medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.22.21265368; this version posted October 25, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-ND 4.0 International license .

Psychological Distress Before and During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Sociodemographic Inequalities in 11 UK Longitudinal Studies

Kishan Patel [1]^, Elaine Robertson [2]^, Alex S. F. Kwong [3,4]^, Gareth J Griffith [4,5]^, Kathryn Willan [6]^, Michael J Green [2]^, Giorgio Di Gessa [7], Charlotte F. Huggins [8], Eoin McElroy [9], Ellen J. Thompson [10], Jane Maddock [1], Claire L Niedzwiedz [11], Morag Henderson [12], Marcus Richards [1], Andrew Steptoe[7], George B. Ploubidis [12], Bettina Moltrecht [12], Charlotte Booth [12], Emla Fitzsimons [12], Richard Silverwood [12], Praveetha Patalay [1,12#], David Porteous [8,13#], Srinivasa Vittal Katikireddi [2#]

^Joint first authors

#Joint last authors

[1]MRC Unit for Lifelong Health and Ageing, UCL

[2]MRC/CSO Social & Public Health Sciences Unit, University of Glasgow

[3]Division of Psychiatry, University of Edinburgh

[4]MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit, University of Bristol

[5]Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol

[6]Bradford Institute for Health Research

[7]Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, UCL

[8]Institute of Genetics and Cancer, University of Edinburgh

[9]Department of Neuroscience, Psychology and Behaviour, University of Leicester

[10]Department of Twin Research and Genetic Epidemiology, School of Life Course Sciences, King's College London

[11]Institute of Health & Wellbeing, University of Glasgow

[12]Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL

[13]Centre for Medical Information, University of Edinburgh

Corresponding author: Praveetha Patalay, p.patalay@ucl.ac.uk

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.22.21265368; this version posted October 25, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Background: How population mental health has evolved across the COVID-19 pandemic under varied lockdown measures is poorly understood, with impacts on health inequalities unclear. We investigated changes in mental health and sociodemographic inequalities from before and across the first year of the pandemic in 11 longitudinal studies.

Methods: Data from 11 UK longitudinal population-based studies with pre-pandemic measures of psychological distress were analysed and estimates pooled. Trends in the prevalence of poor mental health were assessed across the pandemic at three time periods: initial lockdown (TP1, Mar-June 20); easing of restrictions (TP2, July-Oct 20); and a subsequent lockdown (TP3, Nov 20-Mar 21). Multi-level regression was used to examine changes in psychological distress compared to pre-pandemic; with stratified analyses by sex, ethnicity, education, age, and UK country.

Results: Across the 11 studies (n=54,609), mental health had deteriorated from pre-pandemic scores across all three pandemic time periods (TP1 Standardised Mean Difference (SMD): 0.13 (95% CI: 0.03, 0.23); TP2 SMD: 0.18 (0.09, 0.27); TP3 SMD: 0.20 (0.09, 0.31)). Changes in psychological distress across the pandemic were higher in females (TP3 SMD: 0.23 (0.11, 0.35)) than males (TP3 SMD: 0.16 (0.06, 0.26)), and slightly lower in below-degree level educated persons at some time periods (TP3 SMD: 0.18 (0.06, 0.30)) compared to those who held degrees (TP3 SMD: 0.26 (0.14, 0.38)). Increased distress was most prominent amongst adults aged 35-44 years (TP3 SMD: 0.49 (0.15, 0.84)). We did not find evidence of changes in distress differing by ethnicity or UK country.

Conclusions: The substantial deterioration in mental health seen in the UK during the first lockdown did not reverse when lockdown lifted, and a sustained worsening is observed across the pandemic. Mental health declines have not been equal across the population, with females, those with higher degrees, and younger adults more affected.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.22.21265368; this version posted October 25, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

There have been widespread concerns about the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and related mitigation measures on population mental health[1,2]. Globally, there is evidence that the COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in poorer mental health[3], but much of this might depend on COVID-19 rates and the mitigation policies implemented by different countries. Importantly, concerns exist that specific policy responses, notably so-called 'lockdown' measures, may themselves have adverse mental health consequences. Strict lockdown and stay at home orders were announced by the UK Government on 23rd March 2020, with rules somewhat relaxed in June 2020. However, national lockdowns were reintroduced in early November 2020 for approximately a month and then again at the start of 2021 due to new waves of infections (with slight variation in dates across UK countries).

The findings on changes in population mental health during the first lockdown are conflicting, with some studies indicating a wide-spread decline in psychological wellbeing early in the pandemic[4,5], and other studies reporting improvements or no changes in mental ill-health[6,7], Findings have remained inconsistent as the pandemic has progressed, with both increasing and decreasing levels of poorer mental health being reported[8-10].

Moreover, the COVID-19 pandemic has had disproportionate impacts on different age and socio-demographic groups via different mechanisms[11,12]. For instance, older adults were at greater risk of severe disease and were asked to stay at home and minimise face-to-face contact (shielding), whilst younger people, women, and ethnic minorities have been disproportionately impacted by employment losses and precarity[13]. The focus of many existing studies is on population average levels and cross-sectional prevalences may have concealed inequalities in the impacts of the pandemic on mental health[3].

