

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

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

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

- <sup>1</sup>. School of Public Health Sciences, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada
- <sup>2</sup>. Department of Psychology, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada
- <sup>3</sup>. Department of Communication and Media Research, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland.
- <sup>4</sup>. Ontario Institute for Cancer Research, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

\*Corresponding author information:

Peter A. Hall, Ph.D., School of Public Health Sciences, University of Waterloo, 200 University Avenue West, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, N2L 3G1.

Geoffrey T. Fong, Ph.D., Department of Psychology, University of Waterloo, 200 University Avenue West, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, N2L 3G1

E-mail: [pahall@uwaterloo.ca](mailto:pahall@uwaterloo.ca)

E-mail: [gfong@uwaterloo.ca](mailto:gfong@uwaterloo.ca)

Phone: 519-888-4567 x48110

Word count: 1,829

Submitted to: *BMJ Open* (2021-12-13)

30 **Abstract**

31

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

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

39

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

42

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

46

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

49

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

52

53 **Results:** Those who reported a prior SARS-CoV-2 infection regardless of COVID-19  
54 symptom severity ( $M_{adj}=1.89$ ,  $SE=0.08$ ,  $CI$ : 1.74, 2.04;  $n=175$ ) reported a significantly  
55 higher number of symptoms of executive dysfunction than their non-infected  
56 counterparts ( $M_{adj}=1.63$ ,  $SE=0.08$ ,  $CI$ : 1.47, 1.80;  $n=1,599$ ;  $\beta=0.26$ ,  $p=.001$ ). Among  
57 those infected, there was a dose-response relationship between COVID-19 symptom  
58 severity and level of executive dysfunction, with moderate ( $\beta=0.23$ ,  $CI$ : 0.003-0.46) and  
59 very/extremely severe ( $\beta= 0.69$ ,  $CI$ : 0.22-1.16) COVID-19 symptoms being associated  
60 with significantly greater dysfunction, compared to asymptomatic. These effects  
61 remained reliable and of similar magnitude after removing those who had been received  
62 intubation and when controlling for vaccination status.

63

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

67

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

69 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 70 • Strengths include a population-representative sample and use of a well-validated
- 71 measure of executive dysfunction
- 72 • Sensitivity analyses to determine reliability of findings for those not intubated and
- 73 of a variety of disease severities
- 74 • Causal inference limited by cross-sectional design

75

## 76 Introduction

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

85 Several studies have reported reliable evidence of cognitive dysfunction among  
86 those previously infected with SARS-CoV-2.<sup>7,10-13</sup> However, some of these studies are  
87 limited by non-representative samples and lack of comparison to non-infected controls  
88 in the general population. Examination of a population-based sample including  
89 asymptomatic and minimally symptomatic individuals, coupled with a control sample of  
90 non-infected individuals from the same population facilitates quantification of the  
91 reliability and magnitude of SARS-CoV-2 infection impacts on cognition, if they do  
92 indeed exist. Beyond the above, relatively little is known about the extent to which  
93 cognitive deficits are predicted by age or sex, as demographic moderators.

94 The current study reports findings from a population survey of 1,958 adults in the  
95 general population, who reported cognitive status, SARS-CoV-2 infection history, and  
96 COVID-19 symptom severity. It was hypothesized based on prior research<sup>7,10-13</sup> that (1)  
97 SARS-CoV-2 infection history would be associated with greater symptoms of executive  
98 dysfunction, and (2) severity of COVID-19 symptoms would be positively correlated with  
99 severity of cognitive dysfunction, in a dose response manner. Based on the increased  
100 sensitivity of higher cognitive functions to environmental and systemic insults, it was  
101 expected that older adults would be more susceptible to infection-related executive  
102 dysfunction than younger adults.

103

## 104 1. Methods

### 105 Participants

106 Participants were recruited as part of the Canadian COVID-19 Experiences Project  
107 (CCEP)<sup>14</sup>, a multi-study project which includes a national cohort survey of 1,958 adults  
108 aged 18 to 54. One research objective was to examine differences between fully  
109 vaccinated and vaccine-hesitant individuals on a broad set of demographic,  
110 psychosocial, and experiential variables. Thus, the cohort was recruited to have an  
111 equal proportion of fully vaccinated and vaccine-hesitant Canadians: 50.2% received  
112 two vaccine shots, 43.3% had received no shots, and 5.5% received one vaccine shot,  
113 but were not intending to receive a second shot). The mean age was 37 (SD=10.4) and  
114 60.8% were female.

