	49.6 (45.2 – 54.0)	49.0 (44.3 – 53.7)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.15.21262087; this version posted August 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

CI: 95% Confidence Interval. SEIFA: Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas. Data weighted using national demographic distributions for gender, state, and SEIFA.

[a] Examples of additional health needs include asthma, epilepsy, and diabetes; of disability includes hearing impairment, intellectual disability, and autism

Table 2. Financial and mental health experiences (weighted) of New South Wales and Victorian families surveyed after initial lockdown (June 2020) and during Victoria's ongoing lockdown (September 2020) in proportions (95% confidence intervals) unless specified.

Financial and mental health experiences		New South Wales		Victoria	
		June	September	June	September
1.	Job or income loss due to COVID-19 [a]	28.5 (23.3 – 34.3)	25.2 (20.5 – 30.6)	23.6 (19.0 – 29.0)	35.1 (29.0 – 41.7)
2a.	Any material deprivation: unable to pay for essential items [b]	31.2 (26.0 – 37.0)	30.4 (25.0 – 36.3)	29.5 (24.5 – 35.0)	25.9 (20.6 – 31.9)
2b.	Total material deprivation count [b] mean, (CI)	1.10 (0.85 - 1.34)	1.23 (0.92 - 1.53)	1.12 (0.86 – 1.38)	0.93 (0.70 – 1.17)
3.	Low household income (<AU$1000 p/w) [c]	14.7 (10.4 – 20.4)	21.5 (15.2 – 26.0)	15.2 (11.3 – 20.1)	21.5 (16.0 – 28.3)
4a.	Caregiver mental health (K6 total score), mean (CI)	12.9 (12.1 – 13.6)	12.9 (12.2 – 13.8)	12.9 (12.2 – 13.5)	13.6 (12.8 – 14.4)
4b.	Caregiver poor mental health (K6 cut-point) [d]	20.6 (15.6 – 26.8)	16.6 (12.3 – 22.1)	17.3 (13.0 – 22.5)	22.2 (17.1 – 28.4)
5a.	Negative impact of COVID-19 on caregiver mental health	50.2 (44.3 – 56.1)	49.8 (43.9 – 55.9)	48.3 (42.6 – 54.1)	58.6 (52.3 – 64.6)
5b.	Negative impact of COVID-19 on child mental health	32.1 (27.0 –37.8)	39.2 (33.3 – 45.4)	30.8 (26.0 – 36.1)	47.6 (41.3 – 54.0)
6a.	Caregiver struggling or not coping [e]	11.4 (8.3 – 15.4)	16.3 (12.1 – 21.5)	13.7 (9.9 – 18.6)	19.2 (14.6 – 24.7)
6b.	Child struggling or not coping [e]	10.2 (7.2 – 14.2)	14.5 (10.4 – 19.7)	8.7 (5.7 – 13.3)	14.2 (10.4 – 19.0)

K6: Kessler-6, SEIFA: Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas Index of Relative Disadvantage. Data weighted using national demographic distributions for gender, state, and SEIFA.

[a] Job loss by one or two adults, or reduction in income, due to COVID-19.

[b] Any one or more of mortgage or rent; electricity, gas, water bills; food; healthcare; prescription medicines; home or car insurance; mobile phone bills; internet.

[c] Missing 293 caregivers who preferred not to report income.

[d] K6 dichotomized into a binary "poor mental health" (total score 19 or more) versus not (total score 6-18).

[e] Versus "coping/thriving" categories.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.15.21262087; this version posted August 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.15.21262087; this version posted August 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

The impact of ongoing lockdown (Aim 2): Fig. 1 and Table 3 present the fully-adjusted Difference-in-Difference linear regression analyses testing the impact of ongoing lockdown on families' finances and mental health. Over the June-September 2020 period, relative to their NSW counterparts, Victorians reported an 11% increase in job or income loss (95% CI: 3 to 18%). There was no evidence that ongoing lockdown was related to a change in material deprivation or the proportion of households reporting low income. Ongoing lockdown was associated with a 0.83 point increase (95% CI: -0.08 to 1.74) in the K6 total score and a 6% increase (95% CI: 0.3 to 12%) in the binary K6 measure of poor mental health. The negative impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on mental health was also exacerbated by ongoing lockdown, affecting 14% (95% CI: 6 to 23%) more Victorian caregivers and 12% (95% CI: 4 to 20%) more children relative to their NSW counterparts.