Uncertainty remains about how mental health has changed over the pandemic, including who has been most affected and whether any observed deterioration likely reflects lockdown measures or other aspects of the pandemic. To explore these issues, we conducted co-ordinated analyses of 11 UK longitudinal population studies with data from before and across the pandemic. We aimed to: 1) estimate the impacts of the pandemic on population mental health and how these evolved during the first year of the pandemic as lockdown restrictions changed; and 2) examine inequalities in these impacts by age, sex, ethnicity, education level, and UK country.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.22.21265368; this version posted October 25, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Methods

Design

The UK National Core Studies – Longitudinal Health and Wellbeing initiative aims to co-ordinate primary analyses across multiple UK longitudinal population-based studies[14,15]. Co-ordinating analyses across different datasets minimises methodological heterogeneity and maximises comparability, while appropriately accounting for the study design and characteristics of individual datasets.

Participants

Data were pooled from 11 UK longitudinal population studies which conducted surveys both before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. Details of the design, sample frames, current age range, timing of the pre-pandemic and COVID-19 surveys, response rates, and analytical sample size are available in Table 1. Demographic and socio-economic characteristics of each analytical sample are presented in Supplementary File 1.

Six studies were age homogenous cohorts (similar aged individuals): the Millennium Cohort Study (MCS)[16]; the Children in the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC)[17]; Next Steps (NS; formerly known as the Longitudinal Study of Young People in England)[18]; the 1970 British Cohort Study (BCS70)[19]; the 1958 National Child Development Study (NCDS)[20]; and the 1946 National Survey of Health and Development (NSHD)[21]. Five other studies had age heterogeneous samples (i.e. each study covered a range of ages): Understanding Society (USoc)[22]; Generation Scotland (GS)[23]; Twins UK (TwinsUK)[24]; Born in Bradford (BiB)[25]; and the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA)[26].

Analytical samples included those who had valid observations of psychological distress in a pre-pandemic survey, had at least one survey completed during the COVID pandemic, and had valid data on sex and age. Most studies were weighted to be representative of their target population, accounting for sampling design and differential non-response[27]. Weights were not used for ALSPAC, TwinsUK, GS and BiB.

Ethical approvals were received for data collection in all studies, and ethics statements for each study are detailed in Supplementary File 1.

<Table 1: Key information on each included study>

Measures

Below we describe the variables used for analysis. Full details of the specific scales and coding used within each cohort are available in Supplementary File 1.

Mental Health

Mental health was measured both before the pandemic (a range of 0-7 years prior) and at multiple time-points across the pandemic using validated continuous scales measuring symptoms of common mental health disorders such as depression and anxiety (Table 1 outlines the specific measures used for each cohort). Continuous scales were standardised across time-points and within studies on a common standard deviation-based scale. This enhances comparability of estimates between studies while allowing examination of changes over time within studies. We also conducted analyses with

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.22.21265368; this version posted October 25, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

dichotomous indicators of high psychological distress using established thresholds for each scale (see Supplementary File 1 for details of thresholds used).

While most studies utilised the same measure for both pre-pandemic and COVID-19 surveys, GS and NSHD used different measures. For these studies, we identified comparable items to create a smaller scale consistent over time and the threshold for the binary outcome was re-weighted based on the number of items retained (see Supplementary File 1 for details). Within each study, we conducted a test for measurement invariance across the most recent pre-pandemic survey and the first COVID-19 survey (see Supplementary File 1 for details).

Pandemic Time Period

We identified three time periods (TP1-TP3) representing different stages over the course of the pandemic in the UK, for comparison against pre-pandemic mental health (TP0). Surveys from April-June 2020 represented the first wave of high infection levels accompanied by the first 'lockdown' measures (TP1). Surveys taken from July-October 2020 coincided with easing of restrictions and lower rates of infection (TP2). Following this, infection levels again increased, and lockdown measures were reintroduced; surveys taken from November 2020-March 2021 represent this second wave of infections (TP3). Some studies contributed multiple survey waves to some time periods and not all studies were represented in all three COVID-19 time periods (see Table 1 for details).

Covariates

The following covariates were adjusted for and/or used to stratify estimates: sex (male; female); age (coded in 10-year bands to account for non-linear relationships: 16-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75+); ethnicity (self-reported and coded for main analyses; as White-including white ethnic minorities vs. Non-White ethnic minorities); UK country of residence (England, Scotland, Wales or Northern Ireland); and highest educational qualification (degree vs. less than degree; parental education was used for the MCS cohort, who had not all completed their full-time education).

Statistical Analysis

Changes in the continuous measure of mental health over the three time periods were modelled using multi-level mixed effects models within each study to account for correlations between repeated measures from the same individuals adjusting for age and sex. Time period was the categorical exposure, with TP0 as the reference. In some studies, multiple survey waves were included within the same time period. Coefficients are presented as standardised mean differences (SMD). Multi-level mixed effects Poisson regression models with robust standard errors were used to calculate relative risks for the binary outcome[37].

