

# 1 Executive dysfunction following SARS-CoV-2 infection: A cross-sectional 2 examination in a population-representative sample

3 Peter A. Hall PhD<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Gang Meng PhD<sup>2</sup>, Anna Hudson MSc<sup>1</sup>, Mohammad N. Sakib  
4 MBBS<sup>1</sup>, Sara C. Hitchman PhD<sup>3</sup> and Geoffrey T. Fong PhD<sup>1,2,4</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup>. School of Public Health Sciences, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

6 <sup>2</sup>. Department of Psychology, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

7 <sup>3</sup>. Department of Communication and Media Research, University of Zurich, Zurich,  
8 Switzerland.

9 <sup>4</sup>. Ontario Institute for Cancer Research, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

10 \*Corresponding author information: Peter A. Hall, Ph.D., School of Public Health  
11 Sciences, University of Waterloo, 200 University Avenue West, Waterloo, Ontario,  
12 Canada, N2L 3G1. E-mail: [pahall@uwaterloo.ca](mailto:pahall@uwaterloo.ca)

## 13 Abstract

14

15 **Objective:** To determine whether SRS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19 symptom  
16 severity are associated with executive dysfunction among members of the general  
17 population, including those not hospitalized or exposed to intubation.

18 **Design:** Cross-sectional observation study with data from an ongoing national cohort  
19 study of young and middle-aged adults. The Canadian COVID-19 Experiences Survey  
20 (CCES) involves 1,958 adults with equal representation of vaccinated and vaccine  
21 hesitant adults between the ages of 18 and 54 years.

22 **Setting:** Population-based survey of community dwelling adults, representative of the  
23 broader Canadian population.

24 **Participants:** Men and women between 18 and 54 years of age from English and  
25 French speaking provinces. The sample comprised 1,958 adults with a mean age of 37  
26 years ( $SD=10.4$ ); 60.8% were female.

27 **Exposures:** SARS-CoV-2 infection with COVID-19 symptoms of any severity, ranging  
28 from negligible to life-threatening infection requiring hospitalization.

29 **Primary Outcome:** Symptoms of cognitive dysfunction assessed via an abbreviated  
30 form of the Barkley Deficits in Executive Functioning Scale (BDEFS).

31 **Results:** Those who reported a prior SARS-CoV-2 infection regardless of COVID-19  
32 symptom severity ( $M_{adj}=1.89$ ,  $SE=0.08$ ,  $CI$ : 1.74, 2.04;  $n=175$ ) reported a significantly  
33 higher number of symptoms of executive dysfunction than their non-infected  
34 counterparts ( $M_{adj}=1.63$ ,  $SE=0.08$ ,  $CI$ : 1.47, 1.80;  $n=1,599$ ;  $\beta=0.26$ ,  $p=.001$ ). Among  
35 those infected, there was a dose-response relationship between COVID-19 symptom  
36 severity and level of executive dysfunction, with moderate ( $\beta=0.23$ ,  $CI$ : 0.003-0.46) and  
37 very/extremely severe ( $\beta=0.69$ ,  $CI$ : 0.22-1.16) COVID-19 symptoms being associated  
38 with significantly greater dysfunction. These effects remained reliable and of similar  
39 magnitude after removing those who had been received intubation.

40 **Conclusions:** Positive SARS-CoV-2 infection history and COVID-19 symptom severity  
41 are associated with executive dysfunction among young and middle-aged adults with no  
42 history of medically induced coma.

43

44 Key words: SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, brain, cognition, executive function

## 45 Introduction

46 Cognitive dysfunction is one of the potential adverse consequences of SARS-CoV-2  
47 infection. It is understood that SARS-CoV-2 could impact the brain through a number of  
48 non-exclusive, indirect mechanisms including hypoxia, thrombosis, coagulopathy,  
49 cytokine storm, and megakaryocyte invasion<sup>1-6</sup>. Studies of hospitalized patients have  
50 revealed cognitive deficits in the areas of memory, spatial navigation, attention, short-  
51 term memory, and executive function<sup>5,7</sup>. Further, the cognitive impairments following  
52 SARS-Cov-2 infection may persist after the acute phase of infection<sup>5</sup>, a phenomenon  
53 known as “long covid”<sup>8,9</sup>.

