

1 **Title**

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

4

5 **Authors**

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

10

11 **Affiliations**

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

14 ² Centre de Recherche en Santé Publique (CRéSP), Université de Montréal (UdeM), Québec
15 (QC), Canada.

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

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

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

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

24 ⁷ Département des sciences de la santé, Université du Québec à Rimouski, Québec (QC),

25 Canada.

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

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

28

29 **Corresponding author**

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

31

32 **Abstract** (255 words)

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

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

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

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

55

56 **Keywords**

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

58 **Abbreviations**

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

60

61 **Word count**

62 3,748 words (from the beginning of the Introduction to the end of the Results)

63

64

65 **1. Introduction**

66 On January 10, 2020, WHO announced the identification of a new strain of coronavirus, the
67 severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), causing a mild to severe
68 respiratory illness – which may progress to pneumonia and respiratory failure – named
69 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) [1]. The first positive case of COVID-19 in Canada
70 was reported on January 25, 2020 and a state of health emergency was declared across the
71 country between March 13 and March 22, 2020, depending on the province [2,3]. Mid-August
72 2021, there were just over 1.4 million cases in Canada and more than 26,700 deaths [2].

73 Public health measures to control transmission have brought vast sectors of economic
74 activity to a halt, leading to massive unemployment and reductions in income, while reducing
75 people’s daily movements and opportunities for in-person social interactions [4]. This has
76 affected people’s opportunities and access to resources that sustain mental health and well-
77 being. The COVID-19 conditions reinforce the role of various social and environmental
78 health determinants, with differential impacts on the mental health and well-being of
79 populations, depending on age [5], gender [6], housing conditions [7], education [8], job type
80 [9], income [10], or ethnic background [11–13] and, more generally, social and environmental
81 contexts [14,15].

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

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

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

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

108

109 **2. Two-phase COHESION Study objectives**

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

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

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

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

124

125 **3. Two-phase COHESION Study design**

126

127 **3.1. Study design and recruitment**

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

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

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

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

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

153

154 **3.2. Data collection**

155

156 **3.2.1. Involvement options**

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

161

162 **3.2.2. Baseline questionnaires**

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

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

176 The COHESION Study Phase 2 baseline questionnaire will consist in one core (10
177 min) and two optional complementary sections (15 min each). The core baseline
178 questionnaire includes: sociodemographic characteristics and key housing conditions;
179 COVID-19 vaccination status, perceptions of COVID-19 pandemic and related mitigation
180 measures; standardized modules assessing general health (first item of the 12-item Short-
181 Form Health Survey) [32], well-being (5-item World Health Organization Well-Being Index,
182 WHO-5 Index) [33], sleep credit (Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index, PSQI, 4 items only) [34],
183 and psychological distress (Psychological Distress Scale, Kessler-6) [35]; and an outdoor
184 mobility and social interactions module. Optional complementary baseline sections include
185 the map-based questionnaire on activity locations and social contacts (cf. 3.2.4) and additional
186 in-depth questions on relevant themes: additional items retrieved from the Phase 1 baseline
187 questionnaire (it means all items not already included in the Phase 2 core baseline
188 questionnaire); standardized modules on loneliness (University of California Los Angeles,
189 UCLA, 3-item loneliness score) [36], anxiety symptoms (7-item Generalized Anxiety
190 Disorder, GAD-7) [37], depression symptoms (9-item Patient Health Questionnaire, PHQ-9)
191 [38], resilience (6-item Brief Resilience Scale) [39], sense of belonging (Canada Community
192 Health Survey, CCHS) [40], and physical activity (Godin Leisure-Time Exercise) [41]; items
193 for assessing conspiracy beliefs.

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

197

198 **3.2.3. Follow-up questionnaires**

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

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

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

220

221 ***3.2.4. Use of VERITAS-Social to collect daily mobility and social interaction data***

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

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

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

245

246 **3.2.5. *Optional mobile application***

247 Participants enrolling in the mobile phone arm of the study were invited to download Ethica
248 Data mobile application (cf. 3.2.1), used successfully in previous research projects [47]. Once

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

257

258 **3.2.6. Environmental data**

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

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

270 The urbanization degree is measured using *Statistics Canada* classification (at the
271 four-digit code area level; data 2016), based on the number of inhabitants in population
272 centers [51]. “Small”, “medium” and “large” urban population centers correspond to areas
273 embracing between 1,000 and 29,999, between 30,000 and 99,999, and 100,000 and more

274 inhabitants, respectively, while “rural area” is a residual value gathering all areas located
275 outside population centers.

