

This paper was first submitted for publication on the 3rd of June 2022. It has not been peer-reviewed yet.

COVID-19 illness, SARS-CoV2 infection, and subsequent suicidal ideation in the French nationwide population-based EpiCov cohort : a propensity score analysis of more than 50,000 individuals.

Authors

List

Camille Davaisse-Paturet¹, Massimiliano Orri², Stéphane Legleye^{1,3}, Aline-Marie Florence⁴, Jean-Baptiste Hazo⁵, Josiane Warszawski⁶, Bruno Falissard¹, Marie-Claude Geoffroy^{2,7}, Maria Melchior⁴, Alexandra Rouquette^{1,6} and the EPICOV study group

Affiliations

¹Paris-Saclay University, UVSQ, Inserm, Center for Epidemiology and Population Health, Paris, France

²McGill University, Department of Psychiatry, Montreal, Québec, Canada

³Ensaï, Bruz, France

⁴Sorbonne University, Inserm, Pierre Louis institute of Epidemiology and Public Health, Paris, France.

⁵French Ministry of Solidarity and Health, Drees, Paris, France

⁶APHP, Paris-Saclay University, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, Le Kremlin-Bicêtre, France

⁷McGill University, Department of Educational and Counselling Psychology, Québec, Canada

Word count

3411 words, 26 references

Abstract

Symptomatic COVID-19 appears to be associated with suicidal ideation but longitudinal evidence is still scarce. SARS-CoV2-induced neurological damages might underline this association, but findings are inconsistent. We therefore investigated the association between COVID-19 disease and subsequent suicidal ideation in the general population, using both self-reported symptoms and serology as well as inverse probability weighting to draw as near as possible to the direct association.

Using data from the nationwide French EpiCov cohort, COVID-19 disease was assessed through 1) COVID-19 illness (self-reported symptoms of sudden loss of taste/smell or fever alongside cough, shortness of breath or chest oppression, between February and November 2020), and 2) SARS-CoV2 infection (Spike protein ELISA test screening in dried-blood-spot samples). Suicidal ideation was self-reported between December 2020 and July 2021. Inverse probability weighting with propensity scores was used as an adjustment strategy, leading to balanced sociodemographic and health-related factors between the exposed and non-exposed groups of both COVID-19 disease measures. Then, modified Poisson regression models were used to investigate the association of COVID-19 illness and SARS-CoV2 infection with subsequent suicidal ideation.

Among 52,050 participants from the EpiCov cohort, 1.68% [1.54% - 1.82%] reported suicidal ideation in the first half of 2021, 9.57% [9.24% – 9.90%] had a SARS-CoV2 infection in 2020 and 13.23% [12.86% – 13.61%] reported COVID-19 symptoms in 2020. COVID-19 illness in 2020 was associated with higher risks of subsequent suicidal ideation in the first half of 2021 (Relative Risk_{ipw} [CI95%]= 1.43 [1.20 – 1.69]) while SARS-CoV2 infection in 2020 was not (RR_{ipw} = 0.88 [0.69 – 1.12]).

If COVID-19 illness was associated with subsequent suicidal ideation, the exact role of SARS-CoV2 infection with respect to suicide risk has yet to be clarified. Psychological support should be offered to persons recovering from symptomatic COVID-19 in order to minimize suicidal ideation risk. Moreover, if such psychological support is to be implemented, serology status alone does not seem a relevant criterion to define persons who suffered from COVID-19 to prioritize.