54 Several studies have reported reliable evidence of cognitive dysfunction among  
55 those previously infected with SARS-CoV-2.<sup>7, 10-14</sup> However, some of these studies are  
56 limited by non-representative samples and lack of comparison to non-infected controls  
57 in the general population. Examination of a population-based sample including  
58 asymptomatic and minimally symptomatic individuals, coupled with a control sample of  
59 non-infected individuals from the same population facilitates quantification of the  
60 reliability and magnitude of SARS-CoV-2 infection impacts on cognition, if they do  
61 indeed exist. Beyond the above, relatively little is known about the extent to which  
62 cognitive deficits are predicted by age or sex, as demographic moderators.

63 The current study reports findings from a population survey of 1,958 adults in the  
64 general population, who reported cognitive status, SARS-CoV-2 infection history, and  
65 COVID-19 symptom severity. It was hypothesized based on prior research<sup>7, 10-14</sup> that (1)  
66 SARS-CoV-2 infection history would be associated with greater symptoms of executive  
67 dysfunction, and (2) severity of COVID-19 symptoms would be positively correlated with  
68 severity of cognitive dysfunction, in a dose response manner. Based on the increased  
69 sensitivity of higher cognitive functions to environmental and systemic insults, it was  
70 expected that older adults would be more susceptible to infection-related executive  
71 dysfunction than younger adults.

72

## 73 1. Methods

### 74 Participants

75 Participants were recruited as part of the Canadian COVID-19 Experiences Project  
76 (CCEP15), a multi-study project which includes a national cohort survey of 1,958 adults  
77 aged 18 to 54. One research objective was to examine differences between fully  
78 vaccinated and vaccine-hesitant individuals on a broad set of demographic,  
79 psychosocial, and experiential variables. Thus, the cohort was recruited to have an  
80 equal proportion of fully vaccinated and vaccine-hesitant Canadians: 50.2% received  
81 two vaccine shots, 43.3% had received no shots, and 5.5% received one vaccine shot,  
82 but were not intending to receive a second shot). The mean age was 37 (SD=10.4) and  
83 60.8% were female.

## 84 Procedure

85 The survey was conducted from 28 September to 21 October 2021, when the  
86 predominant SARS-CoV-2 variant in Canada was Delta (4 weeks prior to the  
87 appearance of Omicron16). Participants were contacted by email with an invitation to  
88 participate in the survey. A link to the survey was provided for eligible participants, and  
89 all measures were completed online following provision of informed consent. A quota  
90 target of equal number of vaccinated and vaccine hesitant was applied to obtain a  
91 balanced sample with respect to both vaccinated and vaccine-hesitant populations.  
92 Within each quota target, the sample was recruited from ten Canadian provinces  
93 through an online survey panel (Leger Opinion, the largest nationally representative  
94 probability-based panel in Canada). The survey firm and University of Waterloo  
95 monitored survey response in the sample of each quota to achieve the final  
96 representative sample. This study was reviewed and received ethics clearance from the  
97 institutional research ethics board of the University of Waterloo.

## 98 Measures

99 *Executive dysfunction.* Symptoms of executive dysfunction were assessed using four  
100 “self-restraint” subscale items from the Deficits in Executive Functioning Scale, short  
101 form (BDEFS-SF).<sup>15</sup> Respondents were asked how often they have experienced each  
102 the four problems during the past 6 months, including “I am unable to inhibit my  
103 reactions or responses to events or to other people”, “I make impulsive comments to  
104 others”, “I am likely to do things without considering the consequences for doing them”,  
105 and “I act without thinking”. Responses were indicated on a numerical scale where 1=  
106 never or rarely, 2=sometimes, 3=often, and 4=very often. Cronbach’s alpha for the 4  
107 items was 0.89, indicating acceptable reliability. The four executive dysfunction items  
108 were averaged for this analysis to create a composite executive dysfunction measure.

109 *SARS-CoV-2 infection status:* Infection status was assessed using the question “What  
110 best describes YOUR experience with [SARS-CoV-2] infection?” where 1= I have NOT  
111 been infected, 2 =I have been infected, and 3= not stated.

112 *Symptom severity:* COVID-19 symptom severity was assessed among those who have  
113 been infected by SARS-CoV-2 using two questions. (1) “How do you know that you  
114 HAVE BEEN infected with [SARS-CoV-2]?” responses were given the answers of 1=  
115 had symptoms but did not get tested, 2= had symptoms and tested positive, and 3 =  
116 had no symptoms but tested positive. (2) “How severe was your [SARS-CoV-2] illness?”  
117 The five-point response scale was 1=not at all severe, 2=slightly severe, 3=moderately  
118 severe, 4=very severe, 5=extremely severe. Those reporting “had no symptoms but  
119 tested positive” were incorporated into the second question as 1=not at all severe.

