Title

How is the COVID-19 pandemic impacting our life, mental health, and well-being? Design and preliminary findings of the pan-Canadian longitudinal COHESION Study

Authors

Stephan Gabet, PhD, PharmD,[1,2] Benoit Thierry, MSc,[2] Rania Wasfi, PhD,[3] Margaret De Groh, PhD,[3] Guido Simonelli, MD, MSc,[4,5] Catherine Hudon, MD, PhD,[6] Lily Lessard, PhD,[7,8] Ève Dubé, PhD,[9] Bouchra Nasri, PhD,[1,2] Yan Kestens, PhD,[1,2] Grégory Moullec, PhD[1,5]

Affiliations

[1] Département de Médecine Sociale et Préventive, École de Santé publique de l'Université de Montréal (ESPUM), Québec (QC), Canada.

[2] Centre de Recherche en Santé Publique (CReSP), Université de Montréal (UdeM), Québec (QC), Canada.

[3] Centre for Surveillance and Applied Research, Health Promotion and Chronic Disease Prevention Branch, Public Health Agency of Canada / Government of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario (ON), Canada.

[4] Département de Médecine, Université de Montréal (UdeM), Québec (QC), Canada

[5] Centre de Recherche du Centre intégré universitaire de santé et de services sociaux du Nord-de-l'Île-de-Montréal (CIUSSS-NIM), Québec (QC), Canada.

[6] Département de Médecine de Famille et Médecine d'urgence, Université de Sherbrooke (UdeS), Québec (QC), Canada.

[7] Département des sciences de la santé, Université du Québec à Rimouski, Québec (QC), Canada.

[8] Centre de recherche du CISSS de Chaudière-Appalaches, Québec (QC), Canada.

[9] Centre de recherche du CHU de Québec, Université de Laval, Québec (QC), Canada.

Corresponding author

E-mail: gregory.moullec@umontreal.ca (GM)

Abstract (255 words)

With the advent of the COVID-19 pandemic, in-person social interactions and opportunities for accessing resources that sustain health and well-being have drastically reduced. We therefore designed the pan-Canadian population-based prospective *COVID-19: HEalth and Social Inequities across Neighbourhoods* (COHESION) cohort to provide deeper understanding of how the COVID-19 pandemic context affects mental health and well-being, key determinants of health, and health inequities.

This paper presents the design of the two-phase COHESION Study, and descriptive results from the first phase conducted between May 2020 and September 2021. During that period, the COHESION research platform collected monthly data linked to COVID-19 such as infection and vaccination status, perceptions and attitudes regarding pandemic-related measures, and information on participants' physical and mental health, well-being, sleep, loneliness, resilience, substances use, living conditions, social interactions, activities, and mobility.

The 1,268 people enrolled in the Phase 1 COHESION Study are for the most part from Ontario (47%) and Quebec (33%), aged 48 ± 16 years [mean ± standard deviation (SD)], and mainly women (78%), White (85%), with a university degree (63%), and living in large urban centers (70%). According to the 298 ± 68 (mean ± SD) prospective questionnaires completed each month in average, the first year of follow-up reveals significant temporal variations in standardized indexes of well-being, loneliness, anxiety, depression, and psychological distress.

The COHESION Study will allow identifying trajectories of mental health and well-being while investigating their determinants and how these may vary by subgroup, over time, and across different provinces in Canada, in the unique context of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Keywords

COVID-19; mental health; prospective cohort; social interactions; study design; well-being.

Abbreviations

COHESION: *COVID-19: HEalth and Social Inequities across Neighbourhoods*

Word count

3,748 words (from the beginning of the Introduction to the end of the Results)

1. Introduction

On January 10, 2020, WHO announced the identification of a new strain of coronavirus, the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), causing a mild to severe respiratory illness – which may progress to pneumonia and respiratory failure – named coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) [1]. The first positive case of COVID-19 in Canada was reported on January 25, 2020 and a state of health emergency was declared across the country between March 13 and March 22, 2020, depending on the province [2,3]. Mid-August 2021, there were just over 1.4 million cases in Canada and more than 26,700 deaths [2].

Public health measures to control transmission have brought vast sectors of economic activity to a halt, leading to massive unemployment and reductions in income, while reducing people's daily movements and opportunities for in-person social interactions [4]. This has affected people's opportunities and access to resources that sustain mental health and well-being. The COVID-19 conditions reinforce the role of various social and environmental health determinants, with differential impacts on the mental health and well-being of populations, depending on age [5], gender [6], housing conditions [7], education [8], job type [9], income [10], or ethnic background [11–13] and, more generally, social and environmental contexts [14,15].

COVID-19 conditions including lockdown, curfew and physical distancing measures reduce social contacts, increase social isolation and feelings of loneliness, and decrease levels of social support; these dimensions directly influence well-being and mental health [16,17]. Canadian data shows pandemic-related increases in social isolation, domestic violence and anxiety [18], with certain groups such as teens, older adults, women and racialized communities particularly at-risk [19]. Daily mobility and related physical activity are reduced through confinement measures and reduced activity spaces have been linked to depressive symptoms [20,21] and sleep troubles [22]. Walkable environments and access to green space are key

environmental conditions linked to positive health outcomes including physical activity and well-being [23]. With shrinking activity spaces and policy constraints curbing daily mobility, the role of residential living conditions is further amplified.

Priority populations often bear the burden of poor social and environmental living conditions and have been shown to be disproportionately affected by COVID-19 [24,25]. Overcrowding or living in inadequate dwellings are important determinants of mental health and well-being; moreover, prolonged exposure to home environments during lockdown conditions further exacerbate these impacts [26,27]. Economic hardship, which is linked to income reduction and job instability, has heavily contributed to the mental health burden of Canadians, and is also related to housing instability and food insecurity [28,29]. In turn, detrimental health behavior such as alcohol or other substance use are increasing and are linked to poorer mental health outcomes [30].

In total, there is an urgent need to better understand, in particular, how the unintended long-term consequences of COVID-19 pandemic and mitigation measures, contextual conditions (e.g., housing conditions, neighborhood characteristics), and behavior (e.g., mobility, social interaction, sleep) are linked to mental health and well-being trajectories. Furthermore, impacts are likely to vary between population groups (for instance, according to gender, age, racialized communities, or deprivation level).

2. Two-phase COHESION Study objectives

We developed the pan-Canadian *COVID-19: HEalth and Social Inequities across Neighbourhoods* (COHESION) Study to better understand how the COVID-19 pandemic affects health, key determinants of health, and health inequities, with a focus on mental health and well-being. This study will provide longitudinal evidence of how these change over time and across different provinces in Canada.

In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, the COHESION Study aims (Fig 1):

- evaluating the direct impact of physical and social neighborhood characteristics on mental health and well-being trajectories, while controlling for individual-level health behaviors and socio-demographics;
- evaluating if and how physical and social neighborhood characteristics may modify the associations between individual-level predictors and mental health and well-being trajectories.

This paper presents the design and methods used in the two phases of the COHESION study. It also reports descriptive statistics from the longitudinal follow-up of the first phase of the study and lessons learned from its implementation.

3. Two-phase COHESION Study design

3.1. Study design and recruitment

The two-phase COHESION Study is a pan-Canadian population-based prospective cohort study. COHESION Phase 1 was conducted between May 2020 and September 2021. COHESION Phase 2 will be launched in May 2022. All Phase 1 participants will be invited to participate in Phase 2, and additional recruitments (n = 10,000) will be done.

