

1

2 **Executive dysfunction following SARS-CoV-2 infection: A cross-sectional** 3 **examination in a population-representative sample**

4 Peter A. Hall PhD^{1,2,*}, Gang Meng PhD², Anna Hudson MSc¹, Mohammad N. Sakib MBBS¹, Sara C.
5 Hitchman PhD³, James McKillop PhD⁴, Warren K. Bickel PhD⁵, and Geoffrey T. Fong PhD^{1,2,4*}

6
7 ¹ School of Public Health Sciences, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

8 ² Department of Psychology, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

9 ³ Department of Communication and Media Research, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland.

10 ⁴ Department of Psychiatry and Behavioural Neurosciences, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario,
11 Canada

12 ⁵ Virginia Tech Carilion School of Medicine and Research Institute, Roanoke, Virginia, USA

13 ⁶ Ontario Institute for Cancer Research, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

14

15 *Corresponding author information:

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

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

20 E-mail: pahall@uwaterloo.ca

21 Phone: 519-888-4567 x48110

22

23 **Abstract**

24

25 **Background:** Prior studies have documented reliable associations between SARS-CoV-2 infection and
26 adverse cognitive impact in older adults. The current study sought to determine whether SARS-CoV-2
27 infection and COVID-19 symptom severity are associated with cognitive dysfunction among young adults
28 and middle-aged adults in the general population.

29 **Method:** The Canadian COVID-19 Experiences Project (CCEP) survey involves 1,958 adults with equal
30 representation of vaccinated and vaccine hesitant adults between the ages of 18 and 54 years. The
31 sample comprised 1,958 adults with a mean age of 37 years ($SD=10.4$); 60.8% were female. The
32 primary outcome was symptoms of cognitive dysfunction assessed via an abbreviated form of the Barkley
33 Deficits in Executive Functioning Scale (BDEFS) and performance on a validated decision-making task.

34

35 **Results:** Young and middle-aged adults with a positive SARS-CoV-2 infection history reported a
36 significantly higher number of symptoms of executive dysfunction ($M_{adj}=1.89$, $SE=0.08$, $CI: 1.74, 2.04$;
37 $n=175$) than their non-infected counterparts ($M_{adj}=1.63$, $SE=0.08$, $CI: 1.47, 1.80$; $n=1,599$; $\beta=0.26$,
38 $p=.001$). Among those infected, there was a dose-response relationship between COVID-19 symptom
39 severity and level of executive dysfunction, with moderate ($\beta=0.23$, $CI: 0.003-0.46$) and very/extremely
40 severe ($\beta= 0.69$, $CI: 0.22-1.16$) COVID-19 symptoms being associated with significantly greater
41 dysfunction, compared to asymptomatic. These effects remained reliable and of similar magnitude after
42 controlling for age, sex, vaccination status, income, and geographic region, and after removal of those
43 who had been intubated during hospitalization. Similar effects were found for the decision-making task.

44

45 **Conclusions:** Positive SARS-CoV-2 infection history and COVID-19 symptom severity are associated
46 with executive dysfunction among young and middle-aged adults with no history of medically induced
47 coma. These findings are evident on self-reported and task-related indicators of cognitive function.

48

49 **Key words:** SARS-CoV-2; COVID-19; brain; cognition; executive function

50 Introduction

51 Cognitive dysfunction is one of the potential adverse consequences of SARS-CoV-2
52 infection, and this risk may extend well below the age margins for increased mortality
53 risk. It is understood that SARS-CoV-2 could impact the brain through a number of non-
54 exclusive, indirect mechanisms including hypoxia, thrombosis, coagulopathy, cytokine
55 storm, and megakaryocyte invasion.¹⁻⁶ Studies of predominantly older, hospitalized
56 patients have revealed cognitive deficits in the areas of memory, spatial navigation,
57 attention, short-term memory, and executive function.⁵⁻⁷ Further, the cognitive
58 impairments following SARS-Cov-2 infection may persist after the acute phase of
59 infection,⁵ a phenomenon known as “long covid”.^{8,9}

60 Several studies have reported reliable evidence of cognitive dysfunction among
61 those previously infected with SARS-CoV-2.^{7,10-13} However, some of these studies are
62 limited by non-representative samples and lack of comparison to non-infected controls
63 in the general population. Examination of a population-based sample including
64 asymptomatic and minimally symptomatic individuals, coupled with a control sample of
65 non-infected individuals from the same population facilitates quantification of the
66 reliability and magnitude of SARS-CoV-2 infection impacts on cognition, if they do
67 indeed exist. Beyond the above, relatively little is known about the extent to which
68 cognitive deficits are predicted by age or sex, as demographic moderators. The extent
69 to which SARS-CoV-2 adversely impacts cognitive function among younger and middle-
70 aged adults is relatively unknown. Of particular interest are the executive functions,
71 which are especially susceptible to environmental and systemic insult.