## 120 Statistical analysis

121 Samples were post stratified by sampling regions: Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba +  
122 Saskatchewan, Ontario, Quebec English, and Quebec French, and the Atlantic

123 provinces (Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland and  
124 Labrador). Sampling weights were computed using a ranking procedure and calibrated  
125 to target marginal joint population distributions of sampling regions x SARS-CoV-2  
126 infection status, and gender x age groups x SARS-CoV-2 infection status based on the  
127 2016 Canadian census data and the disposition code data in the survey, thus allowing  
128 generalization to the Canadian population. Survey linear regression models  
129 incorporating survey strata and weights were applied to estimate composite executive  
130 dysfunction scores and their associations with SARS-CoV-2 infection status and  
131 COVID-19 symptom severity. Regression models controlled for respondents' gender  
132 and age groups (18-24, 25-39 and 40-54). All models were conducted in SAS with  
133 SUDAAN V11. All confidence intervals (CI) and statistical significance were assessed at  
134 the 95% confidence level.

135

136

## 137 **2. Results**

138 Baseline characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 1. The majority of the  
139 participants were female (60%) and from the 25-39 (40%) and 40-54 (43%) age groups  
140 (Table 1). 84% of participants reported that they had not been infected; those who  
141 reported having been infected reported symptoms to be “not at all severe” (3%), “slightly  
142 severe” (2.4%), “moderately severe” (2.7%), with relatively few experiencing  
143 “very/extremely severe” (1%; Table 1).

144 Those who reported a prior SARS-CoV-2 infection regardless of COVID-19 symptom  
145 severity ( $M_{adj}=1.89$ ,  $SE=0.08$ ,  $CI$ : 1.74, 2.04;  $n=175$ ) reported a significantly higher  
146 number of symptoms of cognitive dysfunction than their non-infected counterparts  
147 ( $M_{adj}=1.63$ ,  $SE=0.08$ ,  $CI$ : 1.47, 1.80;  $n=1,599$ ;  $\beta=0.26$ ,  $p=.001$ ). Men were likely to  
148 experience more cognitive dysfunction than women ( $\beta= 0.15$ ,  $p<.001$ ); younger adults  
149 (25-39 years) were more likely to experience cognitive dysfunction than middle aged  
150 adults (40-54 years;  $\beta= 0.30$ ,  $p<.001$ ).

151 Participants who reported “moderately severe” ( $M_{adj} = 1.85$ , 95%  $CI$  1.63 – 2.08) and  
152 “very” or “extremely severe” ( $M_{adj} = 2.32$ , 95%  $CI$  1.85 – 2.78) COVID-19 symptoms  
153 were significantly more likely to have higher levels of cognitive dysfunction compared to  
154 non-infected individuals ( $M_{adj} = 1.62$ , 95%  $CI$  1.58 – 1.66) (Table 2).

155 A dose-response relationship between COVID-19 symptom severity and cognitive  
156 dysfunction was evident, with moderate ( $\beta=0.23$ ,  $CI$ : 0.003-0.46) and very/extremely  
157 severe ( $\beta= 0.69$ ,  $CI$ : 0.22-1.16) COVID-19 symptoms being associated with significantly  
158 greater degrees of cognitive dysfunction, compared to those not infected and those with  
159 asymptomatic infections (Figure 1). Identical findings emerged following removal of  
160 those who had reported receiving intubation.

161



### 162 3. Discussion

163 In this population-representative cohort of community-dwelling adults, those with a  
164 positive history of SARS-CoV-2 infection reported more symptoms of cognitive  
165 dysfunction than those with no such history. This effect was stronger for men than for  
166 women, and for younger versus older adults. A dose-response relationship between  
167 COVID-19 symptom severity and magnitude of cognitive dysfunction was evident such  
168 that increasing infection severity was associated with greater symptoms of cognitive  
169 dysfunction. Importantly, reliable effects of positive SARS-CoV-2 infection history and  
170 COVID-19 symptom severity on cognitive dysfunction were evident even in this sample  
171 of individuals not typically subject to age-related cognitive decline (ages 18 to 54) and  
172 not exposed to medically induced coma via hospital-based treatment for severe COVID-  
173 19. Our findings were similar to a prior report of executive dysfunction as correlated  
174 with COVID-19 symptom severity in a large population sample<sup>13</sup>.