After consenting to participate to the study, participants are invited to fill a short eligibility questionnaire. Inclusion criteria are being aged 15 years or above, currently residing in Canada, and reading or speaking English or French. Eligible participants are then invited to complete a baseline questionnaire.

The recruitment for COHESION Phase 1 was launched on May 11 2020. We used a combination of methods that have proven successful from previous experience in recruiting population-based research project samples [31], including media communication (e.g., newspaper articles, radio interviews), social media promotion (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and LinkedIn), and outreach through partners' local networks (e.g., local health authorities that relayed the study on their website or through their newsletters).

For COHESION Phase 2, we will further use quota sampling at the health region level, based on 2016's Census data (i.e., age composition, gender, income, educational attainment, and ethnic background). We engaged Potloc Inc., a tech-enabled consumer research company that conducts survey sampling through social networks (Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, LinkedIn), for geo-targeting of respondents based on the sampling quotas. Potloc Inc.'s algorithm will push sociodemographic and geographically targeted online ads to our study until local quotas are attained (targets are monitored daily) and that 10,000 participants have thereby been enrolled.

Enrollment and participation in the two-phase COHESION Study are voluntary, and a raffle of three prizes ($100 gift cards) is drawn every month for active participants for the duration of the study.

3.2. Data collection

3.2.1. Involvement options

Two levels of involvement are proposed. Participants can opt for: i) participating in the online self-administered questionnaires only (baseline + invitation to follow up questionnaires); or ii) participating in the questionnaires and downloading a mobile phone application to provide additional active and passive data (cf. 3.2.5).

3.2.2. Baseline questionnaires

Through the COHESION Study Phase 1 baseline questionnaire (35-45 min), participants report on: their sociodemographic characteristics (e.g., gender, ethnic or cultural background, education level, employment status, income, relationship status, and household composition); housing condition (e.g., house tenure, dwelling type and size, outdoor space) and satisfaction; physical (e.g., chronic disease diagnosis) and mental health conditions (e.g., anxiety and depression), and substance use (alcohol, tobacco, vape, and cannabis); COVID-19 infection status, vulnerability towards COVID-19, perception of- and compliance with COVID-19 mitigation measures, and pre-pandemic employment, income, substances use, loneliness, resilience, and social interactions. Additionally, a map-based questionnaire collects data on activity locations and social contacts (cf. 3.2.4). For parents, a supplementary module on mental health and perceptions of COVID-19 mitigation measures concerning adolescents and children

172 who live in the household is administered (participants answer on behalf of children in their
173 household).

174 The COHESION Study Phase 2 baseline questionnaire will consist in one core (10 min)
175 and two optional complementary sections (15 min each). The core baseline questionnaire
176 includes: sociodemographic characteristics and key housing conditions; COVID-19 vaccination
177 status, perceptions of COVID-19 pandemic and related mitigation measures; standardized
178 modules assessing general health (first item of the 12-item Short-Form Health Survey) [32],
179 well-being (5-item World Health Organization Well-Being Index, WHO-5 Index) [33], sleep
180 credit (Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index, PSQI, 4 items only) [34], and psychological distress
181 (Psychological Distress Scale, Kessler-6) [35]; and an outdoor mobility and social interactions
182 module. Optional complementary baseline sections include the map-based questionnaire on
183 activity locations and social contacts (cf. 3.2.4) and additional in-depth questions on relevant
184 themes: additional items retrieved from the Phase 1 baseline questionnaire (it means all items
185 not already included in the Phase 2 core baseline questionnaire); standardized modules on
186 loneliness (University of California Los Angeles, UCLA, 3-item loneliness score) [36], anxiety
187 symptoms (7-item Generalized Anxiety Disorder, GAD-7) [37], depression symptoms (9-item
188 Patient Health Questionnaire, PHQ-9) [38], resilience (6-item Brief Resilience Scale) [39],
189 sense of belonging (Canada Community Health Survey, CCHS) [40], and physical activity
190 (Godin Leisure-Time Exercise) [41]; items for assessing conspiracy beliefs.

191 Slightly shorten versions of the Phase 2 baseline questionnaires (i.e., excluding
192 questions about birth, ethnics, etc.) have been provided for participants coming from Phase 1
193 and wishing going on Phase 2.

194

195 ***3.2.3. Follow-up questionnaires***

196 Follow-up questionnaires of the COHESION Study are short questionnaires (15 min). For
197 Phase 1, they were first offered biweekly until August 2020, then monthly. COVID-19-related
198 topics cover infection and/or vaccination status, perceived vulnerability, perception of and
199 compliance with mitigation measures, position regarding vaccination, and conspiracy beliefs.
200 Health-related questions focus on general health (SF-12, first item) [32], well-being (WHO-5
201 Index) [33], sleep credit (PSQI, 4 items only) [34], loneliness (UCLA 3-item loneliness score)
202 [36], anxiety symptoms (GAD-7) [37], depression symptoms (PHQ-9) [38], psychological
203 distress (Kessler-6) [35], and sense of belonging (CCHS) [40] (Table 1). Employment status,
204 household income, and substance use are also documented. Additionally, participants are asked
205 at each follow-up about any changes concerning their place of residence and housing conditions.
206 Supplementary module on mental health and perception of COVID-19 mitigation measures
207 concerning children or adolescents living at home is administered when applicable.

208 For Phase 2, follow-up questionnaires will be split in a core ('light') and an optional
209 complementary ('complete') sections, and will be offered every two months. It will include the
210 same questions as for Phase 1, adding a standardized module for assessing physical activity
211 (Godin Leisure-Time Exercise Questionnaire) [41].

212 Questions can vary between follow-ups, depending on the situation and priorities raised
213 by the research team and our public health partners. Thus, these additional themes can focus on
214 health insecurity (i.e., access to health care, prescriptions and medicine) [42], sleep troubles
215 (PSQI) [34], food insecurity (10-item Health Canada Household Food Security Module) [43],
216 and children's difficulties (if any) [44].

217

218 ***3.2.4. Use of VERITAS-Social to collect daily mobility and social interaction data***

219 One of the specificities of COHESION is that it integrates, in baseline and follow-up
220 questionnaires of the two phases, the *Visualization and Evaluation of Route Itineraries, Travel*

221 *destinations, Activity spaces and Social interactions* (VERITAS-Social) questionnaire. For
222 COHESION, it was adapted to locate a possible list of up to 20 activities carried out during the
223 past seven days (Fig 2). As previously described, VERITAS-Social is an interactive map-based
224 questionnaire that jointly collects an individual's social network and activity locations [44]; it
225 is an adaptation of the VERITAS tool, an interactive questionnaire for geo-locating places, and
226 related information of interest (e.g., frequency of visit, transportation modes used) [45]. It uses
227 a Google Map module to facilitate the location of activity places. The social module asks if an
228 activity location is generally visited alone or with someone else; participants can identify one
229 or more individuals, or a group of people (*see* S1a-b Figs). In other words, it is a name generator
230 that identifies network members based on their co-presence at reported destinations [46]. Data
231 on network members include age, gender, type of relationship (e.g., friend, acquaintance),
232 frequency of interactions, and duration of the relationship; for groups, data includes the number
233 of people in the group, and the duration of the relationship.