72 Executive functions are partially supported by the lateral prefrontal cortex, as well as
73 the medial orbitofrontal cortex (mOFC). The mOFC is of particular interest, being the
74 brain subregion most anatomically close to the hypothesized point of SARS-CoV-2
75 neuroinvasion. Decision-making processes supported by the OFC can be best
76 assessed using decision-making paradigms with heavy temporal and evaluative
77 demands, such as a delay discounting task.¹⁴⁻¹⁷ Delay discounting is a neurobehavioral
78 process reflecting the extent to which future rewards are devalued based on their delay
79 in time¹⁸ and summarized relative balance between the prefrontal cortices and the
80 limbic systems.¹⁴ Greater delay discounting is reflected in the tendency to choose a
81 lower value option that is immediately available over a higher value option that is
82 delayed in time.

83 Prior studies have shown that damage to the mOFC is associated with increased
84 delay discounting.^{16,17} Impulsive choice of rewards is mediated by dopaminergic activity
85 within the mOFC,¹⁹ in contrast with choices to avoid punishment, which are mediated by
86 the lateral OFC.²⁰ The most anterior aspect of the mOFC has further been proposed as
87 the subregion most clearly involved in processing of abstract rewards (e.g., money), in
88 contrast with the posterior mOFC, which is involved in computation of basic rewards
89 (e.g., food, physical pleasure).²⁰ Importantly, the anterior mOFC is located immediately
90 superior to the olfactory bulb and nasal mucous membrane, the primary hypothesized

91 sites for SARS-CoV-2 neuroinvasion, and the presumed source of symptoms of
92 anosmia and ageusia reported by some infected individuals.²¹ This may be a partial
93 explanation for the diverse neuropsychiatric symptoms²² displayed by many patients
94 with severe COVID-19.

95 The current study reports findings from a large national survey of adults in the
96 general population, who reported cognitive status, SARS-CoV-2 infection history, and
97 COVID-19 symptom severity. It was hypothesized based on prior research^{7,10-13} that
98 positive SARS-CoV-2 infection history would be associated with greater self-reported
99 cognitive dysfunction, and that severity of COVID-19 symptoms would be positively
100 correlated with severity of cognitive dysfunction, in a dose response manner. Finally,
101 based on the proximity of the mOFC to the hypothesized site of neuroinvasion of SARS-
102 CoV-2, it was expected that deficits would be evident on a delay discounting task.

103

104 1. Methods

105 Participants

106 Participants were recruited as part of the Canadian COVID-19 Experiences Project
107 (CCEP)²³, 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 doses, 43.3% had received no doses, and 6.5% received one vaccine
113 dose, but were not intending to receive a second. 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).²⁴ 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)²⁵. 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 *Delay discounting.* To assess delay discounting, participants completed a validated 5-
141 trial delay discounting task wherein they were presented with a series of hypothetical
142 choices between a smaller monetary amount (\$500) immediately or a larger amount
143 (\$1,000) at various time delays (e.g., 1 month, 3 months).²⁶ Delay discounting was
144 calculated as a k value, reflecting the steepness of a hyperbolic devaluation of delayed
145 rewards; higher values of k indicate more impulsive choice.

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

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

157 **Statistical analysis**

158 Samples were post-stratified by geographic/language regions: Alberta, British Columbia,
159 Manitoba + Saskatchewan, Ontario, Quebec English, and Quebec French, and Atlantic
160 provinces (Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland and
161 Labrador). For each of the vaccinated and vaccine hesitant group separately, sampling
162 weights were computed using a raking procedure and calibrated to target marginal joint
163 population distributions of the geographic/language regions, and the gender and age
164 group combinations, based on population figures in the 2016 Canadian census data and
165 the disposition code in the sample, thus allowing generalization to the Canadian
166 population. Survey linear regression models incorporating survey strata and weights
167 were applied to estimate composite executive dysfunction scores and their associations
168 with SARS-CoV-2 infection status and COVID-19 symptom severity. Regression models

169 controlled for respondents' gender and age groups (18-24, 25-39 and 40-54). All models
170 were conducted in SAS with SUDAAN V11. All confidence intervals (CI) and statistical
171 significance were assessed at the 95% confidence level.

