

Understanding mental health trends during COVID-19 pandemic in the United States using network analysis

October 11, 2022

Hiroko Kobayashi^{c,d}, Raul Saenz-Escarcega^a, Alexander Fulk^b, Folashade B. 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*

Abstract

The emergence of COVID-19 in the United States resulted in a series of federal and state-level lock-downs and COVID-19 related health mandates to manage the spread of the virus. These policies may negatively impact the mental health state of the population. This study focused on the trends in mental health indicators following the COVID-19 pandemic amongst four United States geographical regions, and political party preferences. Indicators of interest included feeling anxious, feeling depressed, and worried about finances. Survey data from Delphi Group in Carnegie Mellon University were analyzed using clustering algorithms and dynamic connectome obtained from sliding window analysis. United States maps were generated to observe spatial trends and identify communities with similar mental health and COVID-19 trends. Between March 3rd, 2021 and January 10th, 2022, states in the south geographic region showed similar trends for reported values of feeling anxious and worried about finances. There were no identifiable communities resembling geographical regions or political party affiliation for the feeling depressed indicator. We observed a high degree of correlation among southern states as well as within republican states, where the highest correlation values from the dynamic connectome analysis for feeling anxious and feeling depressed variables seemingly overlapped with an increase in COVID-19 related cases, deaths, hospitalizations, and rapid spread of the COVID-19 Delta variant.

Keywords: COVID-19, network analysis, mental health, connectome.

1 Introduction

Following an initial outbreak in 2019 in Wuhan, China, the novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) spread rapidly across the world, resulting in nearly 4.2 million infected and

¹Correspondence Email: fbagusto@gmail.com

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

24 approximately 85 thousand dead within the first year of being identified in 2020 [33]. By
25 March 22 of 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global
26 pandemic [8]. This declaration resulted in several countries adopting various protocols
27 to collect data from local counties and municipalities to make informed decisions on
28 COVID-19 policies to curb the spread of COVID-19 in their regions [13, 3]. However,
29 due to limited information available on the novel disease, many countries opted to im-
30 plement large-scale control measures such as lockdowns that had far-reaching impacts
31 on the general population [13].

32 To manage the spread of COVID-19 in the United States, the federal government and
33 state governments implemented a variety of health mandates [14]. However, the federal
34 government at this time opted for a hands-off approach to COVID-19 and allowed
35 individual states to decide on the best ways to limit the spread of this deadly disease
36 [1]. This variation in leadership led to differing outcomes in terms of the spread of
37 COVID-19 [26]. These mandates to protect the public ranged from school and work
38 closures to stay-at-home orders, all of which can have important effects on several
39 aspects of an individual's life. In addition, the increasing incidence of COVID-19 and
40 COVID-19 related deaths likely increased individual's pandemic related worry [12].
41 These potential stressors have, and continue to impact each member of the population
42 to varying degrees. Policies were enacted to enforce many decisions related to the
43 pandemic and may have adverse mental health effects including feelings of anxiety
44 and depression. Elevated adverse mental health conditions were reported at a higher
45 disproportionate rate in the second quarter of 2020 (25.5%) compare to the last quarter
46 of 2019 (8.1%). [9, 21]. Several countries, including the United States, have input
47 measures to allow for reporting of psychological distress among the population via
48 surveys to better tailor support and resources for their respective populations [31, 32].

49 Several studies have concluded that lockdowns and other policies related to COVID-19
50 can increase mental health burden, especially for vulnerable groups [2, 18, 29]. Certain
51 policies related to COVID-19, such as government funds being issued to the general
52 population via stimulus checks, also have the potential for positive impacts on both
53 physical and mental health [11]. Vaccines also likely decreased the prevalence of mental
54 health issues since their initial roll-out in late 2020 [23]. Though a potentially large
55 portion of the public have displayed hesitance towards vaccination and thus may be
56 experiencing similar levels of mental distress [22]. Due to the various possible mental
57 health outcomes that arise from each of these scenarios, it is important to evaluate
58 data in a manner that facilitates dynamic interpretation across time in a clear and
59 concise way.

60 For instance, Amico and Bulai [4] used network analysis to explore the interactions of
61 COVID-19 among the various regions of Italy and the impact of Italy governmental
62 policies in response to the spread of SARS-Cov-2. To analyze the network interaction
63 between regions in Italy, they used six indicators (namely the number of hospitalized
64 individuals in IC, number of hospitalized individuals with symptoms, number of indi-
65 viduals in home isolation, number of new positive, number of discharged healed, and
66 number of deceased individuals) to form a correlation network refer as "Covidome".
67 Their results showed that there was a distinct north-south clustering of the regions in

68 the country. Furthermore, they found distinct difference of the Covidome fluctuations
69 between the first and second wave of the pandemic based on region-specific political
70 choices.

71 In this study, we apply network and clustering analysis to understand the connectivity
72 between states and how COVID-19 impacts mental health across the United States
73 using COVID-19 related mental health indicators such as feeling anxious, feeling de-
74 pressed, and worried about finances. We follow the approach in Amico and Bulai [4]
75 and study the covariance matrix of the mental health indicators (which we refer to as
76 the “mental health functional connectome”). We then compare the results from this
77 study with results from Fulk et al [10] that investigated the effect of several COVID-19
78 related indicators variables on anxiety and depression in the general population using
79 the same data during the same time period as this study. The rest of the paper is
80 organized as follows: Section 2 gives an overview of the methods used in the analyses,
81 including a description of the data; Section 3 describes the results of the study. Section
82 4 presents the discussion, where we put our results into the context of policies that were
83 implemented and also evaluate how our results compares to Fulk et al [10] analysis of
84 this data, as well as their conclusion.

85 2 Methods


86 2.1 Mental health related data and policy timeline

87 Mental health data

88 This research is based on survey results from Carnegie Mellon University’s Delphi
89 Group. The Carnegie Mellon University U.S. COVID-19 Trends and Impact Survey
90 (Delphi US CTIS [24]) was distributed in partnership with Facebook in the form of a
91 daily voluntary survey that Facebook users could respond to. Survey questions ranged
92 from those concerning physical health, the economic impact of COVID-19, to mental
93 health and behavioural prompts. Participant responses were collected, aggregated, and
94 made publicly available. For this study, three indicators of interest were selected to
95 represent the impact of COVID-19 on mental health. These three indicators were (i)
96 the percentage of participants who experienced feelings of anxiety within the last 7
97 days, (ii) the percentage of participants who felt worried about their finances for the
98 following month, and (iii) the percentage of participants who felt depressed within the
99 last 7 days. We refer to these three indicators as feeling anxious, feeling depressed, and
100 worried about finances throughout this paper. Daily confirmed COVID-19 cases and
101 daily deaths from the Center for Systems Science and Engineering at Johns Hopkins
102 University [6] were also included in this study. These indicators were used to assess
103 whether there was any relationship between trends in cases or deaths and the trends
104 in mental health indicators.


105 The survey results collected can be categorized in two separate time-frames, the first
106 starting from September 8th, 2020 running until March 2nd, 2021, and the second
107 beginning from March 2nd, 2021 to January 10th, 2022. This separation is due to a
108 change in the survey questions asked about anxiety and depression; in the first time-

109 frame, the survey asked participants whether they experienced feelings of anxiety or
110 depression for the past 5 days. From March 2nd, 2021, the survey asked whether the
111 participants experienced feelings of anxiety or depression for the past 7 days, resulting
112 in data collected from March 2nd differing from that of earlier dates. Data analysis
113 was only conducted using data collected from the second time-frame due to missing
114 data points for mental health indicators from the first time-frame.



(a)

(b)



(c)

Figure 1: Daily COVID-19 (a) cases, (b) reported deaths, and (c) hospitalization cases across demographic regions.

115 Daily COVID-19 related cases, deaths, and hospitalizations between March 2nd, 2021
116 to January 10th, 2022 were plotted to identify waves in the spread of COVID-19. Three
117 COVID-19 waves were identified, as can be seen in Figure 1. These waves are most
118 distinguishable in Fig 1 (c), depicting daily COVID-19 related hospitalizations across

119 four geographical regions in the US. Based on these waves, we split the data into three
120 periods, reflective of the start and end of each wave. The dates for each period are (a)
121 April 1st, 2021 to July 1st, 2021, (b) July 2nd, 2021 to November 11th, 2021, and (c)
122 November 2nd, 2021 to January 10th, 2022.