175 There are several hypothesized mechanisms by which SARS-CoV-2 infection may  
176 produce cognitive dysfunction, including encephalitis, coagulopathy, cytokine storm,  
177 hypoxia, and megakaryocyte invasion<sup>4,5,6</sup>. The current investigation cannot distinguish  
178 among these neurophysiological mechanisms, or others that may yet be identified. The  
179 current findings do not preclude the possibility that symptoms of cognitive dysfunction  
180 are influenced by reporting biases among those who are continuing to experience  
181 emotional distress following the measurement period. Given that the effects of negative  
182 mood on symptom reporting is causally established<sup>18</sup>, and given that mood impacts of  
183 the COVID-19 pandemic are well-documented<sup>19-23</sup>, this possibility cannot be definitively  
184 excluded. However, at least one prior population-based study has found similar dose-  
185 response effects using performance-based measures of cognitive function (i.e.,  
186 cognitive tasks rather than reported symptoms).<sup>7</sup>

187 It is not clear why there appeared to be a stronger link between SARS-CoV-2  
188 infection and cognitive dysfunction in younger- as compared with middle aged adults. It  
189 is possible that such deficits were more obvious to younger adults, given that a higher  
190 proportion would be in educational programs wherein lapses in attention and  
191 concentration may have been more salient to them. In either case, it is not clear how  
192 consequential symptoms of cognitive dysfunction would be expected to be, even if  
193 reliable across studies. It is not uncommon for other types of viral infections to cause  
194 symptoms of cognitive dysfunction, including the seasonal flu, herpes, MERS, Zika and  
195 Varicella (chickenpox)<sup>24-28</sup>. Documenting the stability and functional impact of any  
196 SARS-CoV-2 infection impairments in cognition will be important.

197 Finally, given that the predominant SARS-CoV-2 variant during the time of the  
198 survey was Delta, the findings are applicable only to the Delta and earlier variants.  
199 Moreover, the retrospective nature of the study does not allow us to determine with  
200 confidence which infections were attributable to Delta versus earlier variants. We also  
201 cannot conclude that the same associations would be observed with the Omicron  
202 variant, in particular because of the lower COVID-19 symptom severity apparent with

203 Omicron in comparison with earlier variants, at least based on early data<sup>29-31</sup>. In the  
204 current (pre-Omicron) sample, we found that only moderate and higher COVID-19  
205 symptom severities were associated with significantly elevated symptoms of executive  
206 dysfunction. Further analyses of follow-up waves of the CCEP data will enable  
207 examination of the relative impact of the Omicron variant on symptoms of executive  
208 dysfunction.

### 209 *Strengths and Limitations*

210 There are several strengths of the current study. One strength is the use of a large  
211 population-representative sample, consisting of infected individuals of a wide range of  
212 disease symptom severities—ranging from asymptomatic to hospitalized—as well as  
213 non-infected controls. Another strength is the use of a validated measure of subjective  
214 symptomology assessing everyday function rather than more sensitive but less  
215 ecologically valid performance-based measures. However, by virtue of the survey  
216 format, it was not possible to validate the infection status of individuals by testing. This  
217 may lead to under- or over-estimation of effect size and statistical significance of tests,  
218 vis-a-vis misreporting of infection status. This is a limitation of all survey studies of  
219 COVID-19 and cognitive dysfunction however. Finally, the cross-sectional design limits  
220 our ability to draw causal inference.

221 Future studies should examine the longevity of cognitive dysfunction symptoms over  
222 time, as well as the extent to which the dose-response and age gradients observed here  
223 are replicable across samples. Finally, additional studies examining neurological  
224 impacts at the level of the brain itself will be required, using functional brain imaging  
225 paradigms.

### 226 *Conclusions*

227 In summary, the current study used a population-representative sample consisting of  
228 a balanced proportion of infected and uninfected individuals to estimate the association  
229 between SARS-CoV-2 infection and symptoms of cognitive dysfunction. Findings  
230 indicated that individuals previously infected with SARS-CoV-2 reported significantly  
231 greater symptoms of cognitive dysfunction than non-infected individuals. Further,  
232 among those reporting an infection, a dose-response relationship between COVID-19  
233 symptom severity and cognitive dysfunction was evident, such that those with moderate  
234 to severe symptoms were more likely to experience symptoms of cognitive dysfunction.

