

1 **Tracking population mental health before and across stages of the COVID-19 pandemic in**
2 **young adults**

3 Alex S. F. Kwong,^{1,2,3} Kate Northstone,³ Rebecca M. Pearson,^{3,4} Andrew M. McIntosh,^{1*} Nicholas
4 J. Timpson,^{2,3*}

5 ¹Division of Psychiatry, University of Edinburgh, UK

6 ²MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit at the University of Bristol, United Kingdom

7 ³Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, UK

8 ⁴Department of Psychology, Manchester Metropolitan University, United Kingdom

9 *Contributed equally to this work

10

11 Corresponding Author: Alex S. F. Kwong, Division of Psychiatry, Royal Edinburgh Hospital,
12 University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom. Email: akwong@ed.ac.uk

13

14 Word count: 1372 words (excluding summary, tables, figures and references)

15

16 Keywords: COVID-19; mental health; ALSPAC; depression; anxiety; longitudinal

17

18 **Summary**

19 The SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) pandemic has been associated with worsening mental health.
 20 Longitudinal studies have monitored changes in mental health from pre-pandemic levels, identifying
 21 critical points for mental health as COVID-19 restrictions evolve. Here we highlight changes in
 22 depression and anxiety in the UK from pre-pandemic across four pandemic occasions: April and June
 23 2020, January, and July 2021 – corresponding to changes in COVID-19 restrictions. Data were from
 24 >5,000 27–29-year-olds from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC). We
 25 found that anxiety almost doubled throughout the pandemic compared to pre-pandemic levels and
 26 remained high until July 2021 when COVID-19 restrictions were fully lifted. Depression was lower
 27 than pre-pandemic levels in April 2020 but increased as the pandemic evolved until July 2021.
 28 Women, those with existing mental/physical health conditions and those with economic hardship were
 29 most at risk of sustained poorer mental health across the pandemic. Our results highlight the
 30 importance of longitudinal studies for tracking mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic and
 31 across virus suppression policy changes.

32

33 Introduction

34 The SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) pandemic and related mitigation measures such as lockdown, social
35 distancing and self-isolation have been associated with poor mental health in the early stages of the
36 pandemic, [1] and as it progressed throughout 2020 and 2021. [2] Longitudinal studies have been vital
37 in monitoring mental health across populations and in response to evolving COVID-19 restrictions,
38 with the added benefit of being able to compare pre-pandemic prevalence with that observed
39 throughout the pandemic. [3, 4] This has aided our ability to examine how mental health has changed
40 over time and who may be at greater risk of poorer mental health at key stages throughout the
41 pandemic (i.e., during periods of heightened or relaxed restrictions).

42 Findings from several longitudinal studies suggest that mental health has deteriorated throughout the
43 pandemic, [5-7] with persistent effects remaining even as restrictions are lifted. [8] This suggests that
44 poorer mental health response to COVID-19 may not be a simple transient reaction to an
45 unprecedented event, but evidence for long-term effects on mental health that may be sustained. [9]
46 However, how severe these effects will be, and the duration is still unclear. Furthermore, changes in
47 mental health are not equally distributed, with women, young people, those with poorer pre-pandemic
48 mental and physical health and those with poorer socioeconomic circumstances purported to be at
49 greater risk during the COVID-19 pandemic. [10] As the response to the pandemic evolves, it is vital
50 that longitudinal studies continue to capture changes in mental health and identify at risk populations
51 to (1) ensure that timely support is provided for the right people, (2) changes in mental health that are
52 coincident with changing restrictions are identified and (3) to identify robust evidence for use in
53 future pandemics.

54 We present results from a large representative population study of young adults with mental health
55 data before and during the pandemic on four occasions – corresponding to periods of strict and eased
56 COVID-19 restrictions.