172

173

174 2. Results

175 Baseline characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 1. The majority of the
176 participants were female (60%) and from the 25-39 (40%) or 40-54 (43%) age groups.
177 84% of participants reported that they had not been infected; those who reported having
178 been infected reported symptoms to be “not at all severe” (3%), “slightly severe” (2.4%),
179 “moderately severe” (2.7%), with relatively few experiencing “very/extremely severe”
180 symptoms (1%). The two cognitive measures were positively correlated ($r=0.17$,
181 $p<.001$).

182 *Self-reported Executive Dysfunction*

183 Those who reported a prior SARS-CoV-2 infection reported a significantly higher
184 number of symptoms of executive dysfunction ($M_{adj}=1.89$, $SE=0.08$, CI : 1.74, 2.04;
185 $n=175$) than their non-infected counterparts ($M_{adj}=1.63$, $SE=0.08$, CI : 1.47, 1.80;
186 $n=1,599$; $\beta=0.26$, $p=.001$). Men were likely to experience more executive dysfunction
187 than women ($\beta= 0.15$, $p<.001$); younger adults (25-39 years) were more likely to
188 experience executive dysfunction than middle aged adults (40-54 years; $\beta= 0.30$,
189 $p<.001$).

190 Among those who were infected, there was a dose-response relationship between
191 COVID-19 symptom severity and executive dysfunction. Participants who reported
192 “moderately severe” ($M_{adj} = 1.85$, 95% CI 1.63 – 2.08) and “very” or “extremely severe”
193 ($M_{adj} = 2.32$, 95% CI 1.85 – 2.78) COVID-19 symptoms were significantly more likely to
194 have higher levels of executive dysfunction compared to non-infected individuals ($M_{adj} =$
195 1.62 , 95% CI 1.58 – 1.66) (Table 2). A dose-response relationship between COVID-19
196 symptom severity and cognitive dysfunction was evident, those with moderate ($\beta=0.23$,
197 CI : 0.003-0.46) and very/extremely severe ($\beta= 0.69$, CI : 0.22-1.16) COVID-19
198 symptoms being associated with significantly greater degrees of executive dysfunction,
199 compared to those not infected and those with asymptomatic infections (Figure 2).
200 Removing the those who reported having been intubated ($n=5$) or hospitalized without
201 intubation ($n=5$) did not change the findings. Likewise, following further adjustment for
202 vaccination status, income, and geographical region, those in the very/extremely severe
203 symptom categories continued to report significantly greater symptoms of executive
204 dysfunction than the non-infected reference group ($\beta=0.71$, 95% CI 0.22 - 1.19, $p=.004$).

205 *Delay Discounting Task Performance*

206 Participants infected with SARS-CoV-2 displayed significantly higher delay
207 discounting rates ($k = 1.22$, $SE=0.48$, CI : 0.27, 2.16) than non-infected participants
208 ($k=0.37$, $SE=0.08$, CI : 0.21, 0.52; $\beta=.31$, $p=.017$; Table 3). With respect to dose-

209 response effects of symptom severity, among infected individuals, those reporting “very
210 severe” COVID-19 symptoms demonstrated significantly higher delay discounting rates
211 than those reporting no infection history, with the remaining severity categories falling
212 between these two values. Discount curves for infected versus non-infected, and
213 among severity levels ranging from asymptomatic and very severe are presented in
214 Figure 1 panel b.

215 In general, males had marginally steeper discount rates than females ($\beta=-.10$,
216 $p=.066$), and individuals reporting high incomes had significantly lower discounting rates
217 than individuals reporting low income ($\beta=-.30$, $p<.001$). No significant age differences in
218 k values were observed (see supplementary materials). No two-way interactions were
219 observed between sex and infection status predicting delay discounting were observed
220 (Wald $F=0.09$, $p=0.91$), or between age and infection status predicting delay discounting
221 (Wald $F=0.90$, $p=0.46$). Likewise, the three-way interaction term between sex, age and
222 infection status in predicting delay discounting was non-significant (Wald $F=1.37$,
223 $p=0.22$).