234 Once all activities, corresponding locations, and all people with whom these activities
235 are carried out have been reported, participants are asked to identify members of their social
236 network from whom they receive support or with whom they enjoy spending time with,
237 including members who may not have been reported among the people seen at usual activity
238 venues. Finally, participants were able to indicate interpersonal relationships between network
239 members (i.e., who knows whom), and whether some specific individuals belonged to
240 documented groups.

241

242 ***3.2.5. Optional mobile application***

243 Participants enrolling in the mobile phone arm of the study were invited to download Ethica
244 Data mobile application (cf. 3.2.1), used successfully in previous research projects [47]. Once
245 installed and launched, the application passively monitors location and mobility (e.g., stationary,

246 in vehicle, walking, or biking) using GPS data (1 minute of data collected every 5 minutes),
247 physical activity (step counter), and social contacts (other smartphones), derived from listings
248 of other Bluetooth discoverable devices in the participant's surroundings [48]. The app further
249 prompts participants to complete Ecological Momentary Assessment (EMA) questionnaires
250 three times a day for one week every month. EMA questionnaires include short self-reports (<1
251 min) on well-being, sleep, mood (Short Mood Scale, 6 items) [49], and social interactions (*see*
252 S2 Fig).
253

254 ***3.2.6. Environmental data***

255 Because some of the data collected is spatial (e.g. place of residence, VERITAS-Social
256 locations, mobile app GPS data), we are able to add area-level environmental data to our dataset.
257 This allows to explore links between individual-level measures and social and environmental
258 contextual conditions. Numerous environmental datasets covering Canada are available
259 through the *Canadian Urban Environmental Health Research Consortium* (CANUE).

260 Contextual variables of interest include measures of neighborhood deprivation, such as
261 the Material and Social Deprivation Indices (MSDI; data 2016) available at the Canadian
262 Census dissemination area level (i.e., the smallest Canadian standard geographic area, with a
263 population of 400 to 700 persons) [50]. These two composite indexes combine Census data on
264 educational attainment, employment ratio, average income, and household composition.

265 The urbanization degree is measured using *Statistics Canada* classification (at the four-
266 digit code area level; data 2016), based on the number of inhabitants in population centers [51].
267 "Small", "medium" and "large" urban population centers correspond to areas embracing
268 between 1,000 and 29,999, between 30,000 and 99,999, and 100,000 and more inhabitants,
269 respectively, while "rural area" is a residual value gathering all areas located outside population
270 centers.

Greenness is evaluated using the growing season Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) (at the six-digit code area level; data 2019), based on Landsat 8 satellite data [52,53].

Area-level walkability is measured using the *Canadian Active Living Environments* (CAN-ALE) database [54].

Additional localized and temporalized data on COVID-19 pandemic conditions, including lockdowns, curfews, vaccination plan, number of cases, and emergence of variants is also available through the *Canadian Institute for Health Information* (CIHI) compilation [55].

3.3. Ethics and data management plan

Before completing the eligibility questionnaire, potential participants are first invited to read the consent form and provide an electronic written consent to participate in the study. In Phase 2, a second consent will be required from participant wishing to register for the prospective follow-ups after having completed baseline questionnaire. Phase 1 COHESION was approved by the ethics board of the *Centre de Recherche du Centre Hospitalier de l'Université de Montréal* (CRCHUM; MP-02-2021-8924) and by the *Public Health Agency of Canada* (PHAC) ethical review board (REB 2020-016P). Phase 2 COHESION was approved by both the ethics board of the *Centre Intégré Universitaire de Santé et de Services Sociaux du Nord-de-l'Île-de-Montréal* (CIUSSS-NIM ; 2022-2327) and PHAC (REB 2020-016P).

For data security and privacy proposal, all data are hosted on *Compute Canada* servers with secondary backups on hospital-grade internal servers. All data has been stripped from any personally identifying information, with only the principal investigator being able to track the records back to one participant. Researchers can access anonymized individual level records by connecting directly through a Secure Shell (SSH) to the database hosted on *Compute Canada* (a SSH allows remote machines accessing data in a secure way since the connection is

encrypted). They can also access aggregated data for analysis through a secure online platform hosted by Tableau [56]. A document listing all the data management policies governing data access and storage has been submitted to the ethic board for approval.

4. COHESION Study Phase 1 first results

4.1. Recruitment and participants

Among the 2,557 people who completed the COHESION Phase 1 eligibility questionnaire, 2,346 (92%) met the selection criteria (Fig 3). Among these ones, 1,268 (54%) completed the baseline questionnaire and have been enrolled in the COHESION Study, and among the latter, 557 (44%) opted for the Ethica mobile application in addition to the online self-administered questionnaires. Although recruitment was continuously open during the Phase 1 timespan, the major part of participants joined the study during the first months following the study launch: 832 (66%) recruitments after three months of follow-up, 1,136 (90%) after six months (Fig 4).

COHESION Phase 1 participants are distributed all across Canada; they live mainly in Ontario (597, 47%) and Quebec (417, 33%) (Fig 5), and 910 (72%) declared English as their favorite language. They are in average 48 ± 16 (mean ± standard deviation, SD) and are mainly women (78%), White (85%), born in Canada (85%), with university or post-graduate level degree (63%), and in a relationship (67%) (Table 2a). The most part is owner (62%) and lives in a house (66%), with their partner or family (74%), without children at home (72%), with private outside space access (97%), with pets (56%), and in large urban centers (i.e., in areas including more than 100,000 inhabitants); though participants show wide contrasts in terms of home surroundings' greenness and neighborhood's material and social deprivation (Table 2b). Participants are, by decreasing order, employed (58%), retired (19%), unemployed (14%), on leave or disabled (5%), or students (2%); they are mostly satisfied about their household annual income (77%) (Table 2a). Concerning health, they are 44% and 35% being affected by a physical (i.e., heart disease, lung disease, cancer, high blood pressure, diabetes, severe obesity, and/or autoimmune disease) or a mental (i.e., depressive disorder and/or anxiety disorder) chronic disease, respectively. A monthly consumption of alcohol, cigarettes and/or vape, and

326 cannabis was reported by 72%, 14%, and 18% of participants at baseline, respectively. Lastly,
327 they are 27% and 38% considering their selves and/or someone in their household at a high risk
328 of being infected by- or of complications of COVID-19, respectively.
329
330 **4.2. Prospective follow-up and attrition**
331 Throughout the first year of follow-up, i.e., from May 2020 to July 2021, up to 17 follow-up
332 questionnaires were administered to participants (Fig 4), and 758 (60%) participants completed
333 at least one (Fig 3). Depending on their date of recruitment, participants were contacted between
334 one and seventeen times as part of the prospective follow-up waves (Fig 4), and they filled out
335 in average 29% ± 36% (mean ± SD) of the follow-up questionnaires they received. Among the
336 first year of follow-up, in average 298 ± 68 participants completed the follow-up questionnaire
337 by wave (Fig 6, *see* S1 Table).
338 Attrition rate throughout the Phase 1 follow-up appeared statistically distinct in some
339 specific groups (Table 3). The older the participants were and the higher the education level
340 was, the less the attrition was (p <0.001 and p = 0.069, respectively); average age was 50 ± 16
341 and 45 ± 16 (mean ± SD) in people participating or not in the longitudinal follow-up,
342 respectively (p <0.001). Attrition appeared higher in employed people and lower in retired ones
343 (p <0.001) (Table 3), and also higher in people living in family (p = 0.005), with children (p =
344 0.013), with pets (p = 0.001), in a house (p = 0.001), and not owner (p = 0.001) (*see* S2a Table).
345 Lastly, people with a chronic physical disease (p = 0.039) or at a high risk of being infected by
346 the COVID-19 (p = 0.001) were less prone to participate to the follow-up. No contrast was
347 noticed according to substance use or residential social and environmental components (*see*
348 S2a-b Tables).
349
350 **4.3. Well-being and mental health**

From June 2020 to July 2021, we administered to participants well-being, sleep credit, loneliness, anxiety, depression and psychological distress -related standardized modules 5, 9, 13, 8, 8, and 11 times, respectively (Table 1). During this period, each thematic module was completed at least once by 481 (38%), 630 (50%), 658 (52%), 612 (48%), 612 (48%), and 692 (55%) Phase 1 participants, respectively (*see* S3a-b Tables).

