

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

LARS H. ANDERSEN

PETER FALLESEN

**TIM A. BRUCKNER** 

STUDY PAPER 157

DECEMBER 2020

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

- 4 Lars H. Andersen<sup>1</sup>, corresponding author: lha@rff.dk
- 5 Peter Fallesen<sup>1,2</sup>
- 6 Tim A. Bruckner<sup>3</sup>
- 7
- 8 <sup>1</sup>ROCKWOOL Foundation, Ny Kongensgade 6, 1472 Copenhagen C, Denmark
- 9 <sup>2</sup>Swedish Institute for Social Research, Stockholm University, 106 91 Stockholm,
- 10 Sweden
- <sup>3</sup>*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
- 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

Statistics Denmark anonymizes and de-identifies the data before making it available to
researchers. Use of the data for research purposes is allowed under Danish law for
individuals affiliated with Danish research institutions without the need for ethical
approval of individual studies. The present study received approval from Statistics
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

- 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.
- 59 aspx?kontor=13&tlfbogsort=sektion or the Danish Data Protection Agency: https://
- 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
- he had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision
- 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].

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

This work, while important, has two key limitations. First, the UK, the US, and France all rank in the top 15 worldwide in COVID-19 deaths per population as of November 30, 2020 [12]. This circumstance leaves open the question of whether experienced national severity of the pandemic (through media reports [8] or through direct experiences), or the social and work restrictions imposed by a lockdown *per se*, drive results. Second, none of these studies includes measures of mental health and/or wellbeing immediately *before* the lockdown. The absence of "baseline" mental health information in weeks
before the lockdown raises the concern of confounding by trends over time in mental
health that coincide with, but are not caused by, the COVID-19 lockdown. Third, unlike
for previously studied countries, the Danish lockdown was imposed uniformly and
rapidly following the first infections and came into effect before the first Danish
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,

given that state-imposed limitations on social activity may affect persons living alone
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

To consider how measures of wellbeing and impairment changed following the imposed
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]).

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

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

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

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

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

Following the state-imposed limitations on social activity, adults may have relied more on family members for social interaction than they did before the lockdown. Persons living alone, however, may have experienced fewer interactions during the lockdown, which implies the possibility of heterogeneous impact of the lockdown orders. We therefore classified the sample by cohabitation status, and then by whether the adult respondent reported children living at home. Of these subgroups, only adults with children living at home (upper panel of Figure 2) show a lower prevalence of depressive
symptoms in late March (i.e., 17% vs. 32% in early March; p<.01, see Table A3 for</li>
adjusted regression results). Using a Chow-test, we found that the decrease for adults
with children in the home compared to adults without children in the home is larger to
statistically detectable degree (p <.05). All other subgroups report no difference in</li>
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).

Lockdown restrictions eased on April 15<sup>th</sup>. We examined whether depressive symptoms and functional impairment differed among respondents several months later—arguably once COVID-related social, economic, and institutional conventions in Denmark stabilized for a while. We restricted the study sample to persons who completed the survey in early March (i.e., pre-lockdown) and again in July 2020 (Appendix Figures A2-A4 show results including late March respondents). In aggregate, depressive symptoms among these adults fell, but functional impairment rose, in July relative to early March
(p<.05 for both tests—see Appendix Table A5).</li>

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 12<sup>th</sup> to 25<sup>th</sup>, as described in the Methods section, did not affect inference (see Appendix 325 326 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 (focusing on age of children) shows that our main results for respondents with children
living at home are robust across age of the children when focusing on the risk of
depression or stress, but that the early to late March decrease in the proportion
experiencing significant functional impairment is driven by respondents with children
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.

Raabe and colleagues' survey of scientists in three European countries coheres with
our findings in that they report improved wellbeing immediately after the COVID-19
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.

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

Our findings diverge from previous population-based reports in the UK, the US and France. This circumstance could arise for several reasons. First, Denmark underwent a much less severe COVID-19 pandemic in Spring 2020 than did these countries, as measured by overall cases or deaths per population. Danes, therefore, may not have had to contend as heavily with the associated fear and anxiety of COVID-19-related morbidity as did other countries. Second, Denmark's strong social safety net largely 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.