123 In addition to looking at individual states, four United States geographical regions
124 (midwest, northeast, south, and west) as well as political party preference (Democratic,
125 Republican) were used to split the states to see if any mental health trends among
126 states clustered similarly to these geographically or politically established communities.
127 There is variation in how the country can be split geographically; in many cases it is
128 based on the historical relationship certain regions have among one another. These
129 relationships can stem from a similar religious community, cultural similarities, shared
130 historical significance or similar climates in the region [20]. In this study, we referenced
131 the United States Census Bureau geographic map of the country which is comprised
132 of four regions: midwest, northeast, south and west [17]. The political party preference
133 was determined from the results of the 2020 presidential election, senate, and overall
134 state party registration percentage [30]. The regions and political party each state
135 belongs to can be seen in Figure 2.





Figure 2: Regional and political maps of the United States. (a) A regional map where blue represents the midwest, orange represents the northeast, yellow represents the south, and purple represents the west; (b) Political map where blue represents Democratic, and red represents Republican party preference. The abbreviations are those given in the International society for organization standard for the United States (ISO 3166-2, website: <https://www.iso.org/obp/ui/#iso:code:3166:US>)

136 Similar to Figure 1, the daily COVID-19 related cases, deaths, and hospitalizations
137 were grouped based on each state's political preference, and were plotted to identify
138 waves in the spread of COVID-19 (see Figure 10 in Appendix A). The survey results
139 on the mental health indicators were also plotted based on geographical regions (see


140

Figure (3)) as well as political preference (see Figure 11 in Appendix B).



(a)

(b)



(c)

Figure 3: Percentage of individuals (a) feeling anxious, (b) feeling depressed, and (c) worried about finances across demographic regions.

141

COVID-19 policy timeline

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

Next we list a timeline of a few policies implemented during the COVID-19 outbreak in the country. Some policies listed in this timeline reflect efforts implemented to tackle the outbreak, such as nation-wide vaccine roll out for all adults, unemployment benefits, and an eviction moratorium. Depending on each policy's target population and topic, as well as how we hypothesized these policies would impact individuals' mental health, the policies were categorized as related to anxiety and depression, or worried about one's finances.

- 149 • March 11, 2021 – Biden signs a coronavirus relief package bill including extended
150 unemployment benefits and a third stimulus check²
- 151 • April 19, 2021 – all adult Americans eligible for vaccines by 4.19³
- 152 • April 21, 2021 – Tax credit for small businesses and non-profits, covers 80h of
153 leave, \$511/day²
- 154 • May 13, 2021 – CDC guidance on masking updated, no longer recommends masks
155 indoors or outdoors for fully vaccinated people regardless of number of people
156 gathered³
- 157 • July 3, 2021 – CDC states more than 50% of cases are Delta variant³
- 158 • July 31, 2021 – Moratorium on eviction expires².
- 159 • August 3, 2021 – CDC issues eviction moratorium specifically in areas with ‘sub-
160 substantial or high’ rates of COVID transmission²
- 161 • August 26, 2021 – Moratorium ends by Supreme Court ruling²
- 162 • September 6, 2021 – Unemployment benefits end for many individuals ²
- 163 • October 20, 2021 – Biden announces plan for distributing vaccine in children 5
164 – 11 if the vaccine is authorized, FDA authorizes Moderna and J&J vaccine in
165 eligible populations, and allows mixing vaccine doses (can use different primary
166 and booster shots)³
- 167 • December 9, 2021 – FDA expands Pfizer-BioNTech booster eligibility to 16- and
168 17-year olds³
- 169 • December 27, 2021 – CDC shortens isolation and quarantine period ³

170 2.2 Clustering and correlation networks

171 For each indicator, we obtained a Pearson’s correlation coefficient matrix, \mathbb{P} [16]. The
172 matrix entry $\mathbb{P}_{i,j}$ is obtained by calculating the Pearson’s correlation coefficient from
173 state i ’s and state j ’s time series data, where i and j may refer to any state in the
174 United States. Each Pearson’s correlation coefficient matrix was used as an adjacency
175 matrix, which defines the connectivity of states (with respect to a particular indicator)
176 in a network. If $\mathbb{P}_{i,j} \neq 0$, then states i and j are connected. Otherwise, they are
177 disconnected. Moreover, $\mathbb{P}_{i,j} > 0$ (positive connection) indicates a positive correlation,
178 while $\mathbb{P}_{i,j} < 0$ (negative connection) indicates a negative correlation; the more positive
179 (or negative) $\mathbb{P}_{i,j}$ is, the stronger the positive (or negative) correlation [16].

180 A cluster consists of states (or nodes) that are more similar (with respect to a particular
181 indicator) to each other than to states in other clusters. Whether a given pair of states
182 are grouped together depends on both how they are connected to each other and how
183 they are connected to other states in the network. We utilized Traag’s implementation
184 of the Leiden algorithm [25] in Python 3.9.7 from Spyder version 5.2.2 (specifically, the
185 `find_partition` and `optimise_partition_multiplex` functions from the `leidenalg` package

²Policy guideline that affects finances

³Policy guideline that affects feeling anxious and depressed

186 [28]). Briefly, these functions were used as follows: Each network was split into a posi-
187 tive and negative sub-network. The positive sub-network contained only the positive
188 connections from the original network, and the negative sub-network contained only
189 the negative connections from the original network [28]. We applied the `find_partition`
190 function to both sub-networks to obtain clusters for each, and we thereafter applied
191 the `optimise_partition_multiplex_function` to both sets of clusters to obtain a single set
192 of clusters for the original network.

193 The clusters returned by Leiden’s algorithm are not unique, meaning that if Leiden’s
194 algorithm is run multiple times, the clusters may not be the same. Consensus clustering
195 addresses this issue by grouping states based on multiple runs of the Leiden algorithm
196 [19]. Specifically, the Leiden algorithm is ran multiple times with a given network
197 (hereafter referred to as the original network), and after all runs are completed, the
198 frequencies at which states are grouped together are used to create a new adjacency
199 matrix (and thus a new network); the Leiden algorithm is then ran with this new
200 network. The resulting clusters are referred to as consensus clusters because they
201 represent the “consensus” of multiple Leiden algorithm runs with the original network.
202 The number of runs necessary may be assessed by tracking how the above-mentioned
203 frequencies change as more runs are performed. We manually implemented consensus
204 clustering in Python with 300 runs of the Leiden algorithm [28]. We verified that 300
205 runs were sufficient by visually inspecting how frequencies changed with more runs.

206 Once these matrices were collected, the Louvain algorithm was used in an iterative
207 process called consensus clustering to determine the best community membership for
208 each state pair. Consensus clustering runs the Louvain algorithm multiple times to as-
209 sess which states go together (often showing similar indicator trends) most frequently
210 and consistently and assigns memberships or communities to each state. These mem-
211 berships were stored in consensus matrices. Each run consisted of 300 iterations, and
212 a minimum of 200 extension runs were conducted. Subsample size was 90% (45 states)
213 to introduce variation, and further extensions were applied following visual analysis of
214 state membership stabilization using progress plots that showed the modularity score
215 change with each iteration. The results from the final iteration for each indicator con-
216 sensus matrix were stored, then mapped onto United States maps to visually assess the
217 memberships for each variable. In addition, the final iteration results were also used
218 to construct an allegiance matrix. The allegiance matrix gives “the probability for two
219 regions of being in the same community across all Covid indicators” [4, 7].

220 **2.3 Dynamic connectome analysis**

221 We follow the approach by Amico and Bulai [4], and use the sliding window analysis
222 to understand the link between mental health indicators, government policy and their
223 relationship across geographic regions and political parties. The sliding window anal-
224 ysis is a technique constructed by taking a fixed time interval to explore the different
225 indicators at various times frames. This technique is commonly used in the field of
226 neuroscience to examine brain network dynamics [4, 5]. In our sliding window analy-
227 sis, we take a fixed window of 30 days, and slide this by 1 day to examine the network
228 dynamics of our mental health indicators. Each data point is thus a correlation value

229 taken across the 30 days within a window, which can be plotted to display the dynamic
230 fluctuations in the variable of interest across the time-frame used. We evaluated the
231 differences between each region according to four different areas (midwest, northeast,
232 south, west) and their respective political affiliation (see Figure 2).

