

THE ROCKWOOL
FOUNDATION

Research

RISK OF STRESS/DEPRESSION AND FUNCTIONAL IMPAIRMENT IN DENMARK IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING A COVID-19 SHUTDOWN

LARS H. ANDERSEN

PETER FALLESEN

TIM A. BRUCKNER

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Risk of Stress/Depression and Functional Impairment in Denmark Immediately Following a COVID-19 Shutdown

Study Paper No. 157

Published by:

© The ROCKWOOL Foundation Research Unit

Address:

The ROCKWOOL Foundation Research Unit

Ny Kongensgade 6

1472 Copenhagen, Denmark

Telephone +45 33 34 48 00

E-mail: kontakt@rff.dk

<https://www.rockwoolfonden.dk/en>

December 2020

1 **Risk of Stress/Depression and Functional Impairment in Denmark Immediately**
2 **Following a COVID-19 Shutdown**

3

4 Lars H. Andersen¹, corresponding author: lha@rff.dk

5 Peter Fallesen^{1,2}

6 Tim A. Bruckner³

7

8 ¹*ROCKWOOL Foundation, Ny Kongensgade 6, 1472 Copenhagen C, Denmark*

9 ²*Swedish Institute for Social Research, Stockholm University, 106 91 Stockholm,*
10 *Sweden*

11 ³*Public Health, University of California, Irvine, CA 92697-3957, United States*

12 **ABSTRACT**

13 **Background**

14 This study aimed to investigate the impact of the first COVID-19 lockdown (March-April
15 2020) on risk for stress/depression and functional impairment in a representative
16 sample of adult individuals in Denmark, and whether the impact of lockdown was
17 heterogeneous across living situation.

18

19 **Methods:**

20 Using a representative, randomly drawn sample from the complete Danish adult
21 population interviewed in March 2 to April 13, 2020 (n=2,836) and again in July 2020
22 (n=1,526, 54% retention rate), we study how the imposed lockdown announced March
23 11 following the onset of the first Danish wave of COVID-19 infections affected mental
24 wellbeing. We use the World Health Organization Five Well-being Index (WHO-5) and
25 the Work and Social Adjustment Scale (WSAS) to capture wellbeing and functioning.
26 Using covariate adjusted ordinary least squares linear probability models and exploiting
27 variation in the timing of responses occurring just before and just after the introduction
28 of lockdown, we compare respondents before lockdown to respondents that answered
29 during lockdown, as well to answers in re-interviews in July.

30

31 **Results:**

32 We find reduced depressive symptoms among adults immediately after the shutdown,
33 concentrated in adults with children living at home. Measures of functional impairment
34 also decline immediately after the March shutdown among adults with children living at
35 home. Impairment intensified for the entire sample between March and July, but
36 depressive symptoms remained at lower rate in July.

37

38 **Conclusions:**

39 Findings in Denmark indicate that living with children at home may have, in the short
40 term, buffered the potential mental health sequelae of the COVID-19 shutdown.

41 **DECLARATIONS**

42 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

43 Statistics Denmark anonymizes and de-identifies the data before making it available to
44 researchers. Use of the data for research purposes is allowed under Danish law for
45 individuals affiliated with Danish research institutions without the need for ethical
46 approval of individual studies. The present study received approval from Statistics
47 Denmark under the auspices of data project no. 707676.

48 **Consent for publication**

49 Not applicable.

50 **Availability of data and materials**

51 Data may be obtained from a third party and are not publicly available. The data used in
52 this study have been made available through a trusted third party, Statistics Denmark.
53 Due to privacy concerns, the data cannot be made available outside the hosted
54 research servers at Statistics Denmark. University-based and private Danish scientific
55 organisations can be authorised to work with data within Statistics Denmark. Such
56 organisations can provide access to individual scientists inside and outside of Denmark.
57 Requests for data may be sent to Statistics Denmark:
58 [http://www.dst.dk/en/OmDS/organisation/TelefonbogOrg.](http://www.dst.dk/en/OmDS/organisation/TelefonbogOrg.aspx?kontor=13&tlfbogsort=sektion)
59 [aspix?kontor=13&tlfbogsort=sektion](http://www.dst.dk/en/OmDS/organisation/TelefonbogOrg.aspx?kontor=13&tlfbogsort=sektion) or the Danish Data Protection Agency: [https://](https://www.datatilsynet.dk/english/the-danish-data-protection-agency/contact/)
60 www.datatilsynet.dk/english/the-danish-data-protection-agency/contact/. The authors
61 document and make available all code needed to reproduce the findings in the study.

62 **Competing interests**

63 Non declared.

64 **Funding**

65 This work was funded by the ROCKWOOL Foundation (grant no. 1227) with additional
66 funding from the Swedish Research Council for Health, Working Life and Welfare (Grant
67 no. 2016-07099) (PF). The research was carried out independently of the funders.

68 **Authors' contributions**

69 LHA, PF, and TAB conceived of the presented idea. LHA and PF performed the
70 computations. LHA, PF, and TAB verified the statistical methods. LHA, PF and TAB
71 discussed the results and wrote the manuscript. The corresponding author confirms that
72 he had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision
73 to submit for publication.

74 **Acknowledgements**

75 The authors thank Laust Hvas Mortensen and Sebastian Simonsen for helpful
76 comments on an earlier draft of the manuscript.

77 INTRODUCTION

78 As of mid-October 2020, more than 90 countries across the world imposed some form
79 of lockdown in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic [1]. Lockdowns range in scope and
80 duration, but all imply a degree of social isolation as well as disruption from routine
81 social, educational, and/or work activity. Previous research which predates COVID-19
82 indicates that, following social isolation and disruptions from work routines, mental
83 wellbeing may decline [2–5], and whether people live together with others or not can be
84 an important stratifying factor [6]. In addition, a review of mental health following more
85 extreme measures of quarantine finds long-term psychological sequelae [7]. Taken
86 together, this literature has raised the concern of a “second pandemic” of morbidity due
87 to mental health problems following COVID-19 [8].

88 Recent research examines mental wellbeing following COVID-19 and the associated
89 lockdowns. Three population-representative studies—in the UK, the US, and France—
90 appear in the literature. All studies report worse mental health in Spring 2020 relative to
91 previous years [8–11]. Ettman and colleagues, for instance, find a much greater
92 prevalence of depressive symptoms among adults in the US in April 2020 relative to
93 2017/2018.

