

1 **Impact of COVID-19 on lifestyle and mental wellbeing in a**
2 **drought-affected rural Australian population: A mixed**
3 **method approach**

4
5 **Authors:** Jack Carlson¹, Kevin Chan¹, Jonah Gray¹, Houston Xue¹, Krista Reed²,
6 Jannine K Bailey², Tegan Dutton², Uchechukwu Levi Osuagwu^{2,3*}, Robyn Vines²

7
8
9 **Affiliations**

10 ¹ School of Medicine, Western Sydney University, Campbelltown, NSW, Australia.
11 19064172@student.westernsydney.edu.au; 19062860@student.westernsydney.edu.au;
12 19101662@student.westernsydney.edu.au; 19079820@student.westernsydney.edu.au

13 ² Bathurst Rural Clinical School, School of Medicine, Western Sydney University,
14 NSW, Australia; R.Vines@westernsydney.edu.au;
15 Tegan.Dutton@westernsydney.edu.au; K.Cockrell@westernsydney.edu.au;;
16 losuagwu@westernsydney.edu.au;

17 ³ Translational Health Research Institute (THRI), School of Medicine, Western Sydney
18 University, Campbelltown, Australia; losuagwu@westernsydney.edu.au;

19 ***Corresponding author**

20 Bathurst Rural Clinical School, School of Medicine, Western Sydney University,
21 PO Box 9008, Bathurst, NSW, 2795, Australia

22

23 **Abstract**

24 ‘

25 **Background:** The Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has caused
26 unprecedented social and economic disruption, accompanied by the enactment of a
27 multitude of public health measures to restrain disease transmission. These public health
28 and social measures have had a considerable impact on lifestyle and mental wellbeing,
29 which has been well-studied in metropolitan populations, but very little in rural
30 populations. Additionally, the development and use of a standardised scoring system for
31 an overall assessment of patient lifestyle management, and monitoring of changes in
32 these, may be warranted in clinical practice.

33 **Methods:** The associations between psychological distress and changes in SNAPS
34 health behaviours (smoking, nutrition, alcohol, physical activity, sleep) since the onset
35 of COVID-19 in rural Australia were examined. A cross-sectional anonymous online
36 survey was distributed among adults in the Western New South Wales Primary Health
37 Network in August 2020. The survey included measures of psychological distress,
38 income, disposition, lifestyle factors and behaviours during the pandemic, as well as
39 changes in lifestyle due to COVID-19. A novel Global Lifestyle Score (GLS) was
40 generated as a holistic assessment of lifestyle across multiple domains.

41 **Results:** The survey was completed by 308 individuals (modal age group: 45-54 years
42 old, 86.4% female). High distress on the K5 scale was present in over one-third of

43 respondents (n=98, 34.3%). Negative change was reported for sleep (24.4%), nutrition
44 (14.3%), alcohol (17.8%), physical exercise (33.8%) and smoking (26.6%) since the
45 onset of the pandemic. Additionally, changes in sleep, nutrition, physical activity and
46 smoking were associated with distress. Respondents with a poor lifestyle (GLS) during
47 the pandemic were significantly more distressed. Perceived COVID-19 impact was
48 associated with high distress, level of drought impact and loss of income.

49 **Conclusion:** High rates of distress amongst rural Australians during the COVID-19
50 pandemic was linked, worsening lifestyles as measured by the GLS and loss of income.
51 Lifestyle promotion strategies should be considered by health professionals for the
52 management of crisis-related distress. Further research may explore the impact of
53 COVID-19 on a larger population, including a greater proportion of male respondents,
54 and the impact of modifying lifestyle factors on the reduction of distress in the context
55 of a stressor such as this pandemic.

56

57 **Keywords:** Psychological distress; COVID-19; Drought; Pandemic; Lifestyle;
58 Behaviour; Mental Health.

59

60 **Introduction**

61

62 According to the World Health Organisation (WHO), as of 1 May 2021, the
63 Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) had infected over 150 million people and been
64 responsible for over 3 million deaths worldwide. Since then, these numbers have more
65 than doubled, reaching 605 million infected people and 6.5 million deaths
66 worldwide(1). In response to the relatively high mortality and morbidity of the
67 pandemic, governments internationally enacted a myriad public health measures,
68 including mandatory social distancing, mask wearing, self-isolation, quarantine and
69 lockdowns(2). At the first peak in April 2020, over half of the global population was
70 under lockdown. Fear, uncertainty, disruption of social interaction and closure of
71 businesses, schools and recreational facilities have had extensive health, economic and
72 social impacts, with the scale of the global economic contraction comparable to the
73 Great Depression of the 1930s(3). The COVID-19 pandemic has been associated with
74 poorer mental health and higher psychological distress in various populations,
75 globally(4, 5).

76

77 One area requiring further investigation is the impact this changing physical and social
78 environment has had on lifestyle behaviours - smoking, nutrition, consumption of
79 alcohol, physical activity, and sleep (SNAPS). It is well known that these highly-
80 modifiable lifestyle behaviours are bi-directionally linked to mental health; this likely
81 remains true in the time of COVID-19(6, 7). However, there is a poor understanding of

82 how COVID-19 may have affected these lifestyle behaviours and the relationship
83 between lifestyle and mental wellbeing in this context. An increased understanding of
84 this could provide clinicians and public health organisations with the confidence to
85 target specific behaviours in the prevention and treatment of pandemic-related mental
86 health issues, post COVID-19.

87

88 An Australian cross-sectional study of an urban population reported decreased physical
89 activity (48.9% of the sample of 1491 adults) and sleep (40.7%), alongside increased
90 smoking (6.9%) and alcohol consumption (26.6%), during the pandemic(7). These
91 changes were associated with higher depression, anxiety and stress related symptoms,
92 especially negative change in self-reported sleep quality, which had the strongest
93 correlation with depression out of all lifestyle factors examined(8). Similar cross
94 sectional studies from Croatia and the United Kingdom reported strong correlations
95 between poorer sleep, diet and exercise and negative mood, but not with alcohol
96 consumption(9). However, these studies were limited to urban populations and some
97 had incomplete assessment of lifestyle behaviours.