Fig. 1. Adjusted mean Difference-in-Difference estimates (%) of the impact of ongoing lockdown on families' finances and mental health (all binary), overall and by subgroups, data drawn from Table 3

Fig. 1 and Table 3 present the adjusted Difference-in-Difference analyses for the subgroups of caregiver gender (female/male); child age (0-4 (pre-school), 5-12 (elementary school), 13-17 years (secondary/high-school)); and location (metropolitan/regional-rural). The evidence for a negative impact of ongoing lockdown on job/income loss and caregiver mental health was strongest for female caregivers, caregivers of elementary-school aged children, and caregivers living in metropolitan areas. Notably, Table 3 ('NSW September' column) shows that the differences between initial and ongoing lockdowns in measures of job/income loss and K6 mental health were in part due to worsening outcomes for Victorians as well as improving outcomes for NSW families. The proportion of NSW caregivers reporting job/income loss decreased by 6% (95% CI: 0.2-11%) from June to September. The same reduction was evident in the poor mental health (K6) of female caregivers (mean difference=6%, 95% CI: 0.3 to 12%). There was evidence that ongoing lockdown exacerbated the negative impact of the pandemic on children's mental health, for all subgroups except for families living in regional/rural areas. There was no evidence of a relationship between ongoing lockdown and whether the caregiver or their children were coping or not, for the cohort overall or by subgroups.

Table 3. Adjusted Difference-in-Difference linear regression models estimating the impact of ongoing lockdown on families' finances and mental health for the Total sample and by subgroups, using New South Wales (NSW) families in June 2020 as reference group.

