

Appendix 1: Search Strategies

Search strategies can be found in the project folder on the Open Science Framework:

<https://osf.io/96csg/>

Supplementary Material 2: Inclusion and Exclusion Coding Guides for Main Changes Review Plus Additional Criteria for Present Report

Title and Abstract Review:

Exclude: not original human data or a case study or case series. If it is clear from the title and abstract that the article is not an original report of primary data, but, for example, a letter, editorial, systematic review or meta-analysis, or it is a single case study or case series, then it is excluded. Studies reporting only on animal, cellular, or genetic data are also excluded. Conference abstracts are included.

Exclude: not a study of any population affected by the COVID-19 outbreak. If it is clear from the title or abstract that the study is not about any population affected by the COVID-19 outbreak, it is excluded. Studies that include fewer than 100 participants, are excluded.

Exclude: not a study which reports mental health symptom changes over a demarcated period. If it is clear from the title or abstract that the study does not report proportions of participants meeting diagnostic criteria using a validated diagnostic interview or validated mental health scale, or proportions of symptoms (based on a threshold or measured continuously) prior to and after a delineated event related to COVID-19, then it will be excluded. Delineated events for pre-post comparisons may include pandemic announcements, social isolation regulations, etc. Pre- and post- samples must include the same cohort, not representative samples. Pre- and post- samples should have less than 10% missing data or should statistically account for missing data if N between samples varies by more than 10%.

Include: study eligible to be included in full-text review.

Full-text Review:

Exclude: not original human data or a case study or case series. If the article is not an original report of primary data, but, for example, a letter, editorial, systematic review or meta-analysis, or it is a single case study or case series, then it is excluded. Studies reporting only on animal, cellular, or genetic data are also excluded. Conference abstracts are included.

Exclude: not a study of any population affected by the COVID-19 outbreak. If the study is not about any population affected by the COVID-19 outbreak, it is excluded. Studies that include fewer than 100 participants, are excluded.

Exclude: not a study which reports mental health symptom changes over a demarcated period. If the study does not report proportions of participants meeting diagnostic criteria using a validated diagnostic interview or validated mental health scale, or proportions of symptoms (based on a threshold or measured continuously) prior to and after a delineated event related to COVID-19, then it will be excluded. Delineated events for pre-post comparisons may include pandemic announcements, social isolation regulations, etc. Delineated events for pre-post comparisons may include pandemic announcements, social isolation regulations, etc. Pre- and post- samples must include the same cohort, not representative samples. Pre- and post- samples should have less than 10% missing data or should statistically account for missing data if N between samples varies by more than 10%.

Include: study eligible for inclusion in systematic review.

Additional Criterion for Present Report: (1) Eligible pre-COVID-19 assessments had to be done between January 1, 2018 and December 31, 2019; (2) Only studies that compared pre-COVID-19 and COVID-19 assessments were included but not studies with longitudinal data only during COVID-19.

Supplementary Material 3: Adequacy of Study Methods and Reporting

Q1. Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population?

Yes: The sampling frame was a true or close representation of the target population.

No: The sampling frame was NOT a true or close representation of the target population.

Unclear: Not enough information provided to determine.

Q2. Were study participants recruited in an appropriate way?

Yes: A census was undertaken, OR, some form of random selection was used to select the sample (e.g. simple random sampling, stratified random sampling, cluster sampling, systematic sampling).

No: A census was NOT undertaken, AND some form of random selection was NOT used to select the sample.

Unclear: Not enough information provided to determine.

Q3. Was the sample size adequate?

Yes: There is evidence that the authors conducted a sample size calculation to determine an adequate sample size OR the study was large enough (e.g., a large national survey) whereby a sample size calculation is not required. In these cases, sample size can be considered adequate. If at least 200 participants are included for continuous outcomes and 250 for proportions, this is considered low risk.

No: The authors did not reach their intended sample size, or no sample size calculation is provided and there are < 100 participants for continuous outcomes, or < 125 for proportions.

Unclear: No sample size calculation is provided, and between 100-199 participants are included for continuous outcomes or between 125-249 for proportions.

Q4. Were the study participants and setting described in detail?

Yes: Data included age, sex, and at least 1 socioeconomic indicator (e.g., income, education, work status).

No: The minimum sociodemographic variables have not been reported.

Unclear: Not stated

Q5. Was the response rate adequate and was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage?

Yes: The overall response rate or response rate for intended subgroups was $\geq 75\%$, OR, an analysis was performed that established that there was not a substantive difference in relevant demographic characteristics between responders and non-responders within a subgroup (if non-response too high (e.g., $> 50\%$), code "No")

No: The overall response rate or response rate for subgroups was $< 75\%$, and if any analysis comparing responders and non-responders was done, it showed a meaningful difference in relevant demographic characteristics between responders and non-responders.

Unclear: Not enough information provided to determine.

Q6. Were valid methods used for the identification of the outcome variable?

Yes: The study instrument had been shown to have reliability and validity, e.g., test-retest, piloting, validation in a previous study, etc.

No: The study instrument had NOT been shown to have reliability or validity.

Unclear: Not stated.

Q7. Was the mental health outcome measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants?

Yes: All self-report data were collected directly from the participants. Any clinical interview data includes at least information about the interviewers' level of education or training received. The same mode of data collection was used for all participants. All aspects of this question must be present (where relevant).

No: In some instances, data were collected from a proxy (e.g., a spouse). The qualifications of clinical interviewers are not reported or not appropriate. The same mode of data collection was NOT used for all participants. If any aspects of this item are absent, it is high risk.

Unclear: Not stated.

Q8. Was there appropriate statistical analysis?

Yes: Continuous variables report (1) mean (SD) of change or (2) pre mean (SD) and post mean (SD) with/out correlation between pre and post scores. For dichotomous variables, numerator, denominator, and percentages are clearly reported. Continuous variables are not artificially dichotomized. The statistical analyses section is detailed enough for readers to understand change scores (see STROBE reporting guidelines, if necessary).

No: Continuous variables do not include a report of the (1) mean (SD) of change or (2) pre mean (SD) and post mean (SD) with/out correlation between pre and post scores. For dichotomous variables, the numerator, denominator, or percentages are not clearly reported. The statistical analyses section does not clearly describe the methods used to assess change scores.

Q9. Was the follow-up rate adequate, and if not, was the low follow-up rate managed appropriately?

Yes: At least 75% of those who participated in the pre-COVID-19 assessment(s) provided follow-up responses and had their responses included in the follow-up, OR, an analysis was performed that showed no substantive difference in relevant demographic characteristics between participants who stayed in the study and drop-outs (if dropout too high (e.g. > 50%), code "No").

No: Less than 75% of those participated in the pre-COVID-19 assessment(s) provided responses and had their responses included in the follow-up, and if any analysis comparing participants who stayed in the study and drop-outs was done, it showed a substantive difference in relevant demographic characteristics between the two groups.

Unclear: Not stated.