

Psychosocial factors and hospitalisations for COVID-19: Prospective cohort study of the general population

G. David Batty^a (Email: david.batty@ucl.ac.uk; ORCID: 0000-0003-1822-5753)

Professor of Epidemiology

Ian J. Deary^b (ian.deary@ed.ac.uk; 0000-0002-1733-263X)

Professor of Differential Psychology

Michelle Luciano^c (michelle.luciano@ed.ac.uk; 0000-0003-0935-7682)

Reader in Psychology

Drew M. Altschul^c (drew.altschul@ed.ac.uk; 0000-0001-7053-4209)

Postdoctoral Researcher in Psychology

Mika Kivimäki^a (m.kivimaki@ucl.ac.uk; 0000-0002-4699-5627)

Professor of Social Epidemiology

Catharine R. Gale^{b,d} (crg@mrc.soton.ac.uk; 0000-0002-3361-8638)

Emeritus Professor of Cognitive Epidemiology

^aDepartment of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College London, UK

^bLothian Birth Cohorts, Department of Psychology, University of Edinburgh, UK

^cDepartment of Psychology, The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

^dMRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton, UK

Manuscript statistics: 3586 words (including 228 abstract), 61 references, 3 tables, 2 figures, 5 supplemental tables

Correspondence: David Batty, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College London, 1-19 Torrington Place, London, UK, WC1E 6BT. E. david.batty@ucl.ac.uk

Funding: GDB is supported by the UK Medical Research Council (MR/P023444/1) and the US National Institute on Aging (1R56AG052519-01; 1R01AG052519-01A1); IJD by the UK Medical Research Council (MR/R024065/1), UK Economic and Social Research Council (ES/S015604/1), and US National Institute on Aging (NIH), US (1R01AG054628-01A1); DMA by the UK Medical Research Council (MRC_MC_PC_17209); and MK by the UK Medical Research Council (MR/R024227), US National Institute on Aging (NIH), US (R01AG056477), NordForsk, and Academy of Finland (311492). There was no direct financial or material support for the work reported in the manuscript.

Acknowledgement: We thank UK Biobank study members for their generosity in participating.

Access to data: Data from UK Biobank (<http://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/>) are available to *bona fide* researchers upon application. Part of this research has been conducted using the UK Biobank Resource under Application 10279.

Competing of interest: Ian Deary was responsible for the design of some of the cognitive function tests in the revised battery used in the imaging sessions in UK Biobank; he is also a study participant. There are no other potential competing interests to report.

Transparency: GDB affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained.

Contributions: The authors collectively generated the idea for the present paper and formulated an analytical plan; ML built the dataset; CRG carried out the data analyses; DMA prepared the figures; and GDB wrote the first draft of manuscript. All authors commented on an earlier version of the manuscript. GDB, CRG, ML and IJD will act as guarantors for this work. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted. CRG and ML had full access to UK Biobank data. GDB takes responsibility for the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Role of the funding source: The funders of the studies had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or report preparation.

Dissemination to participants and related patient and public communities: Findings will be disseminated via the media departments of the authors' institutes. Results from UK Biobank are routinely disseminated to study participants via the study website and Twitter feed.

Ethical approval: In UK Biobank, ethical approval for data collection was received from the North-West Multi-centre Research Ethics Committee and the research was carried out in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki of the World Medical Association.

Open access statement: University College London will cover open access charges (subject to confirmation).

Exclusive licence: The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, a worldwide licence (<http://www.bmj.com/sites/default/files/BMJ%20Author%20Licence%20March%202013.doc>) to the Publishers and its licensees in perpetuity, in all forms, formats and media (whether known now or created in the future), to i) publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store the Contribution, ii) translate the Contribution into other languages, create adaptations, reprints, include within collections and create summaries, extracts and/or, abstracts of the Contribution and convert or allow conversion into any format including without limitation audio, iii) create any other derivative work(s) based in whole or part on the Contribution, iv) to exploit all subsidiary rights to exploit all subsidiary rights that currently exist or as may exist in the future in the Contribution, v) the inclusion of electronic links from the Contribution to third party material where-ever it may be located; and, vi) licence any third party to do any or all of the above. All research articles will be made available on an open access basis (with authors being asked to pay an open access fee—see <http://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-authors/forms-policies-and-checklists/copyright-open-access-and-permission-reuse>). The terms of such open access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence—details as to which Creative Commons licence will apply to the research article are set out in our worldwide licence referred to above.

Abstract

Objective: To examine the association of a range of psychosocial factors with hospitalisation for COVID-19.

Design: Prospective cohort study.

Setting: England.

Participants: UK Biobank comprises around half a million people who were aged 40 to 69 years at study induction between 2006 and 2010 when information on psychosocial factors and covariates were captured.

Main outcome measure: Hospitalisation for COVID-19 in England between 16th March and 26th April 2020 as provided by Public Health England.

Results: There were 908 hospitalisations for COVID-19 in an analytical sample of 431,051 people. In age- and sex-adjusted analyses, an elevated risk of COVID-19 was related to disadvantaged levels of education (odds ratio; 95% confidence interval: 2.05; 1.70, 2.47), income (2.00; 1.63, 2.47), area deprivation (2.20; 1.86, 2.59), occupation (1.39; 1.14, 1.69), psychological distress (1.58; 1.32, 1.89), mental health (1.50; 1.25, 1.79), neuroticism (1.19; 1.00, 1.42), and performance on two tests of cognitive function – verbal and numerical reasoning (2.66; 2.06, 3.34) and reaction speed (1.27; 1.08, 1.51). These associations were graded (p-value for trend ≤ 0.038) such that effects were apparent across the full psychosocial continua. After mutual adjustment for these characteristics plus ethnicity, comorbidity, and lifestyle factors, only the relationship between lower cognitive function as measured using the reasoning test and a doubling in the risk of the infection remained (1.98; 1.38, 2.85).

Conclusion: A range of psychosocial factors revealed associations with hospitalisations for COVID-19 of which the relation with cognitive function was most robust to statistical adjustment.

Key words: risk factors, COVID-19, hospitalisation, cohort study, UK Biobank

Box

What is already known on this subject

- Given the recent discovery of COVID-19, its risk factors are not well understood.
- The little evidence that is available has been gleaned from prognostic studies of disease progression and death.
- We are not aware of any studies examining the role of psychosocial factors in the prevention of serious cases of the infection.

What this study adds

- A higher risk of hospitalisation for COVID-19 was evident at disadvantaged levels of education, income, area deprivation, occupation, mental health, neuroticism, and cognitive function.
- After taking into account multiple confounding factors, the strongest association was apparent for cognitive function, a potential marker of health literacy.

Introduction

With outbreaks by then reported across 114 countries, the novel coronavirus referred to as severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) was declared pandemic by the World Health Organization on 11th March 2020.¹ By 11th May, in the absence of widespread testing in most countries, there was been global notification of 4 million confirmed cases of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) – the disease caused by SARS-CoV-2 – with it being implicated in more than 270,000 deaths.² Equivalent data releases for the UK indicated 223,060 cases and 32,065 fatalities.³

Prior pandemics – Spanish influenza in 1918 and Swine influenza in 2009 – were notable for marked inequalities in their occurrence, whereby more socioeconomically disadvantaged countries,^{4,5} cities,⁶ neighbourhoods,^{7,8} and individuals⁹ experienced the highest mortality rates from the infection. Recent findings from analyses of data for COVID-19 hospitalisations across the five boroughs of New York City¹⁰ and deaths involving the infection in the UK¹¹ reveal higher rates in more deprived areas. The mechanisms that underlie these differences are likely to be numerous and might involve overcrowded living and working conditions, comorbidity, poor access to healthcare, and a relative lack of understanding of prevention advice among socially disadvantaged individuals.¹² Indirect pathways might include the higher prevalence of unfavourable health behaviours – cigarette smoking, alcohol intake, and suboptimal nutrition – in lower social groups which in themselves have been linked to selected lower respiratory tract infections.¹³

Whereas they are correlated with socioeconomic status,^{14,15} mental health and cognitive function might have independent utility in understanding the burden of respiratory disease. Poor mental health has been hypothesised to be a potential consequence of COVID-19 based on the findings of studies of survivors of the severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) pandemic,^{16,17} but it may also influence the risk of contracting the infection, at least in part by impairing innate or adaptive immunity¹⁸ and diminishing the

precautions taken to minimise risk. In a cross-sectional study, mental health problems were correlated with a higher likelihood of reporting the common cold,¹⁹ a coronavirus species. In cohort studies generated using linked electronic registries, people with a history of depression,²⁰ psychosis,²¹ and stress disorders²² serious enough to warrant treatment in a psychiatric care facility subsequently experienced elevated rates of an array of respiratory infections. Additionally, in the general population, even moderate levels of self-reported symptoms of psychological distress (depression and anxiety) have been prospectively linked to an elevated risk of death from pneumonia despite adjustment for confounding factors which include socioeconomic position.²³