224 *Sensitivity Analyses*

225 Further adjustment for education and geographical region (i.e., province) had no
226 overall effect on the findings. In education and province-adjusted models, those
227 reporting a SARS-CoV-2 infection continued to show a significantly greater degree of
228 delay discounting than those non-infected ($\beta=-0.32$, $CI: -0.57, -0.06$, $p=.014$). Also similar
229 to earlier analyses, those in the “very severe” COVID-19 symptom severity category
230 showed greater discounting than those in the non-infected group ($\beta=1.28$, $CI: 0.35, 2.21$,
231 $p=.007$). Likewise, removal of 5 cases reporting being placed on mechanical ventilator
232 did not change the effects of SARS-CoV-2 infection status ($\beta=.23$, $CI: 0.01, 0.45$,
233 $p=.043$) or COVID-19 symptom severity ($\beta=.95$, $CI: 0.20, 1.71$, $p=.014$) on delay
234 discounting rate. Finally, when limiting the “infected” group to only those whom reported
235 having their infection confirmed by a positive PCR test, the effect of SARS-CoV-2
236 infection remained significant, and somewhat stronger in magnitude ($\beta=.40$; $CI: 0.07$,
237 0.72 , $p=.016$).

238

239 **3. Discussion**

240 In this population-representative cohort of community-dwelling adults, those with a
241 positive history of SARS-CoV-2 infection reported more symptoms of cognitive
242 dysfunction than those with no such history. This effect was evident on both self-
243 reported symptoms of executive dysfunction and on a validated decision-making task. A
244 dose-response relationship between COVID-19 symptom severity and magnitude of
245 cognitive dysfunction was evident such that increasing infection severity was associated
246 with greater symptoms of cognitive dysfunction for both self-reported symptoms and
247 task performance. Importantly, reliable effects of positive SARS-CoV-2 infection history
248 and COVID-19 symptom severity on cognitive dysfunction were evident—on both

249 measures—even in this sample of individuals not typically subject to age-related
250 cognitive decline (ages 18 to 54) and not exposed to medically induced coma via
251 hospital-based treatment for severe COVID-19. Our findings were similar to a prior
252 report of executive dysfunction as correlated with COVID-19 symptom severity in a
253 large population sample¹³, but extend them to include self-reported symptoms of
254 interpersonal significance, and a standardized decision making paradigm previously
255 linked to the site of hypothesized neuroinvasion of the SARS-CoV-2 virus (the mOFC;
256 Figure 1 panel A).

257 There are several hypothesized mechanisms by which SARS-CoV-2 infection may
258 produce cognitive dysfunction, including encephalitis, coagulopathy, cytokine storm,
259 hypoxia, and megakaryocyte invasion.^{4–6} The current investigation cannot distinguish
260 among these neurophysiological mechanisms, or others that may yet be identified. The
261 current findings do not preclude the possibility that symptoms of cognitive dysfunction
262 are influenced by reporting biases among those who are continuing to experience
263 emotional distress following the measurement period. Given that the effects of negative
264 mood on symptom reporting is causally established,^{27,28} and given that mood impacts of
265 the COVID-19 pandemic are well-documented,^{29–33} this possibility cannot be definitively
266 excluded. However, at least one prior population-based study has found similar dose-
267 response effects using performance-based measures of cognitive function (i.e.,
268 cognitive tasks rather than reported symptoms).⁷ It is further noteworthy that the same
269 patterns were evident on our decision-making task.

270 It is not clear why there appeared to be a stronger link between SARS-CoV-2
271 infection and cognitive dysfunction in younger adults as compared with middle-aged
272 adults. It is possible that such deficits were more salient to younger adults, given that a
273 higher proportion would be in educational programs wherein lapses in attention and
274 concentration may have been more impactful. In either case, it is not clear how
275 consequential symptoms of cognitive dysfunction would be expected to be, even if
276 reliable across studies. It is not uncommon for other types of viral infections to cause
277 symptoms of cognitive dysfunction, including the seasonal flu, herpes, MERS, Zika and
278 Varicella (chickenpox).^{34–38} Documenting the stability and functional impact of any
279 SARS-CoV-2 infection impairments in cognition will be important. However, in the
280 meantime, reductions in unnecessary exposure to SARS-CoV-2 infection may be an
281 important public health strategy even for young and middle aged adults, despite the
282 limited mortality risk.