## 115 Procedure

116 The survey was conducted from 28 September to 21 October 2021, when the  
117 predominant SARS-CoV-2 variant in Canada was Delta (4 weeks prior to the  
118 appearance of Omicron).<sup>15</sup> Participants were contacted by email with an invitation to  
119 participate in the survey. A link to the survey was provided for eligible participants, and  
120 all measures were completed online following provision of informed consent. A quota  
121 target of equal number of vaccinated and vaccine hesitant was applied to obtain a  
122 balanced sample with respect to both vaccinated and vaccine-hesitant populations.  
123 Within each quota target, the sample was recruited from ten Canadian provinces  
124 through an online survey panel (Leger Opinion, the largest nationally representative  
125 probability-based panel in Canada). The survey firm and University of Waterloo  
126 monitored survey response in the sample of each quota to achieve the final  
127 representative sample. This study was reviewed and received ethics clearance from the  
128 institutional research ethics board of the University of Waterloo.

## 129 Measures

130 *Executive dysfunction.* Symptoms of executive dysfunction were assessed using four  
131 “self-restraint” subscale items from the Deficits in Executive Functioning Scale, short  
132 form (BDEFS-SF)<sup>16</sup>. Respondents were asked how often they have experienced each  
133 the four problems during the past 6 months, including “I am unable to inhibit my  
134 reactions or responses to events or to other people”, “I make impulsive comments to  
135 others”, “I am likely to do things without considering the consequences for doing them”,  
136 and “I act without thinking”. Responses were indicated on a numerical scale where 1=  
137 never or rarely, 2=sometimes, 3=often, and 4=very often. Cronbach’s alpha for the 4  
138 items was 0.89, indicating acceptable reliability. The four executive dysfunction items  
139 were averaged for this analysis to create a composite executive dysfunction measure.

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

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

## 151 Statistical analysis

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

154 provinces (Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland and  
155 Labrador). Sampling weights were computed using a ranking procedure and calibrated  
156 to target marginal joint population distributions of sampling regions x SARS-CoV-2  
157 infection status, and gender x age groups x SARS-CoV-2 infection status based on the  
158 2016 Canadian census data and the disposition code data in the survey, thus allowing  
159 generalization to the Canadian population. Survey linear regression models  
160 incorporating survey strata and weights were applied to estimate composite executive  
161 dysfunction scores and their associations with SARS-CoV-2 infection status and  
162 COVID-19 symptom severity. Regression models controlled for respondents' gender  
163 and age groups (18-24, 25-39 and 40-54). All models were conducted in SAS with  
164 SUDAAN V11. All confidence intervals (CI) and statistical significance were assessed at  
165 the 95% confidence level.

166

167

## 168 **2. Results**

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

175 Those who reported a prior SARS-CoV-2 infection regardless of COVID-19 symptom  
176 severity ( $M_{adj}=1.89$ ,  $SE=0.08$ ,  $CI$ : 1.74, 2.04;  $n=175$ ) reported a significantly higher  
177 number of symptoms of cognitive dysfunction than their non-infected counterparts  
178 ( $M_{adj}=1.63$ ,  $SE=0.08$ ,  $CI$ : 1.47, 1.80;  $n=1,599$ ;  $\beta=0.26$ ,  $p=.001$ ). Men were likely to  
179 experience more cognitive dysfunction than women ( $\beta= 0.15$ ,  $p<.001$ ); younger adults  
180 (25-39 years) were more likely to experience cognitive dysfunction than middle aged  
181 adults (40-54 years;  $\beta= 0.30$ ,  $p<.001$ ).