94 This work, while important, has two key limitations. First, the UK, the US, and France all
95 rank in the top 15 worldwide in COVID-19 deaths per population as of November 30,
96 2020 [12]. This circumstance leaves open the question of whether experienced national
97 severity of the pandemic (through media reports [8] or through direct experiences), or
98 the social and work restrictions imposed by a lockdown *per se*, drive results. Second,
99 none of these studies includes measures of mental health and/or wellbeing immediately

100 *before* the lockdown. The absence of “baseline” mental health information in weeks
101 before the lockdown raises the concern of confounding by trends over time in mental
102 health that coincide with, but are not caused by, the COVID-19 lockdown. Third, unlike
103 for previously studied countries, the Danish lockdown was imposed uniformly and
104 rapidly following the first infections and came into effect before the first Danish
105 registered COVID-19 fatality (see Figure 1).

106 We address these limitations and extend prior work by examining mental wellbeing in
107 Denmark, a country that imposed a lockdown in March 2020 but reports a substantially
108 lower COVID-19 burden (i.e., 14.3 deaths per 100,000 population) than does France,
109 the US, or the UK (i.e., 78 to 87 deaths per 100,000 population) [12]. We also exploit
110 variation in the timing of responses to a nationally representative survey collected in
111 March 2020. On March 11, Denmark imposed nationwide school closures and the
112 closing of public institutions. Survey responses occurred immediately before and after
113 the date when the first COVID-19 lockdown was ordered and imposed.

114 We measured mental wellbeing among the adult Danish population through the World
115 Health Organization Five Well-being Index (WHO-5) and the Work and Social
116 Adjustment Scale (WSAS). These scales capture both pre-clinical measures of mental
117 disorder as well as impairment. Further, we re-interviewed the sample in July 2020
118 when COVID-19 precautions were substantially lessened compared to the lockdown
119 period in March. Given that previous research on some subgroups finds *improved*
120 wellbeing following COVID-19 [13], we specified all tests as two-tailed. We, moreover,
121 explored the relation between the lockdown and mental wellbeing by family structure,

122 given that state-imposed limitations on social activity may affect persons living alone
123 differently than for persons living with family members as suggested by prior research.

124 **BACKGROUND**

125 **Lockdown timeline for Denmark**

126 Figure 1 provides a timeline of the Danish COVID-19-restrictions, the number of
127 confirmed cases for March and start of April 2020, and the data collection window for
128 the first wave of the survey [1, 14]. Denmark reported its first confirmed SARS-CoV-2
129 case on February 27, 2020 [1]. On March 11, Denmark initiated nationwide school
130 closures and the closing of public institutions, as the cumulative number of confirmed
131 infections had increased to 264. Lockdown measures were further strengthened over
132 the following six days to include border closures, the closure of restaurants, malls and
133 hairdressers, and general encouragements to work from home. Financial aid packages
134 to businesses and furloughed employees were launched in the same six-day period.
135 Unlike other European countries, Denmark did not introduce curfews, stay-home orders,
136 or mandatory use of masks during the Spring lockdown. The Danish government began
137 easing lockdown measures from April 15, 2020. Lockdown measures were continuously
138 eased over the summer, and not re-introduced until September 2020. Based on this
139 timeline, we defined the beginning of the lockdown measures as March 11, 2020.

140 **METHODS**

141 **Variables and Data**

142 To consider how measures of wellbeing and impairment changed following the imposed
143 lockdown, we used a representative survey carried out by Statistics Denmark on behalf

144 of the Capital Region of Denmark's Mental Health Services during March-April 2020.
145 Using a random draw from the present population database of all Danish residents aged
146 18 and above, Statistics Denmark initially contacted 8,300 people through personal
147 digital postboxes that are linked directly to people's unique social security numbers and
148 used for communications between Danish residents and governmental institutions.
149 Respondents answered through computer assisted web interviews (CAWI), with those
150 initially failing to respond receiving prompts by message to their digital postbox. The
151 response rate to the first wave of the survey was 34 percent (N=2,836); 1,127
152 respondents completed the survey prior to the lockdown announcement and initiation on
153 March 11, and 1,709 respondents completed it after March 11. These numbers reflect
154 respondents who provided valid responses to all items of our dependent variables.
155 Respondents who completed the survey before and after March 11 were generally alike
156 across the background characteristics, although the proportion of respondents age 60+
157 decreased and the proportion of respondents with children living at home increased
158 slightly (see Appendix Table A1).

159 With permission from the Capital Region of Denmark's Mental Health Services, we then
160 carried out a follow up survey in July 2020, where the same respondents were re-
161 interviewed. Of respondents participating in the first wave, 1,526 (54%) also participated
162 in the second wave collected in July 2020. Younger respondents and respondents with
163 children living at home were less likely to participate in the second wave, as were
164 respondents who experienced significant functional impairment in early March (which
165 will likely cause us to underestimate a potential increase in functional impairment from
166 March to July), but respondents in the second wave generally resemble respondents in

167 early March (see Appendix Table A1). Answers to the survey can be linked at the
168 individual level with administrative data from Statistics Denmark. In addition to survey
169 data on mental wellbeing and functioning, our data therefore contain information on age,
170 gender, living arrangement (single/in a relationship), whether respondents were living
171 with any children in the home, region of residents (Nomenclature of Territorial Units for
172 Statistics, level 2 ([NUTS-2]), and employment status (employed, unemployed, outside
173 the labor force).

174 To capture wellbeing and experienced functional impairment, the survey included two
175 validated measures—the WHO-5 and the WSAS—that both have distinct clinically
176 relevant threshold values. The WHO-5 is a sensitive and specific clinical screening tool
177 for risk of stress and depression that uses five items to capture risk of depression
178 measured between 0-100, with each scale contributing 0-20 points. For this measure, 0
179 indicates the most severe depressive symptoms and 100 indicates no symptoms. The
180 WHO-5 has strong construct validity as a unidimensional scale [15]. For Denmark, the
181 population norm is established as 70 for adults [16]. For the WHO-5 index, we
182 (consistent with work in clinical settings) used the established cutoff point at 50 to create
183 a binary category for whether a respondent is at risk for depression and stress (i.e.
184 $WHO-5 < 50$, [15, Table 2]).

185 The WSAS is a functional impairment measure designed to measure a patient's
186 perceived functional impairment following health problems across five items [17].
187 Although not originally intended for non-clinical populations, the WSAS displays valid
188 psychometric properties across different patient populations that cover both mild and
189 more severe (psycho-)somatic [18–20] and mental health [17, 21–23] conditions.

190 Furthermore, the WSAS captures a dimension of impairment distinct from depression
191 [23]. Although not validated in a Danish version, it has previously been used both in
192 Danish clinical and research settings [21]. WSAS measures impairment on a scale from
193 0 (no impairment) to 40 (most severe impairment). Given that we study a non-clinical
194 sample, we use the cutoff point at a WSAS score of 10, with any score above 10
195 indicating at least significant functional impairment with or without additional
196 psychopathologies (WSAS > 10 [17]).