283 Finally, given that the predominant SARS-CoV-2 variant during the time of the
284 survey was Delta, the findings are applicable only to the Delta and earlier variants.
285 Moreover, the retrospective nature of the study does not allow us to determine with
286 confidence which infections were attributable to Delta versus earlier variants. We also
287 cannot conclude that the same associations would be observed with the Omicron
288 variant, in particular because of the lower COVID-19 symptom severity apparent with
289 Omicron in comparison with earlier variants, at least based on early data.^{39–41} In the

290 current (pre-Omicron) sample, we found that only moderate and higher COVID-19
291 symptom severities were associated with significantly elevated symptoms of executive
292 dysfunction. Further analyses of follow-up waves of the CCEP data will enable
293 examination of the relative impact of the Omicron variant on symptoms of executive
294 dysfunction.

295 *Strengths and Limitations*

296 There are several strengths of the current study. One strength is the use of a large
297 population-representative sample, consisting of infected individuals of a wide range of
298 disease symptom severities—ranging from asymptomatic to hospitalized—as well as
299 non-infected controls. Another strength is the use of a validated measure of subjective
300 symptomology assessing everyday function rather than more sensitive but less
301 ecologically valid performance-based measures. Finally, the finding of similar effects on
302 a decision-making task performance increases confidence that the findings were not a
303 function of self-report methodology alone. In terms of limitations, by virtue of the survey
304 format, it was not possible to validate the infection status of individuals by testing. This
305 may lead to under- or over-estimation of effect size and statistical significance of tests,
306 vis-a-vis misreporting of infection status. This is a limitation of many survey studies of
307 COVID-19 and cognitive dysfunction, however. Finally, the cross-sectional design limits
308 our ability to draw causal inferences.

309 Future studies should examine the longevity of cognitive dysfunction symptoms over
310 time, as well as the extent to which the dose-response and age gradients observed here
311 are replicable across samples. Finally, additional studies examining neurological
312 impacts at the level of the brain itself will be required, using functional brain imaging
313 paradigms to quantify structural and functional impacts of SARS-CoV-2 infection. In
314 particular studies are needed that follow individuals forward from the point of infection to
315 examine changes over time, in a prospective manner.

316 *Conclusions*

317 In summary, the current study used a population-representative sample consisting of
318 a balanced proportion of vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals to estimate the
319 association between SARS-CoV-2 infection and symptoms of cognitive dysfunction.
320 Findings indicated that individuals previously infected with SARS-CoV-2 reported
321 significantly greater symptoms of cognitive dysfunction than non-infected individuals.
322 Further, among those reporting a positive infection history, a dose-response relationship
323 between COVID-19 symptom severity and cognitive dysfunction was evident, such that
324 those with moderate to severe symptoms were more likely to experience symptoms of
325 cognitive dysfunction. The above pattern was evident for both self-reported symptoms
326 of cognitive dysfunction and performance on a decision-making task. Taken together
327 with findings from other studies, cognitive dysfunction appears to be a correlated of
328 SARS-CoV-2 infection, particularly among those with at least moderate COVID-19
329 symptom severity. If such cognitive effects are long-lasting, this may be one piece of

330 evidence in support of public health strategies that eliminate exposure to SARS-CoV-2
331 infection, even for young adults and those below the typical high-risk age threshold for
332 mortality.

333

334 **Research ethics statement**

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

337

338 **Funding statement**

339 Funding for this study was provided by a grant from the Canadian Institutes of Health
340 Research (GA3-177733) to P. Hall (PI), G. Fong (co-PI) and S. Hitchman (co-I).

341

342 **Data Availability Statement**

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

344

345 **Conflicts of Interests**

346 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

347

348 **Acknowledgements**

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

351

352 **Figure 1 Legend**

353 Conceptual diagram (A) and delay discounting curves for non-infected and ranges of
354 COVID-19 symptom severity from asymptomatic to “very severe” (B).