Results from each study were pooled using a random effects meta-analysis with restricted maximum likelihood. Meta-analyses were conducted separately for continuous psychological distress scores, and binary high psychological distress thresholds. Heterogeneity is reported using the I^2 statistic[38].

Interactions were estimated and meta-analysed for sex, education, and ethnicity to formally test for effect modification (i.e., to determine whether trends across time periods varied between population subgroups). Formal interactions could not be tested by age and UK country, given the age homogeneous nature of several cohorts (i.e., only one age group) and few studies included all UK nations (specific within study interactions can be seen in Supplementary File 2).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.22.21265368; this version posted October 25, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Further sensitivity meta-analyses restricted analyses to include studies that only assessed anxiety specifically, studies that assessed depression specifically, and studies that included survey responses for all three time periods. In order to explain the heterogeneity (I^2) in estimates, meta-regression analyses were conducted, quantifying the effects of time between pre- and post-pandemic measures, measurement type, and whether study samples were representative of the general UK population. Supplementary File 2 identifies the studies included in each stage of the sensitivity meta-analyses and subsequent meta-regression analyses. All meta-analyses and meta-regressions were conducted using Stata 17 (StataCorp LP).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.22.21265368; this version posted October 25, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Results

Across 11 individual longitudinal studies, 54,609 participants were analysed, ranging from 1,741 people in BiB to 12,437 for USOC. Descriptive statistics for all the studies, weighted and taking account of complex survey design where relevant, can be found in Supplementary File 2.

Descriptive analysis

Figure 1 shows that for most studies, prevalence of high psychological distress either worsened or was fairly stable over the course of the pandemic. The largest increase in proportion of persons meeting the case threshold for psychological distress was observed within the ELSA study, with an increase in prevalence of 16.5% over the course of the three time periods. The largest increase between two consecutive time periods was observed within the NSHD study, between the pre-pandemic (2015) and first pandemic time periods, rising from 11.4% to 35.0%. In two studies (ALSPAC and BCS70), the prevalence of distress in the final pandemic time period (TP3) was marginally lower than the pre-pandemic time period (prevalence reduced by 2.3% and 0.8% respectively).

Figure 2 shows the sex difference in mental health over the course of the pandemic across the 11 studies. There is evidence of higher prevalence of distress among women than men across all sex-heterogeneous studies. In April and May 2020 (TP1), sex inequalities appeared especially high, with female respondents exhibiting higher prevalence of mental distress in most studies.

Changes in distress from before and during the pandemic: pooled analysis

Psychological distress increased from pre-pandemic scores across all three pandemic time periods examined (this pattern was observed in eight out of the 11 included cohorts when focussing on general distress or depressive symptom measures), with no clear differences in impacts across the three pandemic time periods examined (TP1 SMD: 0.13 (95% CI: 0.03, 0.23); TP2 SMD: 0.18 (0.09, 0.27); TP3 SMD: 0.20 (0.09, 0.31)). However, there was considerable heterogeneity between estimates from different studies (I^2=99.3%, 98.6%, and 99.3% respectively at 3 TPs), with estimates for TP1 ranging from SMD: -0.09 (-0.12, -0.55) for ALSPAC, to SMD: 0.46 (0.37, 0.55) for NSHD. Results for all individual cohorts can be found as part of Supplementary File 2. Similar patterns and high levels of heterogeneity are observed when considering prevalence of psychological distress as a binary outcome (Supplementary Files 2 and 3). Estimates for both the continuous and binary measures of mental distress are shown in Figure 3.

Inequalities in changes over time periods: pooled analysis

Meta-analysis of the study-specific interaction terms between each marker of inequity and time period indicated that changes in distress were greater in females (TP3 SMD: 0.23 (0.11, 0.35)) compared to males (TP3 SMD: 0.16 (0.06, 0.26)) (Supplementary File 2) suggesting a further widening of sex inequalities. Changes were slightly lower at TP1 and TP3 for persons with a below-degree level education (TP3 SMD: 0.18 (0.06, 0.30)) compared to those with a degree (TP3 SMD: (0.26 (0.14, 0.38)), albeit often from a greater pre-pandemic inequality, indicating a slight narrowing of educational inequalities during the pandemic. We did not find evidence for trends differing by ethnicity and UK country. Heterogeneity varied across these analyses, with I^2 values ranging from 44.2% for the interaction between education and TP1, and 88.8% for ethnicity and TP1. Estimates stratified by sex, ethnicity, education, and UK country are shown in Figure 4. Again, in all these

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.22.21265368; this version posted October 25, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

analyses there was large heterogeneity between study estimates. Stratified results for individual cohorts are in Supplementary File 2.

Results stratified by age bands are presented in Figure 5. Whilst the results show no monotonic pattern by age, there is some suggestion that the impact of the pandemic on mental health might have been greater in those aged between 25 and 44 years.