1 **Introduction**

2 Since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, mental health specialists have raised
3 concerns regarding the possibility of an increase in the risk of suicidal behaviors among
4 persons recovering from COVID-19.[1-3] Regarding potential biological pathways, the exact
5 role of SARS-CoV2 with regard to mechanisms involved in suicide risk has yet to be
6 demonstrated. Nonetheless, the virus's ability to invade the central nervous system through
7 fixation on angiotensin converting enzyme 2 receptors,[4] or to inflict brain damage through
8 hyperinflammation,[5] are potential candidates. From a public health point of view, suicide risk
9 related to COVID-19 disease was first supported by findings from cross-sectional studies and
10 case series,[6, 7] and limited evidence from longitudinal studies is now emerging. A systematic
11 review ascertaining the risk of suicidal and self-harm thoughts and behaviors among persons
12 recovering from SARS-CoV2 infection identified 11 relevant studies conducted between
13 January 2020 and July 2021 and representing eight separate samples.[8] Eight out of the 11
14 studies reported elevated risk of suicidal or self-harm thoughts after SARS-CoV2 infection.
15 Unfortunately, these studies were quite heterogenous in terms of suicide risk assessment,
16 study population, or design. Of note, one had a longitudinal cohort design.[9] In this study, self-
17 reported suspicion or diagnosis of COVID-19 was associated with an elevated risk of self-harm
18 thoughts or behaviors over 59 weeks since then end of March 2020. A recent longitudinal study
19 from Australia also reported an increased risk of suicidal ideation in the three months following
20 exposure to COVID-19, even when controlling for the pandemic's impact on employment and
21 financial distress.[10] Yet, as explained by the authors, the situation in Australia at the time of
22 assessment, between March and June 2020, was quite different from that in other parts of the
23 world, including Europe. In a paper gathering data from seven longitudinal cohorts from six
24 Northern-Europe countries, the number of days spent in bed due to SARS-CoV2 infection, was
25 cross-sectionally associated to mental health outcomes in a dose-effect way.[11] Participants
26 not bedridden by the infection were at lower risk of both depressive and anxiety symptoms
27 than those who were not infected, while those bedridden for seven days or more were at higher
28 risk. As depressive and anxiety symptoms are known trigger of suicidal behaviors,[12] taking
29 into account both the infection status and its associated symptoms might therefore be relevant
30 when studying suicide risk. Moreover, as both COVID-19 disease and suicidal behaviors are
31 related to individuals' sociodemographic and health characteristics,[12, 13] comprehensive
32 information regarding theses aspects is needed to address the association between COVID-
33 19 disease and suicidal behavior. To maximize such assessment and get one step closer to
34 causal inference, the use of propensity scores seems promising as it ensures a balance of all
35 selected covariates between exposure groups.[14] Our aim was therefore to study the long-
36 term association between COVID-19 illness, as assessed by self-reported symptoms of
37 COVID-19, SARS-CoV2 infection, as assessed by serology status, in 2020, and subsequent

38 suicidal ideation in 2021. We used data from a French nationwide cohort and accounted for a
39 wide range of sociodemographic and health-related factors through inverse probability
40 weighting.

41 **Methods**

42 ***Study population***

43 The Epidémiologie et conditions de vie sous le COVID-19 (EpiCov) study is a longitudinal,
44 nationwide, French cohort aiming to provide information on the virus' dissemination and the
45 pandemic's consequences on the daily life and health of individuals.[15] Eligibility criteria were
46 to be at least 15 years of age in 2020, to reside in Metropolitan France or three oversea
47 territories (Martinique, Guadeloupe and Réunion), and to not live in a medical retirement home
48 or a jail. 371,000 individuals were randomly selected from France's national tax database, with
49 an expected participation rate of about 50% and a sampling design overrepresenting less
50 densely populated and more socioeconomically disadvantaged areas.[16]

51 EpiCov participants were followed through three waves of data collection, using self-computer-
52 assisted-web interviews (CAWI) or computer-assisted-telephone interviews (CATI). From the
53 371,000 randomly selected individuals, 36.22% (134,391) participated in the first wave
54 (02/05/2020 – 02/06/2020, later referred to as baseline). Of these 134,391 individuals, 80.18%
55 (107,759) participated the second wave of data collection (26/10/2020 – 14/12/2020), and
56 63.30% (85,074) were still followed in the third wave of data collection (24/06/2021 –
57 09/08/2021). The EpiCov study timeline as well as data collected and used at each follow-up
58 wave are available in supplementary figure 1.

59 The EpiCov study received approval from an ethics committee (Comité de Protection des
60 Personnes Sud Méditerranée III 2020- A01191-38) and from France's National Data Protection
61 Agency (Commission Nationale Informatique et Libertés, CNIL, MLD/MFI/AR205138).

62 ***Outcome: suicidal ideation between December 2020 and July 2021***

63 Occurrence of suicidal ideation from December 2020 to July 2021 (yes vs no) was ascertained
64 during the third follow-up wave as follows: “since December 2020, have you thought about
65 committing suicide?” (yes vs no).

66 ***Exposures***

67 **COVID-19 infection: SARS-CoV2 serology**

68 The exact methodology for serology testing has been described elsewhere.[15] Briefly, among
69 85,350 individuals who participated in the second follow-up wave and who agreed to receive
70 a blood sampling kit, 66,826 dried-blood-spot samples were returned and 63,524 were
71 screened for antibodies against SARS-CoV2's spike protein S1 domain, with the use of a

72 commercial ELISA kit. Samples with an optical density ratio above 1.1 were considered as
73 positive for SARS-CoV2 testing, while a ratio between 0.7 and 1.1 was considered as
74 suspicious. As a decline in circulating antibodies might occur with time[17], both positive and
75 suspicious serologies were considered as markers of SARS-CoV2 infection in this study.
76 Positive serological status was unlikely to be due to vaccination as more than 90% of the dried-
77 blood-spot samples used in the present study were performed before January 2021 and the
78 start of the vaccination campaign in France.