355

356 **Figure 2 Legend**

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

359

360 Table 1: Sample characteristics.

Variables	<i>n</i>	%	Executive function (unadjusted) Mean, 95% CI	Executive function (adjusted) Mean, 95% CI
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)

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

365

366

367 Table 2: Associations between SARS-CoV-2 infection status, COVID-19 symptom
368 severity and BDEFS scores.

Variables	Beta (95% CI)	p
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

369

370

371 Table 3: Associations between SARS-CoV-2 infection status, COVID-19 symptom
372 severity and delay discounting.

Variables	Beta	p
<i>Infection Status</i>		
COVID-19 infection status		
Infected	0.31 (0.06, 0.56)	0.017
Not infected	Ref	Ref
Not stated	-0.01 (-0.22, 0.20)	0.91
<i>Symptom Severity</i>		
Gender		
Male	-0.10 (-0.20, 0.01)	0.066
Female	Ref	Ref
Age group		
18-24	-0.04 (-0.18, 0.11)	0.618
25-39	0.01 (-0.11, 0.13)	0.893
40-54	Ref	Ref
Income		
Low	Ref	Ref
Moderate	0.02 (-0.17, 0.21)	0.838
High	-0.30 (-0.45, -0.16)	<0.001
No answer	-0.34 (-0.57, -0.12)	0.002
COVID-19 infection status		
Not infected	Ref	Ref
Infected: Asymptomatic	-0.01 (-0.29, 0.27)	0.934
Infected: Slightly severe	0.24 (-0.09, 0.57)	0.147
Infected: Moderately severe	0.34 (-0.11, 0.79)	0.141
Infected: Very severe	1.26 (0.31, 2.21)	0.009
Not stated	-0.01	0.92

373

374

375 **Author Contributions**

376

377 PH, GF, and SH conceived the study, planned and oversaw the statistical analyses, and
378 wrote the final draft. GM planned and completed all statistical analyses and contributed
379 to the writing of the final draft. MNS, AH, JM, and WB contributed to the writing of the
380 final draft.

381

382 References

383


- 384 1. Boldrini M, Canoll PD, Klein RS. How COVID-19 Affects the Brain. *JAMA*
385 *Psychiatry*. 2021;78(6):682. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2021.0500
- 386 2. Mao L, Jin H, Wang M, et al. Neurologic Manifestations of Hospitalized Patients
387 With Coronavirus Disease 2019 in Wuhan, China. *JAMA Neurol*. 2020;77(6):683-
388 690. doi:10.1001/jamaneurol.2020.1127
- 389 3. McFadyen JD, Stevens H, Peter K. The Emerging Threat of (Micro)Thrombosis in
390 COVID-19 and Its Therapeutic Implications. *Circ Res*. 2020;127(4):571-587.
391 doi:10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.120.317447
- 392 4. Nauen DW, Hooper JE, Stewart CM, Solomon IH. Assessing Brain Capillaries in
393 Coronavirus Disease 2019. *JAMA Neurol*. 2021;78(6):760-762.
394 doi:10.1001/jamaneurol.2021.0225
- 395 5. Ritchie K, Chan D. The emergence of cognitive COVID. *World Psychiatry*.
396 2021;20(1):52-53. doi:10.1002/wps.20837
- 397 6. Solomon T. Neurological infection with SARS-CoV-2 — the story so far. *Nat Rev*
398 *Neurol*. 2021;17(2):65-66. doi:10.1038/s41582-020-00453-w
- 399 7. Jaywant A, Vanderlind WM, Alexopoulos GS, Fridman CB, Perlis RH, Gunning FM.
400 Frequency and profile of objective cognitive deficits in hospitalized patients
401 recovering from COVID-19. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2021;46(13):2235-2240.
402 doi:10.1038/s41386-021-00978-8
- 403 8. Ladds E, Rushforth A, Wieringa S, et al. Persistent symptoms after Covid-19:
404 qualitative study of 114 “long Covid” patients and draft quality principles for
405 services. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2020;20(1):1144. doi:10.1186/s12913-020-06001-
406 y
- 407 9. Rubin R. As Their Numbers Grow, COVID-19 “Long Haulers” Stump Experts.
408 *JAMA*. 2020;324(14):1381-1383. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.17709
- 409 10. Becker JH, Lin JJ, Doernberg M, et al. Assessment of Cognitive Function in
410 Patients After COVID-19 Infection. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4(10):e2130645.
411 doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.30645
- 412 11. Liu YH, Wang YR, Wang QH, et al. Post-infection cognitive impairments in a cohort
413 of elderly patients with COVID-19. *Mol Neurodegener*. 2021;16(1):48.
414 doi:10.1186/s13024-021-00469-w
- 415 12. Almeria M, Cejudo JC, Sotoca J, Deus J, Krupinski J. Cognitive profile following
416 COVID-19 infection: Clinical predictors leading to neuropsychological impairment.
417 *Brain Behav Immun - Health*. 2020;9:100163. doi:10.1016/j.bbih.2020.100163