Sensitivity and meta-regression analyses

Sensitivity analyses were conducted to consider specific measures of mental health (depression or anxiety), and to limit data to participants with survey responses during all three time periods. Findings were consistent with the main analyses (Supplementary File 2).

Given the high levels of heterogeneity across studies, we conducted meta-regressions to examine whether time between pre- and post-pandemic measures, measurement type, and representativeness of the studies for the UK population helped account for some of the observed heterogeneity (Supplementary File 2). The heterogeneity across the results of individual studies was largely unexplained by these factors; the largest explanatory factor was the national representativeness of the studies, which explained 3.25% of the heterogeneity at Time Period 2 and suggested the deterioration in distress was less marked in representative studies. A subsequent meta-analysis including only studies with national coverage showed a worsening of mental health over the pandemic similar to the main meta-analysis (TP1 SMD: 0.15 (95% CI: 0.02, 0.29); TP2: 0.11 (0.05, 0.17); TP3: 0.16 (0.05, 0.27)).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.22.21265368; this version posted October 25, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Discussion

Our analyses of 11 well-established longitudinal studies provide a comprehensive picture of the evolution of mental health over the course of differing lockdown periods during the COVID-19 pandemic. Overall, our results indicate mental health has deteriorated since the onset of the pandemic and this has been sustained with no evidence of recovery, even when lockdown measures temporarily eased in the UK during the summer of 2020. Furthermore, our findings demonstrate that while aggregate population mental health deteriorated over time, not all groups were equally affected. Women, those with a degree-level education, and young adults (aged 25-34 and 35-44) were impacted most, reporting greater increases in psychological distress during the pandemic, and thereby exacerbating pre-pandemic mental health inequalities.

Our findings suggest that initial declines in mental health were not a transient reaction to an unprecedented event, but an early indication of a consistent deterioration from pre-pandemic levels. These findings extend research conducted earlier in the pandemic[4,5], replicate some research suggesting sustained effects[10,39], and contradict findings from convenience samples suggesting improvements in mental health when the initial lockdown was lifted[8]. While the direct mechanisms generating poorer mental health are complex, the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in considerable economic, social, and behavioural changes, and an increase in physical co-morbidities and bereavement, therefore a detectable shift in mental distress is perhaps unsurprising. Financial stressors, changes in social interactions, and disruptions to daily life may all play a part in explaining our findings[40-43]. These results suggest that deteriorations in population mental health may be driven more by time-stable disruption and concern arising from the COVID-19 pandemic, rather than the consequences of time-specific mitigation measures such as lockdowns.

Our results highlight widening gender inequalities in mental health. Females, on average, had much higher distress levels, and also showed greater deterioration during the pandemic. Possible reasons include increased childcare responsibilities that disproportionately fell to women, greater economic impacts, and reports of large increases in gender-based violence[44]. We also observed that deterioration in lockdown periods was greater in those with degree-level education, albeit from a lower pre-pandemic level indicating educational inequalities narrowed during the pandemic[5]. Our investigation of age differences show that all age groups have been adversely affected by the pandemic to some extent, but high psychological distress was greater in 25–44-year-olds. The mechanisms underpinning subpopulation differences remain unclear, but likely include disruptions to social interactions, changes in employment or education, and shifts in parental responsibilities and/or work life balance[45]. For example, individuals between the age of 25 and 44 are more likely to have school-aged children and may therefore have faced additional challenges of working from home and caring for children. Moreover, younger adults have been at an increased risk of employment disruptions[46], as well as changes in healthy behaviours[47,48], which may have contributed to further reductions in their mental health. However, it is worth noting that there is a well-documented midlife peak in psychological distress[49], which may partly explain some of the deterioration we found in these age groups.

Our study has several important strengths. By harnessing high quality existing longitudinal studies, we have robust pre-pandemic baseline data, and multiple waves of data collection capturing different time periods of the pandemic. We investigated the potential impact of COVID-19 policy

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.22.21265368; this version posted October 25, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

responses, specifically the introduction and removal of lockdown measures. Our careful approach to data harmonisation allowed us to develop comparable outcome measures and pool estimates for similar time periods. Furthermore, we maximised the value of existing data by using multi-level models to include all waves of available data. The baseline samples of many of these studies were representative of the target populations from which they were drawn, and were weighted to adjust for selective non-response during COVID-19 surveys. Lastly, this study combines 11 longitudinal data sources and heterogeneity between the study specific estimates was large, highlighting that documenting the results from multiple sources is more reliable for informing policy and health planning than relying on a single data source.

Despite these advantages, methodological limitations should be noted. We cannot definitively attribute changes in population mental health to the COVID-19 pandemic or related policy responses. However, we note that we are unaware of alternate events which would have been likely to substantially confound our analyses or their interpretation. There were differences in the timing of data collection (including when pre-pandemic measures were collected) and the mental health survey instruments used, though this did not appear to significantly contribute to the high levels of statistical heterogeneity observed. Similarly, although weighting was used where possible to control for non-random response, conditioning on voluntary response may induce selection bias, as it is very plausible that the mental health of the observed differ systematically from the target population. However, the broad consistency in the direction of findings across datasets provides reassurance that the key conclusions are likely to be robust to these differences, even if the magnitude of the effect size is harder to confirm.