In the COVID-19 pandemic, the public has been offered much preventative advice and guidelines which span the simple and practical to the complex, contradictory and false.²⁴⁻²⁶ In order to diminish their risk of the infection, the population has to acquire, synthesise, and deploy this information – described by some commentators as an ‘infodemic’ – but the ability to do so seems to vary by levels of health literacy²⁷ just as it may for its close correlate, cognitive function. Although traditionally studied in the context of non-communicable disease,²⁸⁻³⁰ higher levels of cognitive ability – a psychological trait that involves the storage, selection, manipulation, and organisation of information – appear to be related to markedly lower rates of mortality from infectious disease after taking into account social circumstances.^{31,32}

With this evidence base giving us reason to anticipate a relation of these socioeconomic and psychological characteristics with incident COVID-19 infection, we explored them using data from UK Biobank, a large prospective cohort study. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first examination of the role of individual-level psychosocial characteristics in the primary prevention of COVID-19.

Methods

We used data from both UK Biobank, a prospective cohort study, the sampling and procedures of which

have been well described.³³ In brief, baseline data collection took place between 2006 and 2010 in twenty-two research assessment centres across the UK, resulting in a sample of 502,655 people aged 40 to 69 years (response rate 5.5%).³³ In UK Biobank, ethical approval was received from the North-West Multi-centre Research Ethics Committee, and the research was carried out in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki of the World Medical Association, and participants gave informed consent. No additional ethical approval was required for present analyses of anonymised data.

Assessment of socioeconomic factors

We used four indicators of socioeconomic status. Total annual household income before tax was self-reported and classified into three groups (<18,000, -30,999, -51,999, ≥£52,000 GBP). For educational qualifications, we used a three category variable (degree, other qualifications, no qualifications). Using Standard Occupational Classifications of current job, or most recent if participants were not working or data on current job were missing, we produced three categories with managerial positions having the highest prestige: managers & senior officials, professional, associate professional & technical; administrative & secretarial, & skilled; and personal service, sales & customer service, process, plant & machine operatives, elementary. Lastly, we used the Townsend deprivation index as our indicator of neighbourhood socioeconomic circumstances. Based on a composite of four characteristics (home and car ownership, employment, and number of household resident), participants' postcodes at recruitment were matched to areas from the most recent national census. A continuously scored variable, higher values denote greater deprivation.

Assessment of psychological factors

We used five psychological factors. Study members were asked if they had ever been under the care of a psychiatrist for any mental health problem; in the UK, such a referral would ordinarily have been triaged via a general practitioner. Symptoms of psychological distress – anxiety, worrying, anhedonia, and

depression – were measured using the four item version of the Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-4)⁶ in which individual items are rated on a 4 point Likert scale from 0 (“not at all”) to 3 (“nearly every day”) such that total scores range from 0 to 12 (higher scores denote greater distress). Scores on the PHQ-4 show good agreement with longer scales, and reveal known correlations with demographic risk factors for depression and anxiety.⁷ Neuroticism was measured with the 12-item Eysenck Personality Questionnaire-Revised Short Form;⁸ higher scores denote higher levels.

Scores from two tests of cognitive functioning were used. Verbal and numerical reasoning was measured using a computerized 13-item multiple-choice test with a two-minute time limit. The score was the number of correct answers. This test was introduced after the beginning of the baseline assessment period so data are available for a subset of study members (N=180,914). Reaction time was measured using a computerized Go/No-Go “Snap” game. Participants were presented with electronic images of two cards. If symbols on the cards were identical, participants were instructed to immediately push the button-box using their dominant hand. The first five pairs were used as a practice with the remaining seven pairs, containing four identical cards, forming the assessment. Reaction time score was the mean time (milliseconds) to press the button when each of these four pairs was presented. Choice reaction time correlates strongly with single mental tests that involve complex reasoning and knowledge.³⁴

Assessment of confounding factors

Ethnicity was self-reported and categorised as White, Asian, Black, Chinese, Mixed, or other ethnic group. A social isolation scale was derived from enquiries concerning number of people in household, visiting friends/family, and social activities.³⁵ One point was allocated for living alone, one for friends/family visits less than once/month, and one for no weekly participation in social activities. A dichotomous variable was derived with social isolation denoted by a score of 3. Self-reported physician diagnosis was collected for vascular or heart problems, diabetes, chronic lung disease, asthma, and cancer.

Cigarette smoking, physical activity, and alcohol consumption were measured using standard enquiries. Height and weight were measured directly during a medical examination from which body mass index was calculated using the usual formula (weight, kg/height,² m²). Forced expiratory volume in one second, a measure of pulmonary function, was quantified using spirometry with the best of three technically satisfactory exhalations used in our analyses. Handgrip strength was measured using a hydraulic hand dynamometer (Jamar J00105) with the participant maximally squeezing the handle of the dynamometer while seated for 3 seconds; an average of the readings from the right and left hand was used. Seated systolic and diastolic blood pressure measurements were made twice using the Omron HEM-7015IT digital blood pressure monitor (Omron Healthcare)²⁰ or, exceptionally, a manual sphygmomanometer; an average of the two readings was used herein. We defined hypertension according to existing guidelines as systolic/diastolic blood pressure $\geq 140/90$ mmHg and/or self-reported use of antihypertensive medication.³⁶ Non-fasting venous blood, available in a sub-sample, was drawn with assaying conducted at dedicated central laboratory for C-reactive protein, glycated haemoglobin A1c, and high-density lipoprotein cholesterol.³⁷

Ascertainment of hospitalisation for COVID-19

Provided by Public Health England, data on COVID-19 status downloaded on 1st May 2020 covered the period 16th March 2020 until 26th April 2020.³⁸ Nose and/or throat swabs were taken from hospitalised patients and detection of SARS-CoV-2 can be regarded as an indication of severe disease.³⁸ With coverage being for England only, study members from Scotland and Wales were omitted from our analytical sample.

In preliminary analyses, we used three different COVID-19 case definitions based on these data: all apparent cases of the disease (N=908); cases based on samples from in-patients only (N=751); and cases based on two or more samples from in-patients (N=445) – the notion being that these patients were

amongst the most severe cases. Evidence from prognostic studies of hospitalised patients in the USA³⁹ and China⁴⁰ suggest that men, older individuals, ethnic minorities, and those with existing disease experience greater rates of progression to intensive care and death. Preliminary analyses of the present data on incidence of severe disease revealed similar associations irrespective of case definition (supplemental table 1). On the basis of the similarity of this predictive validity, we proceeded with our main analyses in which we used all COVID-19 cases (N=908).

Statistical analyses

We omitted from our analyses men and women who had died before 5th March 2020 – the latest date to which vital status data were available – as they could not contribute to the risk set for COVID-19. Odds ratios and accompanying 95% confidence intervals were computed using logistic regression models to summarise the relationship between psychosocial factors and COVID-19 hospitalisations. In the main analyses, we initially adjusted odds ratios for age and sex, followed by ethnicity, then covariates organised into comorbidities (vascular disease, diabetes etc.), lifestyle factors (cigarette smoking etc.), and, depending on the psychosocial exposures of interest, socioeconomic or psychological factors. In preliminary analyses, the addition of biomarkers to the final model had no appreciable impact on the effects estimates relative to the final model in which they did not feature (supplemental tables 4 and 5 versus tables 2 and 3); these covariates were therefore not included in the main analyses. Analyses were conducted using Stata version 13.

Patient involvement

These analyses are based on existing data of a typically healthy population. We were not involved in their recruitment; thus, to our knowledge, no patients were explicitly engaged in designing the present research question or the outcome measures, nor were they involved in developing plans for recruitment, design, or implementation of the study. No patients were asked to advise on interpretation or writing up of results.

Results from UK Biobank are routinely disseminated to study participants via the study website and social media outlets.

Results

In 431,051 study members (236,725 women) there were 908 hospitalisations for COVID-19 between 16 March 2020 and 26th April in England (402 in women). Of the 28 baseline characteristics featured in table 1, only four – extant cancer, grip strength, neuroticism, and social isolation – did not reveal relationships with COVID-19 at conventional levels of statistical significance in unadjusted analyses. These were therefore excluded as covariates from subsequent multiple regression analyses.