98

99 Rural Australians' experience of COVID-19 is not yet well-represented in the literature.
100 Broadly, the issue of mental illness in rural Australia is exemplified by a high suicide
101 rate, which is up to 40% higher than that of urban areas(10). Rural Australians face a

102 range of general barriers to engagement with mental health services, such as increased
103 physical distance and transport, reduced service availability, a culture of self-reliance
104 and reluctance to discuss mental health issues, in part due to perceived stigma and
105 reduced anonymity(11, 12). In contrast, rural areas benefit from high levels of ‘social
106 capital’, with high rates of community participation and levels of support(13). It
107 remains unknown how living rurally may modify the mental health symptoms in the
108 context of the COVID-19 pandemic. Australian research has demonstrated the
109 development of detrimental health behaviours among rural women during the COVID-
110 19 pandemic, with one study finding that women with children were more likely to
111 report higher high-risk alcohol intake(14).

112

113 Economic prosperity has been found to correlate strongly with distress, with loss of
114 income strongly associated with the development of mood and substance use
115 disorders(15). It is suspected that those with a loss of income are the most affected by
116 COVID-19 and have the highest distress. In addition, in recent years, the rural New
117 South Wales population has experienced a drought crisis, with the Millennium Drought
118 lasting between 2001-2009 and the recent drought subsiding only in early 2020 as the
119 COVID-19 pandemic began(16, 17). It is known that drought substantially increases
120 psychological distress and risk of suicide among certain groups, especially males(18).
121 However, it is not known how drought affects lifestyle behaviours. Framing this study

122 in the context of both drought and COVID-19 may improve our understanding of
123 patterns of lifestyle behavioural change in response to these two adversities.
124 This study explored the relationship between lifestyle behaviours and psychological
125 distress in a drought-affected rural Australian region, after the onset of and during the
126 COVID-19 pandemic. There is a paucity of research involving the use of a clinically
127 applicable lifestyle scoring system. Through this study, a ‘Global Lifestyle Score’
128 (GLS) was created in an attempt to correlate multiple lifestyle factors with the impact of
129 COVID-19 and distress. A holistic and standardised measurement of lifestyle
130 parameters could be applicable in multiple healthcare settings and is in line with current
131 RACGP guidelines requiring comprehensive lifestyle factor screening in patients by
132 their GPs. This study sought to answer the following research questions:

- 133 1. What has been the effect of COVID-19 on lifestyle behaviours and income?
- 134 2. What is the association between psychological distress - in the context of COVID-
135 19 - and current lifestyle behaviours, lifestyle change, income disruption and
136 disposition?
- 137 3. What is the association between respondents reported perceived impact of COVID-
138 19, and current lifestyle behaviours, lifestyle change, income change and
139 disposition?
- 140 4. Does a novel composite ‘Global Lifestyle Score’ have utility in predicting known
141 correlates of lifestyle behaviours, including psychological distress?

142 5. Is there a correlation between respondents' perception of the impact of the separate
143 crises of COVID-19 and the recent drought?

144

145 **Methods**

146

147 **Study design and setting**

148

149 Cross-sectional study in the Western New South Wales (NSW) Primary Health
150 Network Region.

151

152 **Survey respondents**

153

154 An anonymous, online survey was conducted in August 2020 and distributed to
155 various rural communities via Facebook and local email mailing lists. Eligible
156 respondents were any adults aged 18 and over currently living in the study region. At
157 the time of distribution, Victoria was in the midst of a stage 4 lockdown with various
158 unlinked "mystery" cases appearing in NSW prompting significant social distancing,
159 partial lockdown and travel restrictions. Social distancing measures included keeping a
160 minimum 1.5 meters between people and strict limitations to public gatherings. Many
161 restaurants, bars and retail stores had strict capacity limits based on their ability to
162 maintain social distancing. Most schools were slowly returning to in-person study after
163 months of online study. University campuses limited or ceased face-to-face teaching

164 and transitioned to online learning, with most clinical placements postponed or
165 cancelled. Most states had closed their borders to NSW and travel to regional areas was
166 not encouraged.

167

168 **Survey Tool**

169

170 The questions for the survey were developed around sleep and the SNAP
171 lifestyle guidelines of the RACGP(18). To assess mental wellbeing, the Kessler-5 (K5)
172 and Adult Dispositional Hope Score (ADHS) were incorporated into this survey.
173 Additional questions around COVID-19 impact, drought impact and demographic
174 information including age, gender, occupation, and postcode were collected. Further
175 detail of the survey structure is shown in the supplementary file (S1 File). Due to
176 COVID-19 and the difficulty in distributing surveys in-person, community engagement
177 was primarily achieved online, by contacting local councils, who distributed a survey
178 link via email and by posting on community Facebook groups for residents of Central
179 West NSW. The survey was accessible on mobile devices and computers.

180

181 **Assessing the impact of COVID-19 on the lives of respondents** 182 **and mental welfare**

183

184 Details of the response structure are also available in the supplementary file (S1
185 File). Briefly, the impact of COVID-19 on income was measured through estimate of

186 hours worked per week using a Likert scale. Information on government COVID-19
187 payments was also obtained. For subjective assessment of the impact of COVID-19,
188 respondents were asked, “Overall, the COVID-19 situation has had a negative impact
189 on my life, my mental health and wellbeing, my financial situation, my work, my ability
190 to provide for myself and my family”. Physical exercise was reported as the number of
191 days per week doing exercise, classified into moderate intensity exercise for greater
192 than 30 minutes, high intensity exercise for greater than 30 minutes and muscle
193 strengthening exercise. These categories conform to the Australian lifestyle
194 recommendations, which are based on the Metabolic Equivalent Task (MET)
195 measurements for physical activities(19). These exercise categories were collated using
196 by calculating and using the MET scores(20).

197 Sleep was assessed by asking respondents how many hours they slept on
198 average and if the COVID-19 pandemic had changed their sleeping habits. For smoking
199 behaviour, respondents were asked whether they had ever been a regular smoker and/or
200 a current smoker. The change in number of cigarettes smoked daily since the onset of
201 the COVID pandemic was assessed, as was the change in number of stand drinks
202 consumed using the Alcohol Use Disorder Identification Test Consumption (AUDIT-
203 C)(21). The usual number of standard drinks consumed and episodes consuming more
204 than 6 standard drinks was surveyed. Respondents were then asked if the COVID-19
205 Pandemic had changed their drinking habits

206 Current nutrition was assessed using a sliding scale for both the number of
207 vegetables and fruits consumed, based on current government recommendations for five
208 vegetable and two fruit servings a day(22).