Financial and mental health experiences		Subgroup	Group category	N	Mean Difference (95% confidence interval)		
					Vic ongoing lockdown effect	Vic June	NSW September
1.	Job or income loss due to COVID-19 [a]	Total sample	All	2109	0.11 (0.03; 0.18)*	-0.05 (-0.10; -0.001)*	-0.06 (-0.11; -0.002)*
		1. Caregiver gender	female	1084	0.12 (0.01; 0.23)*	-0.06 (-0.13; 0.01)^	-0.06 (-0.14; 0.02)
			male	1025	0.09 (-0.03; 0.20)	-0.03 (-0.11; 0.04)	-0.06 (-0.14; 0.02)
		2. Child age (years)	0-4	334	0.11 (0.09; 0.32)	-0.11 (-0.5; -0.03)	-0.12 (-0.28; 0.04)
			5-12	922	0.11 (0.0001; 0.23)*	-0.07 (-0.14; -0.01)^	-0.03 (-0.11; 0.05)
			13-17	853	0.11 (-0.02; 0.23)^	0.01 (-0.09; 0.07)	-0.07 (-0.16; 0.02)
		3. Location	metro	1836	0.12 (0.04; 0.21)*	-0.06 (-0.12; -0.005)*	-0.07 (-0.13; -0.01)*
			regional	273	0.06 (-0.14; 0.27)	-0.02 (-0.14; 0.10)	0.03 (-0.12; 0.18)
2a.	Any material deprivation: unable to pay for essential items [b]	Total sample	All	2109	0.008 (-0.06; 0.08)	-0.04 (-0.08; 0.01)	-0.03 (-0.09; 0.02)
		1. Caregiver gender	female	1084	0.04 (-0.07; 0.15)	-0.05 (-0.12; 0.02)	-0.06 (-0.13; 0.02)
			male	1025	-0.02 (-0.12; 0.07)	-0.03 (-0.09; 0.04)	-0.02 (-0.09; 0.05)
		2. Child age (years)	0-4	334	-0.01 (-0.19; 0.18)	-0.08 (-0.21; 0.05)	-0.05 (-0.19; -0.20)
			5-12	922	-0.02 (-0.14; 0.08)	-0.02 (-0.09; 0.05)	0.005 (-0.1; 0.08)
			13-17	853	0.06 (-0.05; 0.17)	-0.05 (-0.12; 0.01)	-0.08 (-0.16; 0.005)^
		3. Location	metro	1836	0.01 (-0.07; 0.08)	-0.04 (-0.09; 0.01)	-0.04 (-0.10; 0.01)
			regional	273	0.03 (-0.20; 0.25)	0.005 (-0.15; 0.15)	0.01 (-0.15; 0.18)
2b.	Total material deprivation count,[b] mean (CI)	Total sample	All	2109	-0.06 (-0.40; 0.27)	-0.06 (-0.27; 0.16)	0.02 (-0.27; 0.23)
		1. Caregiver gender	female	1084	0.07 (-0.40; 0.53)	-0.07 (-0.39; 0.25)	-0.09 (-0.44; 0.26)
			male	1025	-0.15 (-0.39; 0.21)	-0.09 (-0.39; 0.21)	-0.004 (-0.36; 0.35)
		2. Child age (years)	0-4	334	-0.42 (-1.42; 0.56)	0.22 (-0.43; 0.87)	0.28 (-0.45; 1.01)
			5-12	922	-0.14 (-0.68; 0.38)	-0.19 (-0.56; 0.17)	0.05 (-0.35; 0.44)
			13-17	853	0.21 (-0.25; 0.68)	-0.08 (-0.38; 0.22)	-0.23 (-0.57; 0.11)
		3. Location	metro	1836	-0.06 (-0.43; 0.31)	-0.07 (-0.30; 0.17)	-0.01 (-0.28; 0.26)
			regional	273	0.07 (-0.88; 1.02)	0.02 (-0.59; 0.64)	-0.11 (-0.86; 0.64)
3.	Low household income (<AU$1000 p/w) [c]	Total sample	All	1816	0.02 (-0.04; 0.08)	0.01 (-0.02; 0.05)	0.02 (-0.02; 0.06)
		1. Caregiver gender	female	922	0.005 (-0.09; 0.10)	0.01 (-0.05; 0.07)	0.04 (-0.03; 0.10)
			male	894	0.02 (-0.06; 0.09)	0.02 (-0.02; 0.06)	0.03 (-0.02; 0.08)
		2. Child age (years)	0-4	287	-0.02 (-0.19; 0.14)	0.04 (-0.07; 0.15)	0.08 (-0.03; 0.20)
			5-12	810	0.02 (-0.07; 0.11)	-0.001 (-0.06; 0.05)	-0.01 (-0.05; 0.06)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.15.21262087; this version posted August 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Financial and mental health experiences		Subgroup	Group category	N	Mean Difference (95% confidence interval) Vic ongoing lockdown effect	Vic June	NSW September
			13-17	719	0.02 (-0.08; 0.12)	0.02 (-0.03; 0.07)	0.01 (-0.06; 0.08)
		3. Location	metro	1577	0.02 (-0.04; 0.08)	0.01 (-0.03; 0.05)	0.02 (-0.02; 0.06)
			regional	239	-0.07 (-0.25; 0.12)	0.05 (-0.07; 0.18)	0.08 (-0.05; 0.22)
4a.	Caregiver mental health (K6 total score), mean (CI)	Total sample	All	2109	0.83 (-0.08; 1.74)^	0.02 (-0.55; 0.58)	-0.13 (-0.78; 0.52)
		1. Caregiver gender	female	1084	1.85 (0.56; 3.13)*	-0.23 (-1.,06; 0.61)	-0.76 (-1.65; 0.14)^
			male	1025	-0.14 (-1.45; 1.16)	0.24 (-0.54; 1.01)	0.44 (-0.51; 1.39)
		2. Child age (years)	0-4	334	0.47 (-1.98; 2.93)	-0.75 (-2.35; 0.85)	-0.47 (-2.39; 1.45)
			5-12	922	1.52 (0.20; 2.85)*	-0.22 (-1.10; 0.65)	-0.21 (-1.12; 0.70)
			13-17	853	0.37 (-1.14; 1.87)	0.56 (-0.30; 1.42)	0.10 (-0.97; 1.17)
		3. Location	metro	1836	0.68 (-0.31; 1.66)	0.03 (-0.59; 0.64)	0.03 (-0.68; 0.74)