In table 2 and figure 1 we depict the association between various socio-economic characteristics and the risk of hospitalisation for COVID-19 infection. After adjustment for age and sex, those study members who were most disadvantaged educationally, financially, and geographically experienced around a doubling in the risk of infection. Effects in these analyses were apparent across the full socioeconomic continuum (p for trend <0.0001). Whereas controlling for ethnicity had little impact on these gradients, partial attenuation was apparent after taking into account comorbidities and lifestyle factors.

However, adjusting for psychological characteristics had the largest attenuating effect relative to the minimally-adjusted (age, sex, and ethnicity) odds ratios. Although the risk of hospitalisation remained somewhat elevated at both lower levels of education and income, statistical significance at conventional levels was lost. Given the known correlation between education and cognitive ability (herein, $r=-0.40$, p -value <0.0001), in sensitivity analyses we removed verbal and numerical reasoning test scores from the model containing the 5 psychological factors. This resulted in the magnitude of the low education–COVID-19 relationship being restored (odds ratio; 95% confidence interval for no qualifications: 2.08; 1.69, 2.56) and suggested most of the marked attention seen for this relationship after taking into account

psychological factors could be ascribed to individual differences in cognitive ability rather than education. The association between area deprivation and risk of infection was more robust to these various statistical adjustments.

Of the socioeconomic variables, occupational classification of the study members revealed the weakest association with hospitalisation for COVID-19 and, in all analyses, study members in the administrative/secretarial occupations in fact experienced some protection against the infection. Lastly, after including up to seventeen covariates in the most complex multivariable models, there was evidence of some weak residual associations for income and deprivation but not for education.

In table 2 and figure 2 we illustrate the associations between psychological traits and the risk of COVID-19. In minimally-adjusted (age, sex, and ethnicity) analyses, all five psychological factors were related to the risk of hospitalisation with the infection. Effects for neuroticism and reaction time – weak initially – were essentially eliminated after control for comorbidities and any subsequent group of covariates. Adjustment for comorbidities also had a partial impact on the relation of distress, psychiatric consultation, and verbal and numerical reasoning with the infection, but associations largely remained, most obviously for reasoning score. After multiple control for all covariates, however, the only relationship that remained with COVID-19 was that for verbal and numerical reasoning such that the most disadvantaged group experienced around a doubling of hospitalisation risk.

We also carried out some planned sensitivity analyses. With the verbal and numerical reasoning test having been introduced part way through baseline data collection, as indicated, analyses featuring this variable were based on a subgroup of study members. To ensure direct comparison across statistical models, for each exposure we therefore recomputed our analyses based on a non-missing dataset

(supplemental table 2 for socioeconomic characteristics, and supplemental table 3 for psychological characteristics). The same patterns of association was apparent in these sensitivity analyses.

Discussion

Principal findings

Our main findings were that disadvantaged levels of a series of psychosocial characteristics – education, income, area deprivation, mental health, and cognitive function – were related to an elevated risk of hospitalisations with COVID-19 in most of the analyses conducted. Net of mutual control for these factors, and after taking into account several other potential confounders, however, only the association of lower cognitive function based on a test of verbal and numerical reasoning with a higher risk of this infection remained. That we were able to replicate findings for apparently known risk factors for COVID-19 from prognostic studies – being male, having an ethnic minority background, carrying a comorbidity – provides some support for the more novel findings for these psychosocial factors.

Our finding that the intermediate occupational group experienced a lower risk of hospitalisation was unexpected. A *post hoc* explanation is that this apparent ‘J’-shaped relation could in part be driven by the higher prestige category containing some medical professionals and, at the opposite end of the continuum, the personal services group being partially composed of carers, both of whom would be more likely to be exposed to the virus. Cardiovascular disease death is an exemplar of socioeconomic inequalities in disease risk,⁴¹ and analyses of this endpoint in relation to these occupational groups revealed a graded effect such that a doubling of risk was apparent in the most disadvantage group (age- and sex-adjusted hazard ratio; 95% confidence interval: 1.90; 1.61, 2.25) with intermediate rates evident in the administrative class (1.32; 1.11, 1.58). As such, these occupational classifications have some predictive validity, so lending some support to the apparently surprising result for COVID-19.

Comparison with results from other studies

We are unaware of any published studies exploring the impact of individual-level psychosocial factors on the occurrence of risk of COVID-19. Prognostic studies using area-based statistics have recently been published, however. In New York City, Manhattan, the most socioeconomically advantaged borough based on routinely collected education and poverty statistics, had the lowest rates of hospitalisations for COVID-19 relative to the four remaining areas.¹⁰ While, by contrast, the Bronx, the least favourable socioeconomically, had the highest level of hospitalisations, rates were graded across the boroughs for education but not poverty. In a recent report from the Office for National statistics in the UK, rates of death in which COVID-19 was implicated were directly related to neighbourhood deprivation in a step-wise manner.¹¹ Outside the eras of pandemics, other respiratory diseases such as tuberculosis,^{42,43} pneumonia,⁴⁴ influenza,⁴⁵ and, importantly, the common cold⁴⁶ – also appear to be similarly socioeconomically patterned, although these are not universal observations.^{47,48} We are unaware of any studies exploring the relation of indicators of cognitive function and mental health with COVID-19, though up to a doubling in rates of death from respiratory disease has been reported in people with lower cognition test scores,^{31,32} individuals with a serious mental illness,²¹ and those with higher levels of psychological distress.²³

Mechanisms of effect

Specific and non-specific mechanisms may link these psychosocial variables to the risk of COVID-19. A plausible explanation for the association between cognition and respiratory infection is that people with higher ability, and indeed the educationally advantaged,¹² may be more likely to take-up influenza and pneumococcal inoculation; however, in absence of any effective vaccination for COVID-19 this is implausible. In our analyses we took into account unfavourable health behaviours which are more common in lower cognition scoring groups⁴⁹⁻⁵³ and have also been implicated in the occurrence of pneumonia,⁵⁴ but the effect for cognition remained. It may be that the deluge of health advice in the

current pandemic during a period when news outlets and social media platforms have never been more ubiquitous, has highlighted that lower cognition and therefore poor health literacy in the population is a public health concern.^{55,56} In a small-scale cross-sectional study, people with low health literacy also reported being less concerned about the current pandemic and to believe they were at lower risk.²⁷

Mental health problems may influence the risk of acquiring a respiratory infection by negatively impacting cognitive function,⁵⁷ potentially compromising the ability to effectively take precautions to minimise the risk, adequately recognise a deterioration in health, actively seek medical attention, and communicate effectively with health care professionals. An unhealthy lifestyle and sub-optimal circumstances including poor housing and lower income are also more common in people with mental health problems^{14,58} but we were careful to covary on these factors in our analyses. It could also be the case that people experiencing higher levels of psychological distress have diminished learned resistance to infection owing to fewer social interactions, although a pre-pandemic measure of social isolation in our analyses did not confer the expected protection against the infection.

More speculative explanations for some of the effects found herein are that our outcome, hospitalisation for COVID-19 infection, represents not only the occurrence of the infection itself but also a sub-optimal viral-response. People with a higher burden of psychological distress – which includes worry about physical health – might be more concerned about becoming seriously unwell and therefore have a lower symptom severity threshold for visiting hospital. Similarly, individuals with lower cognition may have less confidence in their own decision-making, self-care, and UK government messages to remain at home when unwell, instead resorting to hospital-based advice.

Study strengths and limitations

The strengths of our study include it being well characterised for exposures and covariates despite its

scale, allowing us to attempt to identify independent effects. That the study is prospective means assessment of these baseline data preceded that of disease onset; as such, reverse causality is not a concern such that the infection could not, for instance, influence mental health and job loss leading to downward social mobility. Our work has its weaknesses. Samples were taken from hospitalised patients but it is unclear if all cases had been exclusively hospitalised because of COVID-19-type symptoms, or, as seem likely given mass testing within hospitals, some patients were found to be positive for the infection while an inpatient for other reasons. Our outcome also represents an unfavourable response to a viral challenge as opposed to disease incidence across the full population; the latter could only be ascertained with comprehensive testing of our study sample or indeed the population of England as a whole. We excluded study members who had died prior to 5th March 2020 because they could not contribute to the risk set, however, ascertainment of hospitalisations for COVID-19 did not reliably begin until 16th March. It is unlikely, however, that the absence of vital status data for this 11 day period would have substantially biased our effect estimates in this large dataset.