209

210 **Global Lifestyle Score (GLS)**

211

212 A GLS for each respondent was created by grading reported behaviour for each
213 of the five lifestyle items (smoking, nutrition, alcohol, physical activity, and sleep)
214 against Group consensus guidelines as shown in Table 1. Composite score was
215 calculated and ranged from 5 to 15, with higher scores up to a ceiling of 15 indicating a
216 healthier overall lifestyle profile (Table 1).

217

218 **Table 1: Global Lifestyle Score (GLS) Scoring Rubric**

Domain	1 (poor)	2 (intermediate)	3 (meets guidelines)
Smoking	≥6 cigarettes/day	1-5 cigarettes/day	Non-smoker
Nutrition	Inadequate intake of both vegetables and fruit	Recommended intake of vegetables or fruit, but not both	Recommended intake of vegetables and fruit (5+2/day)
Alcohol*	AUDIT-C≥9	AUDIT-C 5-8	AUDIT-C≤4

Physical activity	<500 MET/week	500-1000 METs/week	>1000 METs/week
Sleep	<7h/night	No evidence for an intermediate group ≥ 7 h/night	

219 AUDIT, Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test; MET, metabolic equivalent of task

220

221 **Mental health and wellbeing measures**

222

223 To assess mental wellbeing, the Kessler-5 (K5) for psychological distress and
224 the Adult Hope Scale (AHS: a standardised score calculated from addition of agency
225 and pathway subscales on the Adult Hope Scale) for hopeful dispositional traits were
226 incorporated into this survey. The validated K-5 questionnaire has 5 items which are
227 designed on a Likert scale with the scores ranging from ‘0’ (never) to 5 (all the
228 time)(23). The Adult Hope Scale (AHS)(24), uses 12 statements such as “My past
229 experiences have prepared me well for the future” with responses designed on an 8
230 point scale. The scores ranged from 1 for “Definitely untrue” to 8 for “Definitely true”.
231 A Total Hope Score (THS) was calculated by adding the Pathways Subscale Score (the
232 sum of items 1, 4, 6 and 8) and Agency Subscale Score (the sum of items 2, 9, 10 and
233 12), giving a range of scores from 8 to 64, with higher scores representing higher hope
234 levels.

235

236 **The impact of drought**

237

238 The impact of the drought on this rural population was assessed using the
239 following question: “Prior to COVID, how was the drought affecting the following
240 components of your lifestyle?”. A 5-item Likert scale that included impact on sleep,
241 nutrition, alcohol, physical exercise and smoking was used, with scores ranging from 1
242 for ‘much better’ to 5 for ‘much worse’

243

244 **Data Analysis**

245

246 Statistical analysis was performed on IBM SPSS Version 27 (SPSS Inc.,
247 Armonk, NY). For analysis, Likert scale responses for overall COVID-19 impact,
248 drought impact and impact of COVID-19 on income, smoking, nutrition, alcohol,
249 physical activity, and sleep were recoded into subcategories of negative impact (1),
250 neutral (2), or positive impact (3), to maximise power. Results were presented using
251 descriptive statistics including frequencies and percentages for categorical variables
252 (e.g., demographic variables and COVID-19 impact scales), and means \pm standard
253 deviations (SD) for continuous variables. Independent sample *t*-test or ANOVA with
254 *post-hoc* Tukey tests where necessary, were used to compare the K-5 and the THS
255 between groups, based on the demographics, overall COVID-19 impact and COVID-19
256 income impact. Age was recategorized into <35, 35-54 or >54 years, age groups. The
257 Pearson correlation coefficient was used to assess the relationship between K5 scores

258 and the GLS and THS. The associations between overall COVID-19 impact and
259 demographics and reported impact of COVID-19 on individual lifestyle factors were
260 determined using Chi-square tests. Appropriate statistics (Pearson's r , t , F values, df)
261 were reported for all tests. All tests were two-tailed and $P < 0.05$ was considered
262 statistically significant.

263 Respondents' qualitative comments were analysed by brief thematic analysis to
264 identify key themes regarding the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on lifestyle.

265

266 **Results**

267

268 **Characteristics of the respondents**

269

270 The sociodemographic characteristics of respondents are reported in Table 2 and
271 in Figures 1, 2 and 3. Most respondents were females (86.4%), aged between 45-54
272 years old (27.6%) and were working in a non-agricultural industry (76.2%) at the time
273 of this study. For the mood and disposition measures, over one-third of respondents
274 (34.3%) reported symptoms of psychological distress and the mean AHS was 44.1
275 ± 10.7 .

276

277 **Table 2: Characteristics of the respondents and the health scores.**

Characteristics	N (%)
-----------------	-------

Demography	
Age groups (years), n=307	
<25	21 (6.8)
25-34	55 (17.9)
35-44	51 (16.6)
45-54	85 (27.6)
55-64	58 (18.8)
65+	33 (12.1)
Gender, n=308	
Male	39 (12.7)
Female	266 (86.4)
Prefer not to say	3 (0.9)
Occupation	
Farm worker	13 (4.2)
Others	235 (76.3)
Not working	60 (19.4)
Mood and Disposition variables, n=286	
K-5 (Psychological distress)	
Mean score (\pm SD)	10.5 \pm 4.5
Low/moderate (5-11)	188 (65.7)
High/very high (12-25)	98 (34.3)
AHS, n=269	
Mean score (\pm SD)	44.1 \pm 10.7

278

279 **Perceived Impact of COVID-19 and drought**

280

281 Analysis of the respondents' responses for the perceived impact of COVID-19
282 and drought showed that more than half of them (n=175, 56.8%) reported that COVID-
283 19 had a negative impact on their lives (14.6% lost their income due to COVID-19),
284 13.6% (n=42) said it had a positive impact while the remaining 91 people (29.5%) were

285 neutral. A slightly lower proportion of the respondents stated that they were negatively
286 impacted by the drought (n=145, 48.7%), 11.1% (n=33) reported a positive impact
287 while the rest were neutral (n=120, 40.2%).