79 **COVID-19 illness: self-reported symptoms between February 2020 and November 2020**

80 As a wide range of symptoms can be associated with a SARS-CoV2 infection, only symptoms
81 described as most suspicious in 2020 by the French Public Health Agency were ascertained.
82 Using data from the baseline and the second follow-up wave, the occurrence of COVID-19
83 symptoms (yes or no) between February and November 2020 was defined as a self-report of
84 any unusual episode of sudden loss of taste/smell or any unusual episode of fever alongside
85 a cough, shortness of breath, or chest oppression.

86 ***Covariates for propensity score model***

87 Covariate selection for propensity score modeling was based on current literature and
88 knowledge about factors involved in both COVID-19 and suicidal ideation risks. Of note,
89 particular attention was given to covariates related to suicidal ideation.[7] Directed acyclic
90 graphs (DAGs) were implemented to help conceptualize a framework for the assessment of
91 suicidal ideation related to COVID-19 and minimize bias through appropriate covariate
92 selection.[18, 19]

93 **Sociodemographic and health covariates**

94 The following sociodemographic covariates were ascertained at baseline and included in
95 propensity scores: gender (man, woman), age (years), participant's and participant's parents'
96 place of birth (both participant and parents born in mainland France, participant or parents born
97 in oversea territories, participant born in France of parents born abroad, participant born
98 abroad), highest educational attainment (none, lower secondary school certificate,
99 professional certificate, higher secondary school certificate, bachelor degree or equivalent,
100 Master degree or more), occupational grade (employed, student, unemployed, retired, other
101 including housemakers), perceived financial situation (comfortable, decent, short, difficult or
102 unbearable without taking loans), less than one room per person in participant's usual
103 accommodation (yes or no), residence not in usual housing during the first lockdown (yes or
104 no), access to a private exterior during the first lockdown (balcony or garden, including
105 common ones, yes or no), and usual living area according to the intensity of the first COVID-
106 19 wave in France (less affected areas, Grand-Est, Hauts-de-France, Ile-de-France).

107 The following health-related covariates were also ascertained: perceived general health status
108 at baseline (very good to good, quite good, poor to very poor), baseline body mass index (BMI,
109 less than 18.5 kg/m², between 18.5 and less than 25 kg/m², between 25 and less than 30
110 kg/m², 30kg/m² or more), pre pandemic somatic conditions (yes or no), pre pandemic mental
111 health disorder (yes or no), baseline tobacco use (current, past, never) and baseline alcohol
112 use (daily, often, occasional, rare, never). As pre pandemic mental health disorder is a key
113 factor when studying suicidal ideation, data from the second and third follow-up waves were
114 used to complete baseline information. This covariate hence includes self-reported anxiety,
115 depression and mental disability, or history of at least one suicide attempt before November
116 2019, or self-report of at least one physician diagnosis of anxiety, mood, bipolar, eating,
117 personality or substance use disorder or schizophrenia before the pandemic.

118 **Available indicators**

119 The following indicators, made available by The National Institute for Statistics and Economic
120 Studies (INSEE), were taken into account: deciles of household income per consumption unit
121 studied as a five-category covariate (less resourceful, medium-low, medium, medium-high,
122 wealthiest), household structure (single, couple without children, couple with children, single-
123 parent, participant living with parents, complex household), urban density of living area
124 (oversea territories, less than 2,000 urban units, between 2,000 and 1,999,999 urban units,
125 Paris area), residence in a deprived neighborhood (yes or no), and hospitalization rates in
126 place of residence during the first lockdown (lowest, medium-low, medium-high, highest
127 quartile). An urban unit is a built area with less than 200 meters between two buildings,
128 comprising at least 2,000 inhabitants. A deprived neighborhood is an administrative category
129 to identify an area where particular budgetary efforts are made by the State to tackle
130 inequalities regarding education, early life care, housing and living conditions, employment,
131 social cohesion, security, and crime prevention.

132 **Statistical analyses**

133 Suicidal ideation in the past 12 months, as well as life course suicide attempts were assessed
134 in the second follow-up wave (supplementary figure 1). The related questions were
135 respectively: “In the last 12 months, have you thought about committing suicide?” and “In your
136 lifetime, have you ever attempted suicide?”. To ensure COVID-19 illness or SARS-CoV2
137 infection actually happened before suicidal ideation, participants reporting suicidal ideation in
138 the last 12 months or a history of suicide attempt between November 2019 and 2020, or who
139 did not provide information on the timing of their last suicide attempt, were excluded from the
140 statistical analyses. The number of participants excluded at each step of selection are detailed
141 in Figure 1.