The UK Biobank study sample is recruited from only 5.5% of the target population agreeing to participate.³³ As has been demonstrated,^{59,60} the data material is therefore inappropriate for estimation of risk factor or disease prevalence and incidence of COVID-19 infection, and any data simulations of its dissemination. These observations do not, however, seem to influence reproducibility of the association of established risk factors for non-communicable disease such as vascular disease and selected cancers, and other health endpoints such as suicide.⁶⁰ We think the same reasoning can be applied to associations with communicable diseases.

Conclusions

In conclusion, in aetiological-orientated analyses of data from this prospective cohort study, a range of psychosocial factors showed associations with subsequent hospitalisations for COVID-19, among which

cognitive function – a potential marker of health literacy – was most robustly related. These findings have important implications for public health messaging, but replication is required before policy recommendations can be advanced.

References

1. WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 11 March 2020. <https://web.archive.org/web/20200502133342/https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020> (access 12 May 2020).
2. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) Situation Report – 112. Data as received by WHO from national authorities by 10:00 CEST, 11 May 2020 (accessed 12 May 2020). https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200511-covid-19-sitrep-112pdf?sfvrsn=813f2669_2.
3. Number of coronavirus (COVID-19) cases and risk in the UK. <https://web.archive.org/web/20200512082155/https://www.gov.uk/guidance/coronavirus-covid-19-information-for-the-public> (accessed 12 May 2020).
4. Wiemken TL, Carrico RM, Furmanek SP, et al. Socioeconomic Position and the Incidence, Severity, and Clinical Outcomes of Hospitalized Patients With Community-Acquired Pneumonia. *Public health reports (Washington, DC : 1974)* 2020; **135**(3): 364-71.
5. Simonsen L, Spreeuwenberg P, Lustig R, et al. Global mortality estimates for the 2009 Influenza Pandemic from the GLaMOR project: a modeling study. *PLoS medicine* 2013; **10**(11): e1001558.
6. Rutter PD, Mytton OT, Mak M, Donaldson LJ. Socio-economic disparities in mortality due to pandemic influenza in England. *International journal of public health* 2012; **57**(4): 745-50.
7. Grantz KH, Rane MS, Salje H, Glass GE, Schachterle SE, Cummings DA. Disparities in influenza mortality and transmission related to sociodemographic factors within Chicago in the pandemic of 1918. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 2016; **113**(48): 13839-44.
8. Mamelund SE. A socially neutral disease? Individual social class, household wealth and mortality from Spanish influenza in two socially contrasting parishes in Kristiania 1918-19. *Social science & medicine (1982)* 2006; **62**(4): 923-40.
9. Bengtsson T, Dribe M, Eriksson B. Social Class and Excess Mortality in Sweden During the 1918 Influenza Pandemic. *Am J Epidemiol* 2018; **187**(12): 2568-76.
10. Wadhera RK, Wadhera P, Gaba P, et al. Variation in COVID-19 Hospitalizations and Deaths Across New York City Boroughs. *Jama* 2020.
11. Deaths involving COVID-19 by local area and socioeconomic deprivation: deaths occurring between 1 March and 17 April 2020. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deaths/bulletins/deaths-involvingcovid19bylocalareasanddeprivation/deathsoccurringbetween1marchand17april> (access 12 May 2020).
12. La EM, Trantham L, Kurosky SK, Odom D, Aris E, Hoge C. An analysis of factors associated with influenza, pneumococcal, Tdap, and herpes zoster vaccine uptake in the US adult population and corresponding inter-state variability. *Human vaccines & immunotherapeutics* 2018; **14**(2): 430-41.
13. Yap AG, Baladi N, Allman G, Avenmarg J, Yap S, Shaw RE. Coronary artery bypass surgery on small patients. *J Invasive Cardiol* 2000; **12**(5): 242-6.
14. Russ TC, Stamatakis E, Hamer M, Starr JM, Kivimaki M, Batty GD. Association between psychological distress and mortality: individual participant pooled analysis of 10 prospective cohort studies. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2012; **345**: e4933.
15. Neisser U, Boodoo G, Bouchard Jnr T, et al. Intelligence: knowns and unknowns. *Am Psychol* 1996; **51**: 77-101.
16. Lam MH, Wing YK, Yu MW, et al. Mental morbidities and chronic fatigue in severe acute respiratory syndrome survivors: long-term follow-up. *Archives of internal medicine* 2009; **169**(22): 2142-7.
17. Lee AM, Wong JG, McAlonan GM, et al. Stress and psychological distress among SARS survivors 1 year after the outbreak. *Canadian journal of psychiatry Revue canadienne de psychiatrie* 2007; **52**(4): 233-40.

18. Cohen S, Tyrrell DA, Smith AP. Psychological stress and susceptibility to the common cold. *The New England journal of medicine* 1991; **325**(9): 606-12.
19. Adam Y, Meinschmidt G, Lieb R. Associations between mental disorders and the common cold in adults: a population-based cross-sectional study. *Journal of psychosomatic research* 2013; **74**(1): 69-73.
20. Andersson NW, Goodwin RD, Okkels N, et al. Depression and the risk of severe infections: prospective analyses on a nationwide representative sample. *International journal of epidemiology* 2016; **45**(1): 131-9.
21. Seminog OO, Goldacre MJ. Risk of pneumonia and pneumococcal disease in people with severe mental illness: English record linkage studies. *Thorax* 2013; **68**(2): 171-6.
22. Jiang T, Farkas DK, Ahern TP, Lash TL, Sorensen HT, Gradus JL. Posttraumatic Stress Disorder and Incident Infections: A Nationwide Cohort Study. *Epidemiology (Cambridge, Mass)* 2019; **30**(6): 911-7.
23. Hamer M, Kivimaki M, Stamatakis E, Batty GD. Psychological distress and infectious disease mortality in the general population. *Brain, behavior, and immunity* 2019; **76**: 280-3.
24. Zarocostas J. How to fight an infodemic. *Lancet (London, England)* 2020; **395**(10225): 676.
25. Orso D, Federici N, Copetti R, Vetrugno L, Bove T. Infodemic and the spread of fake news in the COVID-19-era. *European journal of emergency medicine : official journal of the European Society for Emergency Medicine* 2020.
26. Cuan-Baltazar JY, Munoz-Perez MJ, Robledo-Vega C, Perez-Zepeda MF, Soto-Vega E. Misinformation of COVID-19 on the Internet: Infodemiology Study. *JMIR public health and surveillance* 2020; **6**(2): e18444.
27. Wolf MS, Serper M, Opsasnick L, et al. Awareness, Attitudes, and Actions Related to COVID-19 Among Adults With Chronic Conditions at the Onset of the U.S. Outbreak: A Cross-sectional Survey. *Annals of internal medicine* 2020.
28. Deary I, Weiss A, Batty G. Intelligence and personality as predictors of illness and death: How researchers in differential psychology and chronic disease epidemiology are collaborating to understand and address health inequalities. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest* 2011; **11**: 53-79.
29. Batty GD, Deary IJ, Benzeval M, Der G. Does IQ predict cardiovascular disease mortality as strongly as established risk factors? Comparison of effect estimates using the West of Scotland Twenty-07 cohort study. *Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil* 2010; **17**(1): 24-7.
30. Batty GD, Shipley MJ, Mortensen LH, Gale CR, Deary IJ. IQ in late adolescence/early adulthood, risk factors in middle-age and later coronary heart disease mortality in men: the Vietnam Experience Study. *Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil* 2008; **15**(3): 359-61.
31. Gale CR, Deary IJ, Batty GD. Cognitive ability and risk of death from lower respiratory tract infection: findings from UK Biobank. *Scientific reports* 2019; **9**(1): 1342.
32. Calvin CM, Batty GD, Der G, et al. Childhood intelligence in relation to major causes of death in 68 year follow-up: prospective population study. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2017; **357**: j2708.
33. Sudlow C, Gallacher J, Allen N, et al. UK biobank: an open access resource for identifying the causes of a wide range of complex diseases of middle and old age. *PLoS medicine* 2015; **12**(3): e1001779.
34. Deary IJ, Der G, Ford G. Reaction times and intelligence differences: a population-based cohort study. *Intelligence* 2001; **29**: 389-99.
35. Elovainio M, Hakulinen C, Pulkki-Raback L, et al. Contribution of risk factors to excess mortality in isolated and lonely individuals: an analysis of data from the UK Biobank cohort study. *Lancet Public Health* 2017; **2**(6): e260-e6.
36. Chobanian AV, Bakris GL, Black HR, et al. The Seventh Report of the Joint National Committee on Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Pressure: the JNC 7 report. *Jama* 2003; **289**(19): 2560-72.