288

289 **Lifestyle Behavioural Change due to COVID-19**

290

291 All respondents (n=308) answered questions regarding the impact of COVID-19
292 on lifestyle factors (smoking, nutrition, alcohol, physical activity and sleep) and their
293 responses are presented in Figure 1. The figure shows that, more than half of the
294 respondents (56.4%) were active drinkers and over one quarter (26.3%) were active
295 smokers. Across all lifestyle factors, the majority of the respondents reported no change
296 in any of the measured lifestyle factors due to COVID-19. However, a few people
297 (17.8% and 12.2%, respectively) reported increase in alcohol intake and smoking due to
298 the pandemic. The greatest impact of the COVID-19 was observed among those who
299 became inactive due to the pandemic. Compared with those who reported that they had
300 more exercise due to the pandemic, those that reported less exercise were higher by
301 21.1%. The COVID-19 pandemic had more a positive than a negative impact on the
302 respondents' diet intake, but sleep patterns were adversely affected in a quarter of the
303 respondents in this study.

304 **Figure 1: Self-reported Changes in Lifestyle Behaviour due to COVID-19**

305 **Relationship between psychological distress, lifestyle and**
306 **disposition of the respondents.**

307
308 Current lifestyle behaviour at the time of this survey alongside distress levels is
309 summarised in Table 2, Figure 6. The mean GLS score was 11.3 ± 1.63 (range, 7 – 15)
310 and was significantly negatively correlated with psychological distress ($r=-0.27$,
311 $P<0.001$), such that those with a higher positive lifestyle score reported lower scores for
312 psychological distress. As shown in figure 2, the K-5 scores for psychological distress
313 were significantly higher in respondents who slept for 7 hours or less a night, compared
314 to those who slept more than 6 hrs a night ($P<0.001$). Similarly, a statistically
315 significant correlation was observed between psychological distress scores and smoking
316 ($p=0.009$) with *post-hoc* test revealing that heavy smokers had significantly higher
317 psychological distress scores than non-smokers. No significant correlation was found
318 between psychological distress scores and the other lifestyle variables of exercise,
319 nutrition and alcohol intake.

320 **Table 3: Lifestyle Behaviours Correlated with Distress at Time of Survey.**

321 Significant *P*-values are bolded. Independent samples t-test was used for analysis of the
322 sleep variable. One metabolic equivalent task (MET) is defined as energy expenditure
323 at rest per minute, 500 MET is equivalent to 150 minutes of moderate physical activity
324 (at approximately 3.33 MET) or 75 minutes vigorous activity (at approximately 6.66
325 MET).

Lifestyle Factor	N (%)	K-5 mean (\pm SD)	F score	df	<i>P</i>-value
Smoking					
Heavy (>5 cigarettes/day)	36 (11.7)	12.8 (5.2)	4.800	2	0.009
Moderate (<5 cigarettes/day)	3 (1.0)	10.7 (30.1)			

Non-smoker	269 (87.3)	10.2 (4.4)			
Nutrition					
Does not meet 5 veg, 2 fruit	42 (13.6)	9.9 (4.6)	0.830	2	0.437
Meets either 5 veg or 2 fruit	258 (83.8)	10.6 (4.5)			
Meets both 5 veg, 2 fruit	8 (2.6)	9.1 (4.5)			
Alcohol Intake					
High AUDIT-C	10 (3.2)	12.8 (4.5)	1.505	2	0.224
Moderate AUDIT-C	52 (16.9)	10.7 (4.2)			
Low AUDIT-C	246 (79.9)	10.3 (4.6)			
Exercise					
MET score <500	175 (56.8)	10.7 (4.5)	2.326	2	0.1
MET score 500-1000	66 (21.4)	11.0 (4.6)			
MET score >1000	67 (21.8)	9.4 (4.4)			
Sleep!					
<7 hours	118 (38.3)	11.8 (5.1)	15.957	1	<0.001
>7 hours	190 (61.7)	9.7 (4.0)			

326

327 **Insert Figure 2: Mean K-5 scores versus the hours of sleep per night due to**

328 **COVID-19 pandemic. Error bars are shown.**

329

330 **Association between Psychological Distress and Change in**
 331 **Lifestyle Behaviours, Income Loss and Greater Perceived**
 332 **COVID-19 Impact and Hopefulness**
 333

334 Table 3 presents the mean psychological distress scores in relation to the changes in

335 lifestyle and income factors due to COVID-19. From the table, psychological distress

336 scores varied significantly with changes in all lifestyle behavioural factors except for

337 alcohol consumption. The scores were significantly higher in those who reported

338 increase in smoking than those who reported no change ($P<0.001$). Respondents who
 339 reported either increased or decreased sleep, people who reported less exercise, and
 340 people who smoked more reported significantly higher scores for psychological distress
 341 than those who reported no change in these behaviours. Surprisingly, those who
 342 reported improvement in their nutrition had significantly higher scores for
 343 psychological distress than those with no change to their nutrition.

344 Respondents whose incomes were reduced had significantly higher
 345 psychological distress scores than those whose incomes were increased or unaffected,
 346 during the COVID-19 pandemic. Similarly, those who reported a negative COVID-19
 347 impact were also significantly more psychologically distressed than the other groups
 348 (see Table 4).