			regional	273	2.01 (-0.55; 4.57)	-0.02 (-1.55; 1.52)	-1.29 (-2.87; 0.30)
4b.	Caregiver poor mental health (K6 cut-point) [d]	Total sample	All	2109	0.06 (-0.003; 0.12)^	-0.01 (-0.05; 0.03)	-0.02 (-0.06; 0.02)
		1. Caregiver gender	female	1084	0.10 (0.02; 0.19)*	-0.02 (-0.07; 0.04)	-0.06 (-0.12; -0.003)*
			male	1025	0.02 (-0.07; 0.10)	-0.01 (-0.05; 0.04)	0.02 (-0.05; 0.08)
		2. Child age (years)	0-4	334	0.06 (-0.11; 0.22)	-0.09 (-0.20; -0.02)	-0.06 (-0.19; 0.07)
			5-12	922	0.13 (0.03; 0.23)*	-0.04 (-0.10; 0.02)	-0.04 (-0.11; 0.02)
			13-17	853	-0.01 (-0.10; 0.07)	0.05 (-0.002; 0.10)*	0.02 (-0.04; 0.08)
		3. Location	metro	1836	0.05 (-0.02; 0.11)	-0.01 (-0.05; 0.03)	-0.01 (-0.06; 0.04)
			regional	273	0.15 (-0.01; 0.30)^	-0.01 (0.11; 0.08)	-0.10 (-0.20; -0.002)*
5a.	Negative impact of COVID-19 on caregiver mental health	Total sample	All	2109	0.14 (0.06; 0.23)*	-0.05 (-0.11; 0.01)^	-0.04 (-0.10; 0.02)
		1. Caregiver gender	female	1084	0.18 (0.07; 0.30)*	-0.06 (-0.14; 0.02)	-0.03 (-0.12; 0.05)
			male	1025	0.09 (-0.04; 0.21)	-0.03 (-0.11; 0.05)	-0.04 (-0.13; 0.05)
		2. Child age (years)	0-4	334	0.11 (-0.10; 0.33)	0.001 (-0.15; 0.15)	-0.10 (-0.26; 0.06)
			5-12	922	0.21 (0.08; 0.34)*	-0.04 (-0.13; 0.04)	-0.09 (-0.18; 0.003)^
			13-17	853	0.05 (-0.09; 0.005)	-0.06 (-0.15; 0.03)	0.06 (-0.05; 0.16)
		3. Location	metro	1836	0.14 (0.05; 0.23)*	-0.04 (-0.10; 0.02)	-0.02 (0.09; 0.04)
			regional	273	0.09 (-0.16; 0.34)	-0.07 (-0.23; 0.09)	-0.13 (-0.31; 0.05)
5b.	Negative impact of COVID-19 on child mental	Total sample	All	3576	0.12 (0.04; 0.20)*	0.02 (-0.03; 0.07)	0.04 (-0.02; 0.10)
		1. Caregiver gender	female	1842	0.11 (-0.005; 0.22)^	0.02 (-0.05; 0.09)	0.10 (0.02; 0.18)*
			male	1734	0.13 (0.01; 0.24)*	0.04 (-0.03; 0.11)	-0.01 (-0.09; 0.07)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.15.21262087; this version posted August 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Financial and mental health experiences		Subgroup	Group category	N	Mean Difference (95% confidence interval) Vic ongoing lockdown effect	Vic June	NSW September
	health	2. Child age (years)	0-4	710	0.17 (0.05; 0.29)*	-0.02 (-0.10; 0.06)	0.01 (-0.08; 0.09)
			5-12	1757	0.10 (-0.01; 0.21)^	0.05 (-0.03; 0.12)	0.06 (-0.02; 0.14)
			13-17	1109	0.17 (0.03; 0.30)*	0.01 (0.07; 0.09)	0.01 (-0.09; 0.10)
		3. Location	metro	3099	0.13 (0.05; 0.22)*	0.04 (-0.01; 0.09)	0.05 (-0.01; 0.11)
			regional	477	0.02 (-0.21; 0.24)	-0.09 (0.22; 0.05)	0.02 (-0.14; 0.18)
6a.	Caregiver struggling or not coping [e]	Total sample	All	2109	0.03 (-0.03; 0.09)	-0.01 (-0.04; 0.03)	0.02 (-0.02; 0.07)
		1. Caregiver gender	female	1084	0.03 (-0.05; 0.12)	0.02 (-0.04; 0.07)	0.02 (-0.04; 0.08)
			male	1025	0.02 (-0.07; 0.11)	-0.03 (-0.08; 0.02)	0.04 (-0.02; 0.11)
		2. Child age (years)	0-4	334	0.03 (-0.13; 0.18)	-0.11 (-0.23; 0.002)	-0.07 (-0.20; 0.06)
			5-12	922	0.05 (-0.04; 0.15)	-0.01 (-0.06; 0.05)	0.05 (-0.01; 0.12)
			13-17	853	0.02 (-0.07; 0.12)	0.03 (-0.02; 0.09)	0.03 (-0.04; 0.09)
		3. Location	metro	1836	0.05 (-0.02; 0.11)	-0.01 (-0.05; 0.03)	0.02 (-0.03; 0.07)
			regional	273	-0.07 (-0.24; 0.11)	0.04 (-0.05; 0.14)	0.06 (-0.06; 0.18)
6b.	Child struggling or not coping [e]	Total sample	All	3576	0.02 (-0.03; 0.07)	0.002 (-0.02; 0.03)	0.03 (-0.004; 0.07)^
		1. Caregiver gender	female	1842	0.04 (-0.03; 0.10)	-0.02 (-0.05; 0.02)	0.03 (-0.02; 0.07)
			male	1734	-0.005 (-0.08; 0.07)	0.02 (-0.02; 0.05)	0.05 (-0.009; 0.10)
		2. Child age (years)	0-4	710	-0.00004 (-0.08; 0.08)	0.04 (-0.09; 0.02)	0.005 (0.06; 0.07)
			5-12	1757	0.02 (-0.05; 0.10)	0.001 (-0.04; 0.04)	0.04 (-0.01; 0.09)^
			13-17	1109	0.04 (-0.03; 0.12)	0.01 (-0.03; 0.04)	0.02 (-0.04; 0.07)
		3. Location	metro	3099	0.04 (-0.02; 0.09)	-0.003 (-0.03; 0.02)	0.03 (-0.01; 0.06)
			regional	477	-0.06 (-0.19; 0.07)	0.03 (-0.04; 0.10)	0.03 (-0.06; 0.13)