197 **Analytical strategy**

198 Our analytical strategy exploits the fact that data collection took place across the
199 announcement and initiation of lockdown in Denmark in March 2020. First, we use
200 ordinary least squares linear probability models to compare the outcomes between
201 respondents who answered the survey before and after lockdown began. We adjust all
202 models for gender and age. Next, in fully adjusted regression models, we control for
203 NUTS2-region of residence, labor market status (employed, unemployed, outside the
204 labor force), relationship status (single, married/cohabiting), and whether respondents
205 had children at home.

206 The impact of lockdown could differ according to the home environment. Persons living
207 with family, for instance, may experience relative more social interaction than would
208 persons not living with family during the imposed lockdown. To explore this possibility,
209 we performed sub-sample analyses that compares single individuals to individuals who
210 are living with a partner, as well as sub-sample analyses that compare people living
211 without children in the home to people living with children in the home, and test for
212 differences between subgroups using a Chow-test.

213 In addition, to fully leverage our data structure with re-interviews in July 2020, we then
214 compared the reported levels of risk of depression and stress and significant functional
215 impairment measured prior to lockdown in March to the levels experienced by the same
216 persons in July accounting for repeated measures of the same individuals with clustered
217 standard errors. The latter exercise captures the development in the outcomes across
218 the first wave of COVID-19 in Denmark. Here, we control for relatively few variables in
219 the regression because we use within-individual variation across survey waves (e.g.,
220 the age of the individual does not change substantially from March to July). All
221 calculations were carried out using Stata 15/MP.

222 We then performed several robustness checks. First, we evaluated whether our choice
223 of thresholds in the outcome variables ($WHO-5 < 50$ and $WSAS > 10$) affect inference.
224 Second, because our sample is not fully identical to the Danish population on
225 characteristics such as gender and age, we replicate main results using population
226 weights provided by Statistics Denmark instead of controlling for covariates. Third,
227 selective survey participation across the lockdown in March and across the two survey
228 waves (if, for example, people who experience increased mental distress due to the
229 lockdown are less likely to participate than before the lockdown or they are more likely
230 to not respond to survey wave 2) could invalidate our results (Appendix Table A1
231 showed some sign of such selection from wave 1 to 2, although not to any discernable
232 degree from early to late March, on observed characteristics). To address this, we use
233 the within person changes in response between March and July. As there was very little
234 change in lockdown measures in July, all returning respondents recompleted the survey
235 under identical lockdown circumstances. If our main pattern of results between

236 respondents who answered prior to and during lockdown in March persist once we take
237 into account individual change up to the post-lockdown July wave, it would indicate
238 results are robust to differential selection in the first wave of response across the
239 lockdown period, and results would thus at least be internally valid. Fourth, the items of
240 the WHO-5 ask respondents to consider their experiences during the preceding two
241 weeks. To account for the possibility that respondents answering within two weeks after
242 lockdown have to consider both time before and after lockdown, as a robustness check
243 we weighted answers given in the two weeks after lockdown with the amount of time
244 since the lockdown announcement. If people considered a full two-week horizon it
245 would mean that our main estimates of the impact of the lockdown order in March will
246 be biased toward zero—that is, our main estimates would be conservative. Last,
247 because our main results focus on respondents with children living at home, and
248 because there may be different requirements and worries associated with having
249 children at different ages at home, we checked whether results differ by age of the
250 children (which we obtained from the general registers).

251 **RESULTS**

252 Table 1 describes the sociodemographic characteristics of the survey participants and
253 the population. Respondents (n=2,836) are similar to the broader Danish adult
254 population in terms of geographical region and socioeconomic status. We observe
255 some dissimilarities for gender and age, which we therefore control for in all reported
256 results. Over half (54%) of participants in the first survey wave in March 2020 completed
257 the survey in July 2020 (Appendix Table A1). In addition, during the first survey wave,
258 40% completed the survey before the lockdown (March 11th), and 60% completed the

259 survey after the lockdown, which permits adequate sample size to estimate mean levels
260 of depressive symptoms and functional impairment during these two distinct periods in
261 March.

262 Bivariate comparison of our outcomes across the lockdown do not reach conventional
263 levels of statistical detection. Still, adults interviewed after the lockdown in March have a
264 slightly lower prevalence of depression and stress when compared to those interviewed
265 before the lockdown (i.e., 20% vs. 22%, see Appendix Table A1), and this finding is
266 statistically detectable when controlling for age and gender (column 1 of Table A2) yet
267 does not reject the null in the fully adjusted model that controls for additional individual
268 covariates, such as household structure (to which we return; see Appendix Table A2,
269 column 2). If we expand the data to include respondents with valid responses to the
270 WHO-5 items but who had not responded to the WSAS, the decline becomes
271 statistically detectable (i.e., 20% after the lockdown and 23% before, $p < .05$, $N = 3,110$).
272 Functional impairment scores from the WSAS also show a slight decline in late March
273 relative to pre-lockdown (i.e., 17% vs. 16%, see Appendix Table A1), but this difference
274 does not reach conventional levels of statistical detection when we control for age and
275 gender (Appendix Tables A1 and A2).

276 Following the state-imposed limitations on social activity, adults may have relied more
277 on family members for social interaction than they did before the lockdown. Persons
278 living alone, however, may have experienced fewer interactions during the lockdown,
279 which implies the possibility of heterogeneous impact of the lockdown orders. We
280 therefore classified the sample by cohabitation status, and then by whether the adult
281 respondent reported children living at home. Of these subgroups, only adults with

282 children living at home (upper panel of Figure 2) show a lower prevalence of depressive
283 symptoms in late March (i.e., 17% vs. 32% in early March; $p < .01$, see Table A3 for
284 adjusted regression results). Using a Chow-test, we found that the decrease for adults
285 with children in the home compared to adults without children in the home is larger to
286 statistically detectable degree ($p < .05$). All other subgroups report no difference in
287 depressive symptoms between early to late March.

288 The time course of WSAS functional impairment scores largely coheres with that of the
289 subgroup trends for depressive symptoms. Adults with children living at home show a
290 lower prevalence in functional impairment in late, relative to early, March (lower panel of
291 Figure 2; $p < .05$, see Appendix Table A4). Again, using a Chow-test, we found that the
292 decrease for adults with children in the home compared to adults without children in the
293 home is larger to statistically detectable degree ($p < .05$). The lower prevalence of
294 functional impairment among adults with children living at home remains relatively
295 constant across WSAS sub-domains of work, social, and home functioning (Appendix
296 Figure A1). We, by contrast, find no difference in functional impairment scores among
297 other subgroups when comparing pre- vs. post-lockdown periods in March (lower panel
298 of Figure 2 and Appendix Table A4).