349 **Table 4: Differences in mean psychological distress scores (K5) with the changes in**
 350 **lifestyle behavioural and income due to COVID-19.**

351

Variables	N (%)	Mean(\pm SD)	F value	P-value
SNAPS Factor				
Smoking (n=73)				
Less smoking	8 (11.0)	10.3 (4.0)	10.79	<0.001
No change	47 (64.4)	9.8 (3.8)		
More smoking	18 (24.7)	14.9 (4.5)		
Nutrition (n=286)				
Worse nutrition	41 (14.3)	11.6 (4.1)	5.22	0.006
No change	224 (78.3)	10.0 (4.5)		
Better nutrition	21 (7.3)	12.8 (4.9)		
Alcohol (n=165)				
Less alcohol	22 (13.3)	11.1 (4.8)	1.94	0.148
No change	116 (70.3)	10.4 (4.6)		
More alcohol	27 (16.4)	12.2 (4.0)		

Exercise (n=283)				
Less exercise	97 (34.3)	11.4 (4.4)	3.83	0.023
No change	148 (52.3)	9.8 (4.4)		
More exercise	38 (13.4)	10.7 (5.0)		
Sleep (n=286)				
Less sleep	66 (23.1)	13.2 (4.4)	26.31	<0.001
No change	202 (70.6)	9.3 (3.9)		
More sleep	18 (6.3)	13.3 (5.9)		
Income changes due to COVID-19				
Income reduced	43 (15.0)	12.8 (5.1)	7.55	<0.001
No change in income	210 (73.4)	10.1 (4.4)		
Income increased	33 (11.5)	9.5 (4.0)		
Perceived COVID-19 impact				
Negative COVID impact	161 (56.3)	11.7 (4.7)	15.23	<0.001
Neutral COVID impact	86 (30.1)	8.9 (3.7)		
Positive COVID impact	39 (13.6)	8.7 (4.0)		

352

353

There was a significant correlation between having a negative disposition (low

354

THS) and higher psychological distress scores among the respondents ($r = -0.365$,

355

$P < 0.001$). One way ANOVA revealed that those who perceived a negative or no impact

356

of COVID-19 had significantly lower mean THS than those who perceived a positive

357

impact of COVID-19 (43.4 ± 10.4 and 43.0 ± 11.6 vs 48.9 ± 8.9 , $P = 0.008$) in this study.

358

359

Association Between Subjective COVID-19 Impact and

360

Lifestyle Change, Disposition, Income Loss and Drought

361

Impact

362

363

As shown in Supplementary file (S1 Table 1), there was no significant

364

correlation between self-reported COVID-19 impact and gender ($F = 2.059$,

365 $p=0.357$), age ($F=6.966$, $p=0.138$) or occupation ($F=3.586$, $p=0.733$). Current
 366 lifestyle was not significantly correlated with perceived COVID-19 impact, as
 367 measured in both individual lifestyle factors (S1 Table 2) and the composite GLS
 368 ($F=1.817$, $P=0.164$).

369 There was a significant association between subjective COVID-19 impact and
 370 some changes in lifestyle, specifically with increased smoking and decrease in hours of
 371 sleep (Table 5). Those who reported increased smoking and either more or less sleep
 372 were significantly more negatively impacted by COVID-19 than those who reported no
 373 changes. Notably, the impact of COVID-19 varied with the respondents' change in
 374 income ($\chi^2 = 21.80$, $p=0.005$), such that a greater degree of income loss was associated
 375 with a higher self-reported negative impact of COVID-19.

376

377 **Table 5: Perceived COVID-19 Impact correlated with Changes in Lifestyle**

378 **Behaviour**

Variables	Negative COVID-19 impact	No impact	Positive COVID-19 impact	<i>P</i> -value
Lifestyle Factors				
Smoking				
More smoking	14 (66.7)	4 (19.0)	3 (14.3)	0.027
About the same	27 (52.9)	13 (25.5)	11 (21.6)	
Less smoking	6 (60.0)	0 (0.0)	4 (40.0%)	
Nutrition				
Worse nutrition	28 (63.6)	8 (18.2)	8 (18.2)	0.395

No change	134 (55.1)	78 (32.1)	31 (12.8)	
Better nutrition	13 (61.9)	5 (23.8)	3 (14.3)	
Alcohol				
More alcohol	21 (67.7)	9 (29.0)	1 (3.2)	0.103
No change	63 (52.5)	42 (35.0)	15 (12.5)	
Less alcohol	12 (52.2)	5 (21.7)	6 (26.1)	
Physical Exercise				
Less exercise	70 (67.3)	25 (24.0)	9 (8.7)	0.072
No change	83 (51.2)	54 (33.3)	25 (15.4)	
More exercise	20 (51.3)	11 (28.2)	8 (20.5)	
Sleep				
Less sleep	51 (68.0)	18 (24.0)	6 (8.0)	0.005
No change	110 (51.2)	73 (34.0)	32 (14.9)	
More sleep	14 (77.8)	0 (0.0)	4 (22.2)	
Income change				
Significantly lower	20 (83.3)	3 (12.5)	1 (4.2)	0.005
Slightly lower	17 (77.3)	4 (18.2)	1 (4.5)	
About the same	124 (55.6)	74 (32.5)	29 (12.8)	
Slightly greater	11 (39.3)	8 (28.6)	9 (32.1)	
Significantly greater	3 (42.9)	2 (28.6)	2 (28.6)	

379

380

Figure 3 presents the perceived impact of the drought as a function of the

381

COVID-19 impact, among the respondents. People's perception of the drought impact

382

was found to be significantly associated with how they were impacted by the COVID-

383

19 pandemic ($\chi^2 = 31.93$, $P=0.005$). Those who reported a negative impact of COVID-

384

19 were significantly more likely to perceive that the drought had affected them

385

adversely, and vice versa.

386

Insert Figure 3: Self-reported impact of drought as a function of the perceived

387

COVID-19 impact

388

389 **Qualitative Data**

390

391 Some common themes relating to the impact of COVID-19 on lifestyle factors
392 (Table 6) were identified, with general impacts salient throughout including a
393 predominantly negative impact on relationships, socialisation, and the ability to freely
394 participate in in-person events. Respondents identified a reduced sense of connection
395 and support, which was occasionally related to increased feelings of depression. Others
396 also identified an increased level of stress and anxiety due to work or COVID-19
397 requirements. Most respondents did not smoke; however, COVID-19 did provide one
398 individual with the impetus to quit; one participant reported relapsing during COVID-
399 19, but this may or not have been a causative relationship, and no respondents described
400 taking up smoking. Most respondents felt that COVID-19 had a negative impact on
401 their ability to exercise, with the most significant limiting factors including fear of
402 going out and closures/cancellations of facilities such as the gyms. Conversely, some
403 respondents attributed increased levels of exercise to increased time due to less work
404 and fewer social commitments.

