

Years of life lost due to the psychosocial consequences of COVID19 mitigation strategies based on Swiss data

Dominik A. Moser^{1,2}, Jennifer Glaus², Sophia Frangou^{3,4}, Daniel S. Schechter^{2,5,6}

1 Universität Bern, Institute of Psychology, Bern, Switzerland

2 Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Vaudois, Child and Adolescent Psychiatry Service, Department of Psychiatry, Lausanne, Switzerland

3 Djavad Mowafaghian Centre for Brain Health, Department of Psychiatry, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada

4 Department of Psychiatry, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, USA

5 Université de Genève Faculté de médecine, Department of Psychiatry, Geneva, Switzerland

6 New York University Grossman School of Medicine, Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, New York, NY USA

Corresponding Author: Dominik A. Moser email: dominik.moser@psy.unibe.ch

Background: The pandemic caused by COVID-19 has forced governments to implement strict social mitigation strategies to reduce the acute morbidity and mortality from acute infections. These strategies however carry a significant risk for mental health which can lead to increased short-term and long-term mortality, which is currently not included in modelling the impact of the pandemic.

Methods: We used years of life lost (YLL) as the main outcome measure as applied to Switzerland as an exemplar. We focused on suicide, depression, alcohol use disorder, childhood physical abuse and social isolation as these are known to increase YLL in the context of imposed restriction in social contact and freedom of movement. We also estimated a minimum duration of mitigation of 3 months based on current public health plans.

Results: The study projects that the average person would suffer 0.205 YLL due to psychosocial consequence of COVID-19 mitigation measures. However, this loss would be entirely borne by a subpopulation of 2.1 percent of the population, the average of whom suffer an average 9.79 YLL.

Conclusions: The results presented here are likely to underestimate the true impact of the mitigation strategies on YLL. However, model like the one presented here highlight the need for public health models to expand their scope in order to provide better estimates of the risks and benefits of mitigation.

Introduction

Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) has led to the first truly global pandemic. At the time of writing there over two million reported cases worldwide and more than 130,000 deaths attributed to COVID19 acute infection (1). Based on models of its spread, and potential for morbidity and mortality that predicted high COVID-19 associated morbidity and mortality, most governments worldwide have adopted mitigation strategies that are essentially aiming to reduce the spread of the virus by limiting social contacts (2, 3). The aim of these measures would be to “flatten the curve” of acute presentations to prevent widespread morbidity and the break-down of the health care systems. Variants of these social mitigation strategies ranged from “social distancing”, which more broadly encompasses measures of at-home-confinement, referred to as “self-isolation”, selective “quarantine” to population “lockdown” that includes restriction of movement outdoors and closure of schools and all non-essential services and businesses.

None of the existing models have focused on the possible adverse effects at a population level of these mitigation strategies. These can be intuitively anticipated but have never been rigorously modelled (4). The cause of the adverse mental health outcomes can be attributed to the emotional and physiological effects of reduced physical activity, social interaction and human physical contact (5-7). To exemplify the scope, studies from the SARS epidemic found that the length of quarantine was an important predictor of PTSD, depression and anxiety with a cumulative prevalence potentially exceeding 30% of the population (8, 9). Psychosocial stressors such as marriage separations and loneliness are also likely to spike in confinement and have adverse effects to mental and physical health (10-13). Available data suggest that stress associated with population-wide disasters increase the level of violence, including domestic violence and child abuse (14, 15). These are recognised risk factors for mental health and substance abuse problems (16) as well as suicide (17).

The anticipated impact of the COVID19 pandemic on mental health is expected to be significant but has not been included in current models. To address this gap, the present study makes a rapid model-projection concerning the years of life lost (YLL) if restrictive social mitigation measures are implemented for a period of 3 months. This duration was chosen as aligns with the expected duration of social mitigation in many countries. We use data from Switzerland as an exemplar. The model focuses on what we consider to be the major contributors to YLL affecting the majority of the population, primarily, suicide, emergence or increase in psychopathology, strain on partnerships and continued restriction of movement and at home confinement.