K6: Kessler-6, SEIFA: Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas Index of Relative Disadvantage.
Reference group is NSW in June. All differences are mean difference (MD); note, for binary outcomes this is a proportion between 0-1.
Estimated Difference-in-difference interaction adjusted for: child and caregiver age and gender (male/female; noting no other genders were reported), number of children, child with additional health needs (versus not); one-caregiver family (versus not); owns a Health Care Card (versus not); caregiver education (<Year 10/Year 10/Year 12/trade or apprenticeship/certificate or diploma/undergraduate/postgraduate); Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander (versus not); caregiver born outside of Australia (versus in Australia); Home language other than English (versus speaks English at home); lives regionally or rurally (versus metropolitan); and SEIFA quintile. Caregiver mental health (total K6 score) and effects of family cluster were accounted for in all child models using robust estimation.
*p<0.05, ^p<0.1
[a] Job loss by one or two adults, or reduction in income, due to COVID-19.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.15.21262087; this version posted August 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

[b] Any one or more of mortgage or rent; electricity, gas, water bills; food; healthcare; prescription medicines; home or car insurance; mobile phone bills; internet.

[c] Missing 293 caregivers who preferred not to report income.

[d] K6 dichotomized into a binary "poor mental health" (total score 19 or more) versus optimal (total score 6-18).

[e] Versus "coping/thriving" categories.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.15.21262087; this version posted August 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.15.21262087; this version posted August 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Discussion

This study investigated the impacts of COVID-19 lockdown on family finances and mental health in the context of Australia's minimal disease burden. In June 2020, after an initial national lockdown from March-May, a quarter of Australian caregivers of children aged 0-17 years reported job or income loss due to the pandemic. One in three reported material deprivation (being unable to afford essential items such as housing, food, amenities, or healthcare). One in five caregivers reported poor mental health; half said that the first three months of the pandemic had negatively impacted their mental health; and a third reported the same negative impact for their children. By September 2020, Victoria's ongoing lockdown from July onwards was associated with increased job and income loss, and negative mental health impacts for caregivers and children, compared with neighboring NSW. There was no evidence that ongoing lockdown affected families' experiences of material deprivation or income poverty. As anticipated, the evidence for the negative impacts of lockdown were strongest for female caregivers and families living in metropolitan Victoria. While the negative impacts of ongoing lockdown affected families across children's ages, they were most pronounced for families with children of elementary school compared with preschool or high school ages.

Although the RCH Poll does not have pre-pandemic data for comparison, the financial and mental health impacts reported by the June cohort are consistent with national data. In April, the Australian Bureau of Statistics estimated that 2.7 million Australians (almost 20% of the working population) lost their jobs or hours of work.(34) The Australian Temperament Project survey of 498 families from March-September 2020,(27) and the right@home trial survey of 319 mothers from May-December 2020 (unpublished), reported job/income losses of 24% and 27% respectively, using the same questions as our study. The third of families reporting material deprivation is equivalent to pre-pandemic data from the Longitudinal Study of Australian Children.(35) In our study, one in five families reported poor mental health in June 2020 according to the K6. This aligns with the Australian 'Pulse of the Nation' survey in which 24% of parents reported mental distress across the first months of lockdown. Despite the global differences between countries' infection rates and governments' approaches to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.15.21262087; this version posted August 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

public health restrictions, there are commonalities in the mental health data emerging from the pandemic.(36-39) The Born in Bradford study found that 19% and 16% of mothers reported clinically-significant levels of depression and anxiety, respectively, during the first lockdown in UK (April-June 2020).(40) In a nationally weighted survey from the US in June, 27% of parents said their mental health had declined during the pandemic.(41)

Given the negative economic and psychosocial impacts of lockdown,(36-41) it follows that ongoing lockdown was associated with increased job and income loss, and poor mental health. Our findings of a larger negative impact on the mental health of female versus male caregivers is consistent with similar findings from the aforementioned 'Pulse' data.(20) That families with elementary school-aged children were most affected is likely due to the stress and disruption of home-schooling in July-September. More supervision is required for children in elementary school than high school, and balancing home schooling with usual paid or unpaid work was a substantial challenge for families.(42) Finally, metropolitan Victorians experienced stricter and ongoing lockdown than their regional and rural counterparts. This explains the findings of increased job/income loss and greater negative impacts on caregiver and child mental health for this subgroup, relative to their NSW counterparts.

Our findings for children are like other studies investigating the lockdown experiences of young people. Analysis by the Australian Human Rights Commission in the earliest months of the pandemic found that increased numbers of older children reported first time mental health challenges or concerns of self-harm.(43) The COVID-19 Unmasked Study which surveyed Australian families with young children (aged 1-5 years) also found that Victorian caregivers exposed to ongoing lockdown reported increasing mental health symptoms for themselves and their children.(44) Interestingly, in the Unmasked study, young children living outside of Victoria (exposed to only the initial lockdown) were still experiencing higher than average levels of anxiety symptoms by the time of Victoria's ongoing lockdown. We found a similar pattern in our study. For the NSW families exposed to initial lockdown only, caregivers reported improved mental health for themselves by September but not for their children.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.15.21262087; this version posted August 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

This study has several strengths. It builds on existing COVID-19 research to show the specific impacts of ongoing lockdown on families in the relative absence of the virus, i.e., isolating the toll that widespread mortality has on mental health. The RCH Poll is the only nationally-representative survey of Australian families with children to assess financial and mental health impacts of COVID-19. It comprised large cross-sectional and nationally representative surveys, which employed strong methodology (surveys piloted and included the validated K6); collected data on caregiver and child mental health; surveyed female and male caregivers; and achieved good response rates. In other Polls, indicators (frequency/prevalence) across a range of topics are almost universally consistent with more traditionally-obtained estimates, providing support for the sample selection and survey administration methods. The Difference-in-Difference modeling is well-established method of analyzing policy change (in our case, lockdown law differences). The natural experiment allowed us to gauge causal relationships by simulating a counterfactual; that is, what would have happened in the absence of a second lockdown.