299 Lockdown restrictions eased on April 15th. We examined whether depressive symptoms
300 and functional impairment differed among respondents several months later—arguably
301 once COVID-related social, economic, and institutional conventions in Denmark
302 stabilized for a while. We restricted the study sample to persons who completed the
303 survey in early March (i.e., pre-lockdown) and again in July 2020 (Appendix Figures A2-
304 A4 show results including late March respondents). In aggregate, depressive symptoms

305 among these adults fell, but functional impairment rose, in July relative to early March
306 ($p < .05$ for both tests—see Appendix Table A5).

307 When disaggregating the July responses by family structure, only adults with children
308 living at home and adults in couples reported a reduction in depressive symptoms in
309 July relative to early March (upper panel of Figure 3; $p < .05$, see Appendix Table A6). By
310 contrast, adults with no children at home as well as singles show no change in
311 depressive symptoms over time ($p = .713$ and $p = .081$, respectively, see Appendix Table
312 A6). Functional impairment, however, increased in July for all groups, albeit to a much
313 greater extent for adults without children living at home (i.e., 13% to 35% in July; see
314 lower panel of Figure 3 and Appendix Table A7). The increase in functional impairment
315 in July among adults with children living at home was much lower (but still statistically
316 significant, $p < .05$).

317 The results from our robustness checks do not raise concern over the validity of our
318 main results. First, modifying the thresholds used to define depressive symptoms and
319 functional impairment did not substantially change results (see Appendix Table A8).
320 Second, using statistical weights provided by Statistics Denmark instead of controlling
321 for covariates did not affect inference (see Appendix Figure A5). Third, relying on within-
322 individual differences in the outcomes pre- and post-lockdown in March compared to
323 July answers did not change main results (see Appendix Table A9). Fourth, down-
324 weighting “exposure” to the lockdown among respondents who participated on March
325 12th to 25th, as described in the Methods section, did not affect inference (see Appendix
326 Figure A6; we ran the same robustness check for the WSAS and again found results
327 similar to the main Tables (Appendix Figure A7). Results from our last robustness check

328 (focusing on age of children) shows that our main results for respondents with children
329 living at home are robust across age of the children when focusing on the risk of
330 depression or stress, but that the early to late March decrease in the proportion
331 experiencing significant functional impairment is driven by respondents with children
332 older than 6 years (see Appendix Figures A8 and A9).

333 **DISCUSSION**

334 We exploit the unique timing of a population-based behavioral survey to examine
335 whether a COVID-19 related shutdown preceded an acute change in depressive
336 symptoms and functional impairment. We examined these responses in Denmark, a
337 country that experienced relatively low incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infections, but which
338 instituted strong lockdown restrictions in March 2020. Contrary to reports in other
339 countries, we find *reduced* depressive symptoms among adults immediately after the
340 shutdown. This reduction, moreover, concentrates in adults with children living at home.
341 Measures of functional impairment also decline immediately after the March shutdown,
342 but only among adults with children living at home. Findings in Denmark indicate that
343 living with children at home may have, in the short term, buffered the potential mental
344 health sequelae of the COVID-19 shutdown. If others replicate our work, strengthening
345 the type of social support that already seems to be present in families may serve as one
346 potential avenue for minimizing the mental health sequelae of extended COVID-19
347 shutdowns.

348 Raabe and colleagues' survey of scientists in three European countries coheres with
349 our findings in that they report improved wellbeing immediately after the COVID-19
350 lockdown [13]. Similarly, Mari and colleagues find results that mirror ours across

351 residential patterns, although they are limited to studying Italians during lockdown [11].
352 In contrast, a multinational study using data collected late March to early April 2020
353 generally find that families report the most stress during lockdown [24], but these results
354 may simply reflect differences already existing prior to the pandemic (as our results also
355 suggest). Whereas we hesitate to draw population-based lessons from this select
356 survey of well- educated scientists, the authors note that strong security of employment
357 may have contributed to their short-term satisfaction with a slower pace and a flexible
358 work-life organization. This financial security may be similar to the situation of most
359 Danish households during the COVID-19 pandemic. Furthermore, social cohesion may
360 increase following adverse events given that shared adversity can connect individuals to
361 a broader goal and purpose than before the event [25, 26]. This social cohesion
362 explanation seems consistent with reports of fewer than expected suicide deaths
363 immediately following the first set of COVID-19 restrictions in Germany and Japan [27,
364 28]. We note, however, that this explanation is necessarily *post hoc* and requires further
365 refinement and testing before being considered as anything other than informed
366 speculation. We also point out that the reductions in depressive symptoms among
367 Danes appear confined to adults living with children.

368 Whereas adults living with children show reduced depressive symptoms in July (relative
369 to pre-shutdown), they are more likely to report significant functional impairment in July.
370 We suspect that, as they habituate to the reality of a prolonged COVID-19 pandemic,
371 the ability to flexibly balance work, family, and social expectations may become
372 strained. Interestingly, of any subgroup, adults living with children show the lowest rise
373 in significant functional impairment in July 2020. This result should encourage further

374 investigation, in both Denmark and elsewhere, of elements of family life that may benefit
375 social connectivity and general mental health functioning during COVID-19.

376 Strengths of our study include the population-based nature of the survey, the use of two
377 different measures of mental wellbeing and functioning, and the fact that survey
378 responses fall immediately before and after the announced lockdown. Limitations
379 involve the fact that the March comparisons of mental wellbeing before and after the
380 lockdown examine serial cross-sections rather than a panel. We, however, controlled for
381 compositional changes of the panel in our analyses. The WHO-5 also asks about 14-
382 day recall of depressive symptoms, which may have biased pre- vs. post March 11
383 responses towards the null. We, however, controlled for this circumstance using a
384 weighted analysis as a robustness check; findings, moreover, rejected the null, which
385 precludes a type II error. Lastly, we cannot rule out the possibility of seasonal
386 confounding in that late-March coincided with Spring and better temperature than in
387 early March. This seasonal confounding, however, cannot explain the distinct nature of
388 the subgroup responses in which depressive symptoms and functional impairment fall in
389 late-March only among adults with children but not among adults living alone.

