

Assessing the Impacts of COVID-19 and Social Isolation on Mental Health in the United States of America

September 8, 2022

Alexander Fulk^b, Raul Saenz-Escarcega^a, Hiroko Kobayashi^{c,d},
Innocent Maposa^e, Folashade Augusto^b¹

^a*Department of Biology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS*

^b*Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS*

^c*Department of Molecular Biosciences, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS*

^d*Department of Psychology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS*

^e*Health Sciences Research Office, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg*

Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic has had a devastating impact on the world at large with over 500 million cases and over 6 million deaths reported thus far. Of those, over 85 million cases and 1 million deaths have occurred in the United States of America. The mental health of the general population has been impacted by several aspects of the pandemic including lockdowns, media sensationalism, social isolation, and spread of the disease. In this paper, we examine the effect that social isolation and COVID-19 infection and related death had on the prevalence of anxiety and depression in the general population of the USA in a state-by-state multiple time-series analysis. Vector Error Correction Models are estimated and we subsequently evaluated the coefficients of the estimated models and calculated their impulse response functions for further interpretation. We found that variables related to COVID-19 overall led to increase in both anxiety and depression across the studied period, while variables related to social isolation had a varied effect depending on the state being considered.

1 Introduction

Since its emergence, the World Health Organization (WHO) has reported over 500 million cases of COVID-19 globally and over 6 million deaths [1]. COVID-19 is a novel coronavirus disease caused by the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-Cov-2) that set off an unprecedented global health crisis creating a myriad of lockdown restrictions in response to the surge of COVID-19 cases in different parts of the world. First discovered in Wuhan, China in December 2019, the virus has spread from person to person due to its respiratory transmissibility. Individuals infected with

¹Corresponding author's email: fbagusto@gmail.com

23 the virus can pass it on to susceptible individuals by being within 2 meters of contact,
24 sneezing, and/or coughing through aerosol droplets containing the virus. People could
25 also become infected if they touch their eyes or nose after coming into contact with con-
26 taminated surfaces [2]. Areas with poor ventilation in indoor settings and/or crowded
27 rooms can allow for spread to susceptible individuals due to aerosols of the virus sus-
28 pended for longer in these specific conditions [4]. Reported symptoms of COVID-19
29 range from mild to severe symptoms including: fever, sore throat, diarrhea, shortness
30 of breath, headache, and body aches, and there are reports of asymptomatic individ-
31 uals who experience no symptoms, but can still pass on the virus. Older populations
32 (>65+) or those with other underlying medical conditions are associated with a higher
33 likelihood of severe symptoms from COVID-19 [5].

34 In response to the early outbreaks and surges of COVID-19 cases, several country
35 leaders and government officials set up lockdown mandates to suppress transmission
36 between people [6, 7]. These restrictions were in place to stop the ever-growing inci-
37 dence of COVID-19 cases and death from rising drastically. However, the lockdown
38 mandates led to other unprecedented effects on the mental health of the public [7].
39 With lockdown mandates becoming prominent worldwide, there was a rise in mental
40 health problems from pre-pandemic data [8] and an increase in general worry related to
41 the pandemic [9]. Culminating in the rise of self-reported stress levels and depressive
42 symptoms [10]. What’s interesting to take into account is how many countries were
43 implementing swift lockdown measures to mitigate the spread of COVID-19 [14]. In
44 contrast, the United States of America (USA) opted for individual states to choose
45 their lockdown policies. This move led to variation across the country. Mask poli-
46 cies varied from required to optional, businesses remained open or closed for different
47 durations, and policymakers touted different overall messages. This made it difficult
48 for individuals to determine what sources were correct and what information applied
49 to the specific lockdown restriction they were in depending on their state. Timing of
50 when a state enacted a mask mandate had a significant association with the spread of
51 COVID-19 [14]. Recent research has suggested that state-level policy differences may
52 be associated with different outcomes concerning the COVID-19 pandemic [37].

53 This disorganization from the federal government of the United States for individ-
54 ual states to handle their own lockdown issues was also prominent when it came to its
55 vaccine roll-outs. When the Food and Drug Administration began vaccine rollout in
56 December of 2020, there was a vacuum of leadership from the federal government in
57 administrating vaccines to the population [15]. The previous administration provided
58 little to no government insight on how states should run their vaccine roll-out, leaving
59 most states to handle vaccine roll-out at their own discretion [15]. Moreover, vaccina-
60 tion sites were limited on how many shots they were able to administer, but there was
61 a surplus of vaccines distributed to several states. The miscommunications between
62 the federal government and the states caused many of these vaccines to not be given
63 out to these important sites for the public [16]. The uneven vaccine roll-out to the
64 public, spread of misinformation from the state and federal governments, as well as
65 vaccine hesitancy has resulted in difficulty for the public to become vaccinated [17].

66 In the United States, prevalence of symptoms of anxiety disorder rose from the sec-
67 ond quarter of 2019 (8.1%) to 25.5% in June 2020 [3]. Depressive symptoms also saw
68 a reported increase from 6.5% (second quarter) to 24.3% (June 2020) [3]. We subse-
69 quently use the anxiety and depression as indicators of the mental health of the general

70 population. Social isolation also affected the lifestyle and behavior of the public from
71 sleep disorders, unhealthy eating habits, and restriction of in-person social activity,
72 possibly leading to a further increase in mental health problems [7]. Social isolation
73 runs the potential of being a risk factor for other problems such as dementia, premature
74 death, and physiological distress [12]. The United States and many other countries at
75 this stage of the pandemic experienced similar trends in their population from health
76 care providers to the general public reporting elevated mental health issues likely stem-
77 ming from the pandemic and lockdown restrictions [13]. Additionally, uneven vaccine
78 roll-outs, COVID-19 incidence, and deaths throughout the timeline of COVID-19 in
79 the United States have impacted the mental health of the public. State policies, geo-
80 graphic location, and political affiliation may be among some of the potential factors
81 that can be used as mental health indicators.

82 At the same time, surveys have been issued across the population to ascertain the
83 severity of the mental health problems of the population. This research aims to look at
84 the presented data from COVID-19 Trends and Impact Surveys to assess the possible
85 relationship between COVID-19 incidence and death and two social variables that were
86 commonly impacted across the United States via lockdown policies with mental health
87 indicators in each state in two time periods. Due to a change in the formatting of
88 several questions, we had to split the analysis to accurately assess the survey results.
89 The first time period ranges from September 9th, 2020 to March 2nd, 2021 and the
90 second time period ranges from March 2nd, 2021 to January 10th, 2022. In this study,
91 we use the aforementioned survey data collected in each state to assess the impact of
92 both the spread of COVID-19 and the impact of reduced social contact as a result
93 of the pandemic via variables related to social isolation on the mental health of the
94 general population.

95 In Section 2, we provide further detail on the survey data analyzed and describe
96 the formulation of models used for analysis. In Section 3, the coefficients of the fitted
97 models and their impulse response functions are assessed. In the discussion section
98 (Section 4), we present some implications of our results and frame them in the context
99 of existing literature as well as presenting some limitations and strengths of the current
100 study. Finally, in Section 5, we summarize our results and provide insight into future
101 directions for this research.