142 **Descriptive statistics**

143 Study weights were applied to all descriptive statistics in order to take EpiCov's design and
144 attrition bias into account. Briefly, the study weights accounted for demographic and
145 socioeconomic indicators potentially linked to response probability and made available by
146 INSEE from the tax data base. Study weights were also calibrated on margins of the general
147 population according to census data and population projections.[20]

148 **Inverse probability weighting and modified Poisson regression models**

149 First, propensity scores associated with a) reporting COVID-19 symptoms or b) having a
150 positive SARS-CoV2 serology were computed using logistic regression models based on the
151 covariates described above. Then, propensity scores were included in statistical models using
152 inverse probability weights (IPWs). Balance after IPWeighting was considered satisfactory if:
153 1) absolute standardized mean differences (SMDs) between each covariate, as well as each
154 category of each covariate were below 10%, 2) variance ratios of propensity scores computed
155 after weighting were between 0.5 and 2.[14, 21] Covariates distribution after weighting was
156 also assessed with chi-squared and student t-tests. Lastly, IPWeighted modified Poisson
157 regression models with robust error variance were used to assess the association between
158 COVID-19 infection and suicidal ideation. [22] If after IPWeighting residual distribution
159 differences remained for some covariates, regression models were further adjusted for these
160 incompletely balanced covariates. Models were therefore further adjusted for highest
161 educational attainment when assessing COVID-19 illness, and for highest educational
162 attainment, perceived financial situation, household income, and residence in deprived
163 neighborhood when assessing SARS-CoV2 infection.

164 **Sensitivity analyses**

165 To test the robustness of our results, we also estimated relative risks (RR) by weighting the
166 reference groups (no COVID-19 illness; no SARS-CoV2 infection) to match the covariates'
167 distribution in the exposed groups (respectively: COVID-19 illness; SARS-CoV2 infection).
168 This method, called average treatment effect on the treated (ATT), assesses what would have
169 happened to COVID-19 ill participants, or seropositive to SARS-CoV2 participants, if they had
170 not been ill or infected. The more consistent the estimated RRs in IPWeighted and
171 ATTWeighted analyses, the more robust the results.

172 Although we accounted for a wide range of covariates in propensity scores calculation, the
173 probability of not having a comprehensive list of all relevant confounding factors cannot be
174 ruled out. To control for this probability we estimated E-values.[23] An E-value gives the value
175 of the joint minimum strength of association an unmeasured confounder must have with both
176 the exposure and outcome to fully explain the association found between the exposure and

177 outcome, after adjusting for the measured covariates. In the present study, the E-value is given
178 on the relative risk scale. The higher the E-value is, the more strength a potential unmeasured
179 confounder needs to explain the association between the exposure and outcome and the less
180 likely it is to exist.

181 Interactions between gender, or age, and the two COVID-19 exposures with respect to
182 subsequent suicidal ideation were assessed but did not reached statistical significance (all p-
183 value above 0.20).

184 All the analyses were performed using SAS V9.4. Tests were two-sided and considered
185 statistically significant at $p < 0.05$. Missing data on covariates (up to 4.84%) were handled
186 using the fully conditional specification method and assuming that data were missing at
187 random (SAS MI procedure, FCS statement). After imputation, one imputed data set was
188 randomly selected for propensity score analyses.

189 ***Role of the funding source***

190 The present work was supported by a French National Observatory of Suicide grant. Funders
191 had no role in designing, analyzing, interpreting, or writing the present study.

192 **Results**

193 ***Description of the study sample***

194 The final sample included 52,050 participants. As reported in Table 1, our study sample was
195 mostly composed of female, over 25 years of age, born in mainland France, living with a
196 partner with or without children, employed or retired, with at least a professional certificate,
197 living in wealthiest households, and with decent to short perceived financial situations. They
198 were less likely to live in oversea territories or the Paris area, in accommodations with less
199 than one room per person, and in a deprived neighborhood. The study sample participants
200 also more often reported feeling good to very good, had no chronic condition, were non-
201 smokers and non or occasional alcohol drinkers. Most of them resided in their usual
202 accommodation during the first lockdown (17/03/2020 – 11/05/2020), had access to a private
203 exterior, and were more likely to live in an area less affected by the first COVID-19 wave.

204 ***COVID-19 disease and subsequent suicidal ideation***

205 Amongst the 52,050 participants with no history of suicidal ideation nor suicide attempts in
206 2020, 1.68% [1.54% – 1.82%] (863) reported suicidal ideation between December 2020 and
207 July 2021, 9.57% [9.24% – 9.90%] (5,098) had a serology-confirmed SARS-CoV2 infection
208 and 13.23% [12.86% – 13.61%] (7,058) reported COVID-19 symptoms between February and
209 November 2020 (Table 1). Using unadjusted modified Poisson regression model, COVID-19
210 symptoms were associated with a higher risk of suicidal ideation (RR [CI95%]: 1.90 [1.63 –

211 2.23]) while the same association was not observed for serology-confirmed SARS-CoV2
212 infection (0.98 [0.78 – 1.23]).