390 Our findings diverge from previous population-based reports in the UK, the US and
391 France. This circumstance could arise for several reasons. First, Denmark underwent a
392 much less severe COVID-19 pandemic in Spring 2020 than did these countries, as
393 measured by overall cases or deaths per population. Danes, therefore, may not have
394 had to contend as heavily with the associated fear and anxiety of COVID-19-related
395 morbidity as did other countries. Second, Denmark's strong social safety net largely
396 protects adults and families against large financial "shocks" that appear more common

397 in other countries (e.g., the US) when adults lose jobs [29]. Third, the work expectation
398 for adult Danes with children, when the school closures occurred in March, may have
399 been tempered in the short term. As a result, home life with children (at least in the early
400 weeks of the lockdown) may have promoted social interaction and reduced the risk of
401 depression without imposing additional work strain. Future work may want to explicitly
402 consider these important country-level differences when determining what components
403 of the COVID-19 pandemic—the morbidity, the social and educational disruptions, the
404 loss of work—affect changes in mental health and wellbeing. Such work would appear
405 to be critical not only for design of future public health efforts to enhance resilience and
406 recovery, but also for development of theory concerned with collective behavioral
407 responses to adversity.

408 **REFERENCES**

- 409 1. Roser M, Ritchie H, Ortiz-Ospina E, Hasell J. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Cases -
410 Statistics and Research - Our World in Data. Our World in Data. 2020.
- 411 2. Smith R. “Without work all life goes rotten.” *British Medical Journal*. 1992;305:972.
- 412 3. Kasl S V., Gore S, Cobb S. The experience of losing a job: reported changes in
413 health, symptoms and illness behavior. *Psychosom Med*. 1975;37:106–22.
- 414 4. Holt-Lunstad J. The Potential Public Health Relevance of Social Isolation and
415 Loneliness: Prevalence, Epidemiology, and Risk Factors. *Public Policy Aging Rep*.
416 2017.
- 417 5. Cacioppo S, Grippo AJ, London S, Goossens L, Cacioppo JT. Loneliness: Clinical
418 Import and Interventions. *Perspect Psychol Sci*. 2015;10:238–49.

- 419 6. Meltzer H, Bebbington P, Dennis MS, Jenkins R, McManus S, Brugha TS. Feelings of
420 loneliness among adults with mental disorder. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol*.
421 2013;48:5–13.
- 422 7. Brooks SK, Webster RK, Smith LE, Woodland L, Wessely S, Greenberg N, et al. The
423 psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence.
424 *The Lancet*. 2020.
- 425 8. Peretti-Watel P, Alleaume C, Léger D, Beck F, Verger P. Anxiety, depression and
426 sleep problems: A second wave of COVID-19. *General Psychiatry*. 2020.
- 427 9. Ettman CK, Abdalla SM, Cohen GH, Sampson L, Vivier PM, Galea S. Prevalence of
428 Depression Symptoms in US Adults Before and During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JAMA*
429 *Netw open*. 2020.
- 430 10. Niedzwiedz CL, Green MJ, Benzeval M, Campbell D, Craig P, Demou E, et al.
431 Mental health and health behaviours before and during the initial phase of the COVID-
432 19 lockdown: Longitudinal analyses of the UK Household Longitudinal Study. *J*
433 *Epidemiol Community Health*. 2020.
- 434 11. Mari E, Frascchetti A, Lausi G, Pizzo A, Baldi M, Paoli E, et al. Forced Cohabitation
435 during Coronavirus Lockdown in Italy: A Study on Coping, Stress and Emotions among
436 Different Family Patterns. *J Clin Med*. 2020;9:3906. doi:10.3390/jcm9123906.
- 437 12. Mortality Analyses - Johns Hopkins Coronavirus Resource Center.
438 <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/data/mortality>. Accessed 1 Dec 2020.
- 439 13. Raabe IJ, Ehlert A, Johann D, Rauhut H. Satisfaction of scientists during the

440 COVID-19 pandemic lockdown. *Humanit Soc Sci Commun.* 2020;7.
441 doi:10.1057/s41599-020-00618-4.

442 14. Rønnstad EB, Ancher-Jensen M. Tidslinje over coronakrisen: Hvad skete der og
443 hvornår? | Tænk tanken EUROPA. Tænk tanken Europa. 2020.
444 <http://thinkeuropa.dk/politik/tidslinje-over-coronakrisen-hvad-skete-der-og-hvornaar>.
445 Accessed 1 Dec 2020.

446 15. Topp CW, Østergaard SD, Søndergaard S, Bech P. The WHO-5 well-being index: A
447 systematic review of the literature. *Psychother Psychosom.* 2015.

448 16. Ellervik C, Kvetny J, Christensen KS, Vestergaard M, Bech P. Prevalence of
449 depression, quality of life and antidepressant treatment in the Danish General Suburban
450 Population Study. *Nord J Psychiatry.* 2014.

451 17. Mundt JC, Marks IM, Shear MK, Greist JH. The Work and Social Adjustment Scale:
452 A simple measure of impairment in functioning. *Br J Psychiatry.* 2002.

453 18. Cella M, Sharpe M, Chalder T. Measuring disability in patients with chronic fatigue
454 syndrome: Reliability and validity of the Work and Social Adjustment Scale. *J*
455 *Psychosom Res.* 2011.

456 19. Hommel M, Miguel ST, Naegele B, Gonnet N, Jaillard A. Cognitive determinants of
457 social functioning after a first ever mild to moderate stroke at vocational age. *J Neurol*
458 *Neurosurg Psychiatry.* 2009.

459 20. Thandi G, Fear NT, Chalder T. A comparison of the Work and Social Adjustment
460 Scale (WSAS) across different patient populations using Rasch analysis and

461 exploratory factor analysis. *J Psychosom Res.* 2017.

462 21. Kristensen S, Mainz J, Baandrup L, Bonde M, Videbech P, Holmskov J, et al.
463 Conceptualizing patient-reported outcome measures for use within two Danish
464 psychiatric clinical registries: description of an iterative co-creation process between
465 patients and healthcare professionals. *Nord J Psychiatry.* 2018.

466 22. Tchanturia K, Hambrook D, Curtis H, Jones T, Lounes N, Fenn K, et al. Work and
467 social adjustment in patients with anorexia nervosa. *Compr Psychiatry.* 2013.

468 23. Zahra D, Qureshi A, Henley W, Taylor R, Quinn C, Pooler J, et al. The work and
469 social adjustment scale: Reliability, sensitivity and value. *Int J Psychiatry Clin Pract.*
470 2014.

471 24. Kowal M, Coll-Martín T, Ikizer G, Rasmussen J, Eichel K, Studzińska A, et al. Who
472 is the Most Stressed During the COVID-19 Pandemic? Data From 26 Countries and
473 Areas. *Appl Psychol Heal Well-Being.* 2020;;aphw.12234. doi:10.1111/aphw.12234.