233 3 Results

234 All analyses were conducted in R 2021 version, Python 3.9.7 from Spyder version 5.2.2
235 and figures in MATLAB R2021b. The Delphi US CTIS data was accessible through
236 the Covidcast library.

237 Consensus and allegiance clustering

238 Figure 4 shows the membership results of the consensus clustering for the three mental
239 health indicators. The membership results are shown as distinct clusters separated
240 by color on the United States maps in Figure 2 (a). Figures 4 (a) and Figure 4 (c)
241 show similar trends, with no clear community distinction other than a slight South
242 region clustering (darker blue). The south region clustering observed in both Figures
243 4 (a) and Figure 4 (c) looks like the map of the republican party affiliation shown in
244 Figure 2 (b). Figure 4 (b) shows no distinct clustering pattern, indicating that the
245 communities with similar trends for the feeling depressed indicator did not cluster in
246 manners reflecting geographical regions or political party affiliation shown in Figure 2.

247 The membership results across the three mental health indicators were taken to con-
248 struct an allegiance matrix (See Section 2.2 for detailed information). The map on
249 Figure 5 (a) and the corresponding heat-map of the allegiance matrix is shown in
250 Figure 5 (b). These indicate which states were most likely to be grouped together
251 (and exhibit similar trends) across all three mental health indicators. The map shows
252 three main clusters, of which the light blue colored states are most interesting. The
253 clustering of the light blue states closely looks like the south geographic region, with
254 the exception of Virginia, West Virginia, and Arkansas, which were not as frequently
255 grouped together with the rest of the south. The light blue colored states also include
256 California, North Carolina, and Nevada, which are non-southern states.

257 Dynamic connectome

258 Next, we consider the results of the dynamic connectome obtained by taking snapshots
259 of the connectome in overlapping time windows of 30 days using sliding window anal-
260 ysis. The dynamic connectome results include changes in both correlation values (see
261 Figures 6 and 8) as well as eigenvector centrality values (see Figures 7 and 9) for the
262 mental health indicators. Analyses were conducted separately for demographic regions
263 and political party preference. As mentioned in Section 2.1, the survey data collected
264 was split into 3 periods corresponding to the three waves seen within the time-frame
265 used. Maximum and minimum correlation values within each period were recorded, as
266 seen in Tables 1 and 3. The eigenvector centrality values (Tables 2 and 4) work to verify
267 the results of the correlation values; these values highlight regions or parties which are
268 most important, especially in times of lower correlation. To minimize confusion when




Figure 4: Country-wide maps grouping states with similar trends between 3/2/2021 to 1/10/2022 for (a) feeling anxious, (b) feeling depressed and (c) worried about finances indicators. The states with light blue, blue, and dark blue are in the same cluster.




Figure 5: Allegiance clustering for feeling anxious, feeling depressed, and worried about finances indicators. (a) Allegiance map; (b) Allegiance Heat-map. The states with the same color (light blue, blue, or dark blue) are in the same cluster.

269 referencing the dynamic connectome results of each of the three indicators, we denote
 270 all future references by use of the term variable rather than indicator. Changes in the
 271 collected survey data will be discussed in the results and discussion as indicators, while
 272 discussing the results of dynamic connectome on this data (such as correlation values
 273 and eigenvector centrality value changes) will be marked by the word variable.

274 Regional dynamic connectome

275 For the regional dynamic connectome results of the feeling anxious variable, both the
 276 lowest minimum (-0.0648) and highest maximum (0.4523) correlation values within
 277 the first time period were observed from the northeastern region (see Figure 6 (a) and
 278 Table 1). In the second period, the minimum correlation value (-0.0762) remained
 279 in the northeast, and the maximum correlation value (0.5753) was recorded from the
 280 south. The final period showed the minimum correlation value (-0.0694) in the West,
 281 and the maximum correlation was seen in the midwest region (0.0836).

282 For the correlation values in the feeling depressed variable, the first range had both
 283 maximum (0.5958) and minimum (-0.0690) correlation values in the midwest region
 284 (see Figure 6 (b) and Table 1). The second period exhibited a similar pattern to the
 285 feeling anxious variable, with the northeast having the minimum correlation (-0.0867)
 286 and the south with the maximum correlation (0.5160). The final period continued
 287 with the west having the minimum correlation (-0.0633) among all four regions, and
 288 the northeast with the maximum correlation (0.1222). The pattern of the plot of both
 289 the feeling anxious and feeling depressed variable were similar, where the graph initially
 290 shows a sharp negative slope, but has a large peak during the second period.




Figure 6: Average correlation for states in Midwest, Northeast, South, and West regions between 4/3/2021 to 1/10/2022 for (a) feeling anxious, (b) feeling depressed, and (c) worried about finances variables. The vertical blue dot-dash lines indicate the start and end of the epidemic waves observed in Figure 1 and the horizontal dash lines indicate the width of the waves.

291 The remaining variable, worried about finances in Figure 6 (c) and Table 1, exhibited
 292 higher maximum correlation values in the first time period, which decreased with each
 293 coming period. During the first period, the midwest had the minimum correlation
 294 value (-0.0565), and the south had the maximum correlation value (0.8694). The south
 295 region maintained the highest correlation values (0.4765) during the second period, and
 296 the minimum value (-0.1000) was in the northeast. For the third period, the northeast
 297 still had the lowest correlation value (-0.0688) within the four regions, and the west
 298 had the maximum value (0.2447).

Regions	Wave	Anxious Min	Anxious Max	Depressed Min	Depressed Max	Finance Min	Finance Max
Midwest	1	-0.0171	0.4514	-0.0690	0.5958	-0.0565	0.8554
Midwest	2	-0.0317	0.4755	-0.0689	0.4213	-0.0668	0.1232
Midwest	3	-0.0426	0.0836	-0.0291	0.0614	-0.0186	0.1428
North East	1	-0.0648	0.4523	-0.0033	0.5166	-0.0524	0.6376
North East	2	-0.0762	0.4413	-0.0867	0.3642	-0.1000	0.1245
North East	3	-0.0677	0.0478	-0.0330	0.1222	-0.0688	0.2052
South	1	-0.0421	0.4498	-0.0525	0.3267	-0.0216	0.8694
South	2	-0.0365	0.5753	-0.0453	0.5160	0.0026	0.4765
South	3	-0.0382	0.0609	-0.0464	0.0583	-0.0301	0.1457
West	1	-0.0212	0.2302	-0.0524	0.3317	-0.0396	0.7274
West	2	-0.0559	0.3675	-0.0542	0.3576	-0.0472	0.1770
West	3	-0.0694	0.0633	-0.0633	0.0291	-0.0143	0.2447

Table 1: Minimum and maximum values of correlation time series for feeling anxious, feeling depressed, worried about finances between demographic regions

299 For all three variables across each period, the recorded minimum values were very
 300 weak negative correlations (all under -0.1), and the states could be considered to
 301 have no correlation within each region. The third period maximum values also
 302 all have weak positive correlation values (between 0.0291 to 0.2447) compared to
 303 the first and second period where most values are considered moderate to strong
 304 correlations (between 0.3576 to 0.5753). This excludes the worried about finances
 305 variable, which second period has a weak positive correlation (between 0.1232 to
 306 0.177) except for the South states (medium positive correlation, 0.4765)) where
 307 the sliding window plots show a gradual negative slope rather than clear waves
 308 (Figure 6 (c)). The outcomes for the largest minimum and maximum correla-
 309 tion values for the second period was the same for all three variables, with the
 310 minimum being the northeast, and the maximum being the south.

311 Figure 7 and Table 2 shows the results of the eigenvector centrality values for all
 312 the mental health variables. The dynamic connectome plots using eigenvector
 313 centrality values shown in Figure 7 looks like the plots created by the correlation
 314 values in Figure 6. Although, Figures 7 (a) and (b) is less smooth, we see a
 315 similar shape and peak for the feeling anxious and feeling depressed variables.
 316 Following an initial decrease during the first period, both graphs show a sudden

317 peak in the second period which plateaus and remains stable during the third
 318 period. This is a pattern also seen in Figure 6. Similarly, the worried about
 319 finances plot (Figure 7 (c)) also decreases sharply during the first period and
 320 does not fluctuate in the following periods, resembling the shape of Figure 6 (c).