To be clear, this estimation focuses on changes to psychosocial risk factors. The COVID-19 crisis may also have other adverse consequences that may, in turn, interact with longevity such as economic impact changes to activities of daily living such as eating, sleeping, smoking and ordinary alcohol consumption or decrease in doctors’ visits from populations who have health concerns unrelated to COVID-19. Such additional factors are however beyond the scope of the present model projection.

Methods:

Model: We conducted a literature review focusing on studies reporting on YLL in connection to situations conceptually similar to the current pandemic. These included data from studies on confinement in different contexts and from previous disasters including pandemics. We focused on studies from developed countries, primarily Switzerland, and when not available, from Europe followed by the United States, based on the United Nations Development Programme- Country Classification System. Switzerland has a population of 8.57 million (18) and introduced an “extraordinary situation” on March 16 2020. All borders were closed to travel, all schools, markets,

restaurants, non-essential shops, bars and entertainment and leisure facilities were closed, and all public and private events and gatherings were prohibited (19). Several regions had already taken a number of these measures in the preceding days and weeks. The Federal Council called on members of the public to avoid all unnecessary contact and to keep their distance from others and stay whenever possible at home. According to government announcements these are expected to continue until at least April 27 2020 with the majority continuing and a number of measures aimed at “social distancing” and prohibition of gatherings expected to last until at least June 8 (20).

The following risk factors were considered based on importance and data availability: Suicidality, depression, alcohol use disorder, domestic violence, changes in marital status, social isolation. The projection of YLL for each of these factors is further described below. Data concerning incidence of the risk factors well as their impact on YLL were then applied to a model that assumes population-wide severe social mitigation policies (stay-at-home and restriction of outdoors movement) for a duration of 3 months. As a general rule, the present model aimed at erring on the conservative side when choosing YLL. For purposes of illustration only, we also present projected YLL could be projected to countries other than Switzerland based on their population size (21) assuming similar prevalence of risk factors.

The model involved a six step process

For each factor:

- 1. Estimation of baseline risk of outcome i (BRI) based on the literature**
- 2. Estimation of YLL per incident of outcome i ($YLLi$) from the literature**
- 3. Estimation of increased risk factor during the pandemic for outcome i (PRi), where possible based on literature**

- 4. Estimation of the increased incident cases relating to the pandemic outcome i ($PICi$)**

$$PIC_i = (PR_i - 1) * BRI * 0.25$$

Where PR_i is the estimate of the increased risk of outcome i relating to the pandemic, D is the duration of the social mitigation measures, which is fixed 0.25 years (3 months);

- 5. Estimation of YLL for incidence I due to the pandemic ($PYYLi$)**

$$PYYL_i = PIC_i * YLL_i$$

- 6. Calculation of summary statistics**

$PICs$ is the sum of all PIC_i ; $PYLLs$ is the sum of all $PYYL_i$

Average YLL per impacted Person: $PICs / PYLLs$

Percentage of Persons impacted: $PICs / 100 * \text{Population of Switzerland (8.57 million)}$

Average PYLL per person of the general population: $PYLLs / \text{Population of Switzerland (8.57 million)}$

To align with current models that focus on acute mortality, our model focuses on the 3-month period which represents an underestimate of the overall impact of the pandemic.

Results

A summary of the results is provided in Table 1 and details of the estimation of the increased YLL linked to pandemic are presented below

Suicidality:

BRI : In 2017, Switzerland counted 1043 suicides without counting assisted suicide or euthanasia i.e. Non euthanasia-related suicide was the cause of death in 16 out of 1000 deaths (22).

YLLi: US data from 2016, showed 1.542 million years were lost due to suicide (23) across 44965 suicides (24) leading to 34.3 YLL per death (1.542 million/44965).