474 25. Durkheim É. *Suicide: A study in sociology.* New York: Free Press; 1951.

475 26. Claassen CA, Carmody T, Stewart SM, Bossarte RM, Larkin GL, Woodward WA, et
476 al. Effect of 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks in the USA on suicide in areas
477 surrounding the crash sites. *Br J Psychiatry.* 2010.

478 27. Tanaka T, Okamoto S. Suicide during the COVID-19 pandemic in Japan. *medRxiv.*
479 2020;;2020.08.30.20184168. doi:10.1101/2020.08.30.20184168.

480 28. Radeloff D, Papsdorf R, Uhlig K, Vasilache A, Putnam K, Klitzing K von. Trends in
481 suicide rates during the COVID-19. *medRxiv.* 2020;;2020.10.21.20187419.

482 doi:10.1101/2020.10.21.20187419.

483 29. Hansen H, Schultz-Nielsen ML. Social Assistance in Five Countries in North-


484 Western Europe. IZA Discuss Pap. 2015.

485 <https://ideas.repec.org/p/iza/izadps/dp9547.html>. Accessed 11 Aug 2018.

486

487

488 Figure 1. COVID-19 and lockdown development during first wave of data collection, February-
 489 April 2020.




490



491

492

493 Figure 2. Proportion of respondents at risk of depression or stress according to the WHO5 and
494 experiencing significant functional impairment according to the WSAS, by time of completing
495 the survey relative to lockdown and by household structure.



497 Figure 3. Proportion of respondents at risk of depression or stress according to the WHO5, repeat
498 responses in early March and July, by household structure.




500

501 Table 1. Descriptive statistics of sociodemographic characteristics of survey participants and the
 502 population of 18-79-year-old people in Denmark.

Variable	Survey		Population		T-test	p-value
	M	SD	M	SD		
Male	0.449	0.497	0.500	0.500	-5.399	<0.001
Female	0.551	0.497	0.500	0.500	5.399	<0.001
Ages 18-29	0.138	0.345	0.205	0.404	-8.839	<0.001
Ages 30-39	0.109	0.312	0.155	0.362	-6.835	<0.001
Ages 40-49	0.157	0.364	0.172	0.378	-2.112	0.035
Ages 50-59	0.226	0.418	0.183	0.387	5.844	<0.001
Ages 60-69	0.205	0.404	0.153	0.360	7.715	<0.001
Ages 70-79	0.165	0.371	0.131	0.337	5.356	<0.001
Singles	0.301	0.459	0.353	0.478	-5.714	<0.001
Couples	0.699	0.459	0.647	0.478	5.714	<0.001
No children at home	0.675	0.469	0.632	0.482	4.727	<0.001
Children at home	0.325	0.469	0.368	0.482	-4.727	<0.001
No. children age 0-2	0.042	0.253	0.054	0.234	-2.667	0.008
No. children age 3-5	0.070	0.311	0.078	0.291	-1.351	0.177
No. children age 6+	0.397	0.780	0.439	0.807	-2.749	0.006
Northern Jutland	0.104	0.305	0.102	0.303	0.311	0.756
Central Jutland	0.245	0.430	0.227	0.419	2.278	0.023
Southern Denmark	0.208	0.406	0.209	0.407	-0.096	0.924
Capitol	0.295	0.456	0.318	0.466	-2.642	0.008
Zealand	0.148	0.356	0.144	0.351	0.629	0.529
In Job	0.652	0.476	0.643	0.479	1.069	0.285
Unemployed	0.019	0.138	0.021	0.144	-0.702	0.483
Outside labor force	0.324	0.468	0.335	0.472	-1.251	0.211
N	2,836		4,359,539			


503 Note: No. children (top coded at three children) and labor market status (In Job, Unemployment,
 504 and Outside labor force) are measured from the general registers during the latest available data
 505 year (2019).

506 Figure A1. Mean score on subdomains of the WSAS, by time of completing the survey.



507


508 Figure A2. Proportion of respondents at risk of depression or stress according to the WHO5 and
509 proportion of respondents experiencing significant functional impairment according to the
510 WSAS, by time of completing the survey and including respondents in late March.



511


512

513 Figure A3. Proportion of respondents at risk of depression or stress according to the WHO5, by
514 time of completing the survey and including respondents in late March.




515

516 Figure A4. Proportion of respondents with significant functional impairment according to the
517 WSAS, by time of completing the survey and including respondents in late March.



518


519 Figure A5. Main results but using population weights from Statistics Denmark instead of
520 statistical controlling.



521

522


523 Figure A6. Proportion of respondents at risk of depression or stress according to the WHO5,
 524 comparing main results and main results by household structure to results down weighting
 525 respondents March 12 – March 25.



526

527 Note: The down weighting implies weighing individual responses by the numbers of days within
 528 the past two weeks prior to survey response that fell on or after the lockdown date, March 11.


529 Figure A7. Proportion of respondents significantly functionally impaired according to the WSAS,
 530 comparing main results and main results by household structure to results down weighting
 531 respondents March 12 – March 25.



532

533 Note: The down weighting implies weighing individual responses by the numbers of days within
 534 the past two weeks prior to survey response that fell on or after the lockdown date, March 11.

535 Figure A8. Proportion of respondents at risk of depression or stress according to the WHO5,
536 comparing main results for respondents with children living at home and results by age of the
537 children.




538

539

540

541 Figure A9. Proportion of respondents significantly functionally impaired according to the
542 WSAS, comparing main results for respondents with children living at home and results by age
543 of the children.



544

545 Table A1. Means of respondents' background characteristics, by response date and by sample
 546 characteristic.

Data type	Data from first survey wave			Panel data		
	Early March	Late March	p	Responded March and July	Responded March but not July	p
Male	0.447	0.450	0.885	0.457	0.426	0.319
Female	0.553	0.550	0.885	0.543	0.574	0.319
Ages 18-29	0.137	0.139	0.843	0.107	0.198	0.000
Ages 30-39	0.089	0.122	0.005	0.080	0.107	0.134
Ages 40-49	0.135	0.172	0.008	0.106	0.195	<0.001
Ages 50-59	0.208	0.238	0.062	0.212	0.198	0.575
Ages 60-69	0.238	0.183	<0.001	0.274	0.162	<0.001
Ages 70-79	0.194	0.146	0.001	0.220	0.140	0.001
Singles	0.312	0.294	0.307	0.304	0.330	0.386
Couples	0.688	0.706	0.307	0.696	0.670	0.386
No children at home	0.736	0.634	<0.001	0.773	0.659	<0.001
Children at home	0.264	0.366	<0.001	0.227	0.341	<0.001
Northern Jutland	0.103	0.104	0.917	0.102	0.104	0.911
Central Jutland	0.241	0.247	0.735	0.236	0.253	0.537
Southern Denmark	0.232	0.193	0.010	0.241	0.214	0.318
Capitol	0.274	0.308	0.051	0.265	0.294	0.304
Zealand	0.149	0.148	0.940	0.156	0.135	0.347
In Job	0.592	0.692	<0.001	0.579	0.618	0.215
Unemployed	0.022	0.018	0.382	0.025	0.016	0.370
Outside labor force	0.383	0.286	<0.001	0.394	0.360	0.264
WHO-5 < 50	0.224	0.200	0.123	0.208	0.255	0.076
WSAS > 10	0.174	0.159	0.300	0.151	0.223	0.003
N	1,172	1,709		763	364	

547 Notes: Table shows means and p-values refer to T-tests of statistically detectable differences
 548 across table columns within data type.