405

406 **Table 6: Qualitative Survey Responses for Lifestyle Factors**

Topic	Quotes
-------	--------

General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Being a single parent, I found not being able to visit friends and family or receive visitors in my home to be extremely isolating. Having no adult face to face contact messed with my mental health.”</i> • <i>“Stress from COVID, winter, family...has made me depressed and has led to lethargy.”</i> • <i>“Becoming more isolated”</i> • <i>“Visitors from coast don’t visit as often”</i> • <i>“Mental health... anxiety, lots of rules etc. Stress as a business owner.”</i>
Smoking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“2 weeks into quitting and have reduced by half. COVID has had a part in stronger motivation to quit.”</i> • <i>“I was trying to quit but gave up trying when the panic was declared.”</i>
Alcohol	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“[I drink] more due to work stress than COVID but COVID created the extra work stress”</i> • <i>“Since the pubs closed I feel like I have not been able to get my drinking under control”</i> • <i>“I am a social drinker so COVID has made me drink substantially less”</i> • <i>“Drinking alcohol made [stress] worse, so I stopped [drinking] in June</i>
Exercise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“I am avoiding the gym because I can’t risk catching COVID and passing it on to elderly people”</i> • <i>“Gyms either closing or having reduced operating hours impacts my exercise regime”</i> • <i>“My year of planned running events was cancelled.”</i> • <i>“With working from home during the lockdown, I was able to fit more exercise into my day.”</i>
Sleep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“I can't switch off”</i> • <i>“I wake up through the night worrying about the future”</i> • <i>“If everyone complied... life will be able to move forward”</i> • <i>“During the first lockdown I had trouble sleeping ... but now I’m ok”</i> • <i>“Other issues are causing sleep deprivation”</i> • <i>“I have young children”</i>

408 The impact of COVID-19 on alcohol consumption tended to follow two separate
409 trends. Some regular alcohol consumers reported an increase in their alcohol intake due
410 to stress, whereas social drinkers tended to consume less alcohol due to fewer social
411 events. The impact of COVID-19 on sleep habits also showed effects in both directions,
412 with some reporting less sleep due to anxiety regarding health, work, global events and
413 young children, while others reported longer, better sleep and more naps, whilst
414 working from home.

415 The effects of COVID-19 on general mental health of the respondents, appeared
416 to be related to the increase in isolation and stress resulting from increased work
417 demands. The effects of COVID-19 on lifestyle behaviours were variable and
418 dependent on the individual's circumstances.

419

420 **Discussion**

421

422 This study examined the association between lifestyle behaviours (smoking,
423 nutrition, alcohol, physical activity and sleep), lifestyle behavioural change during
424 COVID-19, psychological distress and the reported perceived impact of COVID-19 in a
425 rural Australian population, at a time of significant drought. Key findings were that
426 COVID-19 has, on average, had a negative effect on all domains of lifestyle in this rural
427 community. Those with the poorest lifestyles reported the highest levels of

428 psychological distress during the pandemic, particularly less sleep and increased
429 smoking. In terms of lifestyle change, a negative change in lifestyle (less sleep, poorer
430 nutrition, increased smoking, and less exercise) was associated with an increase in
431 psychological distress, which was consistent with the study's hypothesis. Interestingly,
432 the respondents who reported an improvement in their lifestyle during the lockdown,
433 had similarly elevated psychological distress scores compared to those whose lifestyle
434 remained unchanged. Those who felt the most affected by the COVID-19 pandemic,
435 were also more likely to be distressed and this appears to overlap with those who felt
436 most impacted by the drought before the pandemic. Notably, loss in income was
437 significantly correlated with both higher psychological distress and greater self-reported
438 COVID-19 impact in this study.

439 Several reports outlined earlier have found that, COVID-19 has had a significant
440 impact on lifestyle behaviours and our study confirms this in this rural population. We
441 found that a significant proportion of the respondents reported changes in each lifestyle
442 domain, ranging from 21% with nutrition to 46% with exercise, with more people
443 reporting negative than positive change across all domains. Exercise was also the most
444 impacted domain in Stanton et al.'s cohort in April 2020, during the COVID-19
445 lockdown, with 69% of their respondents reporting an impact(6).

446 Given the well-established relationships between all lifestyle domains that we
447 assessed and mental health, it was expected that both poor current lifestyle and the

448 adoption of poor lifestyle habits during COVID-19 to correlate with higher
449 psychological distress, and vice versa. However, inadequate sleep and active smoking
450 were the only lifestyle behaviours that significantly correlated with psychological
451 distress. Lack of correlation with other well-known factors like exercise may reflect
452 unique characteristics of the rural sample or underpowering of our study resulting in
453 weaker associations. Similar to our findings, Stanton et al (7). found that sleep had the
454 strongest correlation with depression out of all lifestyle factors. Sleep is strongly
455 associated bi-directionally with depression, with sleep duration and architecture being
456 disrupted by depression and, concomitantly, sleep deprivation being a major risk factor
457 for developing depression(7). The COVID pandemic has been associated with poor
458 sleep widespread among the general population, with healthcare workers strongly
459 affected(25). Regarding smoking, depression and psychological distress is known to
460 predict smoking, likely representing ‘self-medication’ and shared underlying
461 environmental causes, with chronic smoking causing neurophysiological changes that
462 promote depression(26). Subsequently, when pooled into our composite GLS, we found
463 that poorer lifestyles were associated with higher levels of distress during the COVID-
464 19 pandemic, confirming our hypothesis and suggesting the potential utility of this
465 global measure in providing an overall lifestyle assessment.

466 Regarding the change in lifestyle behaviours adopted due to COVID-19, we
467 found a negative change in all the domains of the respondents’ lifestyle (less sleep,

468 poorer nutrition, increased smoking, and less exercise), with the notable exception of
469 impact on alcohol consumption. These were associated with higher psychological
470 distress. Ingram et al.'s UK cohort also had no correlation between change in alcohol
471 consumption and negative mood status unlike other lifestyle risk factors; they
472 hypothesised that this may reflect the positive effect of alcohol on peoples mood, under
473 certain social circumstances(8). Furthermore, Hu et al. found that, during the COVID
474 pandemic, a decreased vegetable, fruit, and breakfast intake was associated with lower
475 subjective wellbeing(27). Concerning the unexpectedly increase in psychological
476 distress found among those who adopted healthier lifestyle behaviours, one hypothesis
477 was a “self-medication” theory where those with high distress perhaps attempted to
478 improve their anxiety through healthy outlets. Another theory borne out of the literature
479 suggests that the process of adopting and maintaining a healthier lifestyle may in itself
480 cause distress(28).