In conclusion, mental health has been persistently worse than before the pandemic, particularly among women, those with higher degrees, and 25–44-year-olds. The sustained deterioration, even during easing of lockdown measures, somewhat refutes the notion that easing lockdown measures necessarily leads to better mental health, and implies that there are myriad pathways leading to adverse mental health impacts. This suggests that avoiding lockdown measures alone may not maintain population mental health, and other factors should be considered. For example, health services in the UK were not able to meet their population's mental health needs pre-pandemic, with this situation made substantially worse during the pandemic[50]. To minimise the detrimental longer-term consequences of the pandemic, mental health care provision needs to encompass multiple levels of support, including investment in primary care, community mental health, and public mental health. Initiatives should target groups at greater risk of experiencing mental ill-health, including ensuring rapid access to mental health services, but also addressing the underlying drivers of poor mental health, such as mitigating risks of unemployment, sexual violence, and poverty. The present findings highlight the need for investment in mental health support to turn the tide and improve population mental health going forward.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.22.21265368; this version posted October 25, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

People acknowledgments:

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

TwinsUK: Claire Steves, Ruth C. E. Bowyer, Deborah Hart, María Paz García, Rachel Horsfall
ALSPAC: Nicholas J. Timpson, Kate Northstone, Rebecca M. Pearson
GS: Drew Altschul, Chloe Fawns-Ritchie, Archie Campbell, Robin Flaig
USoc: Michaela Benzeval
NSHD: Andrew Wong, Maria Popham, Karen MacKinnon, Imran Shah, Philip Curran
MCS, NS, BCS70, NCDS: Colleagues in survey, data, and cohort maintenance teams

Funding Acknowledgements:

This work was supported by the National Core Studies, an initiative funded by UKRI, NIHR and the Health and Safety Executive. The COVID-19 Longitudinal Health and Wellbeing National Core Study was funded by the Medical Research Council (MC_PC_20059). Full funding acknowledgements for each individual study can be found as part of Supplementary File 1.

Role of funder:

The funders had no role in the methodology, analysis or interpretation of the findings presented in this manuscript.

Declaration of Interests:

SVK is a member of the Scientific Advisory Group on Emergencies (SAGE) subgroup on ethnicity and co-chair of the Scottish Government's Expert Reference Group on ethnicity and COVID-19. All other authors declare no competing interests, except for the funding acknowledged.

Author Contributions:

Conceptualisation: PP, DP, SVK, ER, ASFK, GJG, MG, EJT, EM, CLN, EF, MH, MR, GBP

Methodology: PP, SVK, GBP, ER, KP, ASFK, MG, GJG, RS, CLN, JM, CH

Analysis: KP, ER, ASFK, GJG, KW, MG, GDG, EM, EJT, CH

Initial Drafting: PP, ER, SVK, MG, ASFK, KP, GJG, KW

Revising: All

Funding Acquisition: PP, DP, GBP, SVK, AS

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.22.21265368; this version posted October 25, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

References

1. Holmes EA, O'Connor RC, Perry VH, et al. Multidisciplinary research priorities for the COVID-19 pandemic: a call for action for mental health science. *The Lancet Psychiatry.* 2020.

2. Hotopf M, Bullmore E, O'Connor RC, Holmes EA. The scope of mental health research during the COVID-19 pandemic and its aftermath. *Br J Psychiatry.* 2020;217(4):540-542.

3. Santomauro DF, Mantilla Herrera AM, Shadid J, et al. Global prevalence and burden of depressive and anxiety disorders in 204 countries and territories in 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. *The Lancet.* 2021.

4. 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. *The Lancet Psychiatry.* 2020;7(10):883-892.

5. Niedzwiedz CL, Green MJ, Benzeval M, et al. Mental health and health behaviours before and during the initial phase of the COVID-19 lockdown: longitudinal analyses of the UK Household Longitudinal Study. *J Epidemiol Community Health.* 2020.

6. Henderson M, Fitzsimons E, Ploubidis G, Richards M, Patalay P. Mental health during lockdown: evidence from four generations - Initial findings from the COVID-19 Survey in Five National Longitudinal Studies. *London: UCL Centre for Longitudinal Studies.* 2020.

7. O'Connor RC, Wetherall K, Cleare S, et al. Mental health and well-being during the COVID-19 pandemic: longitudinal analyses of adults in the UK COVID-19 Mental Health & Wellbeing study. *Br J Psychiatry.* 2020:1-8.

8. 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):141-149.

9. Pierce M, McManus S, Hope H, et al. Mental health responses to the COVID-19 pandemic: a latent class trajectory analysis using longitudinal UK data. *The Lancet Psychiatry.* 2021;8(7):610-619.

10. Kwong ASF, Pearson RM, Smith D, Northstone K, Lawlor DA, Timpson NJ. Longitudinal evidence for persistent anxiety in young adults through COVID-19 restrictions. *Wellcome Open Research.* 2020;5.