There were also limitations. The Poll only samples adults who are 18 years and older, so younger caregivers are missing. As a subgroup who experience more adversity, this means results may be conservative. Measures were caregiver-reported, by only one caregiver in the household. Ideally, information would be collected from all caregivers and children directly. A significant proportion of caregivers did not report family income, and the sample sizes for preschool-aged children and regional/rural subgroup analyses were small, limiting power for detecting differences. There were also limitations to the analyses. The common trends' assumption of Difference-in-Difference estimation supposes that the untreated units (NSW in September) provide the appropriate counterfactual of the trend that the treated units would have followed if they had not been treated. However, our results are defensible because the time between the first and second surveys was short (4 months); thus, minimizing potential differential trends across NSW and VIC. We also controlled for all available and potentially confounding socioeconomic and demographic variables in the analyses.

This work extends the existing evidence base by trying to understand the specific impacts of ongoing lockdown in the context of minimal disease burden. Based on our findings, we offer three considerations for pandemic response and recovery planning. First, while job and income loss increased with ongoing lockdown, this did not

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.15.21262087; this version posted August 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

translate to increased material deprivation or income poverty. This finding provides support for the effectiveness of the Australian government's extraordinary income supplements, introduced early in the pandemic to offset the anticipated economic fallout of lockdown. This interpretation is supported by modeling demonstrating the substantial reductions in Australia's poverty levels resulting from these social policies.(15) Given that the income supplements offered were temporary, the fundamental need for financial security must be considered when enacting future lockdown measures in response to further outbreaks.

Second, for families who were unexposed to ongoing lockdown, there was some recovery in employment/income and female caregivers' mental health. Population-level data for UK adults demonstrated a similar pattern of improved mental health after the initial sharp decline resulting from lockdown.(19) This suggests that many caregivers can recover from the negative impacts of lockdown, provided they have effective financial buffers (and presumably that the public health restrictions are also effective). While the Poll data were limited, they did not suggest a recovery for children. It is important that children's experiences and needs are prioritized during response and recovery planning so that any persistent negative impacts are adequately redressed.(45, 46)

Third, the negative financial and mental health impacts of ongoing lockdown were substantial, and disproportionately affected families with elementary school-aged children, and female caregivers. In a country such as Australia, which has encountered relatively little viral impact, the negative impacts of lockdown, especially for school-aged children and female caregivers, may outweigh the direct impact of the disease itself. While this study was underpowered to investigate the experience of families living in lower socioeconomic environments, the evidence suggests that inequity is likely to be exacerbated and entrenched by the social and economic disruption of COVID-19.(27, 46, 47) Ongoing follow-up of cohorts is necessary to understand if and how caregivers and children recover from lockdown, and how best to support the population groups who are most adversely affected. Balancing the benefits and harms of lockdown requires planned responses to future outbreaks, and evidence-informed financial and mental health supports.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.15.21262087; this version posted August 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