213 As shown in Figure 2, these results remained unchanged after taking covariates into account
214 with IPWeighting. Participants reporting COVID-19 symptoms had almost a 1.5 fold increased
215 risk of subsequent suicidal ideation (RR_{ipw} : 1.43 [1.20 – 1.69]) while those with a positive
216 serology were not at risk (RR_{ipw} : 0.88 [0.69 – 1.12]). Sensitivity ATTWeighted analyses yielded
217 similar results (RR_{watt} : 1.43 [1.22 – 1.68] for COVID-19 symptoms; RR_{watt} : 0.94 [0.75 – 1.18]
218 for serology-confirmed SARS-CoV2 infection).

219 The minimum strength of association a potential unmeasured confounder should have with
220 both COVID-19 illness and subsequent suicidal ideation after IPWeighting is given by the E-
221 value: 2.21 [1.69 - 2.78]. It means that the observed RR_{ipw} of 1.43 would be completely
222 explained by an unmeasured confounder associated with both COVID-19 illness and
223 subsequent suicidal ideation with a relative risk of 2.21, after controlling for the measured
224 covariates. However, given the number of measured confounders taken into account, such a
225 strong unobserved confounder is rather unlikely.

226 **Discussion**

227 ***Summary of findings***

228 In a nationwide study from France, COVID-19 illness in 2020, as defined by self-reports of
229 sudden loss of taste/smell or fever alongside cough or shortness of breath or chest oppression,
230 was associated with an almost 1.5 higher risk of subsequent suicidal ideation in the first half
231 of 2021. Associations persisted after adjusting for a wide range of sociodemographic and
232 health-related factors, using inverse probability weighting. However, SARS-CoV2 status, as
233 confirmed by circulating antibodies, was not associated with subsequent suicidal ideation. To
234 the best of our knowledge it is the first time the causal association between COVID-19 illness,
235 SARS-CoV2 infection and subsequent suicidal ideation is assessed in such a large, randomly
236 selected, longitudinal study.

237 ***SARS-CoV2 infection and suicidal ideation***

238 Our findings suggest that SARS-CoV2 is not likely to be involved in suicidal ideation. Although
239 misclassification of infected individuals with very low levels of circulating antibodies cannot be
240 ruled out, misclassification due to a new variant impairing effective detection of antibodies in
241 blood samples seems unlikely as the first known variant of concern, the alpha variant, was first
242 observed in France at the very end of 2020.[24] In line with our finding, the meta-analysis of 5
243 European cohorts highlighted that individuals with a COVID-19 diagnosis but less acute
244 COVID-19 symptoms were at lower risk of depressive and anxiety symptoms than individuals
245 without a COVID-19 diagnosis.[11] To dive further into the role of SARS-CoV2 in the etiology

246 of suicide risk, future studies should maybe assess suicide risk with respect to the biological
247 consequences of the infection, such as the presence of inflammation processes, rather than
248 only the presence of the virus.[5]

249 ***COVID-19 illness and suicidal ideation***

250 Several mechanisms can explain the association between COVID-19 reported symptoms and
251 suicidal ideation. First, some participants with COVID-19 required hospitalization, sometimes
252 in traumatic units such as intense care ones,[25] and some had persistent physical
253 symptoms.[26] A possible mechanism could be that such stressful and exhausting situations
254 can have negative impacts on the quality of life of individuals, leading to higher risk of suicidal
255 ideation. As an example, long-lasting symptoms or hospitalization could have impaired
256 employment which may lead to financial distress, a risk factor of suicidal ideation.[9, 10]
257 Second, anxiety and depressive symptoms could act as mediators of the relationship between
258 COVID-19 and suicidal ideation. Indeed, COVID-19 has been found to be associated with a
259 higher risk of depression,[9, 11, 25] a predictor of suicidal behaviors.[12] Third, Paul and
260 Fancourt showed that COVID-19 illness or death among friends/family or closed ones was
261 associated with a higher risk of self-harm thoughts and behaviors.[9] This was also true for
262 worries about relatives in the preceding week. As COVID-19 is a communicable disease,
263 individuals with symptomatic COVID-19 could be more likely to have symptomatic cases
264 among their relatives, increasing their risk of suicidal ideation, especially if they feel
265 responsible for their relatives' infection.

266 ***Strengths and limitations***

267 A main limitation of our study is the lack of prospectively collected pre-pandemic information
268 as the EpiCov study was initiated in 2020. Nonetheless, many pre-pandemic characteristics
269 were collected retrospectively and could be taken into account. Specific attention was given to
270 reports of previous mental health disorders, as they are key predictors of suicidal
271 behaviors.[12] We considered participants' history of anxiety, depression, or mental
272 impairment, history of a suicide attempt before November 2019, and self-report of a physician
273 diagnosis of psychiatric disorders. Although less accurate than prospectively collected or
274 health-record data, these information give valuable insights of pre-pandemic mental health
275 conditions.