Regions	Wave	Anxious Min	Anxious Max	Depressed Min	Depressed Max	Finance Min	Finance Max
Midwest	1	0.1014	0.7760	0.1446	0.8178	0.1654	0.9493
Midwest	2	0.2104	0.7737	0.1273	0.7464	0.2076	0.4684
Midwest	3	0.1345	0.4932	0.2303	0.5749	0.1148	0.5763
North East	1	0.1111	0.7954	0.3198	0.8142	0.2076	0.8642
North East	2	0.1128	0.7650	0.1445	0.7820	0.1613	0.6512
North East	3	0.1557	0.5786	0.1622	0.6298	0.1871	0.5992
South	1	0.1966	0.7666	0.1523	0.6981	0.1617	0.9465
South	2	0.1141	0.8252	0.2042	0.7711	0.0791	0.7831
South	3	0.1344	0.4915	0.1982	0.4606	0.1799	0.5155
West	1	0.1340	0.6420	0.1863	0.7038	0.1804	0.8739
West	2	0.1778	0.7232	0.2450	0.6793	0.1360	0.5625
West	3	0.2715	0.4480	0.1966	0.4882	0.1225	0.6512

Table 2: Minimum and maximum values of eigenvector centrality time series for feeling anxious, feeling depressed, worried about finances between demographic regions

321 From Table 2, we observed that during the first period for the feeling anxious vari-
 322 able, the northeast had the highest maximum value (0.7954) while the midwest
 323 had the smallest minimum eigenvector centrality value (0.1014). The minimum
 324 and maximum values during the second period were recorded in the northeast
 325 and South (0.1128 and 0.8252, respectively). This position flips during the third
 326 period, where the South now has the lowest minimum value (0.1344) and the
 327 Northeast has the largest maximum (0.5786).

328 For the dynamic connectome results of the feeling depressed variable, only two
 329 regions are recorded for the largest maximum and lowest minimum eigenvector
 330 centrality values. The midwest has the smallest minimum value for the first and
 331 second period (0.1446 and 0.1273, respectively) and the maximum value for the
 332 first period (0.8178). The second region was the northeast, seen with the largest
 333 maximum values in the second (0.7820) and third (0.6298) periods, as well as the
 334 minimum value (0.1622) in the third period.

335 The maximum and minimum regions for the first period of the worried about
 336 finances variable showed the south as the minimum (0.1617) and the midwest with
 337 the maximum (0.9493) for the eigenvector centrality results. In the second period,
 338 the south is recorded for both the lowest minimum and maximum values (0.0791
 339 and 0.7831, respectively), and the midwest and west states had the minimum
 340 (0.1148) and maximum (0.6512) values for the third period, respectively.




Figure 7: Average eigenvector centrality for states in midwest, northeast, south, and west regions between 4/3/2021 to 1/10/2022 for (a) feeling anxious, (b) feeling depressed, and (c) worried about finances variables. The vertical blue dot-dash lines indicate the start and end of the epidemic waves observed in Figure 1 and the horizontal dash lines indicate the width of the waves.

341 Unlike the correlation values, there are not many similarities across the three
342 variables' eigenvector centrality values. We observed the south recorded for the
343 maximum variable in the second period for both the feeling anxious and worried
344 about finances variables. However, this is not reflected in feeling depressed. When
345 looking at maximum and minimum eigenvector centrality values, the midwest
346 and northeast show up the most frequently, especially for the feeling anxious and
347 depressed variables. The south is seen for both the feeling anxious and worried
348 about finances, while the West is only recorded once for worried about finances.

349 **Political dynamic connectome**

350 The dynamic connectome for political party preferences of the states was con-
351 ducted using sliding window analysis with snapshots of overlapping time windows
352 of 30, resulting in correlation plots (see Figure 8) and eigenvector centrality val-
353 ues plots (see Figure 9). The maximum and minimum values for both data types
354 are summarized in Tables 3 and 4.

355 In Figure 8 (a) there is a difference between Democratic and Republican states
356 at around 30 to 80 days, where the correlation increases for Democratic states,
357 but not as much for Republican states. It should also be mentioned that the
358 correlation value at the start of the plot is higher in the democratic states com-
359 pared to the Republican states. Like the regional dynamic connectome plots for
360 demographic regions, Figure 8 (c) shows a negative slope with a lower plateau
361 by the second period, while Figure 8 (a) and Figure 8 (b) start with a negative
362 slope in the first period, have a peak in the second period and a lower plateau in
363 the third.

364 Similar to the regional dynamic connectome of the geographic regions, the max-
365 imum values recorded during the third period are the lowest within the periods
366 for all three variables. The minimum values are also extremely small numbers
367 close to 0 (within -0.0111 to -0.0316), indicating negligible correlation. Across all
368 three variables, the only consistent outcome was having the highest maximum
369 correlation value in republican states during the second period.

370 From to Table 3, we observed that the lowest minimum and largest maximum
371 correlation values (-0.0196 and 0.3994) for the first period in the feeling anx-
372 ious variable was recorded for the Democratic states. During the second period,
373 the minimum correlation value (-0.0316) remained in the Democratic states; the
374 highest maximum correlation value (0.4394) was among the Republican states.
375 In the third period, these positions are flipped, where the largest minimum value
376 (-0.0181) was among the Republican states and the maximum within the Demo-
377 cratic states (0.0991).

378 For feeling depressed variable, the Republican states has the largest minimum
379 correlation value across all three periods (-0.0277, -0.0293, and -0.0277). The




Figure 8: Average correlation within Democratic and Republican states between 4/3/2021 to 1/10/2022 for (a) feeling anxious, (b) feeling depressed, and (c) worried about finances variables. The vertical blue dot-dash lines indicate the start and end of the epidemic waves observed in Figure 1 and the horizontal dash lines indicate the width of the waves.

380 largest maximum correlation for the first and third period are seen in the Demo-
 381 cratic states (0.3365, and 0.0663), while the largest maximum correlation value
 382 was observed in the republican states for the second period (0.4507).

383 In the worried about finances variable, all minimum and maximum correlation
 384 values are largest among the Republican states. The largest minimum values
 385 for the three time period are (-0.0199, -0.0085, and -0.0077), and the largest
 386 maximum correlation values are (0.8104, 0.1735, and 0.1764).

Parties	Wave	Anxious	Anxious	Depressed	Depressed	Finance	Finance		
		Min	Max		Min		Max	Min	Max
Democratic	1	-0.0196	0.3994		-0.0151	0.3365		-0.0061	0.7423
Democratic	2	-0.0316	0.4007		-0.0217	0.3284		-0.0081	0.1117
Democratic	3	-0.0111	0.0991		-0.0258	0.0663		-0.0077	0.0770
Republican	1	-0.0145	0.2358		-0.0277	0.2810		-0.0199	0.8104
Republican	2	-0.0196	0.4394		-0.0293	0.4507		-0.0085	0.1735
Republican	3	-0.0181	0.0787		-0.0277	0.0301		0.0077	0.1764

Table 3: Minimum and maximum values of correlation time series for feeling anxious, feeling depressed, worried about finances between political parties

387 Figure 9 and Table 4 shows the results of the eigenvector centrality values for all
 388 three mental health variables. Looking at the minimum and maximum values for
 389 the eigenvector centrality for the feeling anxious variable in Table 4 we observed
 390 that the Republican states had the minimum value (0.0804) during the first
 391 wave, while Democratic states had the maximum eigenvector centrality values
 392 (0.6633). In the second wave, the minimum and maximum values (0.1764 and
 393 0.7153) were recorded for the Republican states. In the third wave, the minimum
 394 and maximum eigenvector centrality values (0.1810 and 0.4663) were seen within
 395 the Democratic states.

396 When observing the eigenvector centrality values for the feeling depressed vari-
 397 able, the lowest minimum and largest maximum values have the similar party
 398 outcome as the eigenvector centrality values for the feeling anxious variable; Re-
 399 publican states had the minimum values in the first and second period (0.1624
 400 and 0.1173) and Democratic states (0.1176) in the third time period. A simi-
 401 lar party outcome as feeling anxious was observed for the maximum eigenvector
 402 centrality values, namely Democratic states in the first and third period (0.6597
 403 and 0.4621) and Republican in the second time period (0.7237).