276 Greenness is evaluated using the growing season Normalized Difference Vegetation
277 Index (NDVI) (at the six-digit code area level; data 2019), based on Landsat 8 satellite data
278 [52,53].

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

281 Additional localized and temporalized data on COVID-19 pandemic conditions,
282 including lockdowns, curfews, vaccination plan, number of cases, and emergence of variants
283 is also available through the *Canadian Institute for Health Information* (CIHI) compilation
284 [55].

285

286 **3.3. Ethics and data management plan**

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

296 For data security and privacy proposal, all data are hosted on *Compute Canada* servers
297 with secondary backups on hospital-grade internal servers. All data has been stripped from
298 any personally identifying information, with only the principal investigator being able to track

299 the records back to one participant. Researchers can access anonymized individual level
300 records by connecting directly through a Secure Shell (SSH) to the database hosted on
301 *Compute Canada* (a SSH allows remote machines accessing data in a secure way since the
302 connection is encrypted). They can also access aggregated data for analysis through a secure
303 online platform hosted by Tableau [56]. A document listing all the data management policies
304 governing data access and storage has been submitted to the ethic board for approval.

305

306

307 **4. COHESION Study Phase 1 first results**

308

309 **4.1. Recruitment and participants**

310 Among the 2,557 people who completed the COHESION Phase 1 eligibility questionnaire,
311 2,346 (92%) met the selection criteria (Fig 3). Among these ones, 1,268 (54%) completed the
312 baseline questionnaire and have been enrolled in the COHESION Study, and among the latter,
313 557 (44%) opted for the Ethica mobile application in addition to the online self-administered
314 questionnaires. Although recruitment was continuously open during the Phase 1 timespan, the
315 major part of participants joined the study during the first months following the study launch:
316 832 (66%) recruitments after three months of follow-up, 1,136 (90%) after six months (Fig 4).

317 COHESION Phase 1 participants are distributed all across Canada; they live mainly in
318 Ontario (597, 47%) and Quebec (417, 33%) (Fig 5), and 910 (72%) declared English as their
319 favorite language. They are in average 48 ± 16 (mean \pm standard deviation, SD) and are
320 mainly women (78%), White (85%), born in Canada (85%), with university or post-graduate
321 level degree (63%), and in a relationship (67%) (Table 2a). The most part is owner (62%) and
322 lives in a house (66%), with their partner or family (74%), without children at home (72%),
323 with private outside space access (97%), with pets (56%), and in large urban centers (i.e., in
324 areas including more than 100,000 inhabitants); though participants show wide contrasts in
325 terms of home surroundings' greenness and neighborhood's material and social deprivation
326 (Table 2b). Participants are, by decreasing order, employed (58%), retired (19%), unemployed
327 (14%), on leave or disabled (5%), or students (2%); they are mostly satisfied about their
328 household annual income (77%) (Table 2a). Concerning health, they are 44% and 35% being
329 affected by a physical (i.e., heart disease, lung disease, cancer, high blood pressure, diabetes,
330 severe obesity, and/or autoimmune disease) or a mental (i.e., depressive disorder and/or
331 anxiety disorder) chronic disease, respectively. A monthly consumption of alcohol, cigarettes

332 and/or vape, and cannabis was reported by 72%, 14%, and 18% of participants at baseline,
333 respectively. Lastly, they are 27% and 38% considering their selves and/or someone in their
334 household at a high risk of being infected by- or of complications of COVID-19, respectively.

335

336 **4.2. Prospective follow-up and attrition**

337 Throughout the first year of follow-up, i.e., from May 2020 to July 2021, up to 17 follow-up
338 questionnaires were administered to participants (Fig 4), and 758 (60%) participants
339 completed at least one (Fig 3). Depending on their date of recruitment, participants were
340 contacted between one and seventeen times as part of the prospective follow-up waves (Fig 4),
341 and they filled out in average $29\% \pm 36\%$ (mean \pm SD) of the follow-up questionnaires they
342 received. Among the first year of follow-up, in average 298 ± 68 participants completed the
343 follow-up questionnaire by wave (Fig 6, *see* S1 Table).