37. Elliott P, Peakman TC. The UK Biobank sample handling and storage protocol for the collection, processing and archiving of human blood and urine. *International journal of epidemiology* 2008; **37**(2): 234-44.
38. Records of COVID-19 test results in UK Biobank. <http://biobank.ndph.ox.ac.uk/showcase/field.cgi?id=40100> (access 12 May 2020).
39. Richardson S, Hirsch JS, Narasimhan M, et al. Presenting Characteristics, Comorbidities, and Outcomes Among 5700 Patients Hospitalized With COVID-19 in the New York City Area. *Jama* 2020.
40. Wu C, Chen X, Cai Y, et al. Risk Factors Associated With Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome and Death in Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA internal medicine* 2020.
41. Batty GD, Shipley MJ, Dundas R, et al. Does IQ explain socio-economic differentials in total and cardiovascular disease mortality? Comparison with the explanatory power of traditional cardiovascular disease risk factors in the Vietnam Experience Study. *Eur Heart J* 2009; **30**(15): 1903-9.
42. Spence DP, Hotchkiss J, Williams CS, Davies PD. Tuberculosis and poverty. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 1993; **307**(6907): 759-61.
43. Cantwell MF, McKenna MT, McCray E, Onorato IM. Tuberculosis and race/ethnicity in the United States: impact of socioeconomic status. *American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine* 1998; **157**(4 Pt 1): 1016-20.
44. Burton DC, Flannery B, Bennett NM, et al. Socioeconomic and racial/ethnic disparities in the incidence of bacteremic pneumonia among US adults. *American journal of public health* 2010; **100**(10): 1904-11.
45. Tam K, Yousey-Hindes K, Hadler JL. Influenza-related hospitalization of adults associated with low census tract socioeconomic status and female sex in New Haven County, Connecticut, 2007-2011. *Influenza and other respiratory viruses* 2014; **8**(3): 274-81.
46. Stone AA, Krueger AB, Steptoe A, Harter JK. The socioeconomic gradient in daily colds and influenza, headaches, and pain. *Archives of internal medicine* 2010; **170**(6): 570-2.
47. Vrbova L, Mamdani M, Moineddin R, Jaakimainen L, Upshur RE. Does socioeconomic status affect mortality subsequent to hospital admission for community acquired pneumonia among older persons? *Journal of negative results in biomedicine* 2005; **4**: 4.
48. Charland KM, Brownstein JS, Verma A, Brien S, Buckeridge DL. Socio-economic disparities in the burden of seasonal influenza: the effect of social and material deprivation on rates of influenza infection. *PloS one* 2011; **6**(2): e17207.
49. Batty GD, Deary IJ, MacIntyre S. Childhood IQ and life course socioeconomic position in relation to alcohol induced hangovers in adulthood: the Aberdeen children of the 1950s study. *Journal of epidemiology and community health* 2006; **60**(10): 872-4.
50. Batty GD, Deary IJ, MacIntyre S. Childhood IQ in relation to risk factors for premature mortality in middle-aged persons: the Aberdeen Children of the 1950s study. *Journal of epidemiology and community health* 2007; **61**(3): 241-7.
51. Batty GD, Deary IJ, Schoon I, Emslie C, Hunt K, Gale CR. Childhood mental ability and adult alcohol intake and alcohol problems: the 1970 British cohort study. *American journal of public health* 2008; **98**(12): 2237-43.
52. Batty GD, Deary IJ, Schoon I, Gale CR. Mental ability across childhood in relation to risk factors for premature mortality in adult life: the 1970 British Cohort Study. *Journal of epidemiology and community health* 2007; **61**(11): 997-1003.
53. Batty GD, Deary IJ, Schoon I, Gale CR. Childhood mental ability in relation to food intake and physical activity in adulthood: the 1970 British Cohort Study. *Pediatrics* 2007; **119**(1): e38-e45.
54. Baik I, Curhan GC, Rimm EB, Bendich A, Willett WC, Fawzi WW. A prospective study of age and lifestyle factors in relation to community-acquired pneumonia in US men and women. *Archives of internal medicine* 2000; **160**(20): 3082-8.

55. Reeve CL, Basalik D. Is health literacy an example of construct proliferation? A conceptual and empirical evaluation of its redundancy with general cognitive ability. *Intelligence* 2014; **44**: 93-102.
56. Mottus R, Johnson W, Murray C, Wolf MS, Starr JM, Deary IJ. Towards understanding the links between health literacy and physical health. *Health psychology : official journal of the Division of Health Psychology, American Psychological Association* 2014; **33**(2): 164-73.
57. Pedrelli P, McQuaid JR, Granholm E, et al. Measuring cognitive insight in middle-aged and older patients with psychotic disorders. *Schizophrenia research* 2004; **71**(2-3): 297-305.
58. Phillips AC, Batty GD, Gale CR, et al. Generalized anxiety disorder, major depressive disorder, and their comorbidity as predictors of all-cause and cardiovascular mortality: the Vietnam experience study. *Psychosomatic medicine* 2009; **71**(4): 395-403.
59. Fry A, Littlejohns TJ, Sudlow C, et al. Comparison of Sociodemographic and Health-Related Characteristics of UK Biobank Participants With Those of the General Population. *Am J Epidemiol* 2017; **186**(9): 1026-34.
60. Batty GD, Gale CR, Kivimäki M, Deary IJ, Bell S. Comparison of risk factor associations in UK Biobank against representative, general population based studies with conventional response rates: prospective cohort study and individual participant meta-analysis. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2020; **368**.

Table 1. Psychosocial factors and covariates at baseline according to hospitalisations for COVID-19

	COVID-19 hospitalisation at follow-up		P value	Unadjusted OR (95% CI) ^a
	Yes (n=908)	No (n=430,143)		
<i>Demographic factors</i>				
Age (yrs), mean (SD)	57.27 (8.99)	56.36 (8.10)	0.0007	1.12 (1.05, 1.20)
Female, no. (%)	402 (44.27)	236,323 (54.94)	<0.0001	0.65 (0.57, 0.74)
Non-white ethnicity	128 (14.22)	25,170 (5.89)	<0.0001	2.65 (2.20, 3.20)
Socially isolated, no (%)	90 (9.91)	38,353 (8.92)	0.293	1.12 (0.90, 1.40)
<i>Comorbidities</i>				
Vascular or heart disease, no. (%)	383 (42.7)	124,306 (29.03)	<0.0001	1.82 (1.60, 2.08)
Hypertension, no (%)	566 (64.61)	238,111 (56.35)	<0.0001	1.44 (1.22, 1.69)
Diabetes, no. (%)	90 (10.03)	21,316 (4.98)	<0.0001	2.13 (1.71, 2.64)
Chronic bronchitis or emphysema, no. (%)	28 (3.08)	6,311 (1.47)	<0.0001	2.14 (1.47, 3.11)
Asthma, no. (%)	126 (13.88)	49,600 (11.53)	0.027	1.24 (1.02, 1.49)
Cancer, no. (%)	75 (8.42)	31,051 (7.26)	0.183	1.17 (0.93, 1.49)
<i>Lifestyle factors</i>				
Current smoker, no (%)	102 (11.37)	42,636 (9.97)	<0.0001	1.35 (1.09, 1.68)
No physical activity, no (%)	117 (13.31)	26,096 (6.16)	<0.0001	2.34 (1.93, 2.84)
Drinks alcohol daily/almost daily, no (%)	148 (16.41)	87,754 (20.46)	0.003	0.76 (0.64, 0.91)
Body mass index, mean (SD)	29.2 (5.45)	27.4 (4.77)	<0.0001	1.37 (1.30, 1.44)
<i>Biomarkers</i>				
Lung function, mean (SD)	2.69 (0.82)	2.82 (0.80)	<0.0001	0.84 (0.78, 0.90)
Hand grip strength, mean (SD)	32.5 (11.0)	32.5 (11.3)	0.970	1.00 (0.94, 1.07)
C-reactive protein, median (IQR)	1.63 (0.84-3.04)	1.24 (0.63-2.44)	0.0001	1.29 (1.20, 1.39)
High-density lipoprotein, median (IQR)	1.33 (1.11-1.56)	1.43 (1.20-1.71)	0.0009	0.69 (0.63, 0.76)
HbA1C, median (IQR)	35.6 (33.3-38.2)	35.0 (32.6-37.4)	0.0001	1.29 (1.20, 1.40)
<i>Psychological factors</i>				
Psychological distress score ≥3, no (%)	224 (28.64)	90,981 (23.69)	0.001	1.29 (1.11, 1.51)
Psychiatric consultation, no (%)	140 (15.71)	48,599 (11.38)	<0.0001	1.45 (1.21, 1.74)
Neuroticism, mean (SD)	4.37 (3.39)	4.27 (3.28)	0.371	1.03 (0.96, 1.10)
Reasoning, mean (SD)	5.24 (2.08)	6.03 (2.16)	<0.0001	1.47 (1.32, 1.63)
Reaction time, mean (SD)	574.91 (134.88)	558.83 (117.73)	<0.0001	1.13 (1.06, 1.20)
<i>Socioeconomic factors</i>				
No university education	647 (73.86)	283,693 (67.36)	<0.0001	1.37 (1.18, 1.59)
Annual household income<£18,000	241 (33.1)	80,966 (22.27)	<0.0001	1.73 (1.48, 2.01)
Neighbourhood deprivation score	-0.08 (3.53)	-1.32 (3.06)	<0.0001	1.43 (1.35, 1.51)
Personal service, sales occupations etc	149 (26.28)	58,766 (19.07)	<0.0001	1.51 (1.25, 1.82)

^aOdds ratios are expressed per category, or per SD, increase for continuous variables except for reasoning which is expressed per SD decrease. The maximum analytical sample of 431051 people was lower in selected analyses owing to missing data.