404 In the political dynamic connectome results for worried about finances, all the
 405 lowest minimum and largest maximum eigenvector centrality values are among
 406 the Republican states. The lowest minimum values for the three time period
 407 are (0.1684, 0.1437 and 0.1490), and the largest maximum eigenvector centrality
 408 values are (0.9139, 0.5652 and 0.5483). Across the eigenvector centrality values




Figure 9: Average eigenvalue centrality for Democratic and Republican states between 4/3/2021 to 1/10/2022 for (a) feeling anxious, (b) feeling depressed, and (c) worried about finances variables. The vertical blue dot-dash lines indicate the start and end of the epidemic waves observed in Figure 1 and the horizontal dash lines indicate the width of the waves.

409 for all three variables, the Republican states consistently recorded the highest
410 maximum values during the second period.

Parties	Range	Anxious		Depressed		Finance	
		Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max
Democratic	1	0.1539	0.6633	0.2133	0.6597	0.2062	0.8785
Democratic	2	0.1781	0.6905	0.1651	0.6492	0.1448	0.5127
Democratic	3	0.1810	0.4663	0.1176	0.4621	0.1585	0.4794
Republican	1	0.0804	0.5932	0.1624	0.6461	0.1684	0.9139
Republican	2	0.1764	0.7153	0.1173	0.7237	0.1437	0.5652
Republican	3	0.2116	0.4143	0.1931	0.3836	0.1490	0.5483

Table 4: Minimum and maximum values of eigenvalue centrality time series for feeling anxious, feeling depressed, and worried about finances between political parties

411 4 Discussion

412 In this study, we applied clustering analysis from network theory to understand
413 the connectivity and similarities between states and the impacts of COVID-19
414 on mental health across the country using COVID-19 related mental health in-
415 dicators such as worried about finances, feeling depressed, and feeling anxious.
416 We framed our results in terms of three time periods of three COVID-19 waves
417 identified between March 2nd, 2021 to January 10th, 2022 using daily COVID-19
418 related cases, deaths, and hospitalizations (see Figure 1).

419 At the beginning of the pandemic several policies were put in place to curtail
420 the outbreak; and several mandates were enacted to alleviate the public’s burden
421 of the pandemic, see Section 2.1 for a list of some of the implemented policies
422 and mandates. To understand the trends in people’s mental health during the
423 pandemic we now investigate the possible effects of government policies and man-
424 dates from March 3rd, 2021 to January 10th, 2022. To assess the impact of these
425 policies and mandates on people’s mental health, we evaluated how correlation
426 values (from the regional and political dynamic connectomes) for each variable
427 changed during the initial 30 days after a policy was implemented, and relate
428 this change to the average reported percentages for the correlating mental health
429 corresponding indicator. This allowed us to see if a higher correlation was indica-
430 tive of an increasing or decreasing percentage of people experiencing the mental
431 health indicators of interest. We used consensus clustering to group similar states
432 together and dynamic connectome computed via sliding window analysis to cre-
433 ate a time series of their relationship. The consensus clustering using the three
434 mental health indicators shows correlation between the states. We discuss the
435 outcome in detail below.

436 **Correlation in the south region**

437 In the consensus clustering map shown in Figure 4, a noticeable clustering that
438 resembled the south geographical region grouping shown in Figure 2 (a) can be
439 observed for both the feeling anxious and worried about finances indicators. This
440 similarity was also observed for the Republican party preference, as majority of
441 the southern states are also Republican states, see Figure 2 (b).

442 We expected that the dynamic connectodome time series obtained from the slid-
443 ing window analysis would lead to a high correlation within the states in the
444 south. This is based on consensus clustering results showing many of the states
445 within the south exhibiting similar mental health trends for both feelings of anx-
446 iety and worried about finances (see Figure 4). Thus, looking at the largest
447 maximum and smallest minimum outcomes across the three periods (obtained
448 from the three COVID-19 waves) for both geographical region and political party
449 preference, we see that the south and Republican states consistently have the
450 largest maximum value in the second period or wave between 100 and 200 days
451 for the regional and political dynamic connectodome time series in Figures 6 and
452 8), respectively. This pattern is seen in both correlation and eigenvector central-
453 ity values when looking solely at the feeling anxious and worried about finances
454 variable. Interestingly, only the consensus clustering map for feeling depressed
455 lacked any distinct geographical or political clustering.

456 **Policy impact on feeling anxious and depressed**

457 In Figures 6 and 8), we see that both feeling anxious and depressed variables have
458 a similar wave pattern across the regional and political dynamic connectodome,
459 they have several peaks in the first period, a single peak with high correlation
460 during the second period, and a low plateau in the third. One difference between
461 the two variables are the peaks around day 40 to 80 during the first period in
462 average correlation especially for midwestern, northeastern (Figure 6 (a)), and
463 Democratic states (Figure 8 (a)). The peaks for feeling anxious during this period
464 is not as prominent as the peaks in the feeling depressed plots. These peaks shows
465 an average 1.5% decrease in the midwest states reporting feelings of anxiety, a
466 2% decrease in the northeast, and a 2% decrease in Democratic states. Although
467 the west also has these peaks, the correlation value is only weakly positive (0.21)
468 compared to the midwest and the northeast (0.44 and 0.45, respectively) The
469 presence of these peaks across the feeling anxious and feeling depressed variables
470 during this time for the northeast and midwest may reflect the impact of policy
471 changes on mental health indicators.

472 There were two policies introduced within 30 days prior to the start of these peaks
473 seen between days 40 and 80. The first was a policy on April 19th (19th day
474 mark) that guaranteed all adult Americans are eligible for COVID-19 vaccine,
475 and the second a CDC guidance update on masking made on May 13, the 43rd

476 day mark. In their guidance, the CDC retracted their recommendation for fully
477 vaccinated individuals to wear masks indoors or outdoors.

478 The introduction of a policy that would assist people in getting vaccinated and
479 protecting themselves during the pandemic can reasonably be understood to work
480 towards a decrease in reported percentages of anxiety and depression. The sec-
481 ond policy however, is more ambiguous. While on one hand, individuals can
482 consider this relaxing of guidance to indicate a decrease in severity and danger
483 of the COVID-19 pandemic, others may see this as a premature decision and
484 worry about the potential outcomes of making this announcement. Seeing how
485 the states with an increased correlation all showed a decrease in feeling anxious
486 and depressed indicators, it seems like these policies may have played a part in
487 reducing anxiety and depression within the country, especially in the northeast
488 and midwest regions. In addition to the policies, Figures 1 and 10 show how there
489 had been an uptick in average COVID-19 cases, deaths and hospitalizations in
490 democratic and northeastern states, which started to decrease around May to
491 July of 2021. This timing aligned with the increase in political dynamic con-
492 nectome correlation values for the feeling anxious and depressed variables, and
493 a decrease in their corresponding indicator values. The decrease in COVID-19
494 related cases, deaths, and hospitalizations may have worked in synchrony with
495 the policies mentioned above to alleviate people's worries about COVID-19.

496 In addition to the peaks during the first period between days 40 to 80, the midwest
497 also has another peak within this period for the feeling anxious connectome plots
498 (Figure 6 (a)) with an initial weak correlation of 0.2. However, the feeling anxious
499 indicator decreased in the first 12 days following the first window, resulting in
500 increase in correlation value (medium positive correlation, 0.45). This increase
501 is within 30 days of Biden signing a coronavirus relief bill, and it is possible that
502 this government decision contributed to the decreasing feelings of anxiety among
503 people in the midwest. A similar pattern is also seen for the feeling depressed
504 indicator, where the correlation value increases over the first 14 days then sharply
505 decreases. Like the feeling anxious variable, this fluctuation is within 30 days
506 of the government decision, and is characterized by a decrease in the feeling
507 depressed indicator across states within the midwest. This change in value tapers
508 off, and is reflected by the decreasing correlation value on the graph.