PRi: We focused on the relationship between confinement and suicidality in the context of the penitentiary system. Community cell-confined prisoners already have an increased suicide rate by factors between 3.5 and 21 compared to the general population (25, 26). However, the risk of suicide for prisoners in single cells is further increased approximately 9 to 15 times (27).

Extrapolating from data on prisoners, we assume that confinement in the household increases their likelihood of suicide by a factor of 3 in multi-person households and a factor of 27 in single-person households (3×9). We assume this increase is stable for the entire 3-month duration. In Switzerland, 16% of the population live in single-households (28). This results in a population-wide PRi of 6.84 ($0.16 \times 27 + 0.84 \times 3$).

PICi: $5.84 \times 1043 \times 0.25 = 1523$ additional suicides

PYLLi: $= 1523 \times 34.3 = 52239$

Depression:

General: As mood and anxiety disorders are comorbid, we used data on depression in our model as it is likely to capture much of the distress related psychopathology; additionally, depression has the most convincing link to YLL which is our outcome of interest (29).

BRi: We used population prevalence data for depression as they capture both incident and pre-existing conditions. Accordingly we estimated that the pre-pandemic risk of depression to the Swiss population in a three month phase is 3.45% (i.e. $8.57 \text{ million} \times 0.0345 = 295'665$) with 64.7% of patients being women. Because BRi is already adjusted to 3 months, time will not be factored into the calculation of PICi

YLLi: In accordance with a prior study (30) for depression a loss of 7.91 years of life for men and 6.22 for women was assumed, which given the male-female ratio results YLLi of 6.82.

PRi: A long-term study found that three years later, the proportion of persons with symptoms related to higher stress was still increased by a factor of 3.47 among those who had been in quarantine, thus demonstrating the long-term implications of the phenomenon (31). One study that focused on an Australian population quarantined due to equine flu however suggested a similar 3-fold increase in depression (32); We used this estimate to start our model as it was the most conservative. However not all depressions have long lasting impact and 84% of patients may remit across the following 3 years (33). To be conservative and only capture cases with full effect on mortality, we therefore reduced additional cases by 84% leading to a PRi of 1.32

PICi: $295665 \times 0.32 = 94613$

PYLLi: $94613 \times 6.82 = 645'2260$ YLL.

Alcohol use disorder

General: Distress under any circumstances is a known risk factor for alcohol abuse disorder. There is abundant evidence of increased alcohol consumption during the current pandemic (34). Although the use of other substances seems to be increased as well, our model focuses on alcohol abuse disorder as it is generally the most prevalent substance abuse disorder and the major contributor to mortality world wide (35). Substance use disorders are significantly associated with increased mortality due to increased accidents, impulse-dyscontrol leading to violence and suicide, as well as

increased physical morbidity (i.e. cardiovascular, gastro-intestinal, hepatic, and other somatic conditions) (36-38).

BRI: In Switzerland 16.1/3.2% (men/women), of the population have an AUD, and 7.2/1.4% (men/women) suffer from alcohol dependence(35).

YLLi: A cross-national Scandinavian study indicated that longevity among inpatients with alcohol use disorder (AUD) was related to 24-28 years reduction in longevity compared to the general population of the respective countries (38). A similar study focusing only on natural causes of death indicated 18.1/16.5 years reduction for men and women respectively (37). These numbers were not corrected for socio-economic factors. However, AUD may just well influence socio-economics. To be conservative YLLi was rounded down and assumed at 18 years for men (83.5% of cases) and 16 for women (16.5% of cases). In total this results in YLLi of 17.67.

PRi: We estimate that the increase in AUD will be about 0.15% of the population per month, with the first month leading to a higher incidence (0.3%). Therefore, countermeasures lasting 3 months would increase incidence by approximately 0.6%.