11. Katikireddi SV, Hainey KJ, Beale S. The impact of COVID-19 on different population subgroups: ethnic, gender and age-related disadvantage. *J R Coll Physicians Edinb.* 2021;51:S40-46.

12. Douglas M, Katikireddi SV, Taulbut M, McKee M, McCartney G. Mitigating the wider health effects of covid-19 pandemic response. *BMJ.* 2020;369:m1557.

13. Blundell R, Costa Dias M, Joyce R, Xu X. COVID-19 and Inequalities. *Fiscal Studies.* 2020;41(2):291-319.

14. University College London. COVID-19 Longitudinal Health and Wellbeing. https://www.ucl.ac.uk/covid-19-longitudinal-health-wellbeing/. Published 2021. Accessed 14th October 2021.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.22.21265368; this version posted October 25, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

15. Di Gessa G, Maddock J, Green MJ, et al. Pre-pandemic mental health and disruptions to healthcare, economic and housing outcomes during the COVID-19 pandemic: evidence from 12 UK longitudinal studies. *The British Journal of Psychiatry.* 2021:1-10.

16. Joshi H, Fitzsimons E. The Millennium Cohort Study: the making of a multi-purpose resource for social science and policy. *Longitudinal and Life Course Studies.* 2016;7(4):409-430.

17. Boyd A, Golding J, Macleod J, et al. Cohort Profile: the 'children of the 90s'--the index offspring of the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2013;42(1):111-127.

18. Calderwood L, Sanchez C. Next Steps (formerly known as the Longitudinal Study of Young People in England). *J Open Health Data.* 2016;4(e2).

19. Elliott J, Shepherd P. Cohort profile: 1970 British Birth Cohort (BCS70). *Int J Epidemiol.* 2006;35(4):836-843.

20. Power C, Elliott J. Cohort profile: 1958 British birth cohort (National Child Development Study). *Int J Epidemiol.* 2006;35(1):34-41.

21. Wadsworth M, Kuh D, Richards M, Hardy R. Cohort Profile: The 1946 National Birth Cohort (MRC National Survey of Health and Development). *Int J Epidemiol.* 2006;35(1):49-54.

22. University of Essex IfSaER, NatCen Social Research, Kantar Public. *Understanding Society: Waves 1-10, 2009-2017 and Harmonised BHPS: Waves 1–18, 1991–2009 (13th edn).* UK Data Service2020.

23. Smith BH, Campbell A, Linksted P, et al. Cohort Profile: Generation Scotland: Scottish Family Health Study (GS:SFHS). The study, its participants and their potential for genetic research on health and illness. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2013;42(3):689-700.

24. Verdi S, Abbasian G, Bowyer RCE, et al. TwinsUk: The UK Adult Twin Registry Update. *Twin Res Hum Genet.* 2019;22(6):523-529.

25. Wright J, Small N, Raynor P, et al. Cohort Profile: the Born in Bradford multi-ethnic family cohort study. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2013;42(4):978-991.

26. Steptoe A, Breeze E, Banks J, Nazroo J. Cohort profile: the English longitudinal study of ageing. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2013;42(6):1640-1648.

27. Brown M, Goodman A, Peters A, et al. COVID-19 Survey in Five National Longitudinal Studies: Waves 1, 2 and 3 User Guide (Version 3). *London: UCL Centre for Longitudinal Studies and MRC Unit for Lifelong Health and Ageing* 2021.

28. Goldberg D. *General Health Questionnaire.* Windsor: NFER Publishing Company; 1978.

29. Rodgers B, Pickles A, Power C, Collishaw S, Maughan B. Validity of the Malaise Inventory in general population samples. *Social psychiatry and psychiatric epidemiology.* 1999;34(6):333-341.

30. Angold A, Costello EJ, Messer SC, Pickles A. Development of a short questionnaire for use in epidemiological studies of depression in children and adolescents. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research.* 1995;5(4):237-249.

31. Kessler RC, Andrews G, Colpe LJ, et al. Short screening scales to monitor population prevalences and trends in non-specific psychological distress. *Psychol Med.* 2002;32(6):959-976.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.22.21265368; this version posted October 25, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

32. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JB. The PHQ-9: Validity of a Brief Depression Severity Measure. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2001;16(9):606-613.

33. Kroenke K, Strine TW, Spitzer R, Williams JBW, Berry JT, Mokdad AH. The PHQ-8 as a measure of current depression in the general population. *Journal of Affective Disorders.* 2009;114(1):163-173.

34. Spitzer RL, Kroenke K, Williams JBW, Lowe B. A Brief Measure for Assessing Generalized Anxiety Disorder. *Arch Intern Med.* 2006;166:1092-1097.

35. Radloff LS. The CES-D scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement* 1977;1(3):385-401.

36. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica.* 1983;67(6):361-370.

37. Zou G. A modified poisson regression approach to prospective studies with binary data. *American Journal of Epidemiology.* 2004;159(7):702-706.