509 In Figure 6 (b), the northeast also shows an increasing correlation in the feeling
510 depressed variable over the first 21 days, reaching a medium positive correlation
511 of 0.51 before decreasing. However, during the first 30 days (March 3rd to April
512 1st, 2021), the feeling depressed indicator increased, before slowly decreasing
513 over the 21 days. The initial increase contradicts what we expected to see, as the
514 introduction of the relief package should help alleviate financial and emotional
515 stress. However, this lag in response may possibly be explained when considering
516 that feelings of depression often take time to appear. Thus, it is understandable

517 how the states in the northeast took longer to report a decrease in feelings of
518 depression.

519 The most significant changes in the regional and political dynamic connectome
520 for feeling anxious and depressed variables happened during the second period,
521 when regions and political parties peaked between the 110 and 165 day mark.
522 During this time period, all regions and political parties experienced an increase
523 in the feeling anxious and depressed indicators. Overall, the change in percentage
524 was higher for feeling anxious compared to feeling depressed. Now compare this
525 to the mental feeling anxious and depressed indicators, we see that the midwest
526 had a 3% increase in reported feelings of anxiety, northeast had a 2.5% increase,
527 west a 3% increase, and both Democratic and Republican states had 4% increase.
528 The largest increase of 4.5% was seen in the southern states. For the percentage
529 of individuals with feelings of depression, we see 1% increased in both midwest
530 and the northeast, a 1.6% increase in the south, a 1.5% increase within the west,
531 and a 1.7% increase among Democratic states. The highest increase of 1.8% was
532 observed among Republican states. These increase in correlation begins roughly
533 15 days after the CDC announced that more than 50% of all COVID-19 cases
534 were due to the Delta variant on July 3rd. While this announcement may not
535 have directly resulted in the increase in value for feeling anxious and depressed
536 indicators, we cannot over look how this announcement and correlation increase
537 overlapped at essentially the same time as the increase we see in COVID-19 cases
538 in Figures 1 and 10.

539 Keeping this CDC announcement in mind, we can conclude that the emergence
540 of the Delta variant is a likely contributor to the sudden increase in feelings of
541 anxiety and depression. As most nation-wide mandates had expired, it is likely
542 that each state had to respond to the increase in COVID-19 cases individually,
543 resulting in some states and regions being hit harder than others. In Figures 1
544 and 10 we see how the number of cases and deaths is much higher in the South and
545 republican states. Assuming negative COVID-19 outcomes such as an increase
546 in cases and deaths negatively impacts mental health, we would expect to see
547 the hardest hit regions to also exhibit the largest increases in feeling anxious and
548 depressed indicators. As expected, we found the south and the Republican states
549 showed the largest percentage increase in mental health indicator values during
550 the second period when the Delta variant began spreading.

551 **Policy impact on worries about finances**

552 The regional and political dynamic connectome for the worried about finances
553 variable decreased rapidly within the first 50 days, and maintained a lower plateau
554 for the remainder of the periods, as seen in Figures 6 (c) and 8 (c). This is in
555 contrast to the feeling anxious and feeling depressed variables which consistently
556 showed a notable increase in correlation between 100 and 200 days in the dynamic
557 connectome time series plot. The initial high correlation (all above 0.7 except

558 for the northeast with 0.45) at day 0 for both geographic regional and political
559 party preferences is indicative of how the first 30 days in the dynamic connectome
560 showed the biggest collective trend among states. Looking at the reported values,
561 the worried about finances indicator decreases rapidly across the regions and
562 party preferences, during the first 30 days (from March 3rd to April 1st of 2021).
563 Decreasing approximately 6% in the midwest, 3% for the northeast, 6% in the
564 South, 5% in the West, 4% for Democratic states, and 6% for Republican states.
565 The high correlation value reflects how all the states showed a decrease in the
566 worried about finances indicator during the first few days of the data. Given the
567 plateau following the initial negative slope, it can be assumed that the states
568 went on to exhibit their own trends, and this interstate-level difference resulted
569 in little to no correlation (0.2 and under, except for the south).

570 Following these decrease, the remaining data points for most states fluctuate
571 within 2 to 3 percent at a slower rate post 30 day value. The initial decrease
572 in the first period is the only change we see in the data, with the exception of
573 the southern states that has a medium correlation peak (0.47) around the 110 -
574 135 day marks (Figure 6 (c)) showing an increase in the worried about finances
575 indicator within the south. This uptick was also observed in the midwest and
576 Republican states, albeit at a smaller increase, barely reaching a fairly weak
577 positive correlation of 0.2.

578 The decrease in individuals' worries about finances may be explained by the
579 different policies relating to individual's finances. As listed in Section 2.1, on
580 March 11, 2021 Biden signed a coronavirus relief package which extended un-
581 employment compensation and included a third stimulus check. However, while
582 this event happened during the first 30 days of the collected survey responses, the
583 data was already exhibiting a downward trend. It is likely that there are other
584 external factors playing into this decrease; understanding how this policy may
585 have impacted financial worries would require analysis on earlier time-points.
586 Another possible explanation for the decreasing trend in financial worries may
587 be an improvement in the employment rate. Compared with a peak civilian un-
588 employment rate of 14.7% in April of 2020 ([27]), the unemployment rate was
589 6% during March and April of 2021, steadily decreasing to 4% by January of
590 2022, which marked the end of this study's timeline. However, if all states had
591 experienced a decreasing worry relating to finances, we should expect to see a
592 higher correlation if worries continued to decrease.

593 Additional policies introduced later on such as a tax credit to decrease the bur-
594 den of paid-leave on small businesses and non-profit organizations did not show
595 any increase in correlation. It may be that by the end of the first period, rather
596 than nation-wide policies, state-level government policies had more influence on
597 the mental health of residents, and the direction each state took was not nec-
598 essarily related to or dictated based on geographical regions or political party

599 preference. We hypothesized that policies impacting a large number of people,
600 such as eviction moratoriums and unemployment benefits ending would result in
601 an increase in correlation values across all groups and states, however the average
602 correlations in both the second and third period remain stable 30 days after these
603 policies are implemented.

604 Another possibility arises when considering the slight peak shown by the south
605 during the second period. The 110 day mark (July 20th, 2021) is only 13 days
606 after the CDC announced the COVID-19 Delta variant as responsible for over
607 50% of all COVID-19 cases. In the same line, we see a larger spike in COVID-19
608 cases for both the south and Republican states in late July (Figures 1 and 10). It
609 could be possible that states most heavily impacted with COVID-19 took similar
610 methods to address the Delta variant, resulting in a brief increase in correlation
611 among the south.

612 **Comparison with Fulk et. al [10] results**

613 Fulk et. al [10] investigated the effect that several variables related to the COVID-
614 19 pandemic had on anxiety and depression in the general population during the
615 same time period as this study. They presented their findings in a bidirectional
616 format and found that variables directly related to COVID-19 (i.e. COVID-19
617 incidence and death) had a significant positive effect on anxiety and depres-
618 sion in several states. In our study, we found that the correlation in anxiety
619 and depression between states increased dramatically in the second time period.
620 This coincided with the rise of the Delta variant of SARS-CoV-2, which had
621 significantly increased transmissibility compared to previously dominant strains
622 of SARS-CoV-2. One advantage of using sliding window and clustering analyses
623 over the bidirectional approach taken in [10] is that we are able to see greater
624 variability through time and across the country. Figures 1, 2, 5, and 6 in [10] show
625 that an increase in the incidence of COVID-19 led to an increase in the percent-
626 age of individuals that reported feeling anxious/depressed in a large number of
627 states. We can make similar conclusions based on the results in Figure 3 (a) and
628 (b) in conjunction with Figure 4 (a) and (b). Further, we can see which states
629 were behaving similarly (e.g. the south cluster) in their correlation over the en-
630 tire period of the analysis and we don't have to rely solely on significant results
631 to draw our conclusions. An additional insight that the results of [10] pertains
632 to why certain states are commonly clustered together. For example, Florida
633 and Texas were significant in several of the analyses of the effect of COVID-19
634 incidence on anxiety and depression, which may indicate that their populations
635 were responding similarly to the growing pandemic and thus explains why they
636 are grouped together with respect to each of the variables evaluated in our study.
637 The variables related to social isolation in [10] were less informative to our study
638 and seemed to vary significantly more compared to variables related to COVID-
639 19. This may indicate that the trends seen in our indicators were impacted more
640 by COVID-19 related issues than social isolation.