Table 2. Odds ratios (95% CI) for the relation of socioeconomic factors with COVID-19 hospitalisation

	Case no./Risk no. ¹	Adjustments					
		Age & sex	Age, sex & ethnicity	Age, sex, ethnicity & comorbidity ²	Age, sex, ethnicity & lifestyle factors ³	Age, sex, ethnicity & psychological factors ⁴	All covariates
Educational attainment		N=422057	N=420502	N=415945	N=415367	N=155244	N=152739
University degree	229/137717	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
Other qualifications	406/214337	1.16 (0.98, 1.36)	1.19 (1.01, 1.41)	1.16 (0.98, 1.37)	1.03 (0.87, 1.22)	1.06 (0.81, 1.39)	0.94 (0.71, 1.24)
No qualifications	241/70003	2.05 (1.70, 2.47)	2.07 (1.71, 2.50)	1.85 (1.53, 2.25)	1.47 (1.20, 1.80)	1.35 (0.93, 1.95)	1.01 (0.68, 1.49)
P for trend		<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	0.151	0.945
Annual household income		N=364219	N=363175	N=359853	N=359491	N=137808	N=135773
<£18,000	241/81207	2.00 (1.63, 2.47)	1.89 (1.51, 2.35)	1.74 (1.39, 2.17)	1.39 (1.10, 1.75)	1.34 (0.91, 1.97)	1.15 (0.77, 1.73)
£18,000-£30,999	179/92461	1.31 (1.05, 1.63)	1.27 (1.01, 1.60)	1.22 (0.97, 1.54)	1.05 (0.83, 1.32)	1.29 (0.90, 1.85)	1.15 (0.79, 1.68)
£31,000-£51,999	167/95454	1.18 (0.94, 1.48)	1.17 (0.94, 1.47)	1.16 (0.92, 1.45)	1.07 (0.85, 1.34)	1.03 (0.72, 1.49)	1.02 (0.70, 1.48)
≥£52,000	141/95097	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
P for trend		<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	0.006	0.077	0.401
Neighbourhood deprivation		N=430538	N=427986	N=419593	N=418942	N=156360	N=153384
1 (low)	205/143483	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
2	267/143548	1.32 (1.10, 1.58)	1.29 (1.07, 1.55)	1.25 (1.04, 1.50)	1.20 (1.00, 1.45)	1.32 (0.97, 1.79)	1.22 (0.89, 1.65)
3	436/143517	2.20 (1.86, 2.59)	1.97 (1.66, 2.34)	1.79 (1.51, 2.13)	1.57 (1.31, 1.88)	1.52 (1.12, 2.05)	1.20 (0.87, 1.63)
P for trend		<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	0.007	0.297
Occupational classification		N=308689	N=307262	N=302239	N=302495	N=130238	N=128079
Managers, senior officials, etc	324/175637	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
Administrative, secretarial, etc	94/74137	0.70 (0.55, 0.88)	0.69 (0.55, 0.87)	0.68 (0.54, 0.86)	0.63 (0.50, 0.80)	0.65 (0.46, 0.92)	0.59 (0.42, 0.84)
Personal service, sales, etc	149/58915	1.39 (1.14, 1.69)	1.30 (1.07, 1.59)	1.22 (1.00, 1.49)	1.06 (0.86, 1.30)	0.90 (0.65, 1.26)	0.75 (0.53, 1.06)
P for trend		0.024	0.091	0.314	0.780	0.242	0.027

¹ Numbers based on unadjusted model. ² Comorbidity includes diagnoses of vascular or heart disease, diabetes, chronic bronchitis or emphysema, asthma, and hypertension defined according to measured blood pressure and/or use of anti-hypertensive medication. ³ Lifestyle factors includes body mass index, smoking status, alcohol intake frequency & number of types of physical activity taken in last four weeks. ⁴ Psychological factors include psychological distress, psychiatric consultation, neuroticism, verbal and numerical reasoning, & reaction time.


Table 3. Odds ratios (95% CI) for the relation of psychological factors with COVID-19 hospitalisation

	Case no./ Risk no. ¹	Adjustments					
		Age & sex	Age, sex & ethnicity	Age, sex, ethnicity & comorbidity ²	Age, sex, ethnicity & lifestyle factors ³	Age, sex, ethnicity & socioeconomic factors ⁴	All covariates
Psychological distress		N=384909	N=383655	N=377290	N=376562	N=248162	N=245119
1 (low)	267/153504	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
2	291/140200	1.28 (1.08, 1.51)	1.29 (1.09, 1.53)	1.22 (1.03, 1.45)	1.16 (0.98, 1.38)	1.16 (0.93, 1.45)	1.07 (0.86, 1.35)
3	224/91205	1.58 (1.32, 1.89)	1.51 (1.26, 1.81)	1.37 (1.14, 1.65)	1.18 (0.98, 1.43)	1.26 (0.98, 1.61)	1.09 (0.84, 1.41)
P for trend		<0.0001	<0.0001	0.001	0.068	0.064	0.487
Per SD increase		1.22 (1.14, 1.29)	1.19 (1.12, 1.26)	1.15 (1.08, 1.23)	1.09 (1.02, 1.17)	1.12 (1.02, 1.22)	1.07 (0.97, 1.17)
Psychiatric consultation		N=427819	N=426823	N=418218	N=417481	N=269373	N=265566
No	751/379080	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
Yes	140/487739	1.50 (1.25, 1.79)	1.51 (1.26, 1.81)	1.45 (1.21, 1.75)	1.32 (1.09, 1.59)	1.23 (0.94, 1.62)	1.15 (0.87, 1.52)
Neuroticism		N=425707	N=424212	N=416378	N=415622	N=265538	N=264784
1 (low)	224/106910	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
2	345/174705	1.01 (0.85, 1.19)	1.03 (0.87, 1.22)	0.99 (0.83, 1.17)	0.99 (0.83, 1.18)	1.03 (0.82, 1.30)	1.01 (0.80, 1.27)
3	319/144092	1.19 (1.00, 1.42)	1.21 (1.02, 1.44)	1.10 (0.92, 1.31)	1.08 (0.90, 1.29)	1.06 (0.84, 1.35)	1.00 (0.78, 1.28)
P for trend		0.038	0.023	0.277	0.382	0.621	0.985
Per SD increase		1.08 (1.01, 1.15)	1.08 (1.01, 1.16)	1.05 (0.98, 1.12)	1.03 (0.96, 1.10)	1.00 (0.92, 1.10)	0.99 (0.90, 1.09)
Verbal numerical reasoning		N=175267	N=174581	N=172530	N=415777	N=126721	N=124890
1 (low)	152/43988	2.66 (2.06, 3.34)	2.31 (1.77, 3.02)	2.17 (1.65, 2.86)	1.92 (1.45, 2.53)	2.14 (1.50, 3.05)	1.98 (1.38, 2.85)
2	115/58446	1.52 (1.16, 1.99)	1.45 (1.10, 1.90)	1.46 (1.10, 1.92)	1.36 (1.03, 1.80)	1.57 (1.14, 2.17)	1.58 (1.14, 2.18)
3	96/72833	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
P for trend		<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001
Per SD decrease		1.47 (1.32, 1.64)	1.37 (1.23, 1.53)	1.33 (1.19, 1.49)	1.27 (1.13, 1.42)	1.35 (1.17, 1.57)	1.31 (1.13, 1.52)
Reaction time		N=426147	N=424432	N=416366	N=415777	N=268826	N=265002
1 (low)	262/140934	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
2	274/141575	1.04 (0.87, 1.23)	1.00 (0.84, 1.19)	0.97 (0.82, 1.16)	0.95 (0.79, 1.13)	1.02 (0.82, 1.27)	1.02 (0.81, 1.27)
3	345/143368	1.27 (1.08, 1.51)	1.16 (0.98, 1.37)	1.11 (0.93, 1.32)	1.04 (0.88, 1.24)	1.06 (0.84, 1.34)	1.02 (0.80, 1.29)
P for trend		0.004	0.078	0.205	0.572	0.608	0.876
Per SD increase		1.12 (1.06, 1.19)	1.07(1.01, 1.14)	1.06 (0.99, 1.13)	1.03 (0.97, 1.10)	1.08 (0.98, 1.18)	1.07 (0.97, 1.17)

¹Numbers based on age & sex adjusted model. ²Comorbidity includes diagnoses of vascular or heart disease, diabetes, chronic bronchitis or emphysema, asthma, and hypertension defined according to measured blood pressure and/or use of anti-hypertensive drugs. ³Lifestyle factors included body mass index, smoking status, alcohol intake frequency & number of types of physical activity taken in last four weeks.