344 Attrition rate throughout the Phase 1 follow-up appeared statistically distinct in some
345 specific groups (Table 3). The older the participants were and the higher the education level
346 was, the less the attrition was ($p < 0.001$ and $p = 0.069$, respectively); average age was 50 ± 16
347 and 45 ± 16 (mean \pm SD) in people participating or not in the longitudinal follow-up,
348 respectively ($p < 0.001$). Attrition appeared higher in employed people and lower in retired
349 ones ($p < 0.001$) (Table 3), and also higher in people living in family ($p = 0.005$), with
350 children ($p = 0.013$), with pets ($p = 0.001$), in a house ($p = 0.001$), and not owner ($p = 0.001$)
351 (*see* S2a Table). Lastly, people with a chronic physical disease ($p = 0.039$) or at a high risk of
352 being infected by the COVID-19 ($p = 0.001$) were less prone to participate to the follow-up.
353 No contrast was noticed according to substance use or residential social and environmental
354 components (*see* S2a-b Tables).

355

356 **4.3. Well-being and mental health**

357 From June 2020 to July 2021, we administered to participants well-being, sleep credit,
358 loneliness, anxiety, depression and psychological distress -related standardized modules 5, 9,
359 13, 8, 8, and 11 times, respectively (Table 1). During this period, each thematic module was
360 completed at least once by 481 (38%), 630 (50%), 658 (52%), 612 (48%), 612 (48%), and
361 692 (55%) Phase 1 participants, respectively (*see* S3a-b Tables).

362 The median of the 5-WHO well-being Index ranged from 44% (interval interquartile,
363 IQR: 24-65; wave 21/27) to 52% (IQR: 32-72; wave 20/52) depending on the wave. Well-
364 being appeared decreasing waves after waves, the median index value from the last two
365 administered waves (21/23 and 21/27, it means 2021, June and July) being significantly lower
366 than the one from the first three ones (20/52, 21/15, and 21/19, it means 2020, December,
367 2021, April, and 2021, May, respectively) (Fig 7a; *see* S4a Table). The sleep duration
368 appeared stable throughout the first year of the Phase 1 follow-up (mean \pm SD: from 7.9 ± 1.3
369 to 8.0 ± 1.4 hours; waves 21/23 and 20/30, respectively); no change was statistically found.
370 During the prospective follow-up, the median of the UCLA 3-item score of loneliness
371 oscillated between 5 (IQR: 3-6; wave 21/27) and 6 (IQR: 4-7; wave 21/15). These changes
372 were statistically significant, with a feeling of loneliness higher during the period from 2020,
373 October (wave 20/44) to 2021, April (wave 21/15), yet for the wave 20/52, corresponding to
374 the festive season. Moreover, all UCLA 3-item score median values through the follow-up
375 were significantly higher than the UCLA 3-item score median assessed retrospectively for the
376 period prior to the COVID-19 pandemic (4; IQR: 3-6).

377 Concerning mental health, the first year of follow-up of the Phase 1 showed
378 statistically significant changes between questionnaire waves regarding reporting of anxiety
379 symptoms, depression symptoms, and psychological distress (Fig 7b; *see* S4b Table). Thus,
380 GAD-7 median score ranged between 4 (IQR: 1-7; wave 21/27) and 5 (IQR: 2-10; wave
381 21/15) and PHQ-9 median score varied from 4 (IQR: 1-7; wave 21/27) and 6 (IQR: 3-9.3;

382 wave 20/30). For these both composite indexes, the median value from the wave 21/27 (2021,
383 July) was the lowest among all waves administered during the first year of follow-up, and
384 some statistically significant contrasts were observed. Lastly, Kessler-6 psychological distress
385 median score oscillated from 4 (IQR: 1-9; wave 20/52) and 5 (IQR: 2-10; wave 20/44);
386 several comparisons between psychological distress median score from the wave 20/52 (2020,
387 December) and other waves were statistically significant.