641 **Conclusion**

642 Numerous studies have observed an increase in negative mental health conditions
643 across the United States in parallel with the emergence of COVID-19 [9, 10,
644 12, 21]. Increase in COVID-19 incidence and deaths has been implicated in
645 increased feelings of anxiety and depression across multiple states [10]. In this
646 work, we applied network and clustering analysis to study the connectivity and
647 similarities between states and how COVID-19 impacts mental health across
648 the country using the “mental health functional connectome” obtained from the
649 covariance matrix of mental health indicators, namely worried about finances,
650 feeling anxious and feeling depressed. We summarize our findings below:

- 651 (i) The southern states and Republican party showed similar trends for feeling
652 anxious and worried about finances indicators between March 3rd, 2021 and
653 January 10th, 2022.
- 654 (ii) The mental health indicator for feeling depressed showed no identifiable
655 communities resembling geographical regions or political party affiliation.
- 656 (iii) The highest correlation values for the feeling anxious and feeling depressed
657 variable seemingly overlapping with an increase in COVID-19 related cases,
658 deaths, hospitalizations, and rapid spread of the COVID-19 Delta variant.

659 **Future steps and limitations**

660 Results from this study showed a decrease in worries about finances variable
661 across the country in the correlation among states and political affiliation; con-
662 ducting further research using more survey data, particularly from dates earlier
663 than March 3rd, 2021 may provide further insight into possible reasons for the
664 decrease.

665 Anxiety can be fueled by sources such as media exposure and negative experiences
666 with COVID-19; however, the government and state response to increasing cases
667 may also alleviate or exacerbate feelings of anxiety. Since the data collected
668 for this time-frame began in the early half of 2021, most lockdown measures
669 had ended, and organizations such as the CDC were consistently issuing and
670 updating health mandates and guidance information. In addition to national
671 government responses, some states were actively loosening restrictions compared
672 to others that maintained some level of safety measures to combat the appearance
673 of COVID-19 variants. Whether participants felt safe or worry in response to
674 loosening restrictions in that state could influence how they responded on the
675 survey, affecting how a state related to other regions, and are a potential area
676 for future research. Previous studies have identified certain protective factors
677 against symptoms of anxiety, including old age, higher education, being male,
678 and a good economic situation [15]. Comparing these factors with the map
679 distribution for anxiety, such as the average level of education attained in each
680 state, could provide more insight as well.

681 Given how close certain policies were implemented, such as the expiration of an
682 eviction moratorium as well as unemployment benefits happening within 11 days
683 of each other, it is difficult to speculate how a given policy may have impacted a
684 mental health indicator. It also fully possible that the impact a policy could have
685 on a variable - if any - arose due to the anticipation of a policy being introduced or
686 a mandate being lifted rather than after it is implemented. Since we observed any
687 correlation fluctuation 30 days after a policy was introduced rather than before,
688 we have not taken anticipatory effects into consideration. In addition, by using
689 a 30 day window, our sliding window analysis may have become less sensitive
690 to short-term changes in correlation, as the values would need to collectively
691 increase or decrease for a longer span of time in order to be picked up by the
692 analysis.

693 Sliding window analysis requires the researchers to balance parameters such as
694 window size prior to conducting the analysis. However, as there is no established
695 standard for setting a window size, it is up to each researcher to choose a param-
696 eter that best fits their research question and intentions resulting in ambiguity.
697 Incorporating different methods of centrality and network analysis would allow
698 for more insight, stability and interpretation on the changes in values over time,
699 which the sliding window analysis and eigenvector centrality values may not fully
700 provide.

701 Another limitation observed in this study is the difficulty of interpreting the
702 feelings of depression variable. This mental health indicator is difficult to measure
703 due to the long-term nature of depression, as well as the overlapping effects
704 certain policy changes may have on the mental health indicators of interest.
705 Unlike anxiety and worries about finances, depressive symptoms may take much
706 longer to manifest themselves in any person, making it difficult to determine what
707 policies impacted this indicator. Any singular policy change may also affect a
708 multitude of mental health indicators, and the extent of which each indicator is
709 affected cannot readily be analyzed.

710 **Data Availability**

711 Data used are available at the link <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2111454>
712 118

713 All code, data, and results are available upon request from the corresponding
714 author.

715 **Conflicts of Interest**

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

717 Author contributions

718 Hiroko Kobayahsi: formal analysis, writing - original draft preparation, reviewing
719 and editing; Raul Saenz-Escarcega: Writing - original draft preparation, review-
720 ing and editing, Alexander Fulk: Writing - formal analysis, original draft prepara-
721 tion, reviewing and editing, and Folashade B. Agosto: Conceptualization, project
722 administration, supervision, writing- reviewing and editing, funding acquisition.

723 Acknowledgement

724 This research was funded by the National Science Foundation, grant number
725 DMS2028297 and DMS2230117.

726 References

- 727 [1] Abdul Basit Adeel, Michael Catalano, Olivia Catalano, Grant Gibson, Ezgi
728 Muftuoglu, Tara Riggs, Mehmet Halit Sezgin, Olga Shvetsova, Naveed Tahir,
729 Julie VanDusky-Allen, et al. Covid-19 policy response and the rise of the
730 sub-national governments. *Canadian Public Policy*, 46(4):565–584, 2020.
- 731 [2] Lara B Akin, Jan-Emmanuel De Neve, Elizabeth W Dunn, Daisy E Fan-
732 court, Elkhonon Goldberg, John F Helliwell, Sarah P Jones, Elie Karam,
733 Richard Layard, Sonja Lyubomirsky, et al. Mental health during the first
734 year of the covid-19 pandemic: A review and recommendations for moving
735 forward. *Perspectives on psychological science*, 17(4):915–936, 2022.
- 736 [3] American Medical Association (AMA). The role of data collection in the
737 COVID-19 pandemic. [https://www.ama-assn.org/delivering-care/
738 health-equity/role-data-collection-covid-19-pandemic](https://www.ama-assn.org/delivering-care/health-equity/role-data-collection-covid-19-pandemic). Accessed:
739 2022-07-27.
- 740 [4] Enrico Amico and Iulia Martina Bulai. How political choices shaped covid
741 connectivity: The italian case study. *Plos One*, 16(12):e0261041, 2021.
- 742 [5] Blazej M Baczkowski, Tom Johnstone, Henrik Walter, Susanne Erk, and
743 Ilya M Veer. Sliding-window analysis tracks fluctuations in amygdala func-
744 tional connectivity associated with physiological arousal and vigilance during
745 fear conditioning. *Neuroimage*, 153:168–178, 2017.
- 746 [6] Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE). COVID-19 Data
747 Repository at Johns Hopkins University . [https://github.com/CSSEG
748 ISandData/COVID-19](https://github.com/CSSEGISandData/COVID-19). Accessed: 2021-06-15.
- 749 [7] Rastko Ciric, Jason S Nomi, Lucina Q Uddin, and Ajay B Satpute. Context-
750 tual connectivity: A framework for understanding the intrinsic dynamic archi-
751 tecture of large-scale functional brain networks. *Scientific reports*, 7(1):1–
752 16, 2017.