38. Higgins JP, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Statistics in medicine.* 2002;21(11):1539-1558.

39. McGinty EE, Presskreischer R, Anderson KE, Han H, Barry CL. Psychological Distress and COVID-19-Related Stressors Reported in a Longitudinal Cohort of US Adults in April and July 2020. *JAMA.* 2020;324(24):2555-2557.

40. Chandola T, Kumari M, Booker CL, Benzeval M. The mental health impact of COVID-19 and lockdown-related stressors among adults in the UK. *Psychol Med.* 2020:1-10.

41. Iob E, Frank P, Steptoe A, Fancourt D. Levels of Severity of Depressive Symptoms Among At-Risk Groups in the UK During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2020;3(10):e2026064.

42. Zheng J, Morstead T, Sin N, et al. Psychological distress in North America during COVID-19: The role of pandemic-related stressors. *Social Science & Medicine.* 2021;270.

43. Ettman CK, Abdalla SM, Cohen GH, Sampson L, Vivier PM, Galea S. Prevalence of Depression Symptoms in US Adults Before and During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2020;3(9):e2019686.

44. Zhou M, Hertog E, Kolpashnikova K, Kan M-Y. Gender inequalities: Changes in income, time use and well-being before and during the UK COVID-19 lockdown. *SocArXiv.* 2020.

45. Zamarro G, Prados MJ. Gender differences in couples' division of childcare, work and mental health during COVID-19. *Review of Economics of the Household.* 2021;19(1):11-40.

46. Gustafsson M. Young workers in the coronavirus crisis: Findings from the Resolution Foundation's coronavirus survey. https://www.resolutionfoundation.org/publications/young-workers-in-the-coronavirus-crisis/. Published 2020. Accessed 12th October 2021.

47. Bann D, Villadsen A, Maddock J, et al. Changes in the behavioural determinants of health during the COVID-19 pandemic: gender, socioeconomic and ethnic inequalities in five British cohort studies. *J Epidemiol Community Health.* 2021.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.22.21265368; this version posted October 25, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

48. Wielgoszewska B, Maddock J, Green MJ, et al. The UK Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme and changes in diet, physical activity and sleep during the COVID-19 pandemic: Evidence from eight longitudinal studies. *medRxiv*. 2021.

49. Blanchflower DG. Is happiness U-shaped everywhere? Age and subjective well-being in 145 countries. *J Popul Econ.* 2020:1-50.

50. Rose N, Manning N, Bentall R, et al. The social underpinnings of mental distress in the time of COVID-19 - time for urgent action. *Wellcome Open Res.* 2020;5:166.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.22.21265368; this version posted October 25, 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-ND 4.0 International license.

Table 1. Details of each included study

Study Population	Design and Sample Frame	2020 Age Range in years	Most Recent Pre-Pandemic Survey	Details of COVID-19 Surveys (Response Rate)	Mental Distress Measure Used	Analytic N
Age Homogenous Cohorts						
MCS: Millennium Cohort Study[16]	Cohort of UK children born between Sept 2000 and Jan 2002 with regular follow-up surveys from birth.	18-20	2018	Three surveys: May (26.6%); Sep-Oct (24.2%); Feb-Mar (22%)	Kessler-6 (K6)[31]	4,988
ALSPAC: Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children-Generation 1[17]	Cohort of children born in the South-West of England between April 1991 and Dec 1992, with regular follow-up questionnaires from birth.	27-29	2017-2018	Three surveys: April (19%); June (17.4%); December (26.4%)	Short Mood and Feelings Questionnaire (SMFQ)[30]	3,208
NS: Next Steps, formerly known as Longitudinal Study of Young People in England[18]	Sample recruited via secondary schools in England at around age 13 with regular follow-up surveys thereafter.	29-31	2015	Three surveys: May (20.3%); Sep-Oct (31.8%); Feb-Mar (29%)	General Health Questionnaire 12 (GHQ-12)[28]	4,139
BCS70: British Cohort Study 1970[19]	Cohort of all children born in Great Britain (i.e., England, Wales & Scotland) in one week in 1970, with regular follow-up surveys from birth.	50	2016	Three surveys: May (40.4%); Sep-Oct (43.9%); Feb-Mar (40%)	9-item Malaise inventory[29]	5,532
NCDS: National Child Development Study[20]	Cohort of all children born in Great Britain (i.e., England, Wales & Scotland) in one week in 1958, with regular follow-up surveys from birth.	62	2013	Three surveys: May (57.9%); Sep-Oct (53.9%); Feb-Mar (52%)	9-item Malaise inventory[29]	6,667
NSHD: National Survey of Health and Development[21]	Cohort of all children born in Great Britain (i.e., England, Wales & Scotland) in one week in 1946, with regular follow-up surveys from birth.	74	2015	Three surveys: May (68.2%); Sep-Oct (61.5%); Feb-Mar (90%)	General Health Questionnaire 12 (GHQ-12)[28]	2,007
Age Heterogeneous Studies						
USoc: Understanding Society: the UK Household Longitudinal Survey[22]	A nationally representative longitudinal household panel study, based on a clustered-stratified probability sample of UK households, with all adults aged 16+ in chosen households surveyed annually.	16-96	2018-2019	Seven surveys: April (40.3%); May (33.6%); Jun (32.0%); July (31.2%); Sep (29.2%); Nov (27.3%); Jan 2021 (27.2%)	General Health Questionnaire 12 (GHQ-12)[28]	12,437