276 Regarding propensity scores, balance between persons who did or did not experience COVID-
277 19 is only achieved for covariates included in propensity score estimations. Definition of
278 relevant factors to assess COVID-19 disease and suicidal ideation was based on the existing
279 scientific literature and availability of information in study questionnaires. The probability of
280 imperfect balance due to unmeasured factors cannot be ruled out. Yet, many factors were

281 taken into account, quality of propensity score weighting was systematically assessed and
282 available as supplementary material, and the estimated E-value of 2.21 [1.69 - 2.78] indicated
283 a low probability of an unmeasured factor completely explaining the observed association
284 between COVID-19 illness and subsequent suicidal ideation.

285 **Conclusion**

286 Self-reported COVID-19 illness but not serology-confirmed SARS-CoV2 infection was
287 associated with a higher risk of subsequent suicidal ideation while adjusting for a wide range
288 of sociodemographic and health-related factors using inverse probability weighting. To
289 highlight relevant targets for intervention, future studies should explore the long-term impact
290 of symptomatic COVID-19, both biologically confirmed and not confirmed, on the quality of life
291 of individuals as serology status alone do not seem like a relevant one.

292

Figures

Figure 1: study sample selection from the 85,074 individuals who participated to the three follow-up waves of the EpiCov cohort, in 2020 and 2021, in France.





Figure 2: relative risks of suicidal ideation in 2021 in COVID-19 ill or SARS-CoV2 infected participants in 2020 from the EpiCov cohort, France



Tables

Table 1: outcome, exposures, and covariates distribution in study sample, weighted by study weights, n = 52,050

	Distribution
<i>Suicidal ideations since December 2020</i>	
No	98.32% [98.18 - 98.46]
Yes	1.68% [1.54 - 1.82]
<i>SARS-CoV2 infection in 2020</i>	
No	90.43% [90.1 - 90.76]
Yes	9.57% [9.24 - 9.90]
<i>Covid-19 illness between February and December 2020</i>	
No	86.77% [86.39 - 87.14]
Yes	13.23% [12.86 - 13.61]
<i>Gender</i>	
Men	46.16% [45.58 - 46.73]
Women	53.84% [53.27 - 54.42]
<i>Age (years)</i>	
15 - 25	11.25% [10.90 - 11.61]
26 - 45	27.83% [27.33 - 28.33]
46 - 65	34.92% [34.40 - 35.44]
> 65	26.00% [25.44 - 26.56]
<i>Place of birth</i>	
Both participant and parents born in mainland France	82.01% [81.53 - 82.50]
Participant or parents born in oversea territories	1.96% [1.81 - 2.11]
Participant born in France of parents born abroad	8.61% [8.27 - 8.95]
Participant born abroad	7.41% [7.05 - 7.78]
<i>Highest educational attainment</i>	
None	8.20% [7.75 - 8.65]
Lower secondary school certificate	13.31% [12.83 - 13.78]
Professional certificate	19.11% [18.66 - 19.56]
Baccalauréat (higher secondary school certificate)	19.55% [19.12 - 19.98]
Bachelor degree or equivalent	25.34% [24.90 - 25.78]
Master degree or more	14.49% [14.16 - 14.83]

weighted % [95% Confidence interval]

Table 1 continued :

	Distribution
<i>Occupational grade</i>	
Employed	48.02% [47.45 - 48.59]
Students	8.75% [8.45 - 9.06]
Unemployed	4.63% [4.36 - 4.90]
Retired	30.36% [29.79 - 30.92]
Other including housemakers	8.23% [7.89 - 8.58]
<i>Perceived financial situation</i>	
Comfortable	16.15% [15.78 - 16.52]
Decent	43.37% [42.80 - 43.93]
Short	31.02% [30.46 - 31.58]
Difficult or unbearable without taking loans	9.47% [9.07 - 9.87]
<i>Household structure</i>	
Single	16.73% [16.23 - 17.22]
Couple without children	32.12% [31.59 - 32.65]
Couple with children	28.75% [28.26 - 29.23]
Single-parent	7.21% [6.90 - 7.52]
Participant living with parents	7.85% [7.55 - 8.16]
Complex household	7.34% [7.04 - 7.65]
<i>Household income per consumption units</i>	
Less resourceful	13.79% [13.33 - 14.25]
Medium-low	16.60% [16.09 - 17.11]
Medium	19.85% [19.38 - 20.32]
Medium-high	23.82% [23.37 - 24.28]
Wealthiest	25.93% [25.50 - 26.36]
<i>Less than one room per person in usual accommodation</i>	
No	93.32% [93.00 - 93.64]
Yes	6.68% [6.36 - 7.00]
<i>Residence not in usual housing during the first lockdown</i>	
No	95.03% [94.78 - 95.27]
Yes	4.97% [4.73 - 5.22]
<i>Access to a private exterior during the first lockdown</i>	
No	8.67% [8.31 - 9.03]
Yes	90.40% [90.03 - 90.78]
Other situations	0.93% [0.80 - 1.05]
<i>Usual living area</i>	
Less affected area	65.67% [65.13 - 66.21]
Grand-Est	8.70% [8.39 - 9.01]
Hauts-de-France	8.34% [8.02 - 8.67]
Ile-de-France	17.29% [16.86 - 17.72]
<i>Urban density of living area (urban units)</i>	
Oversea territories	1.26% [1.15 - 1.37]
Less than 2,000	24.07% [23.58 - 24.55]
Between 2,000 and 1,999,999	59.58% [59.02 - 60.14]
Paris area	15.09% [14.68 - 15.50]
<i>Usual residence in deprived neighborhood</i>	
No	95.69% [95.39 - 95.99]
Yes	4.31% [4.01 - 4.61]

weighted % [95% Confidence interval]