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

186 A dose-response relationship between COVID-19 symptom severity and cognitive  
187 dysfunction was evident, with moderate ( $\beta=0.23$ ,  $CI$ : 0.003-0.46) and very/extremely  
188 severe ( $\beta= 0.69$ ,  $CI$ : 0.22-1.16) COVID-19 symptoms being associated with significantly  
189 greater degrees of cognitive dysfunction, compared to those not infected and those with  
190 asymptomatic infections (Figure 1). Identical findings emerged following removal of  
191 those who had reported receiving intubation. Likewise, when controlling for vaccination  
192 status, the same trend was evident such that those in the very/extremely severe  
193 symptom categories reported significantly greater symptoms of executive dysfunction  
194 than the non-infected reference group ( $\beta=0.67$ , 95%  $CI$  0.20 - 1.15,  $p=.005$ ).

### 195 3. Discussion

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

208 There are several hypothesized mechanisms by which SARS-CoV-2 infection may  
209 produce cognitive dysfunction, including encephalitis, coagulopathy, cytokine storm,  
210 hypoxia, and megakaryocyte invasion.<sup>4-6</sup> The current investigation cannot distinguish  
211 among these neurophysiological mechanisms, or others that may yet be identified. The  
212 current findings do not preclude the possibility that symptoms of cognitive dysfunction  
213 are influenced by reporting biases among those who are continuing to experience  
214 emotional distress following the measurement period. Given that the effects of negative  
215 mood on symptom reporting is causally established,<sup>17</sup> and given that mood impacts of  
216 the COVID-19 pandemic are well-documented,<sup>18-22</sup> this possibility cannot be definitively  
217 excluded. However, at least one prior population-based study has found similar dose-  
218 response effects using performance-based measures of cognitive function (i.e.,  
219 cognitive tasks rather than reported symptoms).<sup>7</sup>

220 It is not clear why there appeared to be a stronger link between SARS-CoV-2  
221 infection and cognitive dysfunction in younger- as compared with middle aged adults. It  
222 is possible that such deficits were more obvious to younger adults, given that a higher  
223 proportion would be in educational programs wherein lapses in attention and  
224 concentration may have been more salient to them. In either case, it is not clear how  
225 consequential symptoms of cognitive dysfunction would be expected to be, even if  
226 reliable across studies. It is not uncommon for other types of viral infections to cause  
227 symptoms of cognitive dysfunction, including the seasonal flu, herpes, MERS, Zika and  
228 Varicella (chickenpox).<sup>23-27</sup> Documenting the stability and functional impact of any  
229 SARS-CoV-2 infection impairments in cognition will be important.

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

236 Omicron in comparison with earlier variants, at least based on early data.<sup>28–30</sup> In the  
237 current (pre-Omicron) sample, we found that only moderate and higher COVID-19  
238 symptom severities were associated with significantly elevated symptoms of executive  
239 dysfunction. Further analyses of follow-up waves of the CCEP data will enable  
240 examination of the relative impact of the Omicron variant on symptoms of executive  
241 dysfunction.

#### 242 *Strengths and Limitations*

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

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

#### 259 *Conclusions*

260 In summary, the current study used a population-representative sample consisting of  
261 a balanced proportion of infected and uninfected individuals to estimate the association  
262 between SARS-CoV-2 infection and symptoms of cognitive dysfunction. Findings  
263 indicated that individuals previously infected with SARS-CoV-2 reported significantly  
264 greater symptoms of cognitive dysfunction than non-infected individuals. Further,  
265 among those reporting an infection, a dose-response relationship between COVID-19  
266 symptom severity and cognitive dysfunction was evident, such that those with moderate  
267 to severe symptoms were more likely to experience symptoms of cognitive dysfunction.

268

269

270



271

272 **Research ethics statement**

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

275

276 **Funding statement**

277 This investigation was completed using funding supplied by the Canadian Institutes of  
278 Health Research to P. Hall (PI), G. Fong (co-PI) and S. Hitchman (co-I).