- 418 13. Hampshire A, Trender W, Chamberlain SR, et al. *Cognitive Deficits in People Who*
419 *Have Recovered from COVID-19 Relative to Controls: An N=84,285 Online Study.*;
420 2020:2020.10.20.20215863. doi:10.1101/2020.10.20.20215863
- 421 14. McClure SM, Laibson DI, Loewenstein G, Cohen JD. Separate Neural Systems
422 Value Immediate and Delayed Monetary Rewards. *Science*. 2004;306(5695):503-
423 507. doi:10.1126/science.1100907
- 424 15. Massar SAA, Libedinsky C, Weiyan C, Huettel SA, Chee MWL. Separate and
425 overlapping brain areas encode subjective value during delay and effort
426 discounting. *NeuroImage*. 2015;120:104-113.
427 doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.06.080
- 428 16. Peters J, D'Esposito M. Effects of Medial Orbitofrontal Cortex Lesions on Self-
429 Control in Intertemporal Choice. *Curr Biol*. 2016;26(19):2625-2628.
430 doi:10.1016/j.cub.2016.07.035
- 431 17. Sellitto M, Ciaramelli E, di Pellegrino G. Myopic Discounting of Future Rewards
432 after Medial Orbitofrontal Damage in Humans. *J Neurosci*. 2010;30(49):16429-
433 16436. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2516-10.2010
- 434 18. Bickel WK, Marsch LA. Toward a behavioral economic understanding of drug
435 dependence: delay discounting processes. *Addiction*. 2001;96(1):73-86.
436 doi:10.1046/j.1360-0443.2001.961736.x
- 437 19. Winstanley CA, Theobald DEH, Dalley JW, Cardinal RN, Robbins TW. Double
438 Dissociation between Serotonergic and Dopaminergic Modulation of Medial
439 Prefrontal and Orbitofrontal Cortex during a Test of Impulsive Choice. *Cereb*
440 *Cortex*. 2006;16(1):106-114. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhi088
- 441 20. Kringelbach ML, Rolls ET. The functional neuroanatomy of the human orbitofrontal
442 cortex: evidence from neuroimaging and neuropsychology. *Prog Neurobiol*.
443 2004;72(5):341-372. doi:10.1016/j.pneurobio.2004.03.006
- 444 21. Vaira LA, Salzano G, Deiana G, De Riu G. Anosmia and Ageusia: Common
445 Findings in COVID-19 Patients. *The Laryngoscope*. 2020;130(7):1787-1787.
446 doi:10.1002/lary.28692
- 447 22. Taquet M, Geddes JR, Husain M, Luciano S, Harrison PJ. 6-month neurological
448 and psychiatric outcomes in 236-379 survivors of COVID-19: a retrospective
449 cohort study using electronic health records. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2021;8(5):416-427.
450 doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(21)00084-5
- 451 23. Hall P, Fong G, Hitchman S. The Canadian COVID-19 Experiences Survey: Study
452 Protocol. medRxiv. Published online 2021.
- 453 24. Canada PHA of. COVID-19 daily epidemiology update. aem. Published April 19,
454 2020. Accessed January 2, 2022. <https://health-infobase.canada.ca/covid->