Table 1 continued :

	Distribution
<i>Perceived general health status</i>	
Good to very good	77.80% [77.27 - 78.34]
Quite good	18.70% [18.21 - 19.20]
Poor to very poor	3.49% [3.23 - 3.75]
<i>Body Mass Index (kg/m²)</i>	
Under 18.5	3.38% [3.18 - 3.58]
From 18.5 to under 25	50.80% [50.23 - 51.38]
From 25 to under 30	30.89% [30.36 - 31.43]
From 30 and over	14.93% [14.49 - 15.36]
<i>Pre pandemic somatic condition</i>	
None	60.91% [60.33 - 61.48]
At least one	39.09% [38.52 - 39.67]
<i>Pre pandemic mental health disorder</i>	
None	89.00% [88.62 - 89.38]
At least one	11.00% [10.62 - 11.38]
<i>Tobacco use</i>	
Never	48.76% [48.18 - 49.33]
Past only	32.32% [31.79 - 32.84]
Current	18.93% [18.46 - 19.39]
<i>Alcohol use</i>	
Never	29.39% [28.83 - 29.94]
Rare	13.59% [13.19 - 13.99]
Occasional	23.35% [22.88 - 23.82]
Often	23.12% [22.67 - 23.57]
Daily	10.56% [10.21 - 10.91]
<i>Hospitalization rates in place of residence during the 1st lockdown</i>	
Lowest	23.63% [23.14 - 24.12]
Medium-low	27.89% [27.38 - 28.41]
Medium-High	22.56% [22.08 - 23.04]
Highest	25.92% [25.42 - 26.41]

weighted % [95% Confidence interval]

Authors contribution

CDP: conceptualisation, data curation, formal analysis, methodology, project administration, validation, visualisation, writing - original draft

MO: conceptualisation, funding acquisition, supervision, validation, writing - review & editing

SL: methodology, supervision, validation, writing - review & editing

AMF: conceptualisation, data curation, validation, writing - review & editing

JBH: conceptualisation, data curation, investigation, validation, writing - review & editing

JW: investigation, validation, writing - review & editing

BF: methodology, supervision, validation, writing - review & editing

MCG: conceptualisation, funding acquisition, supervision, validation, writing - review & editing

MM: conceptualisation, methodology, supervision, validation, writing - review & editing

AR: conceptualisation, funding acquisition, methodology, project administration, supervision, validation, writing - review & editing

Data sharing

Anonymous aggregated data for the baseline wave are available online. The EpiCov dataset is available for research purpose concerning baseline wave, and will be available by March 2022 concerning the second follow-up wave for research purpose on CASD (<https://www.casd.eu/>), after submission to approval of French Ethics and Regulatory Committee procedure (Comité du Secret Statistique, CESREES and CNIL). Access to anonymized individual data underlying the findings may be available before the planned period, on request to the corresponding author, to be submitted to approval of ethics and reglementary Committee for researchers who meet the criteria for access to data.

Acknowledgment

The present work was supported by a French National Observatory of Suicide research grant attributed to AR (grant number R21094LL). The EpiCov study was supported by research grants from Inserm (Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale), the French Ministry for Research and its department of research, studies, evaluation and statistics (Direction de la Recherche, des Etudes, de l'Evaluation et des Statistiques, Drees), the French Ministry for Health, and the Région Ile de France. Dr.Bajos has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (grant agreement number 856478). This project has also received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement number 101016167, ORCHESTRA (Connecting European Cohorts to Increase Common and Effective Response to SARS-CoV-2 Pandemic).

For the purpose of Open Access, a CC-BY public copyright licence has been applied by the authors to the present document and will be applied to all subsequent versions up to the Author Accepted Manuscript arising from this submission.