1. Hale T, Angrist, Noam. , Goldszmidt R, Kira B, Petherick A, Phillips T, et al. A global panel database of pandemic policies (Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker). Nature Human Behaviour. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01079-8. Retrieved from: https://ourworldindata.org/grapher/covid-stringency-index [Online Resource] (2021). 2021.
2. World Health Organization. WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard [updated 6 Dec 2020. Available from: https://covid19.who.int/.
3. Brooks SK, Webster RK, Smith LE, Woodland L, Wessely S, Greenberg N, et al. The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. The Lancet. 2020;395( ):912-20.
4. Loades ME, Chatburn E, Higson-Sweeney N, Reynolds S, Shafran R, Brigden A, et al. Rapid Systematic Review: The Impact of Social Isolation and Loneliness on the Mental Health of Children and Adolescents in the Context of COVID-19. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry. 2020;59(11):1218-39.
5. Nearchou F, Flinn C, Niland R, Subramaniam SS, Hennessy E. Exploring the Impact of COVID-19 on Mental Health Outcomes in Children and Adolescents: A Systematic Review. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 2020;17(22):8479.
6. Gibbs L, Nursey J, Cook J, Ireton G, Alkemade N, Roberts M, et al. Delayed disaster impacts on academic performance of primary school children. Child development. 2019;90(4):1402-12.
7. Russell F, Uahwatanasakul W, Neal E. Melbourne Children's Campus. COVID-19 kids research evidence update. 2020.
8. Racine N, Cooke JL, Eirich R, Korczak DJ, McArthur B, Madigan S. Child and adolescent mental illness during COVID-19: A rapid review. Psychiatry research. 2020.
9. Galea S, Merchant RM, Lurie N. The Mental Health Consequences of COVID-19 and Physical Distancing: The Need for Prevention and Early Intervention. JAMA Internal Medicine. 2020;180(6):817-8.
10. Dorn E, Hancock B, Sarakatsannis J, Viruleg E. COVID-19 and learning loss—disparities grow and students need help. McKinsey & Company, Public & Social Sector. https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/public-and-social-sector/our-insights/covid-19-and-learning-loss-disparities-grow-and-students-need-help [Accessed 26 March 2021]. 2020 8 December 2020.
11. Evans S, Mikocka-Walus A, Klas A, Olive L, Sciberras E, Karantzas G, et al. From “It Has Stopped Our Lives” to “Spending More Time Together Has Strengthened Bonds”: The Varied Experiences of Australian Families During COVID-19. Frontiers in Psychology. 2020;11(2906).
12. Suleman S, Ratnani Y, Stockley K, Jetty R, Smart K, Bennett S, et al. Supporting children and youth during the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond: A rights-centred approach. Paediatr Child Health. 2020;25(6):333-6.
13. Department of Health and Human Services. Updates about the outbreak of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19): State Government of Victoria; 2020 [Available from: https://www.dhhs.vic.gov.au/coronavirus/updates.
14. Australian Government. Coronavirus (COVID-19) response site. News and Updates: Australian Government; 2020 [Available from: https://www.australia.gov.au/news-and-updates.
15. Phillips B, Gray M, Biddle N. COVID-19 JobKeeper and JobSeeker impacts on poverty and housing stress under current and alternative economic and policy scenarios. Acton, ACT: Australian National University Centre for Social Research and Methods; 2020.
16. Cassells R, Duncan A. JobKeepers and JobSeekers: How many workers will lose and how many will gain? Bentley, WA: Curtin University; 2020.
17. Gandy S. Care expands for moms, babies. Nursing & Allied Healthweek. 1996;1(13):1.
18. Klapdor M. Parliament of Australia. COVID-19 Economic response—free child care. https://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/FlagPost/2020/April/Coronavirus_response-Free_child_care [Accessed 26 March 2021]. 2020.
19. Fancourt D, Steptoe A, Bu F. Trajectories of anxiety and depressive symptoms during enforced isolation due to COVID-19 in England: a longitudinal observational study. The Lancet Psychiatry. 2021;8(2):141-9.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.15.21262087; this version posted August 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