57

58 **Methods**

59 **Sample**

60 Data were from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC) an ongoing
61 longitudinal population-based cohort study that recruited pregnant women residing in Avon (South-
62 West of England) with expected delivery dates between 1st April 1991 and 31st December 1992. [11,
63 12] The cohort consists of 14,901 children, now young adults (ages 27-29). [13] Ethical approval for
64 the study was obtained from the ALSPAC Ethics and Law Committee and the Local Research Ethics
65 Committees. This study uses data from four COVID-19 questionnaires assessed between April 2020
66 (during the first UK national lockdown), June 2020 (when restrictions were partially eased), January
67 2021 (during the third UK national lockdown) and July 2021 (when UK restrictions were fully eased
68 at this period). [14]

69 **Mental health measures**

70 Depressive and anxiety symptoms were assessed pre-pandemic and in each COVID-19 questionnaire,
71 examining symptoms within the previous two weeks. Depressive and anxiety symptoms were
72 measured using the Short Mood and Feelings Questionnaire (SMFQ), [15] and Generalised Anxiety
73 Disorder Assessment (GAD-7), [16], respectively. We used established cut-offs to examine the
74 proportion of individuals with probable depression and anxiety (see Supplement). Pre-pandemic
75 depressive symptoms were last measured between 2017-2018 (mean age: ~25 years old) and anxiety
76 symptoms last measured between 2013-2014 (mean age: ~22 years old. Further details regarding
77 these measures and additional time points are given in the Supplement. Herein we refer to depressive
78 symptoms as depression and anxiety symptoms as anxiety.

79 **Statistical analysis**

80 First, we described the prevalence of both depression and anxiety, at the most recent pre-pandemic
81 occasion and across the four COVID-19 data sweeps. We then compared depression and anxiety
82 prevalence across COVID-19 sweeps according to several demographics including sex, pre-pandemic
83 mental and physical health conditions, living alone status, pre-pandemic financial problems, income
84 loss and changes to employment (including furlough). Further information is provided in the
85 Supplement. McNemar's tests were used to determine differences in prevalence across time and
86 between groups.

87

88 Results

89 In total, 5,036 participants completed at least one COVID-19 questionnaire, with 3,429 participants
90 completing at least one of the COVID-19 questionnaires *and* the most recent pre-pandemic mental
91 health questionnaire. Sample characteristics of those who completed any COVID-19 questionnaire, or
92 those who completed any COVID-19 questionnaire *and* the latest pre-pandemic assessment, were
93 similar to the most recent pre-pandemic sample in terms of sex, parental education status, deprivation,
94 and pre-pandemic mental health (see Supplement Table 1).

95 There was evidence that depression decreased from pre-pandemic levels of 23.9% (95% CIs: 22.5-
96 25.4%) to 17.7% (16.2%-19.4%) during the first UK lockdown. However, depression increased to
97 21.6% (20.1%-23.1%) in the third UK lockdown in December 2020, before decreasing again to 16.1%
98 (14.8%-17.5%) when restrictions were fully lifted in the summer of 2021. Conversely, anxiety
99 increased from pre-pandemic levels of 12.6% (11.4%-14%) to 22.1% (20.3%-24.1%) in the first UK
100 lockdown and rising further to 25% (23.3%-26.8%) during the third UK lockdown, before decreasing
101 to 20.5% (18.8%-22.2%) during the summer of 2021 (see Figure 1; Supplement Tables 2-3).

102 Of those completing at least one COVID-19 questionnaire, women, those with a history of
103 mental/physical health conditions and those with existing financial problems were at greater risk of
104 sustained poorer mental health across the pandemic, compared to their non-at-risk counterparts
105 (Figure). Additionally, unlike their counterparts, those with existing mental/physical health
106 conditions, those with existing financial problems, and those experiencing income/employment loss as
107 result of COVID-19 did not see improvements in anxiety when restrictions were fully eased. A similar
108 pattern was observed such that those with existing physical health conditions and living alone did not
109 see improvements in depression. Full estimates are given in Supplement Tables 4-5. Tests for
110 differences between waves are given in Supplement Tables 6-7. Finally, 30.6% of individuals (95%
111 CIs: 29.4%-31.9%) reported at least one depressive episode (above threshold levels), whilst 37.0%
112 (95% CIs: 35.7%-38.3%) reported at least one anxiety episode across any of the COVID-19
113 questionnaires (Supplement Tables 8-9).