388

389 **5. Discussion**

390

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

401

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

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

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

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

436 Finally, as suggested by Fumagalli et al. (2013), promising approaches based on
437 persona principles as those used in marketing strategies might help. Thus, we plan to tailor the
438 content of newsletters, to strengthen the sense of belonging of those most at risk of dropping

439 out, a strategy that has proved effective for re-engaging young and busy people [61]. Despite
440 all these methodological efforts to minimize it, the risk of attrition can hardly be eliminated.
441 One way to account for the potential effect of residual attrition bias is through various
442 analytical strategies, including the use of inverse probability weights for trajectory analyses
443 (e.g., growth curve models) on mental health and well-being.

444

445 One critical issue with our cohort that was launched in mid-spring 2020 is the lack of a
446 true pre-pandemic baseline. This can partly be circumvented with retrospective questions, but
447 as time goes by, the recall bias increases, particularly for subjective mental health measures
448 [62]. After first using specific ‘pre-pandemic’ reference questions, a strategy we adopted,
449 from fall 2020 onwards, to minimize the cognitive effort and bias, was to use a combination
450 of broader questions about psychological changes since the pandemic outbreak (improvement,
451 deterioration, no change) and very factual questions for which recall bias is expected lower
452 (i.e., use of mental health services and substance use in the pre-pandemic year). Despite these
453 adaptations, the risk of recall bias remains, meaning that interpretation about change from
454 pre-pandemic measures should be done with caution.

455

456 An advantage of a prospective cohort design is the potential for adapting surveys to
457 new or unforeseen circumstances, including evolving priorities of public health authorities.
458 As months passed by and the situation evolved, we developed and administered new modules
459 to address such needs, including on substance use, a priority identified by our partner the
460 Public Health Agency of Canada, or on parent-related stress during the back-to-school periods.
461 Repeated surveys also provide the opportunity for timely dissemination of findings. To
462 facilitate dissemination and use of data by our public health partners, we developed an online
463 dashboard for real-time monitoring of key indicators (www.cohesionstudy.ca/dashboard).

464 Throughout phase 2 of COHESION, we will continue adapting our survey content with timely
465 themes, helping uncovering key pathways linking individual trajectories, environmental
466 contexts, and health and equity outcomes.

467

468 An important contribution of this project is to offer both a pan-Canadian portrait while
469 allowing local oversampling and providing very contextualized information. An example of
470 local adaptation is planned for public health territory of CIUSSS Nord-de-l'Île-de-Montréal
471 (NIM) in Québec [63], with a target local sample of 1,000 participants. Data will be used to
472 support the co-construction of tailored local intersectoral interventions towards mental health
473 and more broadly to support activities towards health equity as part of a longer-term
474 pandemic recovery strategy.

475

476 While COHESION Study Phase 1 aimed to understand the mechanisms linking
477 residential living conditions (built environment, surrounding greenness, neighborhood
478 deprivation) to differential trajectories of mental health and well-being since the outbreak of
479 the pandemic, Phase 2 may also provide decision support for public health authorities across
480 Canada. This contextualized information on a potential representative sample of general
481 population would be particularly important for policy makers in the pandemic recovery period
482 where it will be crucial to address health inequities related to income, housing, daily mobility
483 and social interactions, intimate partner violence, childhood, access to food and health care,
484 and racism exacerbated over the past two years.

485

486 **6. Conclusion**

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

498

499

500

501 **7. Acknowledgments**

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

512

513 **8. Funding**

514 The COHESION Study is supported by the *Public Health Agency of Canada* (PHAC, Ref #
515 4500416825 – 450041483) and the *Fonds de Recherche du en Santé du Québec en Santé*
516 (*FRQ-S*) and the *Ministère de l'Économie et de l'Innovation du Québec* (Ref # 52266), and
517 has benefited from infrastructure support from the *Canadian Foundation for Innovation* (CFI,
518 Ref # 41072).

519

520 **9. Conflict of interest**

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

523 The content and views expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily
524 reflect those of the Government of Canada.