235

236

237

238

239 **Research ethics statement**

240 This study protocol was reviewed by and received approval from the University of  
241 Waterloo Office of Research Ethics.

242

243 **Funding statement**

244 This research was supported by an operating grant to P. Hall (PI), G. Fong (co-PI) and  
245 S. Hitchman (co-I) by the Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR), Institute for  
246 Population and Public Health (GA3-177733).

247

248 **Data Availability Statement**

249 Data will be available upon reasonable request to the corresponding author.

250

251 **Conflicts of Interests**

252 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

253

254 **Acknowledgements**

255 We thank Anne C.K. Quah and Thomas Agar for their assistance with survey design  
256 and management

257

258 **Figure 1 Legend**

259 Effects of SARS-CoV-2 infection status and COVID-19 symptom severity on BDEFS  
260 scores; BDEFS=Barkley Deficits in Executive Functioning Scale.

261

262 Table 1: Sample characteristics.

<b>Variables</b>	<b><i>n</i></b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Executive function (unadjusted) Mean, 95% CI</b>	<b>Executive function (adjusted) Mean, 95% CI</b>
Gender				
Male	747	39.27	-	-
Female	1155	60.73	-	-
Age Group				
18-24	313	16.46	-	-
25-39	769	40.43	-	-
40-54	820	43.11	-	-
Infection Status				
Not infected	1599	84.07	1.62 (1.58, 1.66)	1.62 (1.58, 1.66)
Infected: Not at all severe	57	3.00	1.72 (1.52, 1.93)	1.73 (1.54, 1.91)
Infected: Slightly severe	46	2.42	1.78 (1.44, 2.11)	1.75 (1.45, 2.05)
Infected: Moderately severe	51	2.68	1.83 (1.60, 2.06)	1.85 (1.63, 2.08)
Infected: Very/extremely severe	21	1.10	2.29 (1.82, 2.76)	2.32 (1.85, 2.78)
Not stated	128	6.73	1.64 (1.46, 1.81)	1.63 (1.47, 1.80)

263 Note: Executive dysfunction mean is the average of the four BDEFS items. Participants  
 264 who had no COVID-19 symptoms, but tested positive for SARS-CoV-2, were classified  
 265 as “not at all severe”. The adjusted parameters are adjusted by sex and group. Table 1  
 266 includes the sample used in the current analysis ( $N = 1,902$ ).

267

268



269 Table 2: Regression analysis predicting BDEFS scores from demographics, SARS-  
270 CoV-2 infection status and symptom severity.

---

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Beta (95% CI)</b>	<b>p</b>
Gender		
Male	0.15 (0.07, 0.22)	<0.001
Female	Ref	Ref
Age Group		
18-24	0.30 (0.19, 0.41)	<0.001
25-39	0.06 (-0.02, 0.14)	0.138
40-54	Ref	Ref
COVID-19 Infection Status		
Not infected	Ref	Ref
Infected: Not at all severe	0.10 (-0.09, 0.29)	0.284
Infected: Slightly severe	0.13 (-0.17, 0.42)	0.406
Infected: Moderately severe	0.23 (0.00, 0.46)	0.047
Infected: Very/Extremely severe	0.69 (0.22, 1.16)	0.004
Not stated	0.01 (-0.16, 0.18)	0.903

---

271

272

273

274

275

276 **Author Contributions**

277

278 PH, GF and SH conceived the study, planned and oversaw the statistical analyses, and  
279 wrote the final draft. GM planned and completed all statistical analyses and contributed  
280 to the writing of the final draft. MNS and AH contributed to the writing of the final draft.