⁴Socioeconomic factors included occupational classification, educational attainment, Townsend deprivation index, & household income before tax

Figure 1. Odds ratios (95% CI) for the relation of socioeconomic factors with COVID-19 hospitalisation



Adjustments are as per table 2.

Figure 2. Odds ratios (95% CI) for the relation of psychological factors with COVID-19 hospitalisation



Adjustments are as per table 2.

Supplemental Table 1. Analyses of apparent known risk factors (based on clinical studies) for COVID-19 hospitalisation in UK Biobank (N=431,052)

	All COVID-19 cases (N=908)	COVID-19 cases known to have been hospitalised (‘origin’=1) (N=751)	COVID-19 cases known to have been hospitalised (‘origin’=1) *and* with >=2 tests conducted (N=445)
<i>Age</i>			
40-49	Ref (1.0)	Ref (1.0)	Ref (1.0)
50-59	0.69 (0.57, 0.83)	0.77 (0.63, 0.95)	0.81 (0.62, 1.05)
60+	1.09 (0.93, 1.27)	1.16 (0.97, 1.38)	1.17 (0.83, 1.48)
Per decade increase	1.15 (1.06, 1.25)	1.18 (1.08, 1.29)	1.17 (1.04, 1.32)
<i>Sex</i>			
Female	Ref (1.0)	Ref (1.0)	Ref (1.0)
Male	1.53 (1.35, 1.75)	1.56 (1.35, 1.81)	1.55 (1.28, 1.87)
<i>Ethnicity</i>			
White	Ref (1.0)	Ref (1.0)	Ref (1.0)
Non-white	2.65 (2.20, 3.20)	2.45 (1.98, 3.03)	3.12 (2.42, 4.01)
<i>Long-standing illness</i>			
No	Ref (1.0)		
Yes	2.06 (1.80, 2.35)	2.03 (1.75, 2.04)	2.26 (1.87, 2.73)

Supplemental Table 2. Odds ratios (95% CI) for the relation of socioeconomic factors with COVID-19 hospitalisation – based on complete data

	Case no./ Risk no. ¹	Adjustments					
		Age & sex	Age, sex & ethnicity	Age, sex, ethnicity & comorbidity ¹	Age, sex, ethnicity & lifestyle factors ²	Age, sex, ethnicity & psychological factors ³	Adjusted for all covariates
Educational attainment							
University Degree	90/55905	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
Other qualifications	144/77597	1.17 (0.89, 1.52)	1.19 (0.91, 1.55)	1.15 (0.88, 1.49)	1.03 (0.79, 1.34)	1.06 (0.81, 1.39)	0.94 (0.71, 1.24)
No qualifications	54/19237	1.70 (1.20, 2.41)	1.75 (1.23, 2.48)	1.60 (1.12, 2.27)	1.28 (0.89, 1.84)	1.30 (0.89, 1.90)	1.01 (0.68, 1.49)
P for trend		0.005	0.003	0.015	0.245	0.214	0.945
Annual household income							
<£18,000	68/26578	1.90 (1.31, 2.77)	1.79 (1.23, 2.60)	1.63 (1.12, 2.38)	1.41 (0.96, 2.08)	1.41 (0.95, 2.09)	1.15 (0.77, 1.73)
£18,000-£30,999	71/34301	1.52 (1.06, 2.20)	1.47 (1.02, 2.11)	1.41 (0.98, 2.03)	1.28 (0.89, 1.85)	1.28 (0.88, 1.86)	1.15 (0.79, 1.68)
£31,000-£51,999	60/36526	1.19 (0.82, 1.72)	1.16 (0.80, 1.68)	1.14 (0.79, 1.65)	1.07 (0.74, 1.56)	1.09 (0.75, 1.57)	1.02 (0.70, 1.48)
≥£52,000	54/38368	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
P for trend		<0.0001	0.001	0.006	0.053	0.060	0.401
Townsend Deprivation Index							
1 (low)	69/48529	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
2	102/53718	1.34 (0.99, 1.82)	1.31 (0.97, 1.78)	1.29 (0.95, 1.75)	1.24 (0.91, 1.68)	1.28 (0.94, 1.74)	1.22 (0.89, 1.65)
3	121/51407	1.70 (1.26, 2.29)	1.55 (1.14, 2.09)	1.46 (1.08, 1.97)	1.28 (0.94, 1.75)	1.41 (1.04, 1.92)	1.20 (0.87, 1.63)
P for trend		<0.0001	0.005	0.016	0.130	0.030	0.297
Occupational classification							
Managers, senior officials, etc	154/76773	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
Administrative, secretarial, etc	42/29676	0.71 (0.51, 1.01)	0.71 (0.51, 1.01)	0.70 (0.50, 0.99)	0.65 (0.46, 0.91)	0.64 (0.45, 0.90)	0.59 (0.42, 0.84)
Personal service, sales, etc	48/21630	1.12 (0.81, 1.55)	1.08 (0.78, 1.50)	1.04 (0.75, 1.45)	0.90 (0.65, 1.25)	0.86 (0.61, 1.21)	0.75 (0.53, 1.06)
P for trend		0.993	0.887	0.713	0.219	0.145	0.027

¹Comorbidity includes diagnoses of vascular or heart disease, diabetes, chronic bronchitis or emphysema, asthma, and hypertension defined according to measured blood pressure and/or use of anti-hypertensive medication. ² Lifestyle factors includes body mass index, smoking status, alcohol intake frequency & number of types of physical activity taken in last four weeks. ³ Psychological factors include psychological distress, psychiatric consultation, neuroticism, verbal and numerical reasoning, & reaction time.

Supplemental Table 3. Odds ratios (95% CI) for the relation of psychological factors with COVID-19 hospitalisation – based on complete data