102 2 Materials and Methods

103 2.1 Data

104 The data used in this study was collected and aggregated by the Delphi Research Group
105 at Carnegie Mellon University in partnership with Facebook [18]. These surveys are
106 issued by the Delphi Research Group at Carnegie Mellon which collects survey results
107 about people’s responses to the current situation of the pandemic. These responses are
108 distributed through the collaboration of Facebook and selected at random. The surveys
109 themselves cover questions such as a person’s demographics, their mental health during
110 the pandemic, how COVID-19 affected them, vaccine roll-out, and other important
111 questions. These surveys allow investigators to compare responses across different
112 regions of the United States and make informed public health decisions [18]. We used
113 results from the COVID-19 Trends and Impact survey as well as case and death data

114 provided by John Hopkins University, both of which can be accessed using the covidcast
115 R package created by the Delphi Research Group. The survey asked respondents several
116 questions regarding various topics, but we focus on the results of questions surrounding
117 mental health and social distancing and travel for analysis. The survey results are
118 weighted to be representative of the population of the United States and are reported
119 as an estimated percentage.

120 As stated above, we perform our analysis on two subsets of the survey results due
121 to the format of questions being changed on March 2nd of 2021. Our first analysis
122 covers the period of September 8th, 2020 to March 2nd, 2021 and the second analysis
123 covers the period of March 2nd, 2021 to January 10th 2022. As a measure of anxiety in
124 the general population of each state, we used the ‘Estimated percentage of respondents
125 who reported feeling nervous, anxious, or on edge for most or all of the past 5 days’.
126 As a measure of depression, we used the ‘Estimated percentage of respondents who
127 reported feeling depressed for most or all of the past 5 days’. We used two indicators
128 as a proxy for social isolation. The first indicator was the ‘Estimated percentage of
129 respondents who spent time with someone who isn’t currently staying with you in the
130 past 24 hours’. The second indicator was the ‘Estimated percentage of respondents
131 who worked or went to school outside their home in the past 24 hours’. This means
132 that if an increase is observed in one of these variables, that is considered a decrease
133 in the prevalence of social isolation in the general population. This also means that
134 one might expect that these variables commonly have an inverse relationship with
135 anxiety/depression (i.e. an increase in the percentage of respondents who worked or
136 went to school should be associated with a decrease in anxiety/depression under normal
137 circumstances).

138 In the context of the pandemic, there is a greater potential for the opposite effect
139 to occur since individuals may be more worried about becoming sick with the more
140 interactions they have. We used two measures of COVID-19 severity, the first being
141 the number of new confirmed COVID-19 cases per 100,000 population per day and
142 the second being the number of new confirmed deaths due to COVID-19 per 100,000
143 population per day. Due to the reporting schedule skipping weekends, we used the 7
144 day moving averages of these indicators to smooth the observed signals. As previously
145 mentioned, the nature of questions changed slightly in the second period, for indicators
146 used to measure anxiety and depression, the questions shifted from asking about the
147 past 5 days to the past 7 days. For indicators used as a proxy for social isolation, the
148 questions changed to ‘Estimated percentage of respondents who spent time *indoors* with
149 someone who isn’t currently staying with you in the past 24 hours’ and ‘Estimated
150 percentage of individuals who worked or went to school *indoors* and outside their
151 home in the past 24 hours’. COVID-19 related indicators were unchanged in both
152 time periods. The implications that these changes have will be discussed in Section
153 4. Models fit in the second time period also included the ‘Estimated percentage of
154 respondents who have already received a vaccine for COVID-19’, and the results for
155 that indicator are discussed in the Supplementary Figures. Next, we describe the
156 methods used to analyze the survey data.

2.2 Model Formulation

The time series data described is non-stationary and co-integrated and thus was analyzed using Vector Error Correction Models (VECMs). To verify that our data were non-stationary and co-integrated, we ran an autocorrelation function and Johansen’s test for each state and found each time series to be non-stationary and co-integrated up to at least order 1 in every state. The results of each of these are provided in the results folder of the GitHub link (https://github.com/alxjfulk/social_isolation_and_COVID19) . VECMs are modified Vector Auto-Regressive Models (VARs) that are able to account for possible long-run relationships that arise in non-stationary, co-integrated time series data [19]. VARs have long been used to analyze economic data in an attempt to gain insight into what factors contribute to a particular economic variable [20] and we believe that the COVID-19 pandemic presents a unique opportunity to leverage those methods to gain insight into which factors (social isolation or COVID-19) seem to have more of an effect on the mental health of the general population of the United States. In order to make the results as interpretable as possible, we used the same general formula for each state with two lags of each variable included in each equation. From the urca package in R [21], a general VAR model is given as:

$$Y_t = \mu + \Phi D_t + \Theta_1 Y_{t-1} + \dots + \Theta_p Y_{t-p} + \epsilon_t, \quad (2.1)$$

for $t = 1, \dots, T$. Where μ is a constant, D_t is the trend matrix, Θ_i is the coefficient matrix, ϵ_t is the error vector, and Y_{t-i} is the vector of variables. Then, our VECM is specified as:

$$\Delta Y_t = \mu + \Phi D_t + \Gamma_1 \Delta Y_{t-1} + \dots + \Gamma_{p-1} \Delta Y_{t-p+1} + \Pi Y_{t-p} + \epsilon_t \quad (2.2)$$

with:

$$\Gamma_i = \sum_{j=1}^i \Theta_j - I, \quad i = 1, \dots, p-1 \quad (2.3)$$

$$\Pi = \sum_{k=1}^p \Theta_k - I \quad (2.4)$$

Where the Γ_i matrices contain cumulative long-run impacts of variables. Notably, since point estimates of each variable can be biased as mentioned in the limitations section of the survey data, we evaluate the sign (positive, negative, or not significant) of each variable in the equations for anxiety and depression in each state as the surveys are likely to effectively capture when a variable increases or decreases. This allows us to make inferences on the effect of each variable on anxiety and depression without actually having to evaluate the estimates themselves, thus limiting the effect of that bias. In addition, we converted each VECM into a VAR using the `vec2var` function in the `vars` package for the purpose of estimating impulse response functions (IRFs) for each variable of interest [22]. Our VECM equations are given in Appendix A.

188

3 Results

189

3.1 Vector Error Correction Model Results

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

For the sake of brevity, we only present the results of the VECMs fitted to state data in the time period from March 2nd, 2021 to January 10th, 2022. The results of the VECMs fitted using data from the time period of September 8th, 2020 to March 2nd, 2021 are provided in the Appendix B. Furthermore, the results of the VECMs fitted using data on the percentage of individuals vaccinated in the second time period are given in Appendix C. Note that we abbreviate the variables related to social isolation (i.e. ‘estimated percentage of respondents who spent time indoors with someone who isn’t currently staying with you in the past 24 hours’ and ‘estimated percentage of individuals who worked or went to school indoors and outside their home in the past 24 hours’) as time spent w/ others and work outside home, respectively.

3.1.1 Effects of COVID-19 in the Second Time Period




Figure 1: Effect of COVID-19 on Anxiety. States that had significantly positive or negative coefficients in their equation for anxiety for the first or second lag of variables related to COVID-19 in the second time period. The color depicts whether a state had a positive (blue), negative (purple), or no significant coefficient for the corresponding variable. COVID-19 Incidence lag 1 (top left): (positive) Alaska, Florida, Idaho, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, (negative) Vermont. Lag 2 (bottom left): (positive) Alaska, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin. COVID-19 Related Death lag 1 (top right): (positive) New Jersey, Washington, (negative) Illinois, North Dakota. Lag 2 (bottom right): (positive) Hawaii, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, New York, Oregon, Tennessee, (negative) Maryland.