281

## 282 References

- 283 1. Boldrini M, Canoll PD, Klein RS. How COVID-19 Affects the Brain. *JAMA Psychiatry*.  
284 2021;78(6):682. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2021.0500
- 285 2. Mao L, Jin H, Wang M, et al. Neurologic Manifestations of Hospitalized Patients With  
286 Coronavirus Disease 2019 in Wuhan, China. *JAMA Neurol*. 2020;77(6):683-690.  
287 doi:10.1001/jamaneurol.2020.1127
- 288 3. McFadyen JD, Stevens H, Peter K. The Emerging Threat of (Micro)Thrombosis in COVID-  
289 19 and Its Therapeutic Implications. *Circ Res*. 2020;127(4):571-587.  
290 doi:10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.120.317447
- 291 4. Nauen DW, Hooper JE, Stewart CM, Solomon IH. Assessing Brain Capillaries in  
292 Coronavirus Disease 2019. *JAMA Neurol*. 2021;78(6):760-762.  
293 doi:10.1001/jamaneurol.2021.0225
- 294 5. Ritchie K, Chan D. The emergence of cognitive COVID. *World Psychiatry*. 2021;20(1):52-  
295 53. doi:10.1002/wps.20837
- 296 6. Solomon T. Neurological infection with SARS-CoV-2 — the story so far. *Nat Rev Neurol*.  
297 2021;17(2):65-66. doi:10.1038/s41582-020-00453-w
- 298 7. Jaywant A, Vanderlind WM, Alexopoulos GS, Fridman CB, Perlis RH, Gunning FM.  
299 Frequency and profile of objective cognitive deficits in hospitalized patients recovering from  
300 COVID-19. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2021;46(13):2235-2240. doi:10.1038/s41386-021-  
301 00978-8
- 302 8. Ladds E, Rushforth A, Wieringa S, et al. Persistent symptoms after Covid-19: qualitative  
303 study of 114 “long Covid” patients and draft quality principles for services. *BMC Health*  
304 *Serv Res*. 2020;20(1):1144. doi:10.1186/s12913-020-06001-y
- 305 9. Rubin R. As Their Numbers Grow, COVID-19 “Long Haulers” Stump Experts. *JAMA*.  
306 2020;324(14):1381-1383. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.17709
- 307 10. Becker JH, Lin JJ, Doernberg M, et al. Assessment of Cognitive Function in Patients After  
308 COVID-19 Infection. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4(10):e2130645.  
309 doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.30645
- 310 11. Liu YH, Wang YR, Wang QH, et al. Post-infection cognitive impairments in a cohort of  
311 elderly patients with COVID-19. *Mol Neurodegener*. 2021;16(1):48. doi:10.1186/s13024-  
312 021-00469-w
- 313 12. Almeria M, Cejudo JC, Sotoca J, Deus J, Krupinski J. Cognitive profile following COVID-19  
314 infection: Clinical predictors leading to neuropsychological impairment. *Brain Behav Immun*  
315 *- Health*. 2020;9:100163. doi:10.1016/j.bbih.2020.100163
- 316 13. Hampshire A, Trender W, Chamberlain SR, et al. Cognitive Deficits in People Who Have  
317 Recovered from COVID-19 Relative to Controls: An N=84,285 Online Study.;  
318 2020:2020.10.20.20215863. doi:10.1101/2020.10.20.20215863