The median of the 5-WHO well-being Index ranged from 44% (interval interquartile, IQR: 24-65; wave 21/27) to 52% (IQR: 32-72; wave 20/52) depending on the wave. Well-being appeared decreasing waves after waves, the median index value from the last two administered waves (21/23 and 21/27, it means 2021, June and July) being significantly lower than the one from the first three ones (20/52, 21/15, and 21/19, it means 2020, December, 2021, April, and 2021, May, respectively) (Fig 7a; *see* S4a Table). The sleep duration appeared stable throughout the first year of the Phase 1 follow-up (mean ± SD: from 7.9 ± 1.3 to 8.0 ± 1.4 hours; waves 21/23 and 20/30, respectively); no change was statistically found. During the prospective follow-up, the median of the UCLA 3-item score of loneliness oscillated between 5 (IQR: 3-6; wave 21/27) and 6 (IQR: 4-7; wave 21/15). These changes were statistically significant, with a feeling of loneliness higher during the period from 2020, October (wave 20/44) to 2021, April (wave 21/15), yet for the wave 20/52, corresponding to the festive season. Moreover, all UCLA 3-item score median values through the follow-up were significantly higher than the UCLA 3-item score median assessed retrospectively for the period prior to the COVID-19 pandemic (4; IQR: 3-6).

Concerning mental health, the first year of follow-up of the Phase 1 showed statistically significant changes between questionnaire waves regarding reporting of anxiety symptoms, depression symptoms, and psychological distress (Fig 7b; *see* S4b Table). Thus, GAD-7 median score ranged between 4 (IQR: 1-7; wave 21/27) and 5 (IQR: 2-10; wave 21/15) and PHQ-9 median score varied from 4 (IQR: 1-7; wave 21/27) and 6 (IQR: 3-9.3; wave 20/30). For these

both composite indexes, the median value from the wave 21/27 (2021, July) was the lowest among all waves administered during the first year of follow-up, and some statistically significant contrasts were observed. Lastly, Kessler-6 psychological distress median score oscillated from 4 (IQR: 1-9; wave 20/52) and 5 (IQR: 2-10; wave 20/44); several comparisons between psychological distress median score from the wave 20/52 (2020, December) and other waves were statistically significant.

5. Discussion

In total, more than 1,200 people enrolled in the Phase 1 of the pan-Canadian population-based COHESION cohort, and about 60% of them participated in the prospective follow-up. The COHESION Study overrepresents women, White and graduated people. The first year of follow-up reveals significant temporal variations in standardized indices of well-being, loneliness, anxiety, depression, and psychological distress. Thus, well-being appeared decreasing waves after waves over the follow-up whereas sleep duration appeared stable throughout. Feeling of loneliness was significantly higher for each follow-up wave compared to the period prior to the COVID-19 pandemic while oscillations in mental health indices were observed over the follow-up timespan. Indices of loneliness and psychological distress were significantly better around the festive period.

Challenges. lessons learned from Phase 1, and proposed adaptations for Phase 2

Loss to follow-up is an issue in any longitudinal study. In Phase 1, attrition was related to age, education level, employment, housing conditions, and some health conditions, similar to other longitudinal studies [57,58]. To try to reduce attrition in Phase 2 and better retain those that are at greatest risk of loss to follow-up, we have devised the following strategies: 1) Reminders: Our questionnaire platform provides automated reminders for online follow-up survey completion including for EMA; 2) Flexibility: Phase 2 will offer easier participation options, relying on a multi-stage on-boarding process, which includes a short initial 10-min questionnaire and easy-to-sign-up longitudinal follow-ups, with possible ‘light’ or ‘complete’ choices. To increase accessibility, participation and retention (notably with younger participants), we have also optimized the online questionnaire for ease of use through smartphones. 3) Gifts: While enrollment and participation to the COHESION Study are free

408 and voluntary, a lottery of 3 monthly prizes ($100 gift cards) is organized for active participants.
409 In Phase 2, participants who choose the full participation (by completing the optional follow-
410 up questionnaire modules) will be entered twice in the raffle to increase their chance of winning.
411 4) Improved feedback: In December 2020, an opinion survey was sent to participants to gather
412 feedback on the experience of COHESION Study Phase 1, including on perceived complexity,
413 length, and usability of the questionnaires, interest in surveyed topics, interactions with the
414 mobile application. Suggestions for improvement included better messaging on the purpose of
415 the study, including through regular updates and better recognition of their contribution, and
416 sharing stories to increase the sense of belonging. These elements were considered when re-
417 designing the study for Phase 2, in collaboration with the Center of Excellence on Partnership
418 with Patients and the Public [59].

419 It is important to include marginalized populations better. We have worked in
420 collaboration with public health partners to identify best recruitment strategies, including by
421 building connections with local partners (e.g., Médecins du Monde, Red Cross, Food banks)
422 that are working directly with various priority groups and have established trust with these
423 individuals and communities [60]. The use of high-precision targeted social media campaigns,
424 provided by partnering consumer research company Potloc Inc., along with continuous
425 monitoring of stratified targets by region, age and gender, should also contribute to optimize
426 sample representation. Now, because the survey uses online technologies that may be a barrier
427 for participation in remote communities and for more marginalized groups, we will also offer
428 computer-assisted phone interviews during working hours through our study helpline.

429 Finally, as suggested by Fumagalli et al. (2013), promising approaches based on persona
430 principles as those used in marketing strategies might help. Thus, we plan to tailor the content
431 of newsletters, to strengthen the sense of belonging of those most at risk of dropping out, a
432 strategy that has proved effective for re-engaging young and busy people [61]. Despite all these

433 methodological efforts to minimize it, the risk of attrition can hardly be eliminated. One way to
434 account for the potential effect of residual attrition bias is through various analytical strategies,
435 including the use of inverse probability weights for trajectory analyses (e.g., growth curve
436 models) on mental health and well-being.
437
438 One critical issue with our cohort that was launched in mid-spring 2020 is the lack of a
439 true pre-pandemic baseline. This can partly be circumvented with retrospective questions, but
440 as time goes by, the recall bias increases, particularly for subjective mental health measures
441 [62]. After first using specific 'pre-pandemic' reference questions, a strategy we adopted, from
442 fall 2020 onwards, to minimize the cognitive effort and bias, was to use a combination of
443 broader questions about psychological changes since the pandemic outbreak (improvement,
444 deterioration, no change) and very factual questions for which recall bias is expected lower (i.e.,
445 use of mental health services and substance use in the pre-pandemic year). Despite these
446 adaptations, the risk of recall bias remains, meaning that interpretation about change from pre-
447 pandemic measures should be done with caution.
448
449 An advantage of a prospective cohort design is the potential for adapting surveys to new
450 or unforeseen circumstances, including evolving priorities of public health authorities. As
451 months passed by and the situation evolved, we developed and administered new modules to
452 address such needs, including on substance use, a priority identified by our partner the Public
453 Health Agency of Canada, or on parent-related stress during the back-to-school periods.
454 Repeated surveys also provide the opportunity for timely dissemination of findings. To
455 facilitate dissemination and use of data by our public health partners, we developed an online
456 dashboard for real-time monitoring of key indicators (www.cohesionstudy.ca/dashboard).
457 Throughout phase 2 of COHESION, we will continue adapting our survey content with timely