549

550

551

552 Table A2. Parameter estimates from OLS regressions of being at risk of depression/stress
 553 (WHO5 < 50) and experiencing significant functional impairment (WSAS > 10).

Model	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Outcome	WHO5<50	WHO5<50	WSAS>10	WSAS>10
Before 3/11/20	0.291*** (0.026)	0.364*** (0.038)	0.183*** (0.022)	0.307*** (0.034)
After 3/11/20	-0.037* (0.018)	-0.029 (0.016)	-0.024 (0.014)	-0.013 (0.014)
Female	0.024 (0.015)	0.014 (0.015)	0.022 (0.014)	0.010 (0.014)
Ages 18-29	-0.015 (0.031)	-0.059 (0.032)	0.072* (0.029)	0.008 (0.029)
Ages 30-39	-0.008 (0.033)	-0.014 (0.033)	0.054 (0.030)	0.046 (0.029)
Ages 50-59	-0.065* (0.027)	-0.065* (0.028)	-0.012 (0.023)	-0.019 (0.024)
Ages 60-69	-0.121*** (0.026)	-0.160*** (0.031)	-0.077*** (0.023)	-0.150*** (0.027)
Ages 70-79	-0.185*** (0.026)	-0.275*** (0.033)	-0.076** (0.023)	-0.222*** (0.032)
Single		0.077*** (0.018)		0.070*** (0.016)
Children at home		0.006 (0.022)		-0.011 (0.019)
In Job		-0.121*** (0.020)		-0.181*** (0.020)
Unemployed		-0.071 (0.062)		-0.171*** (0.052)
North Jutland		0.006 (0.027)		0.046 (0.024)
Central Jutland		-0.004 (0.020)		0.041* (0.018)
Southern Denmark		0.042 (0.022)		0.055** (0.020)
Zealand		0.029 (0.024)		0.030 (0.021)
<i>N</i>	2,836	2,836	2,836	2,836

554 Standard errors in parentheses.
 555 * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

556 Table A3. Parameter estimates from OLS regressions of being at risk of depression/stress
 557 (WHO5 < 50), by household structure.

Model Household structure	(1) Singles	(2) Couples	(3) No children at home	(4) Children at home
Before 3/11/20	0.435*** (0.053)	0.239*** (0.029)	0.355*** (0.045)	0.273*** (0.039)
After 3/11/20	-0.035 (0.031)	-0.034 (0.018)	-0.011 (0.018)	-0.089** (0.032)
Female	-0.031 (0.031)	0.045** (0.017)	0.009 (0.018)	0.068* (0.029)
Ages 18-29	-0.092 (0.057)	-0.014 (0.038)	-0.068 (0.052)	-0.018 (0.043)
Ages 30-39	-0.028 (0.069)	-0.011 (0.037)	-0.043 (0.060)	-0.009 (0.039)
Ages 50-59	-0.137* (0.057)	-0.040 (0.030)	-0.155** (0.048)	-0.005 (0.037)
Ages 60-69	-0.192*** (0.056)	-0.096** (0.029)	-0.193*** (0.046)	-0.002 (0.090)
Ages 70-79	-0.237*** (0.057)	-0.166*** (0.028)	-0.255*** (0.046)	-0.184*** (0.029)
<i>N</i>	855	1981	1,913	923

558 Standard errors in parentheses
 559 * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

560
 561

562

563 Table A4. Parameter estimates from OLS regressions being at risk of significant functional
 564 impairment (WSAS > 10), by household structure.

Model Household structure	(1) Singles	(2) Couples	(3) No children at home	(4) Children at home
Before 3/11/20	0.331*** (0.051)	0.131*** (0.023)	0.267*** (0.042)	0.150*** (0.033)
After 3/11/20	-0.015 (0.029)	-0.024 (0.016)	-0.001 (0.017)	-0.066* (0.028)
Female	-0.029 (0.029)	0.040** (0.015)	0.009 (0.017)	0.066** (0.025)
Ages 18-29	-0.048 (0.054)	0.106** (0.036)	-0.010 (0.049)	0.091* (0.041)
Ages 30-39	0.027 (0.067)	0.053 (0.033)	0.021 (0.058)	0.046 (0.035)
Ages 50-59	-0.077 (0.054)	0.009 (0.025)	-0.111* (0.044)	0.039 (0.031)
Ages 60-69	-0.146** (0.053)	-0.054* (0.023)	-0.170*** (0.042)	0.059 (0.083)
Ages 70-79	-0.161** (0.054)	-0.046 (0.025)	-0.166*** (0.043)	-0.084*** (0.024)
<i>N</i>	855	1,981	1,913	923

565 Standard errors in parentheses

566 * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

567

568

569 Table A5. Parameter estimates from OLS regressions of being at risk of depression/stress
 570 (WHO5 < 50) and experiencing significant functional impairment (WSAS > 10), repeat
 571 responses in early March and July.