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.22.21265368; this version posted October 25, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

ELSA: English Longitudinal Study of Aging[26]	A nationally representative population study of individuals aged 50+ living in England, with biennial surveys and periodic refreshing of the sample to maintain representativeness.	52-90+	2018-2019	Two surveys: Jun-July (75%); Nov-Dec (73%)	Centre for Epidemiological Studies – Depression (CES-D) [35]	5,699
GS: Generation Scotland: The Scottish Family Health Study[23]	A family-structured, population-based Scottish cohort, with participants aged 18-99 recruited between 2006-2011	27-100	2006-2011	Three surveys: April-Jun 2020 (21.3%); Jul-Aug 2020 (15.4%); Feb 2021 (14.3%)	Patient Health Questionnaire 9 (PHQ-9) [32] or Patient Health Questionnaire 8 (PHQ-8) [33] and Generalised Anxiety Disorder Assessment 7 (GAD-7) [34]	4,151
TwinsUK: the UK Adult Twin Registry[24]	A cohort of volunteer adult TwinsUK (55% monozygotic and 43% dizygotic) from around the United Kingdom who were sampled between 18-101 years of age.	22-96	2017-2018	Three surveys: April (64.3%); July (77.6%); November (76.1%)	Hospital and Anxiety Depression Scale (HADS) [36]	4,040
BiB: Born in Bradford[25]	Two birth cohorts recruiting pregnant women and their children between 2007 and 2010 (BiB Growing Up), and from 2016 (Born in Bradford's Better Start (BiBBS))	16-57	2016-2020	Two surveys: April-Jun (30.7%); Oct-Nov (39.9%)	Patient Health Questionnaire 9 (PHQ-9) [32] or Patient Health Questionnaire 8 (PHQ-8) [33] and Generalised Anxiety Disorder Assessment 7 (GAD-7) [34]	1,741

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.22.21265368; this version posted October 25, 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure captions

Figure 1: Trends in overall prevalence of psychological distress within each of the 11 longitudinal studies analysed in this paper, as defined by measure-specific thresholds. Coloured boxes indicate the time period groupings used for analysis in this paper.

Figure 2: Sex stratified prevalence estimates for psychological distress by study, as defined by instrument specific measurement thresholds. Coloured boxes indicate the time period groupings used for analysis in this paper.

Figure 3: Changes in psychological distress before and during the pandemic in pooled analyses of 11 longitudinal UK studies. Overall impacts across time periods (compared to pre pandemic distress) for the continuous psychological distress scores (left panel) and binary high distress scores (right panel). Each light grey point represents estimates from a different included study (study specific estimates can be seen in Supplementary File 2) and the dark point is the pooled estimate with 95% CIs.

Figure 4: Changes in psychological distress over time by: a) sex; b) education; c) ethnicity; d) UK country. Stratified changes across time periods (compared to pre-pandemic distress). Each light-coloured point represents estimates from a different included study (study specific estimates can be seen in Supplementary File 2).

Figure 5: Trends in prevalence of psychological distress by age group


Age Homogeneous
Age Heterogeneous
Case Prevalence (%)
MCS
USOC
ALSPAC
ELSA
NS
GS
BCS70
TWINSUK
NCDS
BiB
NSHD
Period 1
Period 2
Period 3
Pre-Pandemic
March 2020
June 2020
September 2020
December 2020
March 2021
Pandemic Timepoint


Sex
female
male
High Distress Prevalence (%)
MCS
USOC
ALSPAC
ELSA
NS
GS
BCS70
TWINSUK
NCDS
BiB
NSHD
Period 1
Period 2
Period 3
Pre-Pandemic
March 2020
June 2020
September 2020
December 2020
March 2021
Pandemic Timepoint


Continuous Psychological Distress Score
Standardised Mean Difference
0.60
0.40
0.20
0.00
-0.20
Pre-COVID [ref]
Apr-Jun'20
Jul-Sep'20
Oct'20-Feb'21


High Psychological Distress (Caseness)
Relative Risk
2.50
2.00
1.50
1.00
0.75
Pre-COVID [ref]
Apr-Jun'20
Jul-Sep'20
Oct'20-Feb'21


Sex
Education
Ethnicity
Country
Standardised Mean Difference
-0.20
0.00
0.20
0.40
0.60
0.80
Pre-COVID [ref]
Apr-Jun'20
Jul-Sep'20
Oct'20-Feb'21
Female
Male
Degree
No Degree
White
Non-White
England
Wales
Scotland
Northern Ireland


Age
Standardised Mean Difference
1.00
0.50
0.00
-0.50
Pre-COVID [ref]
Apr-Jun'20
Jul-Sep'20
Oct'20-Feb'21
16-24
25-34
35-44
45-54
55-64
65-74
75+