458 themes, helping uncovering key pathways linking individual trajectories, environmental
459 contexts, and health and equity outcomes.
460
461 An important contribution of this project is to offer both a pan-Canadian portrait while
462 allowing local oversampling and providing very contextualized information. An example of
463 local adaptation is planned for public health territory of CIUSSS Nord-de-l'Île-de-Montréal
464 (NIM) in Québec [63], with a target local sample of 1,000 participants. Data will be used to
465 support the co-construction of tailored local intersectoral interventions towards mental health
466 and more broadly to support activities towards health equity as part of a longer-term pandemic
467 recovery strategy.
468
469 While COHESION Study Phase 1 aimed to understand the mechanisms linking
470 residential living conditions (built environment, surrounding greenness, neighborhood
471 deprivation) to differential trajectories of mental health and well-being since the outbreak of
472 the pandemic, Phase 2 may also provide decision support for public health authorities across
473 Canada. This contextualized information on a potential representative sample of general
474 population would be particularly important for policy makers in the pandemic recovery period
475 where it will be crucial to address health inequities related to income, housing, daily mobility
476 and social interactions, intimate partner violence, childhood, access to food and health care, and
477 racism exacerbated over the past two years.
478

6. Conclusion

Real-time monitoring and evaluation of the unintended consequences on mental health and health inequities of the pandemic is essential for shaping and adapting effective public health policies and programs targeting contextual living conditions (e.g., pedestrianization of streets, securing access to parks, housing renovation programs, permanent supportive housing programs, neighborhood greening program). We will benefit from the support of the Uni-Cité Collaboratory [64] which specializes in science to policy approaches – to equip research teams and cities with tools to better incorporate science into urban public policy. Our study will provide a comprehensive portrait of the key pathways of the COVID-19 impacts on mental health and well-being across Canada. Our flexible infrastructure will ensure that we can adjust to local needs and to the evolving situation from pandemic to post-pandemic recovery.

7. Acknowledgments

The authors would like to warmly thank Dre. Kate Zinszer (*Centre de Recherche en Santé Publique*, Montreal, QC, Canada) for her crucial involvement in the foundation of this project; Alexandra Otis (*CIUSSS Nord-de-l'Ile-de-Montréal*, Montreal, QC, Canada) and Marina Najjar (*Centre de Recherche en Santé Publique*, Montreal, QC, Canada) for their decisive coordination work in the Phase 1 COHESION study; Alexie Kim, Salma Sahil, and Andréanne Fortin for their assistance in study's communication; Alexandre Naud for his help with the VERITAS questionnaire; and Catherine Grenon for her help in analyzing the verbatims of the completed surveys. NDVI and MSDI metrics, indexed to DMTI Spatial Inc. postal codes, were provided by the *Canadian Urban Environmental Health Research Consortium* (CANUE).

8. Funding

The COHESION Study is supported by the *Public Health Agency of Canada* (PHAC, Ref # 4500416825 – 450041483) and the *Fonds de Recherche du en Santé du Québec en Santé (FRQ-S)* and the *Ministère de l'Économie et de l'Innovation du Québec* (Ref # 52266), and has benefited from infrastructure support from the *Canadian Foundation for Innovation* (CFI, Ref # 41072).

9. Conflict of interest

YK holds shares in Polygon Research Inc., the data collection platform that is used for the COHESION study.

10. References

1. World Health Organization. Rolling updates on coronavirus disease (COVID-19). 2020 [cited 25 Aug 2021]. Available: https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/events-as-they-happen
2. Government of Canada. COVID-19 daily epidemiology update. 2021 [cited 25 Aug 2021]. Available: https://health-infobase.canada.ca/covid-19/epidemiological-summary-covid-19-cases.html
3. Bernier C-A, Boire-Schwab D, Bélanger C, Castonguay J-S, Fimiani M, Fitz-Simon N, et al. COVID-19: Emergency Measures Tracker. 2021 [cited 25 Aug 2021]. Available: https://www.mccarthy.ca/fr/node/63791
4. Statistics Canada. Canadian Economic Dashboard and COVID-19. 2021 [cited 30 Mar 2021]. Available: https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/71-607-x/71-607-x2020009-eng.htm
5. Bruine de Bruin W. Age Differences in COVID-19 Risk Perceptions and Mental Health: Evidence From a National U.S. Survey Conducted in March 2020. Isaacowitz D, editor. The Journals of Gerontology: Series B. 2021;76: e24–e29. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbaa074
6. Wenham C, Smith J, Morgan R. COVID-19: the gendered impacts of the outbreak. The Lancet. 2020. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30526-2
7. Tsai J, Wilson M. COVID-19: a potential public health problem for homeless populations. The Lancet Public Health. 2020. doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30053-0
8. Jenkins EK, McAuliffe C, Hirani S, Richardson C, Thomson KC, McGuinness L, et al. A portrait of the early and differential mental health impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic in Canada: Findings from the first wave of a nationally representative cross-sectional survey. Preventive Medicine. 2021;145: 106333. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2020.106333
9. The New York Times. The Workers Who Face the Greatest Coronavirus Risk. 15 Mar 2020.
10. Chen JT, Krieger N. Revealing the unequal burden of COVID-19 by income, race/ethnicity, and household crowding: US county versus zip code analyses. Journal of Public Health Management and Practice. 2021;27: S46–S56. doi:10.1097/PHH.0000000000001263
11. Van Lancker W, Parolin Z. COVID-19, school closures, and child poverty: a social crisis in the making. The Lancet Public Health. 2020. doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30084-0
12. Yancy CW. COVID-19 and African Americans. JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association. 2020. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.6548
13. Pareek M, Bangash MN, Pareek N, Pan D, Sze S, Minhas JS, et al. Ethnicity and COVID-19: an urgent public health research priority. The Lancet. 2020. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30922-3
14. Samuelsson K, Barthel S, Colding J, Macassa G. Urban nature as a source of resilience during social distancing amidst the coronavirus pandemic. 2020. doi:10.31219/osf.io/3wx5a
15. Varshney LR, Socher R. COVID-19 Growth Rate Decreases with Social Capital. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.04.23.20077321
16. Courtet P, Olie E, Debien C, Vaiva G. Keep socially (but not physically) connected and carry on: Preventing suicide in the age of COVID-19. Journal of Clinical Psychiatry. 2020. doi:10.4088/JCP.20com13370