PICi: 0.6% of the population (8.57 million) = 51'000

PYLLi: $51000 * 17.67 = 901'170$

Marital Status

General: Several recent media reports indicate anecdotally that divorce rates may spike due to COVID-19 mitigation (11, 39). In individual cases, divorces and separations can be beneficial to individual health and stress levels (for example in situations of abuse). Overall, however, even after taking into account risk factors that contribute to divorce and separation (i.e. financial stressors, mental and physical illness and substance abuse), divorce and separation given the experience of relational and economic stress, loss, and greater likelihood for social isolation, have been shown to have a negative impact on longevity (10). Causes for this may also include detrimental habits that individuals may adopt to cope with the stress, loss, and isolation (such as increased smoking (40)). Additionally having parents who divorce during childhood has been estimated to increase mortality by 44% and reduce life expectancy by an average of 4 years (41).

BRI: In 2018, there were 16542 divorces leading to BRI =33084 in Switzerland. Additionally 12212 minors were third parties (42).

YLLi: A German study estimating YLL due to divorce range from 3/4 years for women/men all the way to 8/9 years (43). For this projection 3.5 YLLi are assumed per couple (4 for men, 3 for women). 4=YLLi was assumed for each associated minor (41).

PRi: Report on previous disaster (hurricane Hugo) indicated that increased divorces at a rate of 1.63 (44) for the year following the disaster (wherefore factor D is omitted in the calculation of PICi)

PICi: for adults: $33084 * 0.63 = 20842$; for associated minors: $12212 * 0.63 = 7694$.

PYLLi: for adults: $20842 * 3.5 = 72947$; for associated minors: $7694 * 4 = 30776$

Adverse childhood events due to domestic violence:

General: Although family violence is commonly targeted towards both women and children we focus specifically on the effects on children as specific impact on women was hard to quantify.

BRI: Even when not directly being the victim themselves, children being witnesses to violence can be an adverse childhood event.

The year 2013 saw 9381 victims of domestic violence registered by the Swiss police. A survey however indicated that that this latter number of victims would only represent 22% of the actual number which would increase the number to 42641 victims per year ($9381/22*100$). 64.5% of domestic violence referred to violent interactions between either parents and their children or current romantic partners (45) ($42641*0.645=27'503$). Of Swiss multi-person-households 46% include children (28) and on average there are 1.76 children living in each of these households (46). BRI is therefore assumed to be 22'266 ($27503*0.46*1.76$).

YLLi: Experiencing 3 or more adverse childhood events (ACEs) is associated with 9.5 years of reduced expected quality longevity (47). Among adults 25% report having experienced multiple adverse childhood events (48). Because of this we conservatively project that only about every fourth of these events will lead to the full loss of 9.5 years. Therefore YLL is divided by 4 to arrive at a YLLi of 2.37 years.

PRi: According to the World Health Organization (WHO), there has been a threefold increase in family violence (49). However, additional events are not likely to be normally distributed across victims (45) and the measures to which these numbers refer may have been stricter than the one in Switzerland. PRi = 2 is therefore assumed in order to be conservative.

PICi: $22266*1*0.25=5567$

PYLLi: $5567*2.37=13194$

Social isolation and reduced social connectedness

General: No studies were found indicating the cost of social isolation or reduced social connectivity in YLL in a way directly adaptable to the present study, moreover the entire population is somewhere on a spectrum from socially hyperconnected to socially isolated. However studies concerning risk ratios do exist. For this reason the calculation steps for social isolation and social connectedness differ from the other incidences discussed for PICi, and YLLi as they are not applied to every person who felt isolated or less connected, but rather for every excess death due to social isolation or reduced social connectivity.

BRI: The entire population of 8.57 million is on a spectrum from socially connected to socially isolated.