201 Figure 1 shows which states had positive, negative, or non-significant VECM coeffi-
 202 cients for COVID-19 incidence and death in the second time period. A total of 30
 203 states returned significant positive coefficients and one state returned significant neg-
 204 ative coefficients for COVID-19 incidence, indicating that as incidence increases, so
 205 does anxiety in the general population. This does not mean that COVID-19 is directly
 206 causing this increase, though it may be to some degree based on previous studies [10].
 207 Rather, the many factors surrounding an increase in COVID-19 incidence, such as possi-
 208 ble school and work closing, increased limits on gatherings, and media coverage of the
 209 topic, are likely contributing to this increase in anxiety. We see much less of an impact
 210 of COVID-19 related death on anxiety, however, there are still several significant co-
 211 efficients. We see mostly positive results with 11 states returning positive coefficients
 212 and 3 states returning significant negative coefficients. There are many more positive

213 results in the former case when comparing the impact of COVID-19 incidence versus
 214 death. This may mean that people are overall more concerned with becoming infected
 215 with the virus than dying from it.




Figure 2: Effect of COVID-19 on Depression. States that had significantly positive or negative coefficients in their equation for depression for the first or second lag of variables related to COVID-19 in the second time period. The color depicts whether a state had a positive (blue), negative (purple), or no significant coefficient for the corresponding variable. COVID-19 Incidence lag 1: (positive) Connecticut, Minnesota, Nevada, Tennessee, Washington. Lag 2: (positive) Arizona, Illinois, Kansas, Maryland, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Carolina, Oregon, Washington, Wisconsin, (negative) Louisiana. COVID-19 Related Death lag 1: (positive) Iowa, New Jersey, (negative) Nevada, West Virginia. Lag 2: (positive) Hawaii, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Texas, Vermont.

216 Thirteen states had significant positive coefficients for COVID-19 incidence and one
 217 state returned a negative coefficient in their equations for depression as shown in Figure
 218 2. COVID-19 related death had 12 states with positive coefficients and two states with
 219 negative coefficients. Here we also see mostly positive results, however there seems
 220 to be less of an impact of these variables on depression compared to anxiety, though
 221 it is possible that we were not able to account for enough lags to see the longer-term
 222 effects of these variables. Notice that, while rare and only for the first lag of COVID-19
 223 related death, there are some states that had significant coefficients for depression, but
 224 not anxiety (Iowa, Nevada, New Jersey, and West Virginia).

3.1.2 Effects of Social Isolation in the Second Time Period




Figure 3: Effect of Social Isolation on Anxiety. States that had significantly positive or negative coefficients in their equation for anxiety for the first or second lag of variables related to Social Isolation in the second time period. The color depicts whether a state had a positive (blue), negative (purple), or no significant coefficient for the corresponding variable. Time Spent w/ Others lag 1: (positive) Indiana, Mississippi, (negative) Maryland, Michigan, Oklahoma, Texas. Lag 2: (positive) Mississippi, New York, Ohio, Virginia, (negative) Maine. Work Outside Home lag 1: (positive) Oklahoma, (negative) Ohio, Wyoming. Lag 2: (positive) Georgia, Illinois, Michigan, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, (negative) Louisiana, Oregon, South Dakota.

226 Figure 3 shows that time spent with others indoors had a total of five states with
 227 significant positive coefficients for this variable and five states with significant
 228 negative coefficients. No states in the western United States returned significant results for this
 229 variable. There is also a break in the pattern of more significant results in the second
 230 lag with time spent with others indoors and there is no clear indication as to whether
 231 this variable is associate more with an increase or decrease in anxiety. Working outside
 232 of the home indoors gave significant positive coefficients for nine states and negative
 233 coefficients for five states. The results were more varied for this variable in terms of
 234 geographic distribution compared to time spent with others indoors. It does tend to
 235 happen that an increase in people working outside their homes indoors is associate
 236 with an increase in anxiety, but it is not a strict rule as more than 35% of the total
 237 number of significant states for this variable had negative coefficients.




Figure 4: Effect of Social Isolation on Depression. States that had significantly positive or negative coefficients in their equation for depression for the first or second lag of variables related to Social Isolation in the second time period. The color depicts whether a state had a positive (blue), negative (purple), or no significant coefficient for the corresponding variable. Time Spent w/ Others lag 1: (positive) Connecticut, Illinois, Mississippi, (negative) Idaho, Maryland, Michigan. Lag 2: (positive) California, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, (negative) South Dakota. Work Outside Home lag 1: (positive) Idaho, Illinois, (negative) New Hampshire, Ohio, South Carolina, Texas, Washington, Wyoming. Lag 2: (positive) Arkansas, California, Maryland, Missouri, New Jersey, North Carolina, Washington, (negative) Louisiana, Montana, Oregon.

238 Finally, we describe the number of states with significant coefficients for social vari-
 239 ables in the second time period in equations for depression (see Figure 4). Nineteen
 240 states returned positive results and four states returned negative results for the vari-
 241 able time spent with others indoors. Note that one state (Michigan) had a negative
 242 coefficient for the first lag and a positive coefficient for the second lag of this variable,
 243 making it difficult to determine the actual effect it had on the population in that state.
 244 The variable estimating the percentage of individuals working outside their home in-
 245 doors had nine states with positive results and nine states with negative coefficients.
 246 In this case, two states went from negative in the first lag to positive in the second lag.
 247 Here, we see a slight preference for more (positive) results in the second lag of the first
 248 variable and a slight preference for negative results in the first lag and positive results
 249 in the second lag of the second variable. Unlike what was observed in the variables
 250 related to COVID-19, there is much less of an association between which states were
 251 significant for anxiety versus depression. Overall, this can be interpreted as variables
 252 related to COVID-19 having a much more predictable and mostly positive effect on the

253 prevalence of mental health issues whereas since the interactions caused by an increase
254 in social variables can be good or bad, these variables were less significant and less reli-
255 able in terms of their affect the prevalence of anxiety and depression. For both anxiety
256 and depression, we have either more or an equal number of states with significant co-
257 efficients in the second lag of variables compared to the first. This preference for later
258 lags is also evident in the results for the first time period as well and it may indicate
259 that it is important to evaluate more lags if possible when evaluating the effects of
260 certain variables on anxiety and depression.

261 **3.2 Impulse Response Function Results**

262 Due to the nature of impulse response functions (IRFs), we are able to more easily
263 interpret the effect that an increase in each variable has on anxiety and depression
264 in the general population. Again, seeing a significant result for one variable after
265 increasing another does not imply that the latter variable is causing the increase in the
266 former. Likely due to the fact that we have fewer data points in the first time period,
267 there are more differences between significant results in the first time period's IRFs
268 compared to the coefficient results discussed previously. Due to that and for the sake of
269 brevity, we present only the results for the second time period and provide the results
270 of the first time period as well as the IRF results from the percentage of individuals
271 vaccinated in the second time period in the Appendices B.3 and Appendix C.