- 753 [8] Domenico Cucinotta and Maurizio Vanelli. Who declares covid-19 a pan-
754 demic. *Acta Bio Medica: Atenei Parmensis*, 91(1):157, 2020.
- 755 [9] Mark É Czeisler, Rashon I Lane, Emiko Petrosky, Joshua F Wiley, Aleta
756 Christensen, Rashid Njai, Matthew D Weaver, Rebecca Robbins, Elise R
757 Facer-Childs, Laura K Barger, et al. Mental health, substance use, and
758 suicidal ideation during the covid-19 pandemic—united states, june 24–30,
759 2020. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 69(32):1049, 2020.
- 760 [10] Alexander Fulk, Raul Saenz-Escarcega, Hiroko Kobayashi, Innocent Ma-
761 posa, and Folashade Augusto. Assessing the impacts of covid-19 and social
762 isolation on mental health in the united states of america. *medRxiv*, 2022.
- 763 [11] Matthew L Goldman, Benjamin G Druss, Marcela Horvitz-Lennon,
764 Grayson S Norquist, Kristin Kroeger Ptakowski, Amy Brinkley, Miranda
765 Greiner, Heath Hayes, Brian Hepburn, Shea Jorgensen, et al. Mental health
766 policy in the era of covid-19. *Psychiatric Services*, 71(11):1158–1162, 2020.
- 767 [12] David Gunnell, Louis Appleby, Ella Arensman, Keith Hawton, Ann John,
768 Nav Kapur, Murad Khan, Rory C O’Connor, Jane Pirkis, Eric D Caine,
769 et al. Suicide risk and prevention during the covid-19 pandemic. *The Lancet*
770 *Psychiatry*, 7(6):468–471, 2020.
- 771 [13] Thomas Hale, Anna Petherick, Jessica Anania, Bernardo Andretti, Noam
772 Angrist, Roy Barnes, Thomas Boby, Emily Cameron-Blake, Alice Cavalieri,
773 Martina Di Folco, Benjamin Edwards, Lucy Ellen, Jodie Elms, Rodrigo
774 Furst, Liz Gomes Ribeiro, Kaitlyn Green, Rafael Goldszmidt, Laura Hal-
775 las, Beatriz Kira, Maria Luciano, Saptarshi Majumdar, Thayslene Marques
776 Oliveira, Radhika Nagesh, Toby Phillips, Annalena Pott, Julia Sampaio,
777 Helen Tatlow, Adam Wade, Samuel Webster, Andrew Wood, Hao Zha, and
778 Yuxi Zhang. Variation in Government Responses to COVID-19, Version 13.0.
779 www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/covidtracker, 2022. Blavatnik School of Government
780 Working Paper.
- 781 [14] Laura Hallas and Saptarshi Majumdar Monika Pyarali Andrew Wood
782 Thomas Hale Ariq Hatibie, Rachele Koch. Variation in US states’ COVID-
783 19 policy responses. [https://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/publicatio](https://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/publications/variation-us-states-responses-covid-19)
784 [ns/variation-us-states-responses-covid-19](https://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/publications/variation-us-states-responses-covid-19), 2021.
- 785 [15] Angela M Kunzler, Nikolaus Röthke, Lukas Günthner, Jutta Stoffers-
786 Winterling, Oliver Tüscher, Michaela Coenen, Eva Rehfues, Guido
787 Schwarzer, Harald Binder, Christine Schmucker, et al. Mental burden and its
788 risk and protective factors during the early phase of the sars-cov-2 pandemic:
789 systematic review and meta-analyses. *Globalization and health*, 17(1):1–29,
790 2021.
- 791 [16] Joseph Lee Rodgers and W Alan Nicewander. Thirteen ways to look at the
792 correlation coefficient. *The American Statistician*, 42(1):59–66, 1988.

- 793 [17] Mark Abadi. Even the US government can't agree on how to divide up the
794 states into regions. <https://www.businessinsider.com/regions-of-united-states-2018-5>. Accessed: 2022-08-24.
795
- 796 [18] Emma E McGinty, Rachel Presskreischer, Hahrie Han, and Colleen L Barry.
797 Psychological distress and loneliness reported by us adults in 2018 and april
798 2020. *Jama*, 324(1):93–94, 2020.
- 799 [19] Stefano Monti, Pablo Tamayo, Jill Mesirov, and Todd Golub. Consensus
800 clustering: a resampling-based method for class discovery and visualization
801 of gene expression microarray data. *Machine learning*, 52(1):91–118, 2003.
- 802 [20] National Geographic. United States Regions. <https://education.nationalgeographic.org/resource/united-states-regions>. Accessed:
803 2022-07-27.
804
- 805 [21] Nirmita Panchal, Rabah Kamal, Kendal Orgera, Cynthia Cox, Rachel
806 Garfield, Liz Hamel, and Priya Chidambaram. The implications of covid-19
807 for mental health and substance use. *Kaiser family foundation*, 21, 2020.
- 808 [22] Elise Paul, Andrew Steptoe, and Daisy Fancourt. Attitudes towards vaccines
809 and intention to vaccinate against covid-19: Implications for public health
810 communications. *The Lancet Regional Health-Europe*, 1:100012, 2021.
- 811 [23] Francisco Perez-Arce, Marco Angrisani, Daniel Bennett, Jill Darling, Arie
812 Kapteyn, and Kyla Thomas. Covid-19 vaccines and mental distress. *PLoS*
813 *One*, 16(9):e0256406, 2021.
- 814 [24] Joshua A Salomon, Alex Reinhart, Alyssa Bilinski, Eu Jing Chua, Wichada
815 La Motte-Kerr, Minttu M Rönn, Marissa B Reitsma, Katherine A Morris,
816 Sarah LaRocca, Tamer H Farag, et al. The us covid-19 trends and impact
817 survey: Continuous real-time measurement of covid-19 symptoms, risks,
818 protective behaviors, testing, and vaccination. *Proceedings of the National*
819 *Academy of Sciences*, 118(51):e2111454118, 2021. Accessed: 2021-06-15.
- 820 [25] Vincent A. Traag, Ludo Waltman, and Nees Jan Van Eck. From louvain to
821 leiden: guaranteeing well-connected communities. *Scientific reports*, 9(1):1–
822 12, 2019.
- 823 [26] Megh M Trivedi and Anirudha Das. Did the timing of state mandated
824 lockdown affect the spread of covid-19 infection? a county-level ecological
825 study in the united states. *Journal of Preventive Medicine and Public Health*,
826 54(4):238, 2021.
- 827 [27] U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Civilian unemployment rate. <https://www.bls.gov/charts/employment-situation/civilian-unemployment-rate.htm>. Accessed: 2022-09-12.
828
829
- 830 [28] Vincent A. Traag. leidenalg. <https://github.com/vtraag>, 2020. Accessed:
831 2022-08-23.
- 832 [29] Yunhe Wang, Le Shi, Jianyu Que, Qingdong Lu, Lin Liu, Zhengang Lu,
833 Yingying Xu, Jiajia Liu, Yankun Sun, Shiqiu Meng, et al. The impact

- 834 of quarantine on mental health status among general population in china
835 during the covid-19 pandemic. *Molecular psychiatry*, 26(9):4813–4822, 2021.
- 836 [30] Wikipedia. Political party strength in U.S. states. [https://en.wikiped](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political_party_strength_in_U.S._states)
837 [ia.org/wiki/Political_party_strength_in_U.S._states](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political_party_strength_in_U.S._states). Accessed:
838 2022-09-07.
- 839 [31] World Health Organization (WHO). COVID-19 pandemic triggers 25 per-
840 cent increase in prevalence of anxiety and depression worldwide. [https://](https://www.who.int/news/item/02-03-2022-covid-19-pandemic-triggers-25-increase-in-prevalence-of-anxiety-and-depression-worldwide)
841 [www.who.int/news/item/02-03-2022-covid-19-pandemic-triggers-2](https://www.who.int/news/item/02-03-2022-covid-19-pandemic-triggers-25-increase-in-prevalence-of-anxiety-and-depression-worldwide)
842 [5-increase-in-prevalence-of-anxiety-and-depression-worldwide](https://www.who.int/news/item/02-03-2022-covid-19-pandemic-triggers-25-increase-in-prevalence-of-anxiety-and-depression-worldwide).
843 Accessed: 2022-07-27.
- 844 [32] World Health Organization (WHO). The impact of COVID-19 on mental
845 health cannot be made light of. [https://www.who.int/news-room/feat](https://www.who.int/news-room/feature-stories/detail/)
846 [ure-stories/detail/](https://www.who.int/news-room/feature-stories/detail/). Accessed: 2022-07-27.
- 847 [33] World Health Organization (WHO). WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dash-
848 board. <https://covid19.who.int/>. Accessed: 2022-07-27.

849 **A Political: Cases, deaths, and hospitalization**
850 **data**

851 The daily COVID-19 related cases, deaths, and hospitalizations were grouped
852 based on each state's political siding showing waves in the spread of COVID-19.





Figure 10: Daily COVID-19 (a) cases, (b) reported deaths, and (c) hospitalization cases between state political preference.

853


B Political: Mental health data

854


The survey results on the mental health indicators based on political preference.



(a)



(b)



(c)

Figure 11: Percentage of individuals (a) feeling anxious, (b) feeling depressed, and (c) worried about finances between state political preference.