17. Monteith LL, Holliday R, Brown TL, Brenner LA, Mohatt N V. Preventing Suicide in Rural Communities During the COVID-19 Pandemic. Journal of Rural Health. Blackwell Publishing Ltd; 2021. pp. 179–184. doi:10.1111/jrh.12448
18. Dawkins G. Mental health survey shows Manitobans feeling more anxious due to social isolation. Winnipeg Sun. 5 May 2020.
19. Mcmaster G. Why COVID-19 loneliness can be especially hard on teens. 2020.
20. Vallée J, Cadot E, Roustit C, Parizot I, Chauvin P. The role of daily mobility in mental health inequalities: The interactive influence of activity space and neighbourhood of residence on depression. Social Science & Medicine. 2011;73: 1133–1144. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.08.009
21. Chung MH, Leung SF, Välimäki M. Use of tracking technology to examine life-space mobility among people with depression: a systematic review protocol. BMJ Open. 2020;10: e034208. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-034208
22. Astell-Burt T, Feng X, Kolt GS. Does access to neighbourhood green space promote a healthy duration of sleep? Novel findings from a cross-sectional study of 259 319 Australians. BMJ Open. 2013;3: e003094. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2013-003094
23. Public Health Agency of Canada. The Chief Public Health Officer's Report on the State of Public Health in Canada 2017 – Designing Healthy Living. 2017.
24. Abedi V, Olulana O, Avula V, Chaudhary D, Khan A, Shahjouei S, et al. Racial, Economic, and Health Inequality and COVID-19 Infection in the United States. Journal of Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities. 2021;8: 732–742. doi:10.1007/s40615-020-00833-4
25. Turcotte M, Hango D. Incidence des conséquences économiques de la COVID-19 sur les préoccupations sociales des Canadiens. 2020.
26. Pevalin DJ, Reeves A, Baker E, Bentley R. The impact of persistent poor housing conditions on mental health: A longitudinal population-based study. Preventive Medicine. 2017;105. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2017.09.020
27. Schellenberg G, Fonberg J. Housing characteristics and staying at home during the COVID-19 pandemic. 2020.
28. Deaton J, Deaton B. Food security and Canada's agricultural system challenged by COVID-19. Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics. 2020;68. doi:10.1111/cjag.12227
29. Loopstra R. Vulnerability to food insecurity since the COVID-19 lockdown. 2020.
30. Rotermann M. Canadians who report lower self-perceived mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic more likely to report increased use of cannabis, alcohol and tobacco. 2020.
31. Wasfi R, Poirier Stephens Z, Sones M, Laberee K, Pugh C, Fuller D, et al. Recruiting Participants for Population Health Intervention Research: Effectiveness and Costs of Recruitment Methods for the INTERACT (INTErventions, Research, and Action in Cities Team) study. Journal of Medical Internet Research. 2021. doi:10.2196/21142
32. Turner-Bowker D, Hogue SJ. Short Form 12 Health Survey (SF-12). Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands; 2014. pp. 5954–5957. doi:10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5_2698
33. Bech P. Measuring the dimension of psychological general well-being by the WHO-5. In: Quality of life newsletter. 2004.
34. Smyth C. The Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI). Journal of Gerontological Nursing. 1999;25: 10–10. doi:10.3928/0098-9134-19991201-10
35. Kessler RC, Green JG, Gruber MJ, Sampson NA, Bromet E, Cuitan M, et al. Screening for serious mental illness in the general population with the K6 screening scale: results

613 from the WHO World Mental Health (WMH) survey initiative. International Journal of
614 Methods in Psychiatric Research. 2010;19: 4–22. doi:10.1002/mpr.310
615 36. Russell DW. UCLA Loneliness Scale (Version 3): Reliability, validity, and factor
616 structure. Journal of Personality Assessment. 1996;66: 20–40.
617 doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa6601_2
618 37. Spitzer RL, Kroenke K, Williams JBW, Löwe B. A brief measure for assessing
619 generalized anxiety disorder: The GAD-7. Archives of Internal Medicine. 2006;166.
620 doi:10.1001/archinte.166.10.1092
621 38. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JBW. The PHQ-9: Validity of a brief depression
622 severity measure. Journal of General Internal Medicine. 2001;16. doi:10.1046/j.1525-
623 1497.2001.016009606.x
624 39. Smith BW, Dalen J, Wiggins K, Tooley E, Christopher P, Bernard J. The brief
625 resilience scale: Assessing the ability to bounce back. International Journal of
626 Behavioral Medicine. 2008;15: 194–200. doi:10.1080/10705500802222972
627 40. Statistics Canada. Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS) - Mental Health. [cited
628 1 May 2020]. Available:
629 https://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p3Instr.pl?Function=assembleInstr&a=1&&lang=en
630 &Item_Id=119788
631 41. Godin G, Shephard RJ. A simple method to assess exercise behavior in the community.
632 Canadian journal of applied sport sciences. 1985;10: 141–6.
633 42. Canadian Income Survey - 2019 Questionnaire [Unmet health care needs module].
634 [cited 16 Mar 2022]. Available:
635 https://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p3Instr.pl?Function=assembleInstr&a=1&&lang=en
636 &Item_Id=1270841
637 43. Office of Nutrition Policy and Promotion, Health Products and Food Branch. Canadian
638 Community Health Survey, Cycle 2.2, Nutrition (2004) - Income-Related Household
639 Food Security in Canada. Ottawa, CA; 2007.
640 44. Naud A, Sueur C, Basile C, Kestens Y. Combining social network and activity space
641 data for health research: tools and methods. Health and Place. 2020;66: 102454.
642 doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2020.102454
643 45. Chaix B, Kestens Y, Perchoux C, Karusisi N, Merlo J, Labadi K. An interactive
644 mapping tool to assess individual mobility patterns in neighborhood studies. American
645 Journal of Preventive Medicine. 2012;43. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2012.06.026
646 46. Campbell KE, Lee BA. Name generators in surveys of personal networks. Social
647 Networks. 1991;13: 203–221. doi:10.1016/0378-8733(91)90006-F
648 47. Fuller D, Bell S, Firth CL, Muhajarine N, Nelson T, Stanley K, et al. Wave 1 results of
649 the INTerventions, Research, and Action in Cities Team (INTERACT) cohort study:
650 Examining spatio-temporal measures for urban environments and health. Health &
651 Place. 2021. doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2021.102646
652 48. Yang YS, Ryu GW, Han I, Oh S, Choi M. Ecological Momentary Assessment Using
653 Smartphone-Based Mobile Application for Affect and Stress Assessment. Healthcare
654 Informatics Research. 2018;24: 381. doi:10.4258/hir.2018.24.4.381
655 49. Wilhelm P, Schoebi D. Assessing Mood in Daily Life. European Journal of
656 Psychological Assessment. 2007;23: 258–267. doi:10.1027/1015-5759.23.4.258
657 50. Pampalon R, Hamel D, Gamache P, Philibert MD, Raymond G, Simpson A. An Area-
658 based Material and Social Deprivation Index for Public Health in Québec and Canada.
659 Canadian Journal of Public Health. 2012;103: S17–S22.
660 51. Statistics Canada. Population centre size class values by province and territory, 2016
661 Census. [cited 2 Aug 2021]. Available: https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-
662 recensement/2016/ref/dict/tab/t1_13-eng.cfm