Effects of COVID-19 in the Second Time Period




Figure 5: Effect of COVID-19 on Anxiety. States that had significantly positive or negative impulses for anxiety for variables related to COVID-19 in the second time period. The color depicts whether a state had a positive (blue), negative (purple), or no significant coefficient for the corresponding variable. COVID-19 Incidence (left): (positive) Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Kansas, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, Ohio, Oregon, (negative) North Dakota, Vermont, Wisconsin. COVID-19 Related Death (right): (positive) Idaho, Maine, Missouri, Ohio, (negative) Arizona, Arkansas, Illinois, Nevada, North Dakota, Oregon.

273 For the effect of an impulse of COVID-19 incidence on the prevalence of anxiety, we
 274 have a similar behavior as when we were looking at coefficients as there are 13 states
 275 that increased in anxiety and 3 states that decreased following an increase in incidence
 276 as shown in Figure 5. An important thing to notice here is that there are fewer
 277 states with significant results compared to the coefficients of the first and second lag
 278 of this variable. This may indicate that one should consider more aspects than just
 279 the IRF when analyzing the effects of different variables in a VAR or VECM. Moving
 280 on to COVID-19 related death, there were 4 states that returned significant positive
 281 responses and 6 states that returned significant negative responses. In this case, there
 282 is a clear difference in the geographic distribution of significant impulses compared
 283 to the coefficient results, further highlighting the need for in-depth analysis of each
 284 aspect of our models. Since there are 5 states that have significant impulses that did
 285 not have significant coefficients for either the first or second lag of COVID-19 related
 286 death, it may be that there are more intricate relationships going on between variables
 287 than simply that an increase in one causes an increase in another. More likely is that

288
289

an increase in COVID-19 related death leads to or coincides with changes in other variables that then have a more significant impact on anxiety in a particular state.




Figure 6: Effect of COVID-19 on Depression. States that had significantly positive or negative impulses for depression for variables related to COVID-19 in the second time period. The color depicts whether a state had a positive (blue), negative (purple), or no significant coefficient for the corresponding variable. COVID-19 Incidence (left): (positive) Arizona, Kansas, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, (negative) Hawaii, New Hampshire. COVID-19 Related Death (right): (positive) Delaware, Idaho, Maine, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, (negative) Arizona, Oregon, West Virginia.

290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298

The results of the IRFs of COVID-19 related variables on depression are presented in Figure 6 and they paint a similar picture to the coefficient results, though there are some exceptions as was the case with the IRFs for anxiety. An increase in COVID-19 incidence indicated a positive impulse in depression for 8 states and a negative impulse for 2 states. So, we again see that an increase in COVID-19 incidence is associated with an increase in anxiety. An impulse in COVID-19 related death led to a positive impulse in depression for 8 states and a negative impulse for 3 states. There are also several states that have significant coefficients for COVID-19 incidence or COVID-19 related death that did not have significant impulses and vice versa.




Figure 7: Effect of Social Variables on Anxiety. States that had significantly positive or negative impulses for anxiety for social variables in the second time period. The color depicts whether a state had a positive (blue), negative (purple), or no significant coefficient for the corresponding variable. Time spent with others indoors (left): (positive) Arkansas, Florida, Hawaii, Indiana, Mississippi, Nebraska, (negative) Arizona, Kansas, Michigan, North Carolina, Oklahoma. Work outside home indoors (right): (positive) New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, (negative) Arizona, Florida, Hawaii, Louisiana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, Ohio, Oregon, Wyoming.

299 While the results of the IRFs for the effect of social variables on anxiety show a
 300 similar number of significant states compared to the coefficient results (11 vs 10), there
 301 is a notable difference in which states are significant in each case (see Figures 3 and
 302 7). There are 6 states that had a positive impulse following an impulse in time spent
 303 with others indoors and 5 states with a negative impulse. The effect of working outside
 304 the home indoors had a clearer split in that only 3 states had a positive impulse and
 305 10 states had a negative impulse. The variable time spent with others indoors likely
 306 captures some interactions with individuals that the respondent isn't familiar with
 307 which may explain why we commonly see positive impulses in anxiety following an
 308 impulse in this variable. Another possibility is that this variable does not provide any
 309 insight into whether the time spent with someone a respondent isn't currently staying
 310 with is positive or negative, so there may be negative social interactions that are not
 311 directly linked to a respondent being worried about contracting COVID-19. On the
 312 other hand, there are many more states that had significant negative impulses for
 313 working outside the home indoors. While this variable also does not capture whether
 314 a respondent has a positive or negative work environment, the benefits of consistency
 315 and stability of in-person employment may outweigh the negative effects of a poor work




Figure 8: Effect of Social Variables on Depression. States that had significantly positive or negative impulses for anxiety for social variables in the second time period. The color depicts whether a state had a positive (blue), negative (purple), or no significant coefficient for the corresponding variable. Time spent with others indoors (left): (positive) Arkansas, Illinois, Mississippi, Ohio, Wisconsin, (negative) Arizona, Idaho, Maryland, Michigan. Work outside home indoors (right): (positive) Delaware, Maryland, Nevada, South Dakota, Wisconsin, (negative) Arizona, Iowa, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Ohio, Oregon, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

317 The IRF results for the variables related to social isolation are given in Figure 8.
 318 Similar to the effects that social variables had on anxiety, we see a roughly even split
 319 in terms of significant impulses for time spent with others indoors with 5 states have
 320 positive impulses and 4 states having negative impulses. For working outside the home
 321 indoors, there were 4 states with positive impulses and 8 states with negative impulses.

322 4 Discussion

323 The results of the impacts of COVID-19 on mental health in the general population
 324 have two major highlights. First, we see that COVID-19 incidence and death played
 325 significant roles in determining the prevalence of anxiety and depression in both time
 326 periods (see Figures 1, 2, 5, 6 and Appendix B for results in the first time period).
 327 When not double counting states that had the same sign of significant results in each
 328 lag, we had a total of 74 significant positive coefficients and 3 significant negative

329 coefficients for the COVID-19 incidence variable across both time periods. COVID-
330 19 related death had 25 significant positive coefficients returned and 13 significant
331 negative coefficients across both time periods. Thus, for a majority of states, when we
332 see a rise in COVID-19 incidence or death, we also tended to see an increase in the
333 prevalence of anxiety and depression in the general population. This trend held for
334 each variable in each time period except for COVID-19 related death in the first time
335 period. It is possible that respondents were more concerned with being infected with
336 the virus than actually dying of COVID-19 during this time period. These results are
337 in line with previous studies that have provided some insight into possible links between
338 COVID-19 infection and death and development of depressive symptoms and they are
339 important to consider in the context of future pandemics. The observed association
340 between these variables may have been enhanced by external factors like the influence
341 of media [34, 36, 28].

342 Several past studies have unearthed possible links between COVID-19 infection and
343 development of anxious or depressive symptoms [24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 28, 23]
344 and while our study does not address that specific topic, it does imply that an increase
345 in COVID-19 incidence and death may lead to increased anxiety and depression and
346 this can be exacerbated by factors that coincide with increased prevalence of disease
347 such as continuous media coverage and the possibility of increased medical bills and
348 loss of wages due to long-term issues that can arise with COVID-19 infection [33, 34].
349 Second, variables related to social isolation did have a significant impact on anxiety
350 and depression in the general population (see Figures 3, 4, 7, and 8), but perhaps less
351 so than the impact that variables related to COVID-19 had. We had a total of 41
352 significant positive coefficients and 16 significant negative coefficients for individuals
353 who spent time indoors with others they aren't currently staying with. For individuals
354 working outside their home, we calculated 27 significant positive coefficients and 22
355 significant negative coefficients. In the case of our variables related to social isolation,
356 we see significant variation across both time periods and although there are fewer
357 significant coefficients for these variables, the negative impacts of social isolation are
358 clear [34, 23] and some effort should be put forth to minimize their impacts.