6. Meltzer H, Bebbington P, Dennis MS, Jenkins R, McManus S, Brugha TS. Feelings of
loneliness among adults with mental disorder. Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol.
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. JAMA429 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, Fraschetti 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? | Tænketanken EUROPA. Tænketanken 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

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.

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

489 April 2020.



492

490

- 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
- the survey relative to lockdown and by household structure.



Share at risk of stress or depression, WHO5<50

Share significantly functionally impaired, WSAS>10



497 Figure 3. Proportion of respondents at risk of depression or stress according to the WHO5, repeat498 responses in early March and July, by household structure.



Share at risk of stress or depression, WHO5<50

Share significantly functionally impaired, WSAS>10



	S	urvey		Population		
Variable	Μ	SD	М	SD	T-test	p-value
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	2,836		4,359,539		

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

Note: No. children (top coded at three children) and labor market status (In Job, Unemployment, 503

504 and Outside labor force) are measured from the general registers during the latest available data year (2019).

505





- 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.



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





- 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.



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



- 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 within528 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

Note: The down weighting implies weighing individual responses by the numbers of days withinthe 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,

comparing main results for respondents with children living at home and results by age of thechildren.



- 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 age543 of the children.



Data type	Data fror	n first surv	ey wave		Panel data	
				Responded	Responded	
	Early	Late		March	March	
Variable	March	March	р	and July	but not July	р
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	

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

547 Notes: Table shows means and p-values refer to T-tests of statistically detectable differences

549

550

<sup>548</sup> across table columns within data type.

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

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

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

Model	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Household	Singles	Couples	No children at	Children at home
structure	-	-	home	
Before 3/11/20	0.435***	0.239***	0.355***	0.273***
	(0.053)	(0.029)	(0.045)	(0.039)
After 3/11/20	-0.035	-0.034	-0.011	-0.089**
	(0.031)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.032)
Female	-0.031	0.045**	0.009	0.068*
	(0.031)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.029)
Ages 18-29	-0.092	-0.014	-0.068	-0.018
-	(0.057)	(0.038)	(0.052)	(0.043)
Ages 30-39	-0.028	-0.011	-0.043	-0.009
0	(0.069)	(0.037)	(0.060)	(0.039)
Ages 50-59	-0.137*	-0.040	-0.155**	-0.005
0	(0.057)	(0.030)	(0.048)	(0.037)
Ages 60-69	-0.192***	-0.096**	-0.193***	-0.002
0	(0.056)	(0.029)	(0.046)	(0.090)
Ages 70-79	-0.237***	-0.166***	-0.255***	-0.184***
2	(0.057)	(0.028)	(0.046)	(0.029)
N	855	1981	1,913	923

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

Standard errors in parentheses\* p < 0.05, \*\* p < 0.01, \*\*\* p < 0.001

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

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

Standard errors in parentheses \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001 

569	Table A5.	Parameter	estimates	from	OLS	regressions	of b	eing	at risk	of	depression	n/stress
-----	-----------	-----------	-----------	------	-----	-------------	------	------	---------	----	------------	----------

(WHO5 < 50) and experiencing significant functional impairment (WSAS > 10), repeat 

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

responses in early March and July. 

Standard errors in parentheses and clustered at the individual level. \* p < 0.05, \*\* p < 0.01, \*\*\* p < 0.001

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

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.

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

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

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

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

Table A8. Summary of robustness check of results sensitivity to cutoffs on the WHO5 andWSAS scales.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	WHO5	WHO5	WHO5	WHO5	WHO5	WHO5
	raw	< 40	< 45	< 50	< 55	< 60
	score < 13					
Before	0.291***	0.183***	0.249***	0.291***	0.327***	0.372***
3/11/20						
	(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)
N	2,836	2,836	2,836	2,836	2,836	2,836
	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
	WSAS	WSAS	WSAS	WSAS	WSAS	WSAS
	> 5	> 8	>10	>12	>15	> 20
Before	0.304***	0.229***	0.183***	0.161***	0.128***	0.062***
3/11/20						
	(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)
N	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

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

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

Standard errors in parentheses \* p < 0.05, \*\* p < 0.01, \*\*\* p < 0.001