Model Outcome	(1) WHO5<50	(2) WHO5<50	(3) WSAS>10	(4) WSAS>10
Early March	0.294*** (0.047)	0.332*** (0.067)	0.166*** (0.046)	0.248*** (0.066)
July	-0.033* (0.014)	-0.033* (0.014)	0.199*** (0.017)	0.199*** (0.017)
Female	0.011 (0.025)	0.006 (0.025)	0.000 (0.026)	-0.008 (0.026)
Ages 18-29	-0.009 (0.058)	-0.034 (0.058)	0.064 (0.062)	0.027 (0.063)
Ages 30-39	0.027 (0.070)	0.026 (0.068)	0.054 (0.066)	0.052 (0.063)
Ages 50-59	-0.095 (0.051)	-0.094 (0.053)	-0.028 (0.052)	-0.023 (0.051)
Ages 60-69	-0.123* (0.050)	-0.150* (0.058)	-0.043 (0.049)	-0.083 (0.056)
Ages 70-79	-0.175*** (0.049)	-0.222*** (0.060)	-0.039 (0.049)	-0.115 (0.060)
Single		0.059* (0.029)		0.048 (0.028)
Children at home		-0.005 (0.040)		0.005 (0.040)
In Job		-0.064* (0.032)		-0.116** (0.035)
Unemployed		0.029 (0.094)		-0.039 (0.090)
North Jutland		-0.019 (0.043)		0.004 (0.047)
Central Jutland		-0.004 (0.034)		-0.004 (0.036)
Southern Denmark		0.001 (0.033)		0.017 (0.036)
Zealand		0.043 (0.041)		0.007 (0.040)
<i>N</i>	1,526	1,526	1,526	1,526

572 Standard errors in parentheses and clustered at the individual level.

573 * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

574

575 Table A6. Parameter estimates from OLS regressions of being at risk of depression/stress
 576 (WHO5 < 50), by household structure. Repeat responses in early March and July.

Model	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Household structure	Singles	Couples	No children at home	Children at home
Early March	0.440*** (0.075)	0.284*** (0.044)	0.374*** (0.064)	0.322*** (0.057)
July	-0.047 (0.027)	-0.033* (0.016)	-0.006 (0.015)	-0.133*** (0.032)
Female	-0.042 (0.044)	0.026 (0.025)	-0.000 (0.025)	0.020 (0.047)
Ages 18-29	-0.061 (0.083)	-0.048 (0.057)	-0.053 (0.076)	-0.033 (0.061)
Ages 30-39	-0.014 (0.108)	-0.021 (0.065)	-0.072 (0.093)	0.022 (0.071)
Ages 50-59	-0.170* (0.084)	-0.109* (0.049)	-0.177* (0.069)	-0.104 (0.059)
Ages 60-69	-0.167* (0.083)	-0.137** (0.047)	-0.211** (0.066)	0.266 (0.222)
Ages 70-79	-0.271*** (0.078)	-0.189*** (0.046)	-0.274*** (0.065)	NA
<i>N</i>	584	1,306	1,420	470

577 Standard errors in parentheses and clustered at the individual level. NA = Not Available.

578 * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

579

580

581

582 Table A7. Parameter estimates from OLS regressions of experiencing significant functional
 583 impairment (WSAS > 10), by household structure. Repeat responses in early March and July.

Model	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Household structure	Singles	Couples	No children at home	Children at home
Early March	0.388*** (0.075)	0.117** (0.040)	0.228*** (0.061)	0.163** (0.050)
July	0.162*** (0.033)	0.191*** (0.020)	0.214*** (0.020)	0.089* (0.035)
Female	-0.110* (0.043)	0.061* (0.026)	-0.016 (0.025)	0.087 (0.048)
Ages 18-29	-0.051 (0.085)	0.090 (0.063)	0.055 (0.074)	0.052 (0.072)
Ages 30-39	0.032 (0.102)	-0.007 (0.059)	0.057 (0.087)	-0.029 (0.066)
Ages 50-59	-0.128 (0.085)	-0.010 (0.047)	-0.092 (0.066)	0.007 (0.061)
Ages 60-69	-0.128 (0.083)	-0.034 (0.044)	-0.099 (0.063)	0.203 (0.173)
Ages 70-79	-0.186* (0.078)	-0.007 (0.046)	-0.102 (0.063)	NA
<i>N</i>	584	1,306	1,420	470

584 Standard errors in parentheses and clustered at the individual level. NA = Not Available.

585 * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

586

587

588 Table A8. Summary of robustness check of results sensitivity to cutoffs on the WHO5 and
 589 WSAS scales.

	(1) WHO5 raw score < 13	(2) WHO5 < 40	(3) WHO5 < 45	(4) WHO5 < 50	(5) WHO5 < 55	(6) WHO5 < 60
Before 3/11/20	0.291***	0.183***	0.249***	0.291***	0.327***	0.372***
	(0.026)	(0.023)	(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.028)
After 3/11/20	-0.037*	-0.032*	-0.030*	-0.037*	-0.032	-0.030
	(0.016)	(0.013)	(0.015)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.017)
<i>N</i>	2,836	2,836	2,836	2,836	2,836	2,836
	(7) WSAS > 5	(8) WSAS > 8	(9) WSAS > 10	(10) WSAS > 12	(11) WSAS > 15	(12) WSAS > 20
Before 3/11/20	0.304***	0.229***	0.183***	0.161***	0.128***	0.062***
	(0.027)	(0.024)	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.019)	(0.014)
After 3/11/20	-0.014	-0.024	-0.024	-0.032*	-0.025*	-0.003
	(0.017)	(0.015)	(0.014)	(0.013)	(0.012)	(0.009)
<i>N</i>	2,836	2,836	2,836	2,836	2,836	2,836

590 Standard errors in parentheses. All models control for gender and age.

591 WHO5<50 signals increased risk of depression and/or stress.

592 WHO5 raw score <13 signals very poor wellbeing.

593 WSAS>10 signals significant functional impairment.

594 WSAS>20 signals moderately severe or worse psychopathology.

595 * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

596

597 Table A9. Summary of results from individual level fixed effects specification

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
WHO-5 < 50	All	Singles	Couples	No Children at home	Children at home
Before 3/11/20	0.212*** (0.012)	0.275*** (0.022)	0.185*** (0.014)	0.177*** (0.012)	0.324*** (0.029)
After 3/11/20	-0.016 (0.020)	-0.022 (0.038)	-0.014 (0.023)	0.016 (0.022)	-0.128** (0.043)
Time trend up to July	-0.033* (0.014)	-0.035 (0.026)	-0.032* (0.016)	0.000 (0.014)	-0.145*** (0.034)
<i>NxT</i>	4,393	1,323	3,070	3,054	1,339
	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
WSAS > 10	All	Singles	Couples	No Children at home	Children at home
Before 3/11/20	0.157*** (0.014)	0.231*** (0.026)	0.126*** (0.017)	0.148*** (0.016)	0.204*** (0.029)
After 3/11/20	-0.002 (0.023)	-0.026 (0.043)	0.008 (0.028)	-0.002 (0.028)	-0.041 (0.042)
Time trend up to July	0.199*** (0.017)	0.190*** (0.032)	0.203*** (0.020)	0.232*** (0.020)	0.087* (0.034)
<i>NxT</i>	4,393	1,323	3,070	3,054	1,339

598 Standard errors in parentheses

599 * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

600

601