359 There are some limitations and strengths of the study presented that should be
360 noted. First, some limitations include that the questions used as proxies for social iso-
361 lation (i.e. 'estimated percentage of respondents who spent time indoors with someone
362 who isn't currently staying with you in the past 24 hours' and 'estimated percentage of
363 individuals who worked or went to school indoors and outside their home in the past 24
364 hours') likely do not accurately reflect the percentage of respondents who felt socially
365 isolated. This is because of the fact that one can have social interaction and still feel
366 socially isolated and also because individuals may be interacting online rather than
367 in-person. Other limitations have to do with the survey data itself, namely the survey
368 data used to fit models for each state was weighted representative of each state's age
369 and gender demographics, but states may differ in other demographics that are not
370 accounted for. Additionally, there is limited data for some regions in states as regions
371 that had less than 100 responses for a particular question were removed from the over-
372 all results of a state. Finally, the change in the wording of the questions from the first
373 time period to the second likely changed how respondents interpreted the questions
374 and may have impacted the results. There are also some strengths of the current study
375 that should be highlighted. First, we have used a robust analytical framework for the

376 analysis of this survey data that allows insight into mechanisms that impacted the
377 prevalence of anxiety and depression in the United States across the studied period.
378 Second, our measures for COVID-19 incidence and death are standard and robust,
379 leaving little room for error in interpretation of results regarding those indicators.

380 5 Conclusions

381 The effects of the COVID-19 pandemic are far reaching and not fully understood,
382 especially in terms of the effects that it has had on the mental health of the general
383 population. This study used an approach commonly employed in economics, namely
384 multiple time-series analysis using vector error-correction models, in an attempt to
385 gain insight into the most significant factors surrounding the pandemic during two
386 time periods ranging from September 8th, 2020 to March 2nd, 2021 and March 2nd,
387 2021 to January 10th, 2022, respectively. We found that indicators related to COVID-
388 19 incidence and death commonly led to an increase in anxiety and depression in the
389 general population across both studied periods. Indicators related to social isolation
390 did not have a clear interpretation as there was significant variation across time and
391 space. It is our hope that this paper provides some insight and guidance into how each
392 state and business should tailor policies to their respective populations to minimize the
393 effects of the variables included in this study on the mental health of those populations.

394 In future research, we will use network analysis with these time series data to
395 gain insights about how the states are clustered together with respect to a particular
396 indicator as well as which policies had significant impacts on those indicators. We will
397 then compare the results obtained with findings from this study.

398 Data Availability

399 Data used are available at the link <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2111452118>

400 All code, data, and results are available at the GitHub link:
401 https://github.com/alxjfulk/social_isolation_and_COVID19

402 Conflicts of Interest

403 The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest.

404 Author contributions

405 Alexander Fulk: Conceptualization, formal analysis, writing - original draft prepara-
406 tion, reviewing and editing; Raul Saenz-Escarcega: Conceptualization, writing - review,
407 Hiroko Kobayahi: Conceptualization, writing - review, and editing; Innocent Maposa:
408 Formal analysis, writing - review, Folashade B. Augusto: Conceptualization, project
409 administration, supervision, writing- reviewing and editing, funding acquisition.

Acknowledgement

This research is supported by National Science Foundation under the grant number DMS 2028297.

References

- [1] World Health Organization (WHO), “COVID-19 Dashboard.” Geneva: World Health Organization, 2020. Available online: <https://covid19.who.int/> (Accessed: 03-06-2022).
- [2] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), “COVID-19 Overview and Infection Prevention and Control Priorities in non-U.S. Healthcare settings.” Available online: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/non-us-settings/overview/index.html\#> (Accessed: 03-06-2022).
- [3] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) “Mental Health, Substance Use, and Suicidal Ideation During the COVID-19 Pandemic — United States, June 24–30, 2020” Available online: <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/pdfs/mm6932a1-H.pdf> (Accessed: 03-06-2022).
- [4] World Health Organization (WHO), “Coronavirus disease (COVID-19): How is it transmitted?” Geneva: World Health Organization, 2020. Available online: <https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-answers/item/coronavirus-disease-covid-19-how-is-it-transmitted> (Accessed: 03-22-2022).
- [5] J. L. St. Sauver, G. S. Lopes, W. A. Rocca, K. Prasad, M. R. Majerus, A. H. Limper, D. J. Jacobson, C. Fan, R. M. Jacobson, L. J. Rutten, A. D. Norman, C. M. Vachon, “Factors Associated With Severe COVID-19 Infection Among Persons of Different Ages Living in a Defined Midwestern US Population.” *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, vol. 96, pp. 2528–2539, issue 10, 2021.
- [6] P. Nouvellet, S. Bhatia, A. Cori, K. E. C. Ainslie, et al. “Reduction in mobility and COVID-19 Transmission.” *Nat Commun*, vol. 12, pp. 1090, 2021.
- [7] M. V. Fasano, M. Padula, M. Azrak, A. J. Avico, M. Sala, M. F. Andreoli, “Consequences of Lockdown During COVID-19 Pandemic in Lifestyle and Emotional State of Children in Argentina.” *Front. Pediatr.*, 2021. Available online: [10.3389/fped.2021.660033](https://doi.org/10.3389/fped.2021.660033) (Accessed: 03-08-2022).
- [8] D. Richter, S. Riedel-Heller, S. Zürcher, “Mental health problems in the general population during and after the first lockdown phase due to the SARS-Cov-2 pandemic: Rapid review of multi-wave studies.” *Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences*, vol. 30, p. e27, 2021.
- [9] X. Nie, K. Feng, S. Wang, Y. Li, “Factors Influencing Public Panic During the COVID-19 Pandemic.” *Front Psychol.*, vol. 12, p. e576301, 2021.
- [10] J. S. Novotný, J. P. Gonzalez-Rivas, Š Kunzová, M. Skladaná, A. Pospíšilová, A. Polcrová, J. R. Medina-Inojosa, F. Lopez-Jimenez, Y. E. Geda, G. B. Stokin, “Risk Factors Underlying COVID-19 Lockdown-Induced Mental Distress.” *Front. Psychiatry*, vol. 11, p. e603014, 2020.