52. Gorelick N, Hancher M, Dixon M, Ilyushchenko S, Thau D, Moore R. Google Earth Engine: Planetary-scale geospatial analysis for everyone. Remote Sensing of Environment. 2017;202: 18–27. doi:10.1016/j.rse.2017.06.031
53. Google Earth Engine. USGS Landsat 8 TOA Reflectance (Orthorectified) - 2013 to 2017. 2017. Available: https://explorer.earthengine.google.com/detail/LANDSAT/LC8_L1T_TOA
54. Herrmann T, Gleckner W, Wasfi RA, Thierry B, Kestens Y, Ross NA. A pan-Canadian measure of active living environments using open data. Health Reports. 2019;30. doi:10.25318/82-003-x201900500002-eng
55. Canadian Institute for Health Information. COVID-19 Intervention Timeline in Canada. 2021 [cited 3 Aug 2021]. Available: https://www.cihi.ca/en/covid-19-intervention-timeline-in-canada
56. Fields E. Tableau Online Security in the Cloud. 2021.
57. Jacobsen E, Ran X, Liu A, Chang CCH, Ganguli M. Predictors of attrition in a longitudinal population-based study of aging. International Psychogeriatrics. 2021;33: 767–778. doi:10.1017/S1041610220000447
58. Young AF, Powers JR, Bell SL. Attrition in longitudinal studies: Who do you lose? Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health. 2006;30: 353–361. doi:10.1111/J.1467-842X.2006.TB00849.X
59. CEPPP – Center of Excellence for Patient and Public Partnership. [cited 4 Apr 2022]. Available: https://ceppp.ca/en/
60. Wasfi R, Stephens ZP, Sones M, Laberee K, Pugh C, Fuller D, et al. Recruiting Participants for Population Health Intervention Research: Effectiveness and Costs of Recruitment Methods for a Cohort Study. J Med Internet Res. 2021;23. doi:10.2196/21142
61. Fumagalli L, Laurie H, Lynn P. Experiments with methods to reduce attrition in longitudinal surveys. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society). 2013;176: 499–519. doi:10.1111/J.1467-985X.2012.01051.X
62. Hipp L, Bünning M, Munnes S, Sauermann A. Problems and pitfalls of retrospective survey questions in COVID-19 studies. Survey Research Methods. 2020;14: 109–114. doi:10.18148/SRM/2020.V14I2.7741
63. CIUSSS du Nord-de-l'île-de-Montréal | Portrait de l'établissement. [cited 4 Apr 2022]. Available: https://www.ciusssnordmtl.ca/a-propos/qui-sommes-nous/portrait-de-letablissement/
64. Home — Collaboratoire Uni-Cité. [cited 4 Apr 2022]. Available: https://www.uni-cite.ca/home
65. Wasfi R, Kestens Y. Built environment and health. Urban Form and Accessibility. Elsevier; 2021. pp. 187–205. doi:10.1016/b978-0-12-819822-3.00005-5

Tables and figures

3 tables and 7 figures (in color).

Table 1. Main information collected in the framework of the COHESION Study Phase 1 prospective follow-up (June 2020 to July 2021).

Theme	Assessment tool	Assessment period	Survey (year/week)																
			20/26	20/30	20/32	20/34	20/36	20/38	20/40	20/44	20/48	20/52	21/03	21/07	21/11	21/15	21/19	21/23	21/27
COVID-19																			
COVID-19 infection status		At the questionnaire administration point	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
COVID-19-pandemic-related perceptions		At the questionnaire administration point	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Anti-COVID-19 measures compliance		At the questionnaire administration point				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Position towards anti-COVID-19 vaccine		At the questionnaire administration point							X			X				X	X	X	X
Anti-COVID-19 vaccination status		At the questionnaire administration point													X	X	X	X	X
Health / Well-being																			
General health	SF-12 (first item only)	During the past 2 weeks	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Well-being	WHO-5 Index	During the past 2 weeks										X				X	X	X	X
Loneliness	UCLA 3-item loneliness score	During the past 2 weeks					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Anxiety symptoms	7-item General Anxiety Disorder (GAD-7)	During the past 2 weeks	X	X				X				X				X	X	X	X
Depression symptoms	9-item Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9)	During the past 2 weeks	X	X				X				X				X	X	X	X
Psychological distress symptoms	6-item Psychological Distress Scale (Kessler-6)	During the past 2 weeks			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
Behaviors																			
Outdoor mobility	VERITAS	During the past 7 days	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Social interactions	VERITAS	During the past 7 days	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sleep credit	Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index	During the past month	X	X				X				X		X		X	X	X	X
Substance use [a]	Frequency questionnaire	During the past 2 weeks			X		X		X	X		X		X		X	X	X	X

[a] Four items: alcohol, cigarettes, vape, and cannabis.

Follow-up questionnaire waves are named according to their week and year of release (for instance, "20/26" for the follow-up questionnaire proposed to participants in the 26th week of 2020).

Table 2a. Description of COHESION Study Phase 1 participants, at recruitment (N = 1,268).

Characteristics	*N*	Percent
Demographics		
Age category		
15-24	103	8.1 %
25-34	231	18.2 %
35-44	227	17.9 %
45-54	230	18.1 %
55-64	282	22.2 %
≥65	195	15.4 %
Gender		
Woman	985	77.7 %
Man	243	19.2 %
Other identity	40	3.2 %
Ethnic or cultural group		
White	1,080	85.2 %
Other group	188	14.8 %
Born in Canada		
Yes	1,073	84.6 %
No	195	15.4 %
Education level		
School degree	179	14.1 %
College degree	278	21.9 %
University degree	408	32.2 %
Post-graduate degree	393	31.0 %
Unknown / Not answered	10	0.8 %
Employment		
Employed, full-time	545	43.0 %
Employed, part-time	148	11.7 %
Self-employed	36	2.8 %
Unemployed	183	14.4 %
Retired	245	19.3 %
On leave / Disabled	59	4.7 %
Student	24	1.9 %
Other	28	2.2 %
Relationship		
In a relationship / Married	847	66.8 %
Single	282	22.2 %
Separated / Divorced / Widowed	135	10.6 %
Other	4	0.3 %
Household characteristics		
Household composition		
Alone	274	21.6 %
With my family	482	38.0 %
With my partner	451	35.6 %
Other	61	4.8 %
Children (living at home)		
0	918	72.4 %
1	155	12.2 %
2	137	10.8 %
≥3	58	4.6 %
Household annual income		
<$21,000	153	12.1 %
$21,000-$36,000	173	13.6 %
$36,000-$48,000	141	11.1 %
$48,000-$96,000	337	26.6 %
≥$96,000	279	22.0 %
Unknown / Not answered	185	14.6 %

Table 2a. To be continued.

Characteristics	*N*	Percent
Satisfaction regarding income/needs		
Very well	453	35.7 %
Well	522	41.2 %
Not well	271	21.4 %
Unknown / Not answered	22	1.7 %
Pet ownership		
Yes	693	56.4 %
No	536	43.6 %
Housing		
House tenure		
Owner	786	62.0 %
Renter	382	30.1 %
Other	69	5.4 %
Unknown / Not answered	31	2.4 %
Dwelling type		
House	833	65.7 %
Apartment / Condo	419	33.0 %
Other	12	0.9 %
Unknown / Not answered	4	0.3 %
Private outside space		
Yard or nature	963	78.4 %
Balcony or terrace	225	18.3 %
No	41	3.3 %
General health		
Chronic physical disease		
Yes	557	43.9 %
No	688	54.3 %
Unknown / Not answered	23	1.8 %
Chronic mental disease		
Yes	441	34.8 %
No	794	62.6 %
Unknown / Not answered	33	2.6 %
Substance use		
Alcohol [a]		
No	352	27.8 %
At least once a month	245	19.3 %
At least once a week	465	36.7 %
At least once a day	206	16.2 %
Cigarettes and/or vape [a]		
No	1,095	86.4 %
At least once a month	16	1.3 %
At least once a week	11	0.9 %
At least once a day	146	11.5 %
Cannabis [a]		
No	1,036	81.7 %
At least once a month	88	6.9 %
At least once a week	57	4.5 %
At least once a day	87	6.9 %
COVID-19 [b]		
At a high risk of being infected		
Yes	327	26.6 %
No	902	73.4 %
At a high risk of complications		
Yes	465	37.8 %
No	764	62.2 %

[a] During the month before completing baseline questionnaire.
[b] Participant and/or someone in his/her household.