279

280 **Data Availability Statement**

281 Data will be available upon reasonable request to either of the corresponding authors.

282

283 **Conflicts of Interests**

284 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

285

286 **Acknowledgements**

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

289

290 **Figure 1 Legend**

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

293

294 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)

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

299

300

301 Table 2: Regression analysis predicting BDEFS scores from demographics, SARS-  
302 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

---

303

304

305

306

307

308 **Author Contributions**

309

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

313

314 References

315

- 316 1. Boldrini M, Canoll PD, Klein RS. How COVID-19 Affects the Brain. *JAMA Psychiatry*.  
317 2021;78(6):682. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2021.0500
- 318 2. Mao L, Jin H, Wang M, et al. Neurologic Manifestations of Hospitalized Patients With Coronavirus  
319 Disease 2019 in Wuhan, China. *JAMA Neurol*. 2020;77(6):683-690.  
320 doi:10.1001/jamaneurol.2020.1127
- 321 3. McFadyen JD, Stevens H, Peter K. The Emerging Threat of (Micro)Thrombosis in COVID-19 and  
322 Its Therapeutic Implications. *Circ Res*. 2020;127(4):571-587.  
323 doi:10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.120.317447
- 324 4. Nauen DW, Hooper JE, Stewart CM, Solomon IH. Assessing Brain Capillaries in Coronavirus  
325 Disease 2019. *JAMA Neurol*. 2021;78(6):760-762. doi:10.1001/jamaneurol.2021.0225
- 326 5. Ritchie K, Chan D. The emergence of cognitive COVID. *World Psychiatry*. 2021;20(1):52-53.  
327 doi:10.1002/wps.20837
- 328 6. Solomon T. Neurological infection with SARS-CoV-2 — the story so far. *Nat Rev Neurol*.  
329 2021;17(2):65-66. doi:10.1038/s41582-020-00453-w
- 330 7. Jaywant A, Vanderlind WM, Alexopoulos GS, Fridman CB, Perlis RH, Gunning FM. Frequency  
331 and profile of objective cognitive deficits in hospitalized patients recovering from COVID-19.  
332 *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2021;46(13):2235-2240. doi:10.1038/s41386-021-00978-8
- 333 8. Ladds E, Rushforth A, Wieringa S, et al. Persistent symptoms after Covid-19: qualitative study of  
334 114 “long Covid” patients and draft quality principles for services. *BMC Health Serv Res*.  
335 2020;20(1):1144. doi:10.1186/s12913-020-06001-y
- 336 9. Rubin R. As Their Numbers Grow, COVID-19 “Long Haulers” Stump Experts. *JAMA*.  
337 2020;324(14):1381-1383. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.17709
- 338 10. Becker JH, Lin JJ, Doernberg M, et al. Assessment of Cognitive Function in Patients After COVID-  
339 19 Infection. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4(10):e2130645. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.30645
- 340 11. Liu YH, Wang YR, Wang QH, et al. Post-infection cognitive impairments in a cohort of elderly  
341 patients with COVID-19. *Mol Neurodegener*. 2021;16(1):48. doi:10.1186/s13024-021-00469-w
- 342 12. Almeria M, Cejudo JC, Sotoca J, Deus J, Krupinski J. Cognitive profile following COVID-19  
343 infection: Clinical predictors leading to neuropsychological impairment. *Brain Behav Immun -*  
344 *Health*. 2020;9:100163. doi:10.1016/j.bbih.2020.100163
- 345 13. Hampshire A, Trender W, Chamberlain SR, et al. *Cognitive Deficits in People Who Have*  
346 *Recovered from COVID-19 Relative to Controls: An N=84,285 Online Study.*;  
347 2020:2020.10.20.20215863. doi:10.1101/2020.10.20.20215863
- 348 14. Hall P, Fong G, Hitchman S. The Canadian COVID-19 Experiences Survey: Study Protocol.  
349 Published online 2021.