- 451 [11] M. É. Czeisler, R. I. Lane, E. Petrosky, et al. “Mental Health, Substance Use, and
452 Suicidal Ideation During the COVID-19 Pandemic — United States, June 24-30,
453 2020.” *MMWR Mor Mortal Wkly Rep*, vol. 69, pp. 1049-1057, 2020.
- 454 [12] A. Novotney, “The risks of social isolation.” *Monitor on Psychology*, vol. 50, no. 5,
455 2019.
- 456 [13] A. Pearman, M. L. Hughes, E. L. Smith, S. D. Neupert, “Mental Health Challenges
457 of United States Healthcare Professionals During COVID-19.” *Front. Psychol.*, vol.
458 11, p. e2065, 2020.
- 459 [14] M. M. Trivedi, A. Das, “Did the Timing of State Mandated Lockdown Affect the
460 Spread of COVID-19 Infection? A County-level Ecological Study in the United
461 States.” *J Prev Med Public Health*, vol. 54, no. 4, pp. 238-244, 2021.
- 462 [15] W. J. Hennigan, A. Park, J. Ducharme, “The U.S. Fumble Its Early Vaccine Roll-
463 out. Will the Biden Administration Put America Back on Track?” *Time*, 2021.
464 Available online: <https://time.com/5932028/vaccine-rollout-joe-biden/>
465 (Accessed: 04-10-2022).
- 466 [16] C. Wilson, “The U.S. COVID-19 Vaccine Rollout is Getting Faster. But is
467 it Fast Enough?” *Time*, 2021. Available online: [https://time.com/5938128/
468 covid-19-vaccine-rollout-biden/](https://time.com/5938128/covid-19-vaccine-rollout-biden/) (Accessed: 04-10-2022).
- 469 [17] M. C. Staff, “Herd immunity and COVID-19: What you need
470 to know.” *Mayo Clinic*, 2021. Available online: [https://www.
471 mayoclinic.org/diseases-conditions/coronavirus/in-depth/
472 herd-immunity-and-coronavirus/art-20486808](https://www.mayoclinic.org/diseases-conditions/coronavirus/in-depth/herd-immunity-and-coronavirus/art-20486808) (Accessed: 04-10-2022).
- 473 [18] A. Reinhart, L. Brooks, M. Jahja, et al. “An open repository of real-time
474 COVID-19 indicators.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 118,
475 p. e2111452118, 2021.
- 476 [19] H. Lütkepohl, “A New Introduction to Multiple Time Series Analysis.” *Springer*,
477 2005.
- 478 [20] J. Stock, and M. Watson. “Vector Autoregressions.” *Journal of Economic Per-
479 spectives*. vol. 15(4), pp. 101-115, 2001.
- 480 [21] B. Pfaff, “Analysis of Integrated and Cointegrated Time Series with R. Second
481 Edition.” *Springer*, New York, 2008. ISBN 0-387-27960-1
- 482 [22] B. Pfaff, “VAR, SVAR and SVEC Models: Implementation Within R Package
483 vars.” *Journal of Statistical Software*, vol. 27, no. 4, 2008.
- 484 [23] T. Hwang, K. Rabheru, C. Peisah, W. Reichman, M. Ikeda, “Loneliness and
485 social isolation during the COVID-19 pandemic.” *International Psychogeriatrics*.
486 vol. 32(10), pp.1217-1220, 2020.
- 487 [24] L. Ramiz, B. Contrand, M. Y. R. Castro, M. Dupuy, L. Lu, C. Sztal-Kutas,
488 E. Lagarde, “A longitudinal study of mental health before and during COVID-19
489 lockdown in the French population.” *Globalization and Health*, vol. 17, pp. 29,
490 2021.
- 491 [25] I. Magnúsdóttir, A. Lovik, A. B. Unnarsdóttir, D. McCartney, et al. “Acute
492 COVID-19 severity and mental health morbidity trajectories in patient popula-
493 tions of six nations: an observational study.” *The Lancet Public Health*, 2022.

- 494 [26] H. Mautong, J. Gallardo-Rumbea, G. Alvarado-Villa, J. Fernández-Cadena,
495 D. Andrade-Molina, C. Orellana-Román, I. Cherrez-Ojeda, “Assessment of de-
496 pression, anxiety and stress levels in the Ecuadorian general population during
497 social isolation due to the COVID-19 outbreak: a cross-sectional study.” *BMC*
498 *Psychiatry*, vol. 21, pp. 212, 2021.
- 499 [27] N. Vindegaard, M. E. Benros, “COVID-19 pandemic and mental health conse-
500 quences: Systematic review of the current evidence.” *Brain, Behavior, and Im-*
501 *munity*, vol. 89, pp. 531-542, 2020.
- 502 [28] J. Xiong, O. Lipsitz, F. Nasri, L. M. W. Lui, et al. “Impact of COVID-19 pandemic
503 on mental health in the general population: A systematic review.” *J Affect Disord*,
504 vol. 277, pp. 55-64, 2020.
- 505 [29] F. Kämpfen, I. Kohler, A. Ciancio, W. Bruine de Bruin, J. Maurer, H. -P. Kohler,
506 “Predictors of mental health during the Covid-19 pandemic in the US: Role of
507 economic concerns, health worries and social distancing.” *PLoS One*, vol. 15,
508 p. e0241895, 2020.
- 509 [30] T. Wu, X. Jia, H. Shi, J. Niu, X. Yin, J. Xie, X. Wang, “Prevalence of mental
510 health problems during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-
511 analysis.” *Journal of Affective Disorders*, vol. 281, pp. 91-98, 2021.
- 512 [31] Z. Santini, P. E. Jose, E. Y. Cornwell, A. Koyanagi, L. Nielsen, et al. “Social
513 disconnectedness, perceived isolation, and symptoms of depression and anxiety
514 among older Americans (NSHAP): a longitudinal mediation analysis.” *The Lancet*
515 *Public Health*, vol. 5, pp. e62-e70, 2020.
- 516 [32] B. Saddik, A. Hussein, A. Albanna, I. Elbarazi, A. Al-Shujairi, et al. “The psycho-
517 logical impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on adults and children in the United
518 Arab Emirates: a nationwide cross-sectional study.” *BMC Psychiatry*, vol. 21,
519 pp. 224, 2021.
- 520 [33] D. Lekkas, J. A. Gyorda, G. D. Price, Z. Wortzman, N. C. Jacobson, “Using the
521 COVID-19 Pandemic to Assess the Influence of News Affect on Online Mental
522 Health-Related Search Behavior Across the United States: Integrated Sentiment
523 Analysis and the Circumplex Model of Affect.” *Journal of Medical Internet Re-*
524 *search*, vol. 24, pp. e32731, 2022.
- 525 [34] A. Burton, A. McKinlay, H. Aughterson, D. Fancourt, “Impact of the COVID-
526 19 pandemic on the mental health and well-being of adults with mental health
527 conditions in the UK: a qualitative interview study.” *Journal of Mental Health*,
528 pp.1-8, 2021.
- 529 [35] Z. Su, D. McDonnell, J. Wen, M. Kozak, J. Abbas, et al. “Mental health conse-
530 quences of COVID-19 media coverage: the need for effective crisis communication
531 practices.” *Global Health*, vol. 17, 2021.
- 532 [36] A. Olagoke, O. Olagoke, A. Hughes, “Exposure to coronavirus news on mainstream
533 media: The role of risk perceptions and depression.” *British Journal of Health*
534 *Psychology*. vol. 25(4), pp.865-874, 2020.
- 535 [37] A. Adeel, M. Catalano, O. Catalano, et al. “COVID-19 Policy Response and the
536 Rise of the Sub-National Governments” *Canadian Public Policy*. vol. 46(4), pp.
537 565-584, 2020.