20. Broadway B, Payne AA, Salamanca N. Coping with COVID-19: Rethinking Australia. Melbourne Institute: Applied Economic & Social Research, the University of Melbourne. 2020.
21. Shen K-L, Yang Y-H, Jiang R-M, Wang T-Y, Zhao D-C, Jiang Y, et al. Updated diagnosis, treatment and prevention of COVID-19 in children: experts' consensus statement (condensed version of the second edition). World Journal of Pediatrics. 2020;16(3):232-9.
22. Bruining H, Bartels M, Polderman TJ, Popma A. COVID-19 and child and adolescent psychiatry: an unexpected blessing for part of our population? Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry. 2020:1-2.
23. Duncan GJ, Ziol-Guest KM, Kalil A. Early-Childhood Poverty and Adult Attainment, Behavior, and Health. Child Development. 2010;81(1):306-25.
24. Goldfeld S, O'Connor M, Chong S, Gray S, O'Connor E, Woolfenden S, et al. The impact of multidimensional disadvantage over childhood on developmental outcomes in Australia. International Journal of Epidemiology. 2018;47(5):1485-96.
25. Loades ME, Chatburn E, Higson-Sweeney N, Reynolds S, Shafran R, Brigden A, et al. Rapid Systematic Review: The Impact of Social Isolation and Loneliness on the Mental Health of Children and Adolescents in the Context of COVID-19. Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry. 2020;59(11):1218-39.e3.
26. Nikolaidis A, Paksarian D, Alexander L, DeRosa J, Dunn J, Nielson DM, et al. The Coronavirus Health and Impact Survey (CRISIS) reveals reproducible correlates of pandemic-related mood states across the Atlantic. medRxiv. 2020.
27. O'Connor M, Greenwood C, Letcher P, Giallo R, Priest N, Goldfeld S, et al. Inequalities in the distribution of COVID-19 related financial difficulties for families with young children. Child: Care, Health and Development. 2021.
28. Wilkins R, Lass I. The Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia Survey: Selected Findings from Waves 1 to 16. Melbourne Institute: Applied Economic & Social Research, University of Melbourne. 2018.
29. Davidson P, Saunders P, Bradbury B, Wong M. Poverty in Australia 2020: Part 1, Overview. ACOSS/UNSW Poverty and Inequality Partnership Report No. 3, Sydney: ACOSS.; 2020.
30. Furukawa TA, Kessler RC, Slade T, Andrews G. The performance of the K6 and K10 screening scales for psychological distress in the Australian National Survey of Mental Health and Well-Being. Psychological medicine. 2003;33(2):357.
31. Young Minds. Coronavirus: Impact on young people with mental health needs. https://youngminds.org.uk/media/3708/coronavirus-report_march2020.pdf. 2020.
32. Australian Government, Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. Secondary education: school retention and completion. https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/australias-welfare/secondary-education-school-retention-completion [Accessed 26 March 2021]. 2019.
33. Australian Government, Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. Profile of Indigenous Australians https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/australias-welfare/profile-of-indigenous-australians [Accessed 26 March 2021]. 2019.
34. Duggan AK, McFarlane EC, Windham AM, Rohde CA, Salkever DS, Fuddy L, et al. Evaluation of Hawaii's Healthy Start Program. The Future of Children. 1999;9(1):66-90.
35. Sollis K. Measuring child deprivation and opportunity in Australia: applying the Nest Framework to develop a measure of deprivation and opporutnity for children using the Longitudinal Study of Australian Children. Canberra; 2019 February.
36. Sciberras E, Patel P, Stokes MA, Coghill D, Middeldorp CM, Bellgrove MA, et al. Physical Health, Media Use, and Mental Health in Children and Adolescents With ADHD During the COVID-19 Pandemic in Australia. Journal of Attention Disorders. 2020;Online ahead of print (17 Dec).
37. The Royal Children's Hospital National Child Health Poll. COVID-19 pandemic: Effects on the lives of Australian children and families. Parkville, Victoria.; 2020.
38. Dickerson J, Kelly B, Lockyer B, Bridges S, Cartwright C, Willan K, et al. Experiences of lockdown during the Covid-19 pandemic: descriptive findings from a survey of families in the Born in Bradford study. Wellcome Open Res. 2021;5:228.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.15.21262087; this version posted August 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

39. Nearchou F, Hennessy E, Flinn C, Niland R, Subramaniam SS. Exploring the Impact of COVID-19 on Mental Health Outcomes in Children and Adolescents: A Systematic Review. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2020;17(22):8479.

40. Dickerson J, Kelly B, Lockyer B, Bridges S, Cartwright C, Willan K, et al. Experiences of lockdown during the Covid-19 pandemic: descriptive findings from a survey of families in the Born in Bradford study [version 2; peer review: 2 approved]. Wellcome Open Research. 2021;5(228).

41. Patrick SW, Henkhaus LE, Zickafoose JS, Lovell K, Halvorson A, Loch S, et al. Well-being of Parents and Children During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A National Survey. Pediatrics. 2020;146(4):e2020016824.

42. Evans S, Mikocka-Walus A, Klas A, Olive L, Sciberras E, Karantzas G, et al. From "It Has Stopped Our Lives" to "Spending More Time Together Has Strengthened Bonds": The Varied Experiences of Australian Families During COVID-19. Front Psychol. 2020;11:588667.

43. Nicolson S, Newell S, Collyer B. Australian Human Rights Commission. Impacts of COVID-19 on children and young people who contact Kids Helpline • September 2020.; 2020.

44. De Young A, Paterson R, March S, Hoehn E, Alisic., Cobham V, et al. COVID-19 Unmasked Young Children Report 2: Impact of the second wave in Australia on the mental health of young children and parents. Brisbane. Queensland Centre for Perinatal and Infant Mental Health, Children's Health Queensland Hospital and Health Service. 2021.

45. Sinha I, Bennett D, Taylor-Robinson DC. Children are being sidelined by COVID-19. BMJ. 2020;369:m2061.

46. Jones B, Woolfenden S, Pengilly S, Breen C, Cohn R, Biviano L, et al. COVID-19 pandemic: The impact on vulnerable children and young people in Australia. Journal of Paediatrics and Child Health. 2020;56(12):1851-5.

47. UN Research Roadmap for the COVID-19 Recovery. Leveraging the Power of Science for a More Equitable, Resilient and Sustainable Future, November 2020. United Nations; 2020.

Supporting information

S1 Fig. Timeline of Australia's COVID-19 public health restrictions and policy changes from March to November 2020

S2 Fig. Respondent flowchart for analytic sample

S1 Table. Detailed financial experiences (weighted) of New South Wales and Victorian families surveyed after initial lockdown (June 2020) and during Victoria's ongoing lockdown (September 2020) in proportions (95% confidence intervals).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.15.21262087; this version posted August 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Legend: solid red, p<0.05; striped orange: p<0.1, white p≥0.1