YLLi: Based on the most recent data Switzerland counted 67008 deaths in 2018 (category 1 (ages: 0-19): 0.8%; cat 2 (20-39): 1.2%; cat3 (40-64): 11.1%; cat 4 (65-79): 25.0%; cat5 (80+): 61.9%)(22). For each of these categories a differential estimated remaining years of life were extrapolated from the 2018 federal statistics on life expectancy, by averaging life-expectancy of men and women and assuming the middle age categories 1 and 2, at 50 years for category 3 and mean of 65 and 80 for category 4 and half of 80 for the 80+ category as a very rough approximation that is -if anything- aimed at underestimating the remaining life expectancy (cat 1: 73.45, cat 2: 54.2, cat 3: 34.8, cat 4: 15.5, cat 5: 4.95). Overall remaining life expectancy is then multiplied with the percentage of each category, leading to YLLi =12.03 for each addition death.

PRi: Having more social connections eventually leads to a lower death rate with an odds ratio of 1.5 (50). Conversely a comprehensive meta-analysis indicated that social isolation is associated with an increase of all-cause mortality by a factor of 1.29 (51). Similarly a large-scale study estimated the increased hazard risk due to social isolation at a factor of 1.73, and 1.26 when corrected for a large

number of potentially mediating factors such as anxiety, depression and socio-economic status (52). In our model we use the most conservative estimate of 1.26. In a phase of confinement, we assume that a majority of 75% of the population experiences either reduced social connectedness and/or increased social isolation. This would lead to a PRi of 1.208.

PICi: Switzerland counted 67008 deaths in 2018 (22). Therefore, PICi is $67008 * 0.208 * 0.25 = 3484$.

PYLLi: $3484 * 12.03 = 41'912$

Summary Statistics:

Statistics are summarized in table 1. The different risk factors contributed the following number of PYLL (in descending order): Alcohol use disorder: 901'170, Depression: 645'260, Divorce (combined): 103'723, Suicide: 52'239, Reduction of Social contact: 41'912, Averse childhood events due to family violence: 13'194.

The sum of all PYLLi was 1'757'498, this represents 0.205 PYLL per person in Switzerland (1757498/8.57 million) (see table 1). In other words we project a loss of 10 weeks and 5 days of longevity for an average person living in Switzerland due to COVID-19 related mitigation strategies.

However, this burden would be primarily borne by a subpopulation. The sum of all PICi across incidents was 179'520 which represents 2.1% of the Swiss population (179520/8.57 million). Among the 179'520 Persons impacted, the average PYLL was estimated to be 9.79 ($1757498/179'520 = 9.79$).

Discussion

The current study focused on years of life lost due to the social mitigation strategies implemented in response to the COVID19 pandemic with a primary focus on confinement.

The literature suggests that the increased duration of confinement is associated with worse outcomes for psychological health of those confined (4). While some of the stress related problems ensuing from confinement may remit, an important portion of this damage may prove to be hard or impossible to reverse. In line with this latter point, our projection suggests that the Swiss population would incur a substantial increase in mortality as a consequence of confinement from demographic and mental health related factors. We thus would advise policy makers to keep the severe adverse cost to overall (mental) health—thus physical AND mental health in mind, when imposing severe measures such as mass confinement on the population regardless of level of vulnerability to severe illness from CoVid-19 in order to appropriately weigh the costs of these measures against their benefits.

The present study hopes to have achieved two aims: 1) to provide information that helps authorities in their considerations whether and how to enact these countermeasures or what resources to employ in the mitigation of their adverse consequences. 2) To serve as a first rapid projection upon which more in-depth analysis can be built.

Limitations: While taking the existing knowledge into account, like all model projections, the present one is based on a number of assumptions about the likely size of the impact of confinement. In this sense, our model projection is obviously constrained by the limitations of the available literature which, itself, involves a number of unknowns. Given the time constraints, the uncertainty in those assumptions is increased; the authors however judge the urgency of such projections to be very high at the moment. Additionally, the present projection does not pretend to be all-encompassing concerning effects of confinement, several other effects are likely to be adverse, such as -for example- increases in prolonged grief disorder, elder abuse, increase of sedentary lifestyle or change

of diet for example. The projection also does not account for potentially beneficial changes in behaviour, for example reductions in car accidents. Furthermore, the model does not include an economic component as a result of COVID-19 mitigation, nor interaction of such a n economic component with psychosocial risk factors. Due to frequent co-occurrence of certain phenomena it is possible that a single individual may be affected by more than one of the factors presented. Where possible data that was adjusted adequately for age, sex and socio-economics was applied, but for several factors, possibilities to do so were limited by the current state of the literature.