- 319 14. Almeria M, Cejudo JC, Sotoca J, Deus J, Krupinski J. Cognitive profile following COVID-19  
320 infection: Clinical predictors leading to neuropsychological impairment. *Brain Behav Immun*  
321 *Health*. 2020 Dec;9:100163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbih.2020.100163>
- 322 15. Hall PA, Fong GT, Hitchman SC, Quah ACK, Agar T, Meng G, Ayaz H, Dore BP, Sakib  
323 MN, Hudson A, Boudreau C. The Canadian COVID-19 Experiences Project: Design and  
324 Protocol. *medRxiv*, 2021; <https://medrxiv.org/cgi/content/short/2021.12.24.21268387v1>
- 325 16. Government of Canada. COVID-19 daily epidemiology update. Available at: [https://health-](https://health-infobase.canada.ca/covid-19/epidemiological-summary-covid-19-cases.html)  
326 [infobase.canada.ca/covid-19/epidemiological-summary-covid-19-cases.html](https://health-infobase.canada.ca/covid-19/epidemiological-summary-covid-19-cases.html). Accessed  
327 December 30, 2022.
- 328 17. Barkley, Russell A. *Barkley deficits in executive functioning scale (BDEFS)*. Guilford  
329 Press, 2011.
- 330 18. Howren MB, Suls J. The symptom perception hypothesis revised: depression and anxiety  
331 play different roles in concurrent and retrospective physical symptom reporting. *Journal of*  
332 *personality and social psychology*. 2011 Jan;100(1):182.
- 333 19. Czeisler MÉ. Mental health, substance use, and suicidal ideation during the COVID-19  
334 pandemic—United States, June 24–30, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep [Internet]*  
335 2020;69:1049–57. Available at: <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6932a1.htm>.  
336 Accessed January 19, 2021.
- 337 20. Xiong J, Lipsitz O, Nasri F, Lui LMW, Gill H, Phan L, Chen-Li D, Iacobucci M, Ho R, Majeed  
338 A, McIntyre RS. Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on mental health in the general population:  
339 a systematic review. *J Affect Disord* 2020;277:55–64.
- 340 21. Duan L, Shao X, Wang Y, Huang Y, Miao J, Yang X, Zhu G. An investigation of mental  
341 health status of children and adolescents in China during the outbreak of COVID-19. *J*  
342 *Affect Disord* 2020;275:112–8.
- 343 22. Daly M, Sutin AR, Robinson E. Longitudinal changes in mental health and the COVID-19  
344 pandemic: evidence from the UK Household Longitudinal Study. *Psychol Med* 2020;1–10.
- 345 23. Hall PA, Sheeran P, Fong GT, Cheah CS, Oremus M, Liu-Ambrose T, Sakib MN, Butt ZA,  
346 Ayaz H, Jandu N, Morita PP. Biobehavioral aspects of the COVID-19 pandemic: A review.  
347 *Psychosomatic medicine*. 2021 May;83(4):309.
- 348 24. Goenka A, Michael BD, Ledger E, Hart IJ, Absoud M, Chow G, Lilleker J, Lunn M, McKee  
349 D, Peake D, Pysden K, Roberts M, Carrol ED, Lim M, Avula S, Solomon T, Kneen R.  
350 Neurological manifestations of influenza infection in children and adults: results of a  
351 national british surveillance study. *Clin Infect Dis* 2014;58:775–84.
- 352 25. Kim JE, Heo JH, Kim HO, Song SH, Park SS, Park TH, Ahn JY, Kim MK, Choi JP.  
353 Neurological complications during treatment of Middle East respiratory syndrome. *J Clin*  
354 *Neurol* 2017;13:227–33.
- 355 26. Barreto de Araújo TV, Rodrigues LC, de Alencar Ximenes RA, de Barros Miranda-Filho D,  
356 Montarroyos UR, Lopes de Melo AP, Valongueiro S, de Fátima Pessoa Militão de  
357 Albuquerque M, Souza WV, Braga C, Filho SPB, Cordeiro MT, Vazquez E, Di Cavalcanti

- 358 Souza Cruz D, Henriques CMP, Bezerra LCA, da Silva Castanha PM, Dhalia R, Marques-  
359 Júnior ETA, Martelli CMT. Association between Zika virus infection and microcephaly in  
360 Brazil, January to May, 2016: preliminary report of a case-control study. *Lancet Infect Dis*  
361 2016;16:1356–63.
- 362 27. Berger JR, Houff S. Neurological complications of herpes simplex virus type 2 infection.  
363 *Arch Neurol* 2008;65:596–600.
- 364 28. Gildea DH, Kleinschmidt-DeMasters BK, LaGuardia JJ, Mahalingam R, Cohrs RJ.  
365 Neurologic complications of the reactivation of varicella-zoster virus. *N Engl J Med*  
366 2000;342:635–45.
- 367 29. Christie B. Covid-19: Early studies give hope omicron is milder than other variants. *BMJ*  
368 2021;375:n3144
- 369 30. Abdullah F, Myers J, Basu D, Tintinger G, Ueckermann V, Mathebula M, Ramlall R, Spoor  
370 S, de Villiers T, Van der Walt Z, Cloete J. Decreased severity of disease during the first  
371 global omicron variant covid-19 outbreak in a large hospital in Tshwane, South Africa.  
372 *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2021 Dec 28.
- 373 31. Sheikh A, Kerr S, Woolhouse M, McMenemy J, Robertson C. Severity of omicron variant  
374 of concern and vaccine effectiveness against symptomatic disease: national cohort with  
375 nested test negative design study in Scotland.  
376 [https://www.research.ed.ac.uk/en/publications/severity-of-omicron-variant-of-concern-and-](https://www.research.ed.ac.uk/en/publications/severity-of-omicron-variant-of-concern-and-vaccine-effectiveness-)  
377 [vaccine-effectiveness-](https://www.research.ed.ac.uk/en/publications/severity-of-omicron-variant-of-concern-and-vaccine-effectiveness-)
- 378
- 379

## COVID-19 symptom severity and BDEFS total score