A VECM Equation Example

$$\begin{aligned}
 anxiety_t &= C_0^1 anxiety_{t-1} + C_1^1 anxiety_{t-2} + C_2^1 depression_{t-1} + C_3^1 depression_{t-2} \\
 &+ C_4^1 spentTime_{t-1} + C_5^1 spentTime_{t-2} + C_6^1 workOutsideHome_{t-1} \\
 &+ C_7^1 workOutsideHome_{t-2} + C_8^1 incidenceProp_{t-1} + C_9^1 incidenceProp_{t-2} \\
 &+ C_{10}^1 deathProp_{t-1} + C_{11}^1 deathProp_{t-2} + D^1, \\
 depression_t &= C_0^2 anxiety_{t-1} + C_1^2 anxiety_{t-2} + C_2^2 depression_{t-1} + C_3^2 depression_{t-2} \\
 &+ C_4^2 spentTime_{t-1} + C_5^2 spentTime_{t-2} + C_6^2 workOutsideHome_{t-1} \\
 &+ C_7^2 workOutsideHome_{t-2} + C_8^2 incidenceProp_{t-1} + C_9^2 incidenceProp_{t-2} \\
 &+ C_{10}^2 deathProp_{t-1} + C_{11}^2 deathProp_{t-2} + D^2, \\
 spentTime_t &= C_0^3 anxiety_{t-1} + C_1^3 anxiety_{t-2} + C_2^3 depression_{t-1} + C_3^3 depression_{t-2} \\
 &+ C_4^3 spentTime_{t-1} + C_5^3 spentTime_{t-2} + C_6^3 workOutsideHome_{t-1} \\
 &+ C_7^3 workOutsideHome_{t-2} + C_8^3 incidenceProp_{t-1} + C_9^3 incidenceProp_{t-2} \\
 &+ C_{10}^3 deathProp_{t-1} + C_{11}^3 deathProp_{t-2} + D^3, \\
 &\vdots
 \end{aligned}$$

539

The equations for the other variables of each VECM follow a similar format. Table 1 provides a brief description of each variable listed in the equations above.

540

Variable	Meaning
<i>anxiety</i>	Estimated percentage of respondents who reported feeling nervous, anxious, or on edge for most or all of the past 5 days.
<i>depression</i>	Estimated percentage of respondents who reported feeling depressed for most or all of the past 5 days.
<i>spentTime</i>	Estimated percentage of respondents who spent time with someone who isn't currently staying with you in the past 24 hours.
<i>workOutsideHome</i>	Estimated percentage of respondents who worked or went to school outside their home in the past 24 hours.
<i>incidenceProp</i>	Number of new confirmed COVID-19 cases per 100,000 population per day.
<i>deathProp</i>	number of new confirmed COVID-19 deaths per 100,000 population per day.
C_j^i	j^{th} coefficient of the i^{th} equation.
D^i	constant associated with the i^{th} equation.

Table 1: Description of the variables for model described above.

541

B Results of the First Time Period

542

B.1 Effects of COVID-19 in the First Time Period




Figure 9: Effect of COVID-19 on Anxiety. States that had significantly positive or negative coefficients in their equation for anxiety for the first or second lag of variables related to COVID-19 in the first time period. The color depicts whether a state had a positive (blue), negative (purple), or no significant coefficient for the corresponding variable. COVID-19 Incidence lag 1: (positive) Alaska, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, North Dakota, Washington, (negative) NA. Lag 2: (positive) Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Utah, (negative) NA. COVID-19 Death lag 1: (positive) West Virginia, (negative) Nebraska, North Dakota, Wyoming. Lag 2: (positive) NA, (negative) Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, Texas, Utah, Vermont

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

Twenty-three states had positive coefficients for COVID-19 incidence and all of these states returned positive values, indicating that an increase in incidence led to an increase in anxiety during the first time period. In contrast, almost all states that returned significant coefficients for COVID-19 related death had negative values and this variable had a much smaller impact overall; One state returned a positive coefficient and 8 states returned negative coefficients for this variable. Lastly, in both variables, we see more significant results in the second lag, which alludes to possible longer-term impacts of COVID-19 on anxiety and depression.




Figure 10: Effect of COVID-19 on Depression. States that had significantly positive or negative coefficients in their equation for depression for the first or second lag of variables related to COVID-19 in the first time period. The color depicts whether a state had a positive (blue), negative (purple), or no significant coefficient for the corresponding variable. COVID-19 Incidence lag 2: (positive) Pennsylvania, Mississippi, New Mexico, Nevada, (negative) Oregon. COVID-19 death lag 2: (positive) Maryland, (negative) NA.

551 Only a handful of returned significant coefficients when analyzing the impact that
552 COVID-19 may have on depression in the first time period. When looking at COVID-
553 19 incidence, we see that 4 states returned a positive coefficient for this variable and 1
554 state returned a negative coefficient for this variable. COVID-19 related death only had
555 one state return a significant positive result. Due to the lack of significant coefficients
556 for these variables, it is difficult to make inferences, but there are several reasons why
557 this may have occurred. First, it may be that we do not have enough data points to
558 capture possible relationships among depression and our COVID-19 related variables.
559 Second, the structure of our model may be ill-suited to capturing possible relationships
560 between these variables. We chose to only include two lags of each variables, but it
561 may be that we need to include more lags to assess the impacts that occur over a longer
562 period of time. This is somewhat supported in our results since the second lag of each
563 variable usually contains more significant coefficients. Finally, it may be that there
564 was little impact of COVID-19 on depression in this time period. With the one state
565 that returned significant results, we again see that the second lags of each contain the
566 most significant results, further supporting the idea that the impacts of these variables
567 on anxiety and depression take time to reveal themselves at the level of the general
568 population.

B.2 Effects of Social Isolation in the First Time Period




Figure 11: Effect of Social Isolation on Anxiety. States that had significantly positive or negative coefficients in their equation for anxiety for the first or second lag of variables related to Social Isolation in the first time period. The color depicts whether a state had a positive (blue), negative (purple), or no significant coefficient for the corresponding variable. TimeSpent lag 1: (positive) Kentucky, Minnesota, (negative) Pennsylvania, New York, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas. Lag 2: (positive) Arizona, Georgia, Maryland, (negative) New York. Work lag 1: (positive) Delaware, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, Wisconsin. Lag 2: (positive) Arkansas, Georgia, (negative) New Mexico, North Dakota.

570 There were five states that returned significant positive coefficients for the variable
 571 based on the estimated percentage of individuals that spent time with someone who
 572 they aren't currently staying with in the past 24 hours and five states that returned
 573 significant negative coefficients for this variable. Our second social variable estimated
 574 the percentage of individuals that worked or went to school outside their home in
 575 the past 24 hours and gave significant positive results for seven states and significant
 576 negative results for two states. The initial results for the effect that our two social
 577 variables may have on anxiety indicate a varied, albeit limited response across the
 578 country.




Figure 12: Effect of Social Isolation on Depression. States that had significantly positive or negative coefficients in their equation for depression for the first or second lag of variables related to Social Isolation in the first time period. The color depicts whether a state had a positive (blue), negative (purple), or no significant coefficient for the corresponding variable. TimeSpent lag 1: (positive) North Carolina, Oklahoma, (negative) New York, South Carolina. Lag 2: (positive) Alaska, Colorado, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Nevada, Oklahoma, Oregon, Virginia, Wisconsin. Work lag 1: (positive) Oregon, (negative) California, Maine, Michigan, Oklahoma, Utah. Lag 2: (positive) Pennsylvania, (negative) Oregon.