References

1. Dong E, Du H, Gardner L. An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real time. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020.
2. Team IC-hSUF, JL M. Forecasting COVID-19 impact on hospital bed-days, ICU-days, ventilator-days and deaths by US state in the next 4 months. 2020.
3. Ferguson N, Laydon D, Nedjati-Gilani G, Imai N, Ainslie K, Baguelin M, et al. Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand. <https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/medicine/sph/ide/gida-fellowships/Imperial-College-COVID19-NPI-modelling-16-03-2020.pdf>. 2020.
4. Brooks SK, Webster RK, Smith LE, Woodland L, Wessely S, Greenberg N, et al. The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10227):912-20.
5. Kerr F, Wiechula R, Feo R, Schultz T, Kitson A. Neurophysiology of human touch and eye gaze in therapeutic relationships and healing: a scoping review. *JBI Database System Rev Implement Rep*. 2019;17(2):209-47.
6. Ellingsen DM, Wessberg J, Chelnokova O, Olausson H, Laeng B, Leknes S. In touch with your emotions: oxytocin and touch change social impressions while others' facial expressions can alter touch. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*. 2014;39:11-20.
7. Jones NA, Sloan A. Neurohormones and temperament interact during infant development. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*. 2018;373(1744).
8. Hawryluck L, Gold WL, Robinson S, Pogorski S, Galea S, Styra R. SARS control and psychological effects of quarantine, Toronto, Canada. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2004;10(7):1206-12.
9. Reynolds DL, Garay JR, Deamond SL, Moran MK, Gold W, Styra R. Understanding, compliance and psychological impact of the SARS quarantine experience. *Epidemiol Infect*. 2008;136(7):997-1007.
10. Rendall MS, Weden MM, Favreault MM, Waldron H. The protective effect of marriage for survival: a review and update. *Demography*. 2011;48(2):481-506.
11. Smith E. Divorce rates jumping in corona-quarantined couples . <https://pagesix.com/2020/03/24/divorce-rates-jumping-in-corona-quarantined-couples/>: Page Six; 2020 [
12. Hawkley LC, Capitanio JP. Perceived social isolation, evolutionary fitness and health outcomes: a lifespan approach. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*. 2015;370(1669).
13. World Health Organisation W. Global action plan on physical activity 2018-2030. 2019.
14. Stark L, Ager A. A systematic review of prevalence studies of gender-based violence in complex emergencies. *Trauma Violence Abuse*. 2011;12(3):127-34.
15. Schumacher JA, Coffey SF, Norris FH, Tracy M, Clements K, Galea S. Intimate partner violence and Hurricane Katrina: predictors and associated mental health outcomes. *Violence Vict*. 2010;25(5):588-603.
16. Van Der Velden PG, Kleber RJ. Substance Use And Misuse After Disasters. In: Neria Y, Galea S, Norris FH, editors. *Psychopathology After Disasters*: Cambridge University Press; 2009.
17. Reger MA, Stanley IH, Joiner TE. Suicide Mortality and Coronavirus Disease 2019-A Perfect Storm? *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2020.
18. Switzerland FSO. Ständige Wohnbevölkerung nach Staatsangehörigkeitskategorie, Alter und Kanton, 2. Quartal 2019. 2019 [Available from: <https://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/en/home/statistics/population.assetdetail.9566127.html>].
19. Press release: Coronavirus: Federal Council declares 'extraordinary situation' and introduces more stringent measures. [press release]. 2020.
20. Press releas: Federal Council to gradually ease measures against the new coronavirus. [press release]. 2020.
21. Wikipedia. List_of_countries_and_dependencies_by_population 2020 [Available from: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_and_dependencies_by_population].