[CC-BY 4.0](#)



Reference

1. Gunnell, D., et al., *Suicide risk and prevention during the COVID-19 pandemic*. Lancet Psychiatry, 2020. **7**(6): p. 468-471.
2. Conejero, I., et al., [*Suicidal behavior in light of COVID-19 outbreak: Clinical challenges and treatment perspectives*]. Encephale, 2020. **46**(3s): p. S66-s72.
3. Sher, L., *Post-COVID syndrome and suicide risk*. Qjm, 2021. **114**(2): p. 95-98.
4. Szcześniak, D., et al., *The SARS-CoV-2 and mental health: From biological mechanisms to social consequences*. Prog Neuropsychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry, 2021. **104**: p. 110046.
5. Costanza, A., et al., *Hyper/neuroinflammation in COVID-19 and suicide etiopathogenesis: Hypothesis for a nefarious collision?* Neurosci Biobehav Rev, 2022. **136**: p. 104606.
6. John, A., et al., *The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on self-harm and suicidal behaviour: update of living systematic review*. F1000Res, 2020. **9**: p. 1097.
7. Hazo, J.-B., et al., *Une dégradation de la santé mentale chez les jeunes en 2020 - Résultats issus de la 2e vague de l'enquête EpiCov*. Etudes & Résultats, 2021. **1210**.
8. Sinyor, M., et al., *SARS-CoV-2 Infection and the Risk of Suicidal and Self-Harm Thoughts and Behaviour: A Systematic Review*. Can J Psychiatry, 2022: p. 7067437221094552.
9. Paul, E. and D. Fancourt, *Factors influencing self-harm thoughts and behaviours over the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic in the UK: longitudinal analysis of 49 324 adults*. Br J Psychiatry, 2022. **220**(1): p. 31-37.
10. Batterham, P.J., et al., *Effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on suicidal ideation in a representative Australian population sample-Longitudinal cohort study*. J Affect Disord, 2022. **300**: p. 385-391.
11. Magnúsdóttir, I., et al., *Acute COVID-19 severity and mental health morbidity trajectories in patient populations of six nations: an observational study*. Lancet Public Health, 2022. **7**(5): p. e406-e416.
12. Turecki, G. and D.A. Brent, *Suicide and suicidal behaviour*. Lancet, 2016. **387**(10024): p. 1227-39.
13. Allen, J., et al., *COVID-19 and the social determinants of health and health equity*. 2021, World Health Organization: Geneva. p. 32.
14. Austin, P.C. and E.A. Stuart, *Moving towards best practice when using inverse probability of treatment weighting (IPTW) using the propensity score to estimate causal treatment effects in observational studies*. Stat Med, 2015. **34**(28): p. 3661-79.
15. Warszawski, J., et al., *Prevalence of SARS-Cov-2 antibodies and living conditions: the French national random population-based EPICOV cohort*. BMC Infect Dis, 2022. **22**(1): p. 41.
16. Statistique, C.N.d.l.I. *EpiCoV : Étude EPIdémiologique de la diffusion du SARS-CoV2 - Vague T1 - 2020X711SA*. 2020 [cited 2022 May 2022]; Available from: <https://www.cnis.fr/enquetes/epicov-etude-epidemiologique-de-la-diffusion-du-sars-cov2-2020x711sa/>.
17. Warszawski, J., et al., *4% de la population a développé des anticorps contre le SARS-CoV-2 entre mai et novembre 2020*, in *Etudes et Résultats*, d.E. Direction de la Recherche, de l'Evaluation et des Statistiques, Editor. 2021, French Ministry of Health: France. p. 8.
18. Shrier, I. and R.W. Platt, *Reducing bias through directed acyclic graphs*. BMC Med Res Methodol, 2008. **8**: p. 70.
19. Hernan, M. and J.M. Robins, *Causal Inference: What if?* 2020.

20. Warszawski, J., et al., *A national mixed-mode seroprevalence random population-based cohort on SARS-CoV-2 epidemic in France: the socio-epidemiological EpiCov study*. medRxiv, 2021: p. 2021.02.24.21252316.
21. Rubin, D.B., *The design versus the analysis of observational studies for causal effects: parallels with the design of randomized trials*. Stat Med, 2007. **26**(1): p. 20-36.
22. Zou, G., *A modified poisson regression approach to prospective studies with binary data*. Am J Epidemiol, 2004. **159**(7): p. 702-6.
23. VanderWeele, T.J. and P. Ding, *Sensitivity Analysis in Observational Research: Introducing the E-Value*. Ann Intern Med, 2017. **167**(4): p. 268-274.
24. France, S.P. *Coronavirus : circulation des variants du SARS-CoV-2*. 2022 11/05/2022 [cited 2022 16/05/2022]; Available from: <https://www.santepubliquefrance.fr/dossiers/coronavirus-covid-19/coronavirus-circulation-des-variants-du-sars-cov-2>.
25. Taquet, M., et al., *6-month neurological and psychiatric outcomes in 236 379 survivors of COVID-19: a retrospective cohort study using electronic health records*. Lancet Psychiatry, 2021. **8**(5): p. 416-427.
26. Sykes, D.L., et al., *Post-COVID-19 Symptom Burden: What is Long-COVID and How Should We Manage It?* Lung, 2021. **199**(2): p. 113-119.