	Case no./ Risk no. ¹	Adjustments					
		Age & sex	Age, sex & ethnicity	Age, sex, ethnicity & comorbidity ¹	Age, sex, ethnicity & lifestyle factors ²	Age, sex, ethnicity & socioeconomic factors ³	Adjusted for all covariates
Psychological distress							
1 (low)	149/96723	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref.)	1.0 (ref.)	1.0 (ref)
2	161/93337	1.14 (0.91, 1.42)	1.15 (0.92, 1.44)	1.12 (0.89, 1.40)	1.09 (0.87, 1.36)	1.13 (0.91, 1.42)	1.07 (0.86, 1.34)
3	113/555059	1.36 (1.06, 1.75)	1.32 (1.03, 1.70)	1.25 (0.97, 1.61)	1.15 (0.89, 1.48)	1.22 (0.95, 1.57)	1.09 (0.84, 1.40)
P for trend		0.016	0.028	0.080	0.272	0.107	0.501
Per SD increase		1.18 (1.08, 1.29)	1.16 (1.06, 1.27)	1.13 (1.03, 1.24)	1.09 (1.00, 1.20)	1.12 (1.02, 1.22)	1.07 (0.97, 1.17)
Psychiatric consultation							
No	412/238768	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
Yes	58/26798	1.26 (0.96, 1.67)	1.29 (0.98, 1.70)	1.26 (0.95, 1.66)	1.19 (0.90, 1.57)	1.22 (0.92, 1.61)	1.15 (0.87, 1.52)
Neuroticism							
1 (low)	119/69458	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
2	191/109358	1.03 (0.82, 1.30)	1.05 (0.83, 1.32)	1.03 (0.81, 1.29)	1.02 (0.81, 1.28)	1.03 (0.82, 1.29)	1.01 (0.80, 1.27)
3	157/85968	1.09 (0.85, 1.39)	1.11 (0.87, 1.41)	1.06 (0.83, 1.36)	1.03 (0.81, 1.32)	1.06 (0.83, 1.35)	1.00 (0.79, 1.28)
P for trend		0.491	0.395	0.612	0.804	0.660	0.982
Per SD increase		1.03 (0.94, 1.13)	1.04 (0.94, 1.14)	1.02 0.93, 1.12)	1.00 (0.91, 1.10)	1.01 (0.92, 1.11)	0.99 (0.90 1.09)
Verbal numerical reasoning							
1 (low)	81/26374	2.52 (1.83, 3.47)	2.09 (1.50, 2.93)	2.03 (1.45, 2.84)	1.86 (1.33, 2.62)	2.06 (1.44, 2.96)	1.98 (1.38, 2.84)
2	86/41404	1.70 (1.24, 2.34)	1.61 (1.17, 2.21)	1.59 (1.16, 2.18)	1.53 (1.11, 2.11)	1.60 (1.16, 2.21)	1.58 (1.14, 2.18)
3	70/57112	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
P for trend		<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.001	<0.0001
Per SD decrease		1.46 (1.27, 1.66)	1.34 (1.17, 1.54)	1.32 (1.15, 1.52)	1.27 (1.10, 1.46)	1.33 (1.15, 1.55)	1.31 (1.12, 1.52)
Reaction time							
1 (low)	164/99395	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
2	155/88713	1.09 (0.87 1.36)	1.05 (0.84, 1.31)	1.04 (0.84, 1.31)	1.03 (0.82, 1.29)	1.03 (0.82, 1.29)	1.02 (0.81, 1.28)
3	148/76914	1.21 (0.96, 1.53)	1.10 (0.87, 1.39)	1.09 (0.86, 1.37)	1.05 (0.83, 1.33)	1.04 (0.82, 1.31)	1.02 (0.80, 1.29)
P for trend		0.104	0.424	0.496	0.659	0.759	0.869
Per SD increase		1.16 (1.06, 1.27)	1.10 (1.01, 1.21)	1.09 (1.00, 1.20)	1.08 (0.99, 1.19)	1.07 (0.98, 1.17)	1.06 (0.97, 1.17)

¹ Comorbidity includes diagnoses of vascular or heart disease, diabetes, chronic bronchitis or emphysema, asthma, and hypertension defined according to measured blood pressure and/or use of anti-hypertensive drugs. ² Lifestyle factors included body mass index, smoking status, alcohol intake frequency & number of types of physical activity taken in last four weeks. ³ Socioeconomic factors included occupational classification, highest educational attainment, Townsend deprivation index, & household income before tax

Supplementary Table 4. Odds ratios (95% CI) for the relation of socioeconomic factors with COVID-19 hospitalisation – *impact of adjusting for biomarkers*

		Adjustments		
	Case no./Risk no. ¹	Age, sex & ethnicity	Age, sex, ethnicity & biomarker ²	All covariates ³
Educational attainment		N=420502	N=301981	N=108462
Degree	229/137717	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
Other qualifications	406/214337	1.19 (1.01, 1.41)	1.15 (0.93, 1.41)	0.94 (0.66, 1.33)
No qualifications	241/70003	2.07 (1.71, 2.50)	1.82 (1.43, 2.31)	1.10 (0.68, 1.77)
P for trend		<0.0001	<0.0001	0.802
Annual household income		N=363175	N=261825	N=96562
<£18,000	241/81207	1.89 (1.51, 2.35)	1.47 (1.12, 1.93)	1.03 (0.62, 1.72)
£18,000-£30,999	179/92461	1.27 (1.01, 1.60)	1.09 (0.83, 1.44)	1.04 (0.65, 1.68)
£31,000-£51,999	167/95454	1.17 (0.94, 1.47)	1.10 (0.84, 1.49)	1.13 (0.72, 1.78)
≥£52,000	141/95097	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
P for trend		<0.0001	0.007	0.988
Neighbourhood deprivation		N=427986	N=301418	N=108898
1 (low)	205/143483	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
2	267/143548	1.29 (1.07, 1.55)	1.14 (0.91, 1.42)	1.10 (0.76, 1.58)
3	436/143517	1.97 (1.66, 2.34)	1.58 (1.28, 1.96)	0.97 (0.66, 1.42)
P for trend		<0.0001	<0.0001	0.840
Occupational classification		N=307262	N=221854	N=91388
Managers, senior officials, etc	324/175637	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
Administrative, secretarial, etc	94/74137	0.69 (0.55, 0.87)	0.65 (0.49, 0.87)	0.48 (0.30, 0.77)
Personal service, sales, etc	149/58915	1.30 (1.07, 1.59)	1.28 (1.01, 1.64)	0.75 (0.48, 1.15)
P for trend		0.091	0.223	0.054

¹ Numbers based on unadjusted model. ² Biomarkers included FEV1, and blood concentrations of c-reactive protein, HbA1c, and HDL cholesterol. ³ Multivariate model included age, sex, ethnicity, diagnoses of vascular or heart disease, diabetes, chronic bronchitis or emphysema, asthma, hypertension defined according to measured blood pressure and/or use of anti-hypertensive drug, body mass index, smoking status, alcohol intake frequency, number of types of physical activity taken in last four week, psychological distress, psychiatric consultation, reasoning, reaction time, FEV1, and blood concentrations of c-reactive protein, HbA1c and HDL cholesterol.

Supplementary Table 5. Odds ratios (95% CI) for the relation of psychological factors with COVID-19 hospitalisation – *impact of adjusting for biomarkers*

	Case no./Risk no. ¹	Adjustments		
		Age, sex & ethnicity	Age, sex, ethnicity & biomarkers ²	All covariates ³
Psychological distress		N=383655	N=273998	N=179391
1 (low)	267/153504	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
2	291/140200	1.29 (1.09, 1.53)	1.16 (0.94, 1.43)	1.04 (0.79, 1.36)
3	224/91205	1.51 (1.26, 1.81)	1.28 (1.01, 1.61)	0.98 (0.71, 1.34)
P for trend		<0.0001	0.033	0.931
Per SD increase		1.19 (1.12, 1.26)	1.12 (1.04, 1.22)	1.04 (0.93, 1.17)
Psychiatric consultation		N=426823	N=303561	N=194162
No	751/379080	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
Yes	140/487739	1.51 (1.26, 1.81)	1.44 (1.15, 1.82)	1.27 (0.91, 1.76)
Neuroticism		N=424212	N=302071	N=193565
1 (low)	224/106910	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
2	345/174705	1.03 (0.87, 1.22)	0.98 (0.79, 1.22)	1.03 (0.78, 1.37)
3	319/144092	1.21 (1.02, 1.44)	1.19 (0.96, 1.48)	1.06 (0.78, 1.42)
P for trend		0.023	0.088	0.725
Per SD increase		1.08 (1.01, 1.16)	1.08 (0.99, 1.17)	0.99 (0.88, 1.11)
Verbal numerical reasoning		N=174581	N=122752	N=89129
1 (low)	152/43988	2.31 (1.77, 3.02)	2.35 (1.68, 3.30)	2.08 (1.33, 3.28)
2	115/58446	1.45 (1.10, 1.90)	1.51 (1.07, 2.13)	1.67 (1.12, 2.49)
3	96/72833	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
P for trend		<0.0001	<0.0001	0.001
Per SD decrease		1.37 (1.23, 1.53)	1.37 (1.19, 1.58)	1.33 (1.10, 1.61)
Reaction time		N=424432	N=302492	N=193832
1 (low)	262/140934	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)	1.0 (ref)
2	274/141575	1.00 (0.84, 1.19)	1.01 (0.81, 1.25)	1.09 (0.83, 1.42)
3	345/143368	1.16 (0.98, 1.37)	1.07 (0.87, 1.33)	1.05 (0.79, 1.40)
P for trend		0.078	0.505	0.724
Per SD increase		1.07 (1.01, 1.14)	1.06 (0.98, 1.15)	1.08 (0.96, 1.21)

¹ Numbers based on age & sex adjusted model. ² Biomarkers included FEV1, and blood concentrations of c-reactive protein, HbA1c, and HDL cholesterol. ³ Multivariate model included age, sex, ethnicity, diagnoses of vascular or heart disease, diabetes, chronic bronchitis or emphysema, asthma, hypertension defined according to measured blood pressure and/or use of anti-hypertensive drug, body mass index, smoking status, alcohol intake frequency, number of types of physical activity taken in last four week, occupational classification, educational attainment, Townsend deprivation index, household income before tax, FEV1, and blood concentrations of c-reactive protein, HbA1c and HDL cholesterol.