- 455 19/epidemiological-summary-covid-19-
456 cases.html?stat=rate&measure=total_last14&map=pt
- 457 25. Barkley RA. *Barkley Deficits in Executive Functioning Scale (BDEFS)*. Guilford
458 Press; 2011.
- 459 26. Koffarnus MN, Bickel WK. A 5-trial adjusting delay discounting task: Accurate
460 discount rates in less than one minute. *Exp Clin Psychopharmacol*.
461 2014;22(3):222-228. doi:10.1037/a0035973
- 462 27. Howren MB, Suls J. The symptom perception hypothesis revised: Depression and
463 anxiety play different roles in concurrent and retrospective physical symptom
464 reporting. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 2011;101(1):182. doi:10.1037/a0021715
- 465 28. Reimers S, Maylor EA, Stewart N, Chater N. Associations between a one-shot
466 delay discounting measure and age, income, education and real-world impulsive
467 behavior. *Personal Individ Differ*. 2009;47(8):973-978.
468 doi:10.1016/j.paid.2009.07.026
- 469 29. Czeisler MÉ, Lane RI, Petrosky E, et al. Mental Health, Substance Use, and
470 Suicidal Ideation During the COVID-19 Pandemic — United States, June 24–30,
471 2020. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(32):1049-1057.
472 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6932a1
- 473 30. Xiong J, Lipsitz O, Nasri F, et al. Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on mental health
474 in the general population: A systematic review. *J Affect Disord*. 2020;277:55-64.
475 doi:10.1016/j.jad.2020.08.001
- 476 31. Duan L, Shao X, Wang Y, et al. An investigation of mental health status of children
477 and adolescents in china during the outbreak of COVID-19. *J Affect Disord*.
478 2020;275:112-118. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2020.06.029
- 479 32. Daly M, Sutin AR, Robinson E. Longitudinal changes in mental health and the
480 COVID-19 pandemic: evidence from the UK Household Longitudinal Study.
481 *Psychol Med*. Published online November 13, 2020:1-10.
482 doi:10.1017/S0033291720004432
- 483 33. Hall PA, Sheeran P, Fong GT, et al. Biobehavioral Aspects of the COVID-19
484 Pandemic: A Review. *Psychosom Med*. 2021;83(4):309-321.
485 doi:10.1097/PSY.0000000000000932
- 486 34. Goenka A, Michael BD, Ledger E, et al. Neurological Manifestations of Influenza
487 Infection in Children and Adults: Results of a National British Surveillance Study.
488 *Clin Infect Dis*. 2014;58(6):775-784. doi:10.1093/cid/cit922
- 489 35. Kim JE, Heo JH, Kim H ok, et al. Neurological Complications during Treatment of
490 Middle East Respiratory Syndrome. *J Clin Neurol*. 2017;13(3):227.
491 doi:10.3988/jcn.2017.13.3.227

- 492 36. de Araújo TVB, Rodrigues LC, de Alencar Ximenes RA, et al. Association between
493 Zika virus infection and microcephaly in Brazil, January to May, 2016: preliminary
494 report of a case-control study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2016;16(12):1356-1363.
495 doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(16)30318-8
- 496 37. Berger JR, Houff S. Neurological Complications of Herpes Simplex Virus Type 2
497 Infection. *Arch Neurol*. 2008;65(5). doi:10.1001/archneur.65.5.596
- 498 38. Gildea DH, Kleinschmidt-DeMasters BK, LaGuardia JJ, Mahalingam R, Cohrs RJ.
499 Neurologic Complications of the Reactivation of Varicella–Zoster Virus. *N Engl J*
500 *Med*. 2000;342(9):635-645. doi:10.1056/NEJM200003023420906
- 501 39. Christie B. Covid-19: Early studies give hope omicron is milder than other variants.
502 *BMJ*. 2021;375:n3144. doi:10.1136/bmj.n3144
- 503 40. Abdullah F, Myers J, Basu D, et al. Decreased severity of disease during the first
504 global omicron variant covid-19 outbreak in a large hospital in tshwane, south
505 africa. *Int J Infect Dis*. Published online December 2021:S120197122101256X.
506 doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2021.12.357
- 507 41. Sheikh A, Kerr S, Woolhouse M, McMenemy J, Robertson C. Severity of Omicron
508 variant of concern and vaccine effectiveness against symptomatic disease: national
509 cohort with nested test negative design study in Scotland. Published online
510 December 22, 2021. Accessed January 2, 2022.
511 [https://www.research.ed.ac.uk/en/publications/severity-of-omicron-variant-of-](https://www.research.ed.ac.uk/en/publications/severity-of-omicron-variant-of-concern-and-vaccine-effectiveness-)
512 [concern-and-vaccine-effectiveness-](https://www.research.ed.ac.uk/en/publications/severity-of-omicron-variant-of-concern-and-vaccine-effectiveness-)
- 513

A



B



COVID-19 symptom severity and BDEFS total score