525

526 10. References

- 527 1. World Health Organization. Rolling updates on coronavirus disease (COVID-19). 2020
528 [cited 25 Aug 2021]. Available: [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/events-as-they-happen)
529 [coronavirus-2019/events-as-they-happen](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/events-as-they-happen)
- 530 2. Government of Canada. COVID-19 daily epidemiology update. 2021 [cited 25 Aug
531 2021]. Available: [https://health-infobase.canada.ca/covid-19/epidemiological-](https://health-infobase.canada.ca/covid-19/epidemiological-summary-covid-19-cases.html)
532 [summary-covid-19-cases.html](https://health-infobase.canada.ca/covid-19/epidemiological-summary-covid-19-cases.html)
- 533 3. Bernier C-A, Boire-Schwab D, Bélanger C, Castonguay J-S, Fimiani M, Fitz-Simon N,
534 et al. COVID-19: Emergency Measures Tracker. 2021 [cited 25 Aug 2021]. Available:
535 <https://www.mccarthy.ca/fr/node/63791>
- 536 4. Statistics Canada. Canadian Economic Dashboard and COVID-19. 2021 [cited 30 Mar
537 2021]. Available: [https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/71-607-x/71-607-x2020009-](https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/71-607-x/71-607-x2020009-eng.htm)
538 [eng.htm](https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/71-607-x/71-607-x2020009-eng.htm)
- 539 5. Bruine de Bruin W. Age Differences in COVID-19 Risk Perceptions and Mental
540 Health: Evidence From a National U.S. Survey Conducted in March 2020. Isaacowitz
541 D, editor. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B*. 2021;76: e24–e29.
542 doi:10.1093/geronb/gbaa074
- 543 6. Wenham C, Smith J, Morgan R. COVID-19: the gendered impacts of the outbreak. *The*
544 *Lancet*. 2020. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30526-2
- 545 7. Tsai J, Wilson M. COVID-19: a potential public health problem for homeless
546 populations. *The Lancet Public Health*. 2020. doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30053-0
- 547 8. Jenkins EK, McAuliffe C, Hirani S, Richardson C, Thomson KC, McGuinness L, et al.
548 A portrait of the early and differential mental health impacts of the COVID-19
549 pandemic in Canada: Findings from the first wave of a nationally representative cross-
550 sectional survey. *Preventive Medicine*. 2021;145: 106333.
551 doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2020.106333
- 552 9. The New York Times. The Workers Who Face the Greatest Coronavirus Risk. 15 Mar
553 2020.
- 554 10. Chen JT, Krieger N. Revealing the unequal burden of COVID-19 by income,
555 race/ethnicity, and household crowding: US county versus zip code analyses. *Journal*
556 *of Public Health Management and Practice*. 2021;27: S46–S56.
557 doi:10.1097/PHH.0000000000001263
- 558 11. Van Lancker W, Parolin Z. COVID-19, school closures, and child poverty: a social
559 crisis in the making. *The Lancet Public Health*. 2020. doi:10.1016/S2468-
560 2667(20)30084-0
- 561 12. Yancy CW. COVID-19 and African Americans. *JAMA - Journal of the American*
562 *Medical Association*. 2020. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.6548
- 563 13. Pareek M, Bangash MN, Pareek N, Pan D, Sze S, Minhas JS, et al. Ethnicity and
564 COVID-19: an urgent public health research priority. *The Lancet*. 2020.
565 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30922-3
- 566 14. Samuelsson K, Barthel S, Colding J, Macassa G. Urban nature as a source of resilience
567 during social distancing amidst the coronavirus pandemic. 2020.
568 doi:10.31219/osf.io/3wx5a
- 569 15. Varshney LR, Socher R. COVID-19 Growth Rate Decreases with Social Capital. 2020.
570 doi:10.1101/2020.04.23.20077321