Discussion

Using data from a longitudinal population study with pre-pandemic information, we found that mental health changes during COVID-19 in young people are closely aligned to COVID-19 mitigation measures, but that mental health improved once restrictions were fully eased. Whilst mitigation measures are crucial for virus suppression, provisions should be made to ensure that support is available for those with poorer mental health during current and future pandemics.

Our results provide evidence for fluctuations early on in the pandemic, followed by a sustained deterioration of mental health that was not just a transient response to an unprecedented event. These results oppose previous research using more intensively collected data, [1] and show sustained periods of poorer mental health lasting for almost a year, with only clear evidence of improvement during a period of maintained COVID-19 eased restrictions (i.e. summer of 2021).

As shown in previous work, the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic have not been universal, with women, those with existing mental/physical health conditions and those with financial/economic hardship most at risk of poorer mental health. [5, 6, 10] Our results build upon such work highlighting that whilst some populations saw improvements when restrictions were eased, others did not (e.g., those with existing health conditions and those with economic hardship). However, it should be noted that effects differed by depression and anxiety, posing a further complexity for treatment and support by mental health professionals.

Work here has been allowed given the availability of repeated measures of depression and anxiety both pre-and-during the pandemic. We have been able to examine changes in mental health that were coincident with COVID-19 policy changes. However, our study has the potential for bias through missing data and study attrition like any longitudinal study and is weakened by varying follow up times between pre-pandemic and COVID-19 assessments, despite measures taken to address this using a wealth of historical data. Furthermore, our results are specific to young adults and thus may not be generalisable to all populations. However, young adults were posited to be a key group at risk of COVID-19, [17] so detailed analysis of this population is essential as this population is likely to face the social and economic fallout from the pandemic.

The use of longitudinal studies is key for policy makers and health officials in determining how mental has changed from before and during the pandemic, and the identification of who is most at risk and when.

Contributors

ASFK, KN, RMP, AMM and NJT contributed to the conception and design of the study. ASFK carried out the study and analysed the data. ASFK drafted the initial output. All authors contributed to the interpretation of data. All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript. ASFK will serve as guarantor for the contents of the paper.

Declaration of interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Grant information

The UK Medical Research Council and Wellcome (Grant Ref: 217065/Z/19/Z) and the University of Bristol provide core support for ALSPAC. A comprehensive list of grant funding is available on the ALSPAC website (<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/external/documents/grant-acknowledgements.pdf>). This work was supported by the Elizabeth Blackwell Institute, University of Bristol, Wellcome Trust Institutional Strategic Support Fund and Rosetrees Trust (Grant Refs: 204813/Z/16/Z; R105121). ASFK, RMP and NJT work in, or are affiliated to, the MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit which is funded by the University of Bristol and UK Medical Research Council (MC_UU_00011/3 and MC_UU_00011/6). European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme, and grants 758813, MHINT and 669545 from the European Research Council Grant Agreements. AMM is supported by the Wellcome Trust (220875/Z/20/Z). This work was also supported by Wellcome through the Wellcome Longitudinal Population Studies COVID-19 Secretariat and Steering Group (UK LPS COVID co-ordination, Grant Ref: 221574). NJT is a Wellcome Trust Investigator (202802/Z/16/Z), is the PI of the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (MRC & WT 217065/Z/19/Z), is supported by the University of Bristol NIHR Biomedical Research Centre (BRC-1215-2001), the MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit (MC_UU_00011/1) and works within the CRUK Integrative Cancer Epidemiology Programme (C18281/A29019).