22. Switzerland FSOo. Specific causes of death 2020 [Available from: <https://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/en/home/statistics/health/state-health/mortality-causes-death/specific.html>].
23. Institute NC. Years of Life Lost 2020 [Available from: https://progressreport.cancer.gov/end/life_lost].
24. Prevention CfDCa. Fatal Injury Reports, National, Regional and State, 1981 - 2018 [Available from: <https://webappa.cdc.gov/sasweb/ncipc/mortrate.html>].
25. Roma P, Pompili M, Lester D, Girardi P, Ferracuti S. Incremental conditions of isolation as a predictor of suicide in prisoners. *Forensic Sci Int*. 2013;233(1-3):e1-2.
26. Eck M, Scoufnaire T, Debien C, Amad A, Sannier O, Chan Chee C, et al. [Suicide in prison: Epidemiology and prevention]. *Presse Med*. 2019;48(1 Pt 1):46-54.
27. Duthe G, Hazard A, Kensey A, Shon JL. Suicide among male prisoners in France: a prospective population-based study. *Forensic Sci Int*. 2013;233(1-3):273-7.
28. Switzerland FSOo. Households Statistics 2019 [
29. Charlson FJ, Baxter AJ, Dua T, Degenhardt L, Whiteford HA, Vos T. Excess Mortality from Mental, Neurological, and Substance Use Disorders in the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. In: Patel V, Chisholm D, Dua T, Laxminarayan R, Medina-Mora ME, editors. *Mental, Neurological, and Substance Use Disorders: Disease Control Priorities, Third Edition (Volume 4)*. Washington (DC)2016.
30. Plana-Ripoll O, Pedersen CB, Agerbo E, Holtz Y, Erlangsen A, Canudas-Romo V, et al. A comprehensive analysis of mortality-related health metrics associated with mental disorders: a nationwide, register-based cohort study. *Lancet*. 2019;394(10211):1827-35.
31. Wu P, Fang Y, Guan Z, Fan B, Kong J, Yao Z, et al. The psychological impact of the SARS epidemic on hospital employees in China: exposure, risk perception, and altruistic acceptance of risk. *Can J Psychiatry*. 2009;54(5):302-11.
32. Taylor MR, Agho KE, Stevens GJ, Raphael B. Factors influencing psychological distress during a disease epidemic: data from Australia's first outbreak of equine influenza. *BMC Public Health*. 2008;8:347.
33. Ten Have M, Penninx B, Tuithof M, van Dorsselaer S, Kleinjan M, Spijker J, et al. Duration of major and minor depressive episodes and associated risk indicators in a psychiatric epidemiological cohort study of the general population. *Acta Psychiatr Scand*. 2017;136(3):300-12.
34. Clay JM, Parker MO. Alcohol use and misuse during the COVID-19 pandemic: a potential public health crisis? *The Lancet Public health*. In Press.
35. WHO WHO. *Global status report on alcohol and health2018*. 2018.
36. Hiroeh U, Appleby L, Mortensen PB, Dunn G. Death by homicide, suicide, and other unnatural causes in people with mental illness: a population-based study. *Lancet*. 2001;358(9299):2110-2.
37. Hiroeh U, Kapur N, Webb R, Dunn G, Mortensen PB, Appleby L. Deaths from natural causes in people with mental illness: a cohort study. *J Psychosom Res*. 2008;64(3):275-83.
38. Westman J, Wahlbeck K, Laursen TM, Gissler M, Nordentoft M, Hallgren J, et al. Mortality and life expectancy of people with alcohol use disorder in Denmark, Finland and Sweden. *Acta Psychiatr Scand*. 2015;131(4):297-306.
39. Praso S. China's Divorce Spike Is a Warning to Rest of Locked-Down World. <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-03-31/divorces-spike-in-china-after-coronavirus-quarantines>; Bloomberg; 2020 [
40. Bourassa KJ, Ruiz JM, Sbarra DA. Smoking and Physical Activity Explain the Increased Mortality Risk Following Marital Separation and Divorce: Evidence From the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing. *Ann Behav Med*. 2019;53(3):255-66.
41. Martin LR, Friedman HS, Clark KM, Tucker JS. Longevity following the experience of parental divorce. *Soc Sci Med*. 2005;61(10):2177-89.