- 350 15. Canada PHA of. COVID-19 daily epidemiology update. aem. Published April 19, 2020. Accessed  
351 January 2, 2022. [https://health-infobase.canada.ca/covid-19/epidemiological-summary-covid-19-](https://health-infobase.canada.ca/covid-19/epidemiological-summary-covid-19-cases.html?stat=rate&measure=total_last14&map=pt)  
352 [cases.html?stat=rate&measure=total\\_last14&map=pt](https://health-infobase.canada.ca/covid-19/epidemiological-summary-covid-19-cases.html?stat=rate&measure=total_last14&map=pt)
- 353 16. Barkley RA. *Barkley Deficits in Executive Functioning Scale (BDEFS)*. Guilford Press; 2011.
- 354 17. Howren MB, Suls J. The symptom perception hypothesis revised: Depression and anxiety play  
355 different roles in concurrent and retrospective physical symptom reporting. *J Pers Soc Psychol.*  
356 2011;101(1):182. doi:10.1037/a0021715
- 357 18. Czeisler MÉ, Lane RI, Petrosky E, et al. Mental Health, Substance Use, and Suicidal Ideation  
358 During the COVID-19 Pandemic — United States, June 24–30, 2020. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.*  
359 2020;69(32):1049-1057. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6932a1
- 360 19. Xiong J, Lipsitz O, Nasri F, et al. Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on mental health in the general  
361 population: A systematic review. *J Affect Disord.* 2020;277:55-64. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2020.08.001
- 362 20. Duan L, Shao X, Wang Y, et al. An investigation of mental health status of children and adolescents  
363 in china during the outbreak of COVID-19. *J Affect Disord.* 2020;275:112-118.  
364 doi:10.1016/j.jad.2020.06.029
- 365 21. Daly M, Sutin AR, Robinson E. Longitudinal changes in mental health and the COVID-19  
366 pandemic: evidence from the UK Household Longitudinal Study. *Psychol Med.* Published online  
367 November 13, 2020:1-10. doi:10.1017/S0033291720004432
- 368 22. Hall PA, Sheeran P, Fong GT, et al. Biobehavioral Aspects of the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Review.  
369 *Psychosom Med.* 2021;83(4):309-321. doi:10.1097/PSY.0000000000000932
- 370 23. Goenka A, Michael BD, Ledger E, et al. Neurological Manifestations of Influenza Infection in  
371 Children and Adults: Results of a National British Surveillance Study. *Clin Infect Dis.*  
372 2014;58(6):775-784. doi:10.1093/cid/cit922
- 373 24. Kim JE, Heo JH, Kim H ok, et al. Neurological Complications during Treatment of Middle East  
374 Respiratory Syndrome. *J Clin Neurol.* 2017;13(3):227. doi:10.3988/jcn.2017.13.3.227
- 375 25. de Araújo TVB, Rodrigues LC, de Alencar Ximenes RA, et al. Association between Zika virus  
376 infection and microcephaly in Brazil, January to May, 2016: preliminary report of a case-control  
377 study. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2016;16(12):1356-1363. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(16)30318-8
- 378 26. Berger JR, Houff S. Neurological Complications of Herpes Simplex Virus Type 2 Infection. *Arch*  
379 *Neurol.* 2008;65(5). doi:10.1001/archneur.65.5.596
- 380 27. Gilden DH, Kleinschmidt-DeMasters BK, LaGuardia JJ, Mahalingam R, Cohrs RJ. Neurologic  
381 Complications of the Reactivation of Varicella-Zoster Virus. *N Engl J Med.* 2000;342(9):635-645.  
382 doi:10.1056/NEJM200003023420906
- 383 28. Christie B. Covid-19: Early studies give hope omicron is milder than other variants. *BMJ.*  
384 2021;375:n3144. doi:10.1136/bmj.n3144

- 385 29. Abdullah F, Myers J, Basu D, et al. Decreased severity of disease during the first global omicron  
386 variant covid-19 outbreak in a large hospital in Tshwane, South Africa. *Int J Infect Dis*. Published  
387 online December 2021:S120197122101256X. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2021.12.357
- 388 30. Sheikh A, Kerr S, Woolhouse M, McMenamin J, Robertson C. Severity of Omicron variant of  
389 concern and vaccine effectiveness against symptomatic disease: national cohort with nested test  
390 negative design study in Scotland. 2021. [https://www.research.ed.ac.uk/en/publications/severity-of-](https://www.research.ed.ac.uk/en/publications/severity-of-omicron-variant-of-concern-and-vaccine-effectiveness-)  
391 [omicron-variant-of-concern-and-vaccine-effectiveness-](https://www.research.ed.ac.uk/en/publications/severity-of-omicron-variant-of-concern-and-vaccine-effectiveness-)
- 392

## COVID-19 symptom severity and BDEFS total score