481 It was also found that a decrease in income was associated with an increase in
482 psychological distress at the time and a greater negative self-reported COVID impact.
483 Economic recessions have been shown to have a devastating effect on mental health. At
484 the time of the current survey, over 206,000 people were unemployed due to COVID-
485 19(29). A recent large prospective, longitudinal study of over 34,000 respondents found
486 that participants who reported a decrease in income over a three year period, were 30%
487 more likely to report a mental health or substance disorder(10). Furthermore, significant

488 financial stress has been associated with increased interpersonal stressors, greater
489 psychological distress and lower levels of psychological well-being(30). It is suggested
490 that economic measures such as JobKeeper and JobSeeker(31) may have prevented the
491 worst of the impact as government policy directed towards financial protection of
492 Australians during COVID has been shown to improve mental health outcomes(32).

493 Regarding the perceived COVID-19 impact, respondents were asked to rate the
494 severity of COVID-19's impact on their life in general. This question was intended to
495 capture the perceived overall psychological burden of the pandemic, including the
496 effects of mandated restrictions on lifestyle, work, and education, broader social
497 changes and fear of contracting the disease itself.
498 Change in sleep and smoking habits were significantly correlated with the respondents'
499 perceived COVID-19 impact, which was expected, though it is notable that the change
500 in other lifestyle behaviours during the pandemic were not significantly correlated with
501 the perceived impact. This study demonstrated that current lifestyle did not correlate
502 with perceived COVID impact, either as individual behaviours or as a composite GLS.
503 As such, respondents with poorer and healthier lifestyles reported similar impact of
504 COVID-19; however, those who reported a negative change in their sleep and smoking
505 behaviours during COVID-19 pandemic, reported an increase in the impact of COVID-
506 19. This lack of relationship between individuals' current lifestyle and their perception
507 of COVID-19 impact suggests that other factors such as income decline (discussed

508 above) appear to be more dominant; nonetheless, as poor lifestyle continues to correlate
509 with overall psychological distress, it remains important for mental health even in the
510 context of additional stressors.

511 Respondents with a high level of self-reported COVID-19 impact also reported
512 higher psychological distress. Considering that our result did not find any correlation
513 between distress and a negative disposition, their report of higher distress can be
514 attributed to the impact of COVID on their lives, rather than their disposition.

515 Consistent with the hypothesis that COVID-19 may have directly caused poorer mental
516 health outcomes, one large longitudinal study has found that people without previous
517 mental health disorders reported an increase in symptom severity on scales used to
518 measure mental health when compared to pre-pandemic levels(19).

519 The current study found no significant association between demographic factors
520 and COVID-19 impact with similar self-reported COVID-19 impacts across age, sex
521 and occupation. A large systematic review on the impact of COVID-19 on mental
522 health identified women, students, age <40, pre-existing psychiatric conditions and
523 increased exposure to social media as risk factors for increased distress, during the
524 pandemic(20). Similarly, the most vulnerable people who had lost their jobs, lived
525 alone or were living in poorly-resourced areas, were providing care to dependent family
526 members of marginalised minorities, women or young people, had the most severe
527 impact(21).

528 The association between perceived COVID-19 impact and drought impact
529 within the same population suggests that there are common mechanisms or
530 vulnerabilities that may impact rural populations, such as the impact of external
531 stressors on income. Throughout the drought, farmers in NSW experienced significant
532 distress due to the effects of the drought on themselves, their families and their
533 communities(17). Specifically, farmers who experienced financial hardship or were
534 isolated from their communities by virtue of working in remote areas, were prone to
535 drought related stress(17). The results of this study suggest that these other risk factors
536 may have been compounded by the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 resulting in the
537 association between drought-related stress and self-reported COVID-19 impact.

538

539 **Limitations and strengths**

540

541 The limitations of the current study include the relatively small sample size,
542 predominantly composed of respondents from one rural town in Australia with access to
543 the Internet on a smartphone or computer. The data was largely skewed towards older
544 female respondents, who are not representative of the entire rural Australian population.
545 This limitation existed due to the inability to distribute the survey in person due to the
546 pandemic and because the online groups where the surveys were distributed, had a
547 relatively inactive younger population and included only individuals who had access to
548 the Internet on a smartphone or computer. Furthermore, the study design did not

549 differentiate between potentially important underlying social and demographic
550 subgroups such as parental status. Glenister et al. reported an increase in alcohol only
551 among women who were living with children at home as opposed to those without(9),
552 and the effect of alcohol on mood is known to vary between social situations. Not
553 taking these subgroups into account may have confounded the correlations found
554 between lifestyle behaviours and COVID-19 impact, by obscuring the underlying
555 correlations in opposite directions. A further limitation of the study was the reliance on
556 self-reported data that cannot be independently verified. The data may therefore have
557 been incorrectly recalled or exaggerated. Cross-sectional studies such as the current one
558 make it difficult to delineate cause and effect. For example, lifestyle change, and
559 COVID-19 impact may work bidirectionally to influence each other. Further research
560 involving alternative data gathering methods and perhaps using a longitudinal study are
561 needed to address these limitations. The current study developed a GLS based on
562 evidence-based recommendations in each of the 5 key lifestyle domains recommended
563 by the RACGPs to be included in standardised lifestyle screening. Although, this
564 scoring system has not, as yet, been validated beyond the current study for use in
565 measuring overall lifestyle, it could potentially be refined into a clinically applicable
566 scoring tool to be used in practice. Further validation is required to enhance its utility
567 in predicting other established lifestyle-dependent conditions, such as cardiovascular

568 disease and diabetes – i.e. before it can be formally used as a GLS. Future research into
569 the impact of COVID-19 on young Australians in a rural setting should consider this.