Table 2b. Residential social and environmental measures (N = 1,268).

Indexes	*N*	Percent
Urbanization degree [a]		
Large center	891	70.4 %
Medium center	102	8.1 %
Small center	138	10.9 %
Rural	135	10.7 %
Surrounding greenness (NDVI) [b]		
<0.28	254	20.1 %
0.28-0.36	259	20.5 %
0.36-0.43	266	21.0 %
0.43-0.51	233	18.4 %
≥0.51	253	20.0 %
Material deprivation index [c]		
Quintile 1	295	24.5 %
Quintile 2	279	23.2 %
Quintile 3	257	21.4 %
Quintile 4	203	16.9 %
Quintile 5	169	14.0 %
Social deprivation index [c]		
Quintile 1	162	13.5 %
Quintile 2	162	13.5 %
Quintile 3	199	16.5 %
Quintile 4	251	20.9 %
Quintile 5	429	35.7 %

[a] According to *Statistics Canada* classification, "small", "medium" and "large" centers correspond to areas including between 1,000 and 29,999, between 30,000 and 99,999, and 100,000 and more inhabitants, respectively, while "rural area" is a residual value gathering all areas located outside population centers (at the four-digit code area level; data 2016) [51].

[b] Quintiles of the growing season Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) in the COHESION Study cohort (at the six-digit code area level; data 2019) [52,53].

[c] Quintiles of the distribution over the whole Canadian territory (at the Canadian Census dissemination area level; data 2016) [50].

Table 3. Attrition in the COHESION Study Phase 1, and comparison of participants enrolling or not in the prospective follow-up according to demographics (N = 1,268).

	Participating in follow-ups (N = 758)		Participated in baseline only (N = 510)		
Characteristics	***N***	**Percent**	***N***	**Percent**	***p*-value [a]**
Age category					<0.001
15-24	47	6.2 %	56	11.0 %	
25-34	120	15.8 %	111	21.8 %	
35-44	134	17.7 %	93	18.2 %	
45-54	131	17.3 %	99	19.4 %	
55-64	183	24.1 %	99	19.4 %	
≥65	143	18.9 %	52	10.2 %	
Gender					0.63
Woman	591	78.0 %	394	77.3 %	
Man	146	19.3 %	97	19.0 %	
Other identity	21	2.8 %	19	3.7 %	
Ethnic or cultural group					0.64
White	649	85.6 %	431	84.5 %	
Other group	109	14.4 %	79	15.5 %	
Born in Canada					0.12
Yes	631	83.2 %	442	86.7 %	
No	127	16.8 %	68	13.3 %	
Education level					0.069
School degree	94	12.4 %	85	16.7 %	
College degree	169	22.3 %	109	21.4 %	
University degree	235	31.0 %	173	33.9 %	
Post-graduate degree	254	33.5 %	139	27.3 %	
Unknown / Not answered	6	0.8 %	4	0.8 %	
Employment					<0.001
Employed, full-time	300	39.6 %	245	48.0 %	
Employed, part-time	85	11.2 %	63	12.4 %	
Self-employed	23	3.0 %	13	2.5 %	
Unemployed	99	13.1 %	84	16.5 %	
Retired	192	25.3 %	53	10.4 %	
On leave / Disabled	29	3.8 %	30	5.9 %	
Student	13	1.7 %	11	2.2 %	
Other	17	2.2 %	11	2.2 %	
Relationship					0.59
In a relationship / Married	511	67.4 %	336	65.9 %	
Single	160	21.1 %	122	23.9 %	
Separated / Divorced / Widowed	85	11.2 %	50	9.8 %	
Other	2	0.3 %	2	0.4 %	

[a] Chi-square test (or Fisher exact test for low numbers).



Figure 1. Conceptual model of the COHESION Study.
Adapted from Wasfi & Kestens (2021) [65].

HOME AND NEIGHBOURHOOD

Can you locate and name the places you have gone to in the past 7 days?

These places could include work, school, shops, services, leisure, cafes, runs, walks, parks, visiting someone's home, etc.



Figure 2. Collecting data on living and activity places with VERITAS-Social.
Screenshot for a fictional participant; the house icon locates the participant's residential address and the pin icons symbolize the visited places located by the participant.



Figure 3. Flow chart of participants' recruitment to the COHESION Study Phase 1 (June 2020 to July 2021).



Figure 4. Timeline of recruitment of the COHESION Study Phase 1 participants (N = 1,268).
Follow-up questionnaire waves are named according to their week and year of release (for instance, "20/26" for the follow-up questionnaire proposed to participants in the 26th week of 2020).



All participants	**1,268**	
Alberta (AB)	61	4.8 %
British Columbia (BC)	123	9.7 %
Manitoba (MB)	31	2.4 %
New Brunswick (NB)	13	1.0 %
Newfoundland and Labrador (NL)	0	0 %
Nova Scotia (NS)	12	0.9 %
Ontario (ON)	597	47.1 %
Prince Edward Island (PE)	2	0.2 %
Quebec (QC)	417	32.9 %
Saskatchewan (SK)	11	0.9 %
Northwest Territories (NT)	1	0.1 %
Nunavut (NU)	0	0 %
Yukon (YT)	0	0 %

Figure 5. Geographical distribution of COHESION Study Phase 1 participants across Canada (N = 1,268).



Figure 6. Participation in Phase 1 of the COHESION Study, baseline and follow-ups (June 2020 to July 2021; $N = 1{,}268$).
Follow-up questionnaire waves are named according to their week and year of release (for instance, "20/26" for the follow-up questionnaire proposed to participants in the 26th week of 2020). Green flow shows participants responding for the first time to a follow-up questionnaire, blue flow shows participants responding again to a follow-up questionnaire, and grey flow shows participants not responding to follow-ups.



Figure 7a. (A) Well-being (WHO-5 Index) level, (B) sleep duration, and (C) feeling of loneliness (UCLA 3-item loneliness score) throughout the first year of prospective follow-up of the COHESION Study Phase 1. Significance of comparison tests, after Bonferroni correction: * <0.05, ** <0.01, *** <0.001. Green: baseline questionnaire; blue: follow-up questionnaire. Follow-up questionnaire waves are named according to their week and year of release (for instance, "20/26" for the follow-up questionnaire proposed to participants in the 26th week of 2020).



Figure 7b. Symptoms of (A) anxiety (7-item General Anxiety Disorder, GAD-7, score), (B) depression (9-item Patient Health Questionnaire, PHQ-9, score), and (C) psychological distress (6-item Kessler Psychological Distress Scale) throughout the first year of prospective follow-up of the COHESION Study Phase 1.

Significance of comparison tests, after Bonferroni correction: * <0.05, ** <0.01, *** <0.001. Follow-up questionnaire waves are named according to their week and year of release (for instance, "20/26" for the follow-up questionnaire proposed to participants in the 26th week of 2020