579 Our chosen social variables seem to have more of an impact and a more consistent
 580 impact in equations for depression compared to anxiety in the first time period, with
 581 12 states returning significant positive coefficients for the variable related to time spent
 582 with others and two states returning significant negative coefficients for this variable.
 583 Our second social variable related to individuals working outside their home yielded
 584 significant positive results for two states and significant negative results for six states.
 585 Note that one state had a significant positive coefficient in the first lag of this variable
 586 and a significant negative coefficient for the second lag. Overall, an increase in our first
 587 social variable generally led to an increase in anxiety across the country. In addition
 588 more states returned significant results in the second lag of this variable indicating that
 589 the impact of meeting new individuals may take days to present itself. Our second social
 590 variable had less of an impact and generally led to individuals becoming less depressed
 591 as more people started working outside their homes. Also, this variable seems to have
 592 a more immediate impact on depression as we see several more significant results in
 593 the first lag.

594

B.3 Impulse Response Function Results

595

B.3.1 Effects of COVID-19 in the First Time Period




Figure 13: Effect of COVID-19 on Anxiety. States that had significantly positive or negative responses for variables related to COVID-19 in the first time period. The color depicts whether a state had a positive (blue), negative (purple), or no significant coefficient for the corresponding variable. COVID-19 Incidence: (positive) Alaska, Arizona, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, Rhode Island, (negative) NA. COVID-19 death: (positive) Arkansas, Indiana, West Virginia, (negative) Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico.

596

597

598

599

600

Moving on to impulse response functions (IRFs), there were ten states that had significant positive responses in anxiety to an impulse in COVID-19 incidence. For COVID-19 related death, three states had significant positive responses and four states had significant negative responses. This may indicate that individuals are more anxious about becoming infected than dying to COVID-19.




Figure 14: Effect of COVID-19 on Depression. States that had significantly positive or negative responses for variables related to COVID-19 in the first time period. The color depicts whether a state had a positive (blue), negative (purple), or no significant coefficient for the corresponding variable. COVID-19 Incidence: (positive) North Dakota, Rhode Island, (negative) Kansas, Kentucky, Vermont. COVID-19 death: (positive) Oregon, South Carolina, Vermont, West Virginia, (negative) Nebraska, Wyoming.

601 Two states had significant positive responses and 3 states had significant negative
 602 responses in depression to an impulse in COVID-19 incidence. Four states had signifi-
 603 cant positive responses and two states had significant negative responses in depression
 604 to an impulse in COVID-19 related death. This may indicate that either there is not
 605 a strong enough effect of these two variables on depression in the general population,
 606 or we have not effectively captured the signal with the current model.

B.3.2 Effects of Social Isolation in the First Time Period




Figure 15: Effect of Social Isolation on Anxiety. States that had significantly positive or negative responses for variables related to Social Isolation in the first time period. The color depicts whether a state had a positive (blue), negative (purple), or no significant coefficient for the corresponding variable. TimeSpent: (positive) Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Georgia, Louisiana, Nebraska, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, North Carolina, Rhode Island, Tennessee, (negative) Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas. Work: (positive) Alaska, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Michigan, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, (negative) Hawaii, Kentucky, Maine, North Dakota.

608 There were 12 states with significant positive responses and 15 states with significant
 609 negative responses in anxiety to an impulse in the time spent variable. An impulse in
 610 working outside your home led to 22 states with positive responses and four states with
 611 negative responses in anxiety. Overall, we see that more time spent with others can
 612 lead to a decrease in anxiety while working outside your home can lead to an increase.




Figure 16: Effect of Social Isolation on Depression. States that had significantly positive or negative responses for variables related to Social Isolation in the first time period. The color depicts whether a state had a positive (blue), negative (purple), or no significant coefficient for the corresponding variable. Time-Spent: (positive) Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Mississippi, Nebraska, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, (negative) Michigan, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, New York, South Carolina, South Dakota, West Virginia. Work: (positive) Alaska, Arkansas, Hawaii, Idaho, New Jersey, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, (negative) California, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Utah, Washington, Wyoming.

613 There are more significant results with these social variables compared to the vari-
 614 ables related to COVID-19 for depression. Fourteen states yielded significant positive
 615 responses and 8 states yielded significant negative responses for depression with an
 616 impulse in the time spent variable. Nine states yielded significant positive responses
 617 and 16 states yielded significant negative responses for depression with an impulse
 618 in working outside the home. We see an opposite trend to what was observed with anx-
 619 iety as there tends to be an increase in depression with an increase in the time spent
 620 variable. There is not as clear of a relationship between depression and working outside
 621 the home.

622

C Effects of Vaccination in the Second Time Period

623




Figure 17: Effect of Vaccination on Anxiety. States that had significantly positive or negative coefficients in their equation for anxiety for the first or second lag of the variable for vaccination in the second time period. The color depicts whether a state had a positive (blue), negative (purple), or no significant coefficient for the corresponding variable. Vaccination Lag 1: (positive) Colorado, Louisiana, Ohio (negative) Arizona, New York, North Dakota. Vaccination Lag 2: (positive) NA, (negative) Hawaii, Michigan, Oregon, Virginia, Washington.

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

A total of three states returned significant positive coefficients for the first lag of vaccination indicating that increased levels of vaccination may have been associated with increased anxiety in those states during this period. A total of three states returned significant negative coefficients for the first lag of vaccination indicating that as vaccination increased, anxiety tended to decrease. No states returned significant positive coefficients for the second lag of vaccination. A total of five states returned significant negative coefficients for the second lag of vaccination in their respective equations for anxiety.




Figure 18: Effect of Vaccination on Depression. States that had significantly positive or negative coefficients in their equation for depression for the first or second lag of the variable for vaccination in the second time period. The color depicts whether a state had a positive (blue), negative (purple), or no significant coefficient for the corresponding variable. Vaccination Lag 1: (positive) Colorado, Iowa, Nevada (negative) Alaska, Montana, New York, Rhode Island, Washington. Vaccination Lag 2: (positive) NA, (negative) Arizona, Kansas, Michigan, New Hampshire, Washington.

632 Results show that three states returned significant positive coefficients for vaccina-
 633 tion in their respective equations for depression, while five states returned significant
 634 negative coefficients for this variable. No states returned significant positive coefficients
 635 for vaccination, similar to the case with anxiety. On the other hand, five states returned
 636 significant negative coefficients for vaccination in their equations for depression.




Figure 19: Effect of Vaccination on Anxiety. States that had significantly positive or negative responses for variables related to vaccination in the second time period. The color depicts whether a state had a positive (blue), negative (purple), or no significant coefficient for the corresponding variable. Vaccination: (positive) Colorado, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Ohio, Vermont, (negative) Arizona, Maryland, New York, North Dakota.

637 An impulse in vaccination had a varied effect across the country with six states
 638 having significant positive responses and four states with significant negative responses
 639 in anxiety.




Figure 20: Effect of Vaccination on Depression. States that had significantly positive or negative responses for variables related to vaccination in the second time period. The color depicts whether a state had a positive (blue), negative (purple), or no significant coefficient for the corresponding variable. Vaccination: (positive) Alabama, Colorado, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Ohio, Vermont, Wyoming, (negative) Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Idaho, Indiana, Maryland, New York, North Dakota.

640 Nine states had positive responses and 8 states had negative responses for depression
 641 to an impulse in vaccination.