- 571 16. Courtet P, Olie E, Debien C, Vaiva G. Keep socially (but not physically) connected and
572 carry on: Preventing suicide in the age of COVID-19. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*.
573 2020. doi:10.4088/JCP.20com13370
- 574 17. Monteith LL, Holliday R, Brown TL, Brenner LA, Mohatt N V. Preventing Suicide in
575 Rural Communities During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Rural Health*.
576 Blackwell Publishing Ltd; 2021. pp. 179–184. doi:10.1111/jrh.12448
- 577 18. Dawkins G. Mental health survey shows Manitobans feeling more anxious due to
578 social isolation. *Winnipeg Sun*. 5 May 2020.
- 579 19. McMaster G. Why COVID-19 loneliness can be especially hard on teens. 2020.
- 580 20. Vallée J, Cadot E, Roustit C, Parizot I, Chauvin P. The role of daily mobility in mental
581 health inequalities: The interactive influence of activity space and neighbourhood of
582 residence on depression. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2011;73: 1133–1144.
583 doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.08.009
- 584 21. Chung MH, Leung SF, Välimäki M. Use of tracking technology to examine life-space
585 mobility among people with depression: a systematic review protocol. *BMJ Open*.
586 2020;10: e034208. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-034208
- 587 22. Astell-Burt T, Feng X, Kolt GS. Does access to neighbourhood green space promote a
588 healthy duration of sleep? Novel findings from a cross-sectional study of 259 319
589 Australians. *BMJ Open*. 2013;3: e003094. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2013-003094
- 590 23. Public Health Agency of Canada. The Chief Public Health Officer’s Report on the
591 State of Public Health in Canada 2017 – Designing Healthy Living. 2017.
- 592 24. Abedi V, Olulana O, Avula V, Chaudhary D, Khan A, Shahjouei S, et al. Racial,
593 Economic, and Health Inequality and COVID-19 Infection in the United States. *Journal*
594 *of Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities*. 2021;8: 732–742. doi:10.1007/s40615-020-
595 00833-4
- 596 25. Turcotte M, Hango D. Incidence des conséquences économiques de la COVID-19 sur
597 les préoccupations sociales des Canadiens. 2020.
- 598 26. Pevalin DJ, Reeves A, Baker E, Bentley R. The impact of persistent poor housing
599 conditions on mental health: A longitudinal population-based study. *Preventive*
600 *Medicine*. 2017;105. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2017.09.020
- 601 27. Schellenberg G, Fonberg J. Housing characteristics and staying at home during the
602 COVID-19 pandemic. 2020.
- 603 28. Deaton J, Deaton B. Food security and Canada’s agricultural system challenged by
604 COVID-19. *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics*. 2020;68.
605 doi:10.1111/cjag.12227
- 606 29. Loopstra R. Vulnerability to food insecurity since the COVID-19 lockdown. 2020.
- 607 30. Rotermann M. Canadians who report lower self-perceived mental health during the
608 COVID-19 pandemic more likely to report increased use of cannabis, alcohol and
609 tobacco. 2020.
- 610 31. Wasfi R, Poirier Stephens Z, Sones M, Laberee K, Pugh C, Fuller D, et al. Recruiting
611 Participants for Population Health Intervention Research: Effectiveness and Costs of
612 Recruitment Methods for the INTERACT (INTERventions, Research, and Action in
613 Cities Team) study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*. 2021. doi:10.2196/21142
- 614 32. Turner-Bowker D, Hogue SJ. Short Form 12 Health Survey (SF-12). *Encyclopedia of*
615 *Quality of Life and Well-Being Research*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands; 2014. pp.
616 5954–5957. doi:10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5_2698
- 617 33. Bech P. Measuring the dimension of psychological general well-being by the WHO-5.
618 In: *Quality of life newsletter*. 2004.
- 619 34. Smyth C. The Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI). *Journal of Gerontological*
620 *Nursing*. 1999;25: 10–10. doi:10.3928/0098-9134-19991201-10