42. Switzerland FSOo. Scheidungen, Scheidungshäufigkeit 2020 [Available from: <https://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/de/home/statistiken/bevoelkerung/heiraten-eingetragene-partnerschaften-scheidungen/scheidungshaeufigkeit.html>].
43. Doblhammer G, Muth E, Kruse A. Lebenserwartung in Deutschland: Trends, Prognose, Risikofaktoren und der Einfluss ausgewählter Medizininnovationen. Rostock; 2008.
44. Cohan CL, Cole SW. Life course transitions and natural disaster: marriage, birth, and divorce following Hurricane Hugo. *J Fam Psychol*. 2002;16(1):14-25.
45. Zoder I. Polizeilich registrierte häusliche Gewalt. In: Switzerland FSOo, editor. 2012.
46. Csonka Y, Mosimann A. Familien in der Schweiz. Statistischer bericht 2017. In: Switzerland FSOo, editor. 2017.
47. Jia H, Lubetkin EI. Impact of adverse childhood experiences on quality-adjusted life expectancy in the U.S. population. *Child Abuse Negl*. 2020;102:104418.
48. Merrick MT, Ford DC, Ports KA, Guinn AS. Prevalence of Adverse Childhood Experiences From the 2011-2014 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System in 23 States. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2018;172(11):1038-44.
49. WHO WHO. COVID-19 and violence against women. What the health sector/system can do. <https://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/VAW-COVID19-Rev1.pdf>; 2020.
50. Holt-Lunstad J, Smith TB, Layton JB. Social relationships and mortality risk: a meta-analytic review. *PLoS Med*. 2010;7(7):e1000316.
51. Holt-Lunstad J, Smith TB, Baker M, Harris T, Stephenson D. Loneliness and social isolation as risk factors for mortality: a meta-analytic review. *Perspect Psychol Sci*. 2015;10(2):227-37.
52. Elovainio M, Hakulinen C, Pulkki-Raback L, Virtanen M, Josefsson K, Jokela M, 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.

Table 1: Projection of lost years of life for the population of Switzerland due to demographics and mental health changes related to a mass confinement of 3 months.

Cause	Estimated Persons Affected with reduced longevity (% of the overall population)	Years of Life Lost per Person	Years of Life Lost for an isolation 3 months period	Years of life lost per person across the entire population (8.57 million)
Suicidality	1'523 (0.02%)	34.3	52'239	0.006
Divorces (spouses)	20'842 (0.24%)	3.5	72'947	0.008
Divorces (affected minors)	7'694 (0.09%)	4	30'776	0.004
Family Violence (affected minors)	5'567 (0.06%)	2.37	13'194	0.002
Depression	94'613 (1.10%)	6.82	645'260	0.075
Alcohol use Disorder	51'000 (0.60%)	17.67	901'170	0.105
Diminished Social contacts	3'484 (0.04%)	12.03	41'912	0.005
Total	179'520 (2.09%)	9.79	1'757'498	0.205

Table 2 indicates how many Years of life lost selected other countries would be projected to have, were their disorder and social representation were the same as Switzerland's (it is simply a multiplication of the years of life lost by the size of the population). Population numbers for countries other than Switzerland were sourced from Wikipedia (21).

Country	Population in millions	Years of Life Lost for an isolation 3 months period in millions
Switzerland	8.57	1.76
Germany	83.15	17.05
France	67.08	13.75
Spain	47.10	9.65
United Kingdom	66.44	13.62
Canada	37.99	7.79
United States	329.61	67.58
Japan	125.95	25.82
China	1402.16	287.47