Acknowledgments

We are extremely grateful to all the families who took part in this study, the midwives for their help in recruiting them, and the whole ALSPAC team, which includes interviewers, computer and laboratory technicians, clerical workers, research scientists, volunteers, managers, receptionists and nurses. Study data were collected and managed using REDCap electronic data capture tools hosted at the University of Bristol (<https://projectredcap.org/resources/citations/>). REDCap (Research Electronic Data Capture) is a secure, web-based software platform designed to support data capture for research studies. The ALSPAC study website contains details of all data available through a fully searchable data dictionary (<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/researchers/our-data/>).

References

1. Fancourt, D., A. Steptoe, and F. Bu, *Trajectories of anxiety and depressive symptoms during enforced isolation due to COVID-19 in England: a longitudinal observational study*. The Lancet Psychiatry, 2021. **8**(2): p. 141-149.
2. Lai, J., et al., *Factors Associated With Mental Health Outcomes Among Health Care Workers Exposed to Coronavirus Disease 2019*. JAMA Netw Open, 2020. **3**(3): p. e203976.
3. Pierce, M., et al., *Says who? The significance of sampling in mental health surveys during COVID-19*. The Lancet Psychiatry, 2020.
4. Holmes, E.A., et al., *Multidisciplinary research priorities for the COVID-19 pandemic: a call for action for mental health science*. The Lancet Psychiatry, 2020.
5. McGinty, E.E., et al., *Psychological Distress and Loneliness Reported by US Adults in 2018 and April 2020*. JAMA, 2020.
6. Pierce, M., et al., *Mental health before and during the COVID-19 pandemic: a longitudinal probability sample survey of the UK population*. The Lancet Psychiatry, 2020. **7**(10): p. 883-892.
7. Niedzwiedz, C.L., et al., *Mental health and health behaviours before and during the initial phase of the COVID-19 lockdown: longitudinal analyses of the UK Household Longitudinal Study*. J Epidemiol Community Health, 2020.
8. McGinty, E.E., et al., *Psychological Distress and COVID-19-Related Stressors Reported in a Longitudinal Cohort of US Adults in April and July 2020*. JAMA, 2020. **324**(24): p. 2555-2557.
9. Kwong, A.S.F., et al., *Longitudinal evidence for persistent anxiety in young adults through COVID-19 restrictions*. Wellcome Open Research, 2020. **5**.
10. Kwong, A.S.F., et al., *Mental health before and during the COVID-19 pandemic in two longitudinal UK population cohorts*. British Journal of Psychiatry, 2020: p. 1-10.
11. Boyd, A., et al., *Cohort Profile: the 'children of the 90s'--the index offspring of the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children*. Int J Epidemiol, 2013. **42**(1): p. 111-27.
12. Fraser, A., et al., *Cohort Profile: the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children: ALSPAC mothers cohort*. Int J Epidemiol, 2013. **42**(1): p. 97-110.
13. Northstone, K., et al., *The Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC): an update on the enrolled sample of index children in 2019*. Wellcome Open Res, 2019. **4**: p. 51.
14. Smith, D., et al., *The Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children - A resource for COVID-19 research: Questionnaire data capture November 2020 - March 2021*. Wellcome Open Res, 2021. **6**: p. 155.
15. Angold, A., et al., *Development of a short questionnaire for use in epidemiological studies of depression in children and adolescents*. International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research, 1995. **5**(4): p. 237-249.
16. Spitzer, R.L., et al., *A Brief Measure for Assessing Generalized Anxiety Disorder*. Arch Intern Med, 2006. **166**: p. 1092-1097.
17. Douglas, M., et al., *Mitigating the wider health effects of covid-19 pandemic response*. BMJ, 2020. **369**: p. m1557.

Figure




Figure 1. Changes in depression (top left) and anxiety (top right) from before to during COVID-19.

Sociodemographic variables by depression (middle left and bottom left) and anxiety (middle right and bottom right) across four waves of COVID-19 data collection. Changes in depression/anxiety from before to during COVID-19 (top panels) were assessed using the sample with both the most recent mental health assessment and any COVID-19 assessment. Changes in depression/anxiety (middle and bottom panels) were assessed using the sample with any COVID-19 measures.