- 621 35. Kessler RC, Green JG, Gruber MJ, Sampson NA, Bromet E, Cuitan M, et al. Screening
622 for serious mental illness in the general population with the K6 screening scale: results
623 from the WHO World Mental Health (WMH) survey initiative. *International Journal of*
624 *Methods in Psychiatric Research*. 2010;19: 4–22. doi:10.1002/mpr.310
- 625 36. Russell DW. UCLA Loneliness Scale (Version 3): Reliability, validity, and factor
626 structure. *Journal of Personality Assessment*. 1996;66: 20–40.
627 doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa6601_2
- 628 37. Spitzer RL, Kroenke K, Williams JBW, Löwe B. A brief measure for assessing
629 generalized anxiety disorder: The GAD-7. *Archives of Internal Medicine*. 2006;166.
630 doi:10.1001/archinte.166.10.1092
- 631 38. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JBW. The PHQ-9: Validity of a brief depression
632 severity measure. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2001;16. doi:10.1046/j.1525-
633 1497.2001.016009606.x
- 634 39. Smith BW, Dalen J, Wiggins K, Tooley E, Christopher P, Bernard J. The brief
635 resilience scale: Assessing the ability to bounce back. *International Journal of*
636 *Behavioral Medicine*. 2008;15: 194–200. doi:10.1080/10705500802222972
- 637 40. Statistics Canada. Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS) - Mental Health. [cited
638 1 May 2020]. Available:
639 [https://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p3Instr.pl?Function=assembleInstr&a=1&&lang=en](https://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p3Instr.pl?Function=assembleInstr&a=1&&lang=en&Item_Id=119788)
640 [&Item_Id=119788](https://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p3Instr.pl?Function=assembleInstr&a=1&&lang=en&Item_Id=119788)
- 641 41. Godin G, Shephard RJ. A simple method to assess exercise behavior in the community.
642 *Canadian journal of applied sport sciences*. 1985;10: 141–6.
- 643 42. Canadian Income Survey - 2019 Questionnaire [Unmet health care needs module].
644 [cited 16 Mar 2022]. Available:
645 [https://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p3Instr.pl?Function=assembleInstr&a=1&&lang=en](https://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p3Instr.pl?Function=assembleInstr&a=1&&lang=en&Item_Id=1270841)
646 [&Item_Id=1270841](https://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p3Instr.pl?Function=assembleInstr&a=1&&lang=en&Item_Id=1270841)
- 647 43. Office of Nutrition Policy and Promotion, Health Products and Food Branch. Canadian
648 Community Health Survey, Cycle 2.2, Nutrition (2004) - Income-Related Household
649 Food Security in Canada. Ottawa, CA; 2007.
- 650 44. Naud A, Sueur C, Basile C, Kestens Y. Combining social network and activity space
651 data for health research: tools and methods. *Health and Place*. 2020;66: 102454.
652 doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2020.102454
- 653 45. Chaix B, Kestens Y, Perchoux C, Karusisi N, Merlo J, Labadi K. An interactive
654 mapping tool to assess individual mobility patterns in neighborhood studies. *American*
655 *Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 2012;43. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2012.06.026
- 656 46. Campbell KE, Lee BA. Name generators in surveys of personal networks. *Social*
657 *Networks*. 1991;13: 203–221. doi:10.1016/0378-8733(91)90006-F
- 658 47. Fuller D, Bell S, Firth CL, Muhajarine N, Nelson T, Stanley K, et al. Wave 1 results of
659 the INTerventions, Research, and Action in Cities Team (INTERACT) cohort study:
660 Examining spatio-temporal measures for urban environments and health. *Health &*
661 *Place*. 2021. doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2021.102646
- 662 48. Yang YS, Ryu GW, Han I, Oh S, Choi M. Ecological Momentary Assessment Using
663 Smartphone-Based Mobile Application for Affect and Stress Assessment. *Healthcare*
664 *Informatics Research*. 2018;24: 381. doi:10.4258/hir.2018.24.4.381
- 665 49. Wilhelm P, Schoebi D. Assessing Mood in Daily Life. *European Journal of*
666 *Psychological Assessment*. 2007;23: 258–267. doi:10.1027/1015-5759.23.4.258
- 667 50. Pampalon R, Hamel D, Gamache P, Philibert MD, Raymond G, Simpson A. An Area-
668 based Material and Social Deprivation Index for Public Health in Québec and Canada.
669 *Canadian Journal of Public Health*. 2012;103: S17–S22.

- 670 51. Statistics Canada. Population centre size class values by province and territory, 2016
671 Census. [cited 2 Aug 2021]. Available: <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census->
672 [recensement/2016/ref/dict/tab/t1_13-eng.cfm](https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/ref/dict/tab/t1_13-eng.cfm)
- 673 52. Gorelick N, Hancher M, Dixon M, Ilyushchenko S, Thau D, Moore R. Google Earth
674 Engine: Planetary-scale geospatial analysis for everyone. *Remote Sensing of*
675 *Environment*. 2017;202: 18–27. doi:10.1016/j.rse.2017.06.031
- 676 53. Google Earth Engine. USGS Landsat 8 TOA Reflectance (Orthorectified) - 2013 to
677 2017. 2017. Available:
678 https://explorer.earthengine.google.com/detail/LANDSAT/LC8_L1T_TOA
- 679 54. Herrmann T, Gleckner W, Wasfi RA, Thierry B, Kestens Y, Ross NA. A pan-Canadian
680 measure of active living environments using open data. *Health Reports*. 2019;30.
681 doi:10.25318/82-003-x201900500002-eng
- 682 55. Canadian Institute for Health Information. COVID-19 Intervention Timeline in Canada.
683 2021 [cited 3 Aug 2021]. Available: <https://www.cihi.ca/en/covid-19-intervention->
684 [timeline-in-canada](https://www.cihi.ca/en/covid-19-intervention-timeline-in-canada)
- 685 56. Fields E. Tableau Online Security in the Cloud. 2021.
- 686 57. Jacobsen E, Ran X, Liu A, Chang CCH, Ganguli M. Predictors of attrition in a
687 longitudinal population-based study of aging. *International Psychogeriatrics*. 2021;33:
688 767–778. doi:10.1017/S1041610220000447
- 689 58. Young AF, Powers JR, Bell SL. Attrition in longitudinal studies: Who do you lose?
690 *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*. 2006;30: 353–361.
691 doi:10.1111/J.1467-842X.2006.TB00849.X
- 692 59. CEPPP – Center of Excellence for Patient and Public Partnership. [cited 4 Apr 2022].
693 Available: <https://ceppp.ca/en/>
- 694 60. Wasfi R, Stephens ZP, Sones M, Laberee K, Pugh C, Fuller D, et al. Recruiting
695 Participants for Population Health Intervention Research: Effectiveness and Costs of
696 Recruitment Methods for a Cohort Study. *J Med Internet Res*. 2021;23.
697 doi:10.2196/21142
- 698 61. Fumagalli L, Laurie H, Lynn P. Experiments with methods to reduce attrition in
699 longitudinal surveys. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in*
700 *Society)*. 2013;176: 499–519. doi:10.1111/J.1467-985X.2012.01051.X
- 701 62. Hipp L, Bünning M, Munnes S, Sauermann A. Problems and pitfalls of retrospective
702 survey questions in COVID-19 studies. *Survey Research Methods*. 2020;14: 109–114.
703 doi:10.18148/SRM/2020.V14I2.7741
- 704 63. CIUSSS du Nord-de-l'île-de-Montréal | Portrait de l'établissement. [cited 4 Apr 2022].
705 Available: <https://www.ciuSSSnordmtl.ca/a-propos/qui-sommes-nous/portrait-de->
706 [letablissement/](https://www.ciuSSSnordmtl.ca/a-propos/qui-sommes-nous/portrait-de-letablissement/)
- 707 64. Home — Collaboratoire Uni-Cité. [cited 4 Apr 2022]. Available: <https://www.uni->
708 [cite.ca/home](https://www.uni-cite.ca/home)
- 709 65. Wasfi R, Kestens Y. Built environment and health. *Urban Form and Accessibility*.
710 Elsevier; 2021. pp. 187–205. doi:10.1016/b978-0-12-819822-3.00005-5
711

1 **Tables and figures**

2 3 tables and 7 figures (in color).

3

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	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	
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					
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	
Substance use ^a	Frequency questionnaire	During the past 2 weeks			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	<i>N</i>	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 ($N = 1,268$).

Characteristics	Participating in follow-ups ($N = 758$)		Participated in baseline only ($N = 510$)		<i>p</i> -value ^a
	<i>N</i>	Percent	<i>N</i>	Percent	
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).




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: * <math><0.05</math>, ** <math><0.01</math>, *** <math><0.001</math>. 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: * <math><0.05</math>, ** <math><0.01</math>, *** <math><0.001</math>. 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