570

571 **Future directions for research**

572

573 As those with perceived increased drought impact were more likely to report
574 increased COVID-19 impact, a direction for future research is the extent to which
575 drought relief initiatives may build resilience within communities to prepare them for
576 future crises. The relationship between previous crises such as drought and the COVID-
577 19 pandemic may also be informative. To the best of the authors' knowledge, a GLS
578 applicable in the clinical setting has never been developed or widely accepted. The
579 proposed GLS is based on lifestyle recommendations from relevant leading health
580 organisations and has been shown to correlate well with high levels of distress in this
581 study. Further research into whether this clinical tool can be validated for further mental
582 and physiological health conditions is required. Several measured lifestyle factors
583 demonstrated correlational trends in opposite directions – i.e. in both positive and
584 negative directions. More in-depth demographic studies are needed to elucidate factors
585 that may contribute to one or other trend, which in turn may provide further information
586 in relation to those who are most vulnerable to distress.

587

588 **Community Engagement**

589

590

Due to COVID-19 and the difficulty in distributing surveys in-person,

591

community engagement was primarily achieved online by contacting local councils,

592

who distributed a link to the survey through email, and additionally by posting on

593

Facebook groups containing members living in the Central West of NSW. Reminders to

594

complete the survey were posted on these groups to increase response numbers. The

595

survey medium and mode of recruitment highlight a likely shift in the context of

596

COVID-19 and, in future, towards use of IT and community engagement online. These

597

surveys can be completed on mobile devices or on a computer, highlighting the multi-

598

modal and ease of access of these on-line surveys, irrespective of the physical location

599

of the participant.

600

601 **Conclusion**

602

603

In conclusion, the current study suggests that rural Australians' lifestyle

604

parameters such as smoking, sleeping, nutrition, exercise but not alcohol, were worse,

605

during the COVID-19 pandemic. Greater COVID-19 impact was associated with higher

606

distress and a greater change in overall lifestyle. These findings present important

607

implications for health professionals towards a greater understanding of COVID-19 and

608

its effect on lifestyle and mental health amongst patients and directing their treatment

609 strategies accordingly. As a contextual factor that continues to evolve at the time of
610 writing, the perceived impact of COVID-19 on the lifestyle factors under consideration
611 is evolving and further research is needed to investigate the clinical utility of these
612 lifestyle behaviours.

613

614 **Conflict of interest**

615 There are no conflicts of interest to declare. The authors received no external funding.

616 **Authors' Contributions**

617 JC, KC, JG, HX, RV, JB designed the study and developed study materials. JC, KC, JG,
618 HX recruited study respondents. JC, KC, JG, HX, RV, JB drafted the manuscript. Data
619 analysis was conducted by JC, KC, JG, HX, with input from JB. All authors contributed
620 to writing, editing and approval of the final manuscript.

621 **Acknowledgements**

622 We have no acknowledgements to make.

623 **Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate**

624 Ethics approval was obtained from Western Sydney University Human Research Ethics
625 Committee (H13796). All respondents were provided with written informed consent
626 prior to participation. The paper contains no identifying information. The study

627 protocol conformed with the tenets of the declaration of Helsinki for studies involving
628 human respondents.

629 References

- 630 1. Organization WH. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19): situation report, 182. 2020.
- 631 2. Team EE. Latest updates on COVID-19 from the European Centre for Disease
632 Prevention and Control. *Eurosurveillance*. 2020;25(6):2002131.
- 633 3. Gopinath G. The great lockdown: Worst economic downturn since the great depression.
634 *IMF blog*. 2020;14:2020.
- 635 4. Qiu J, Shen B, Zhao M, Wang Z, Xie B, Xu Y. A nationwide survey of psychological
636 distress among Chinese people in the COVID-19 epidemic: implications and policy
637 recommendations. *General psychiatry*. 2020;33(2).
- 638 5. González-Sanguino C, Ausín B, Castellanos MÁ, Saiz J, López-Gómez A, Ugidos C, et
639 al. Mental health consequences during the initial stage of the 2020 Coronavirus pandemic
640 (COVID-19) in Spain. *Brain, behavior, and immunity*. 2020;87:172-6.
- 641 6. Manger S. Lifestyle interventions for mental health. *Australian Journal of General
642 Practice*. 2019;48(10):670-3.
- 643 7. Stanton R, To QG, Khalesi S, Williams SL, Alley SJ, Thwaite TL, et al. Depression,
644 anxiety and stress during COVID-19: associations with changes in physical activity, sleep,
645 tobacco and alcohol use in Australian adults. *International journal of environmental research
646 and public health*. 2020;17(11):4065.
- 647 8. Franzen PL, Buysse DJ. Sleep disturbances and depression: risk relationships for
648 subsequent depression and therapeutic implications. *Dialogues in clinical neuroscience*. 2022.
- 649 9. Ingram J, Maciejewski G, Hand CJ. Changes in diet, sleep, and physical activity are
650 associated with differences in negative mood during COVID-19 lockdown. *Frontiers in
651 psychology*. 2020;11:588604.
- 652 10. Ziersch AM, Baum F, Darmawan IGN, Kavanagh AM, Bentley RJ. Social capital and
653 health in rural and urban communities in South Australia. *Australian and New Zealand journal
654 of public health*. 2009;33(1):7-16.
- 655 11. Brown P. Mental health in rural Australia. *Australian Journal of Rural Health*.
656 2017;25(5):258-9.
- 657 12. Judd FK, Humphreys JS. Mental health issues for rural and remote Australia. *Australian
658 Journal of Rural Health*. 2001;9(5):254-8.
- 659 13. Government A. Deaths by suicide by remoteness areas. Canberra: Australian Institute of
660 Health Welfare; 2020 14/10/2021.
- 661 14. Glenister KM, Ervin K, Podubinski T. Detrimental health behaviour changes among
662 females living in rural areas during the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of
663 Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2021;18(2):722.

- 664 15. Sareen J, Afifi TO, McMillan KA, Asmundson GJ. Relationship between household
665 income and mental disorders: findings from a population-based longitudinal study. *Arch Gen*
666 *Psychiatry*. 2011;68(4):419-27.
- 667 16. NSW State Seasonal Update - September 2020 [press release]. New South Wales: NSW
668 Department of Primary Industries 2020.
- 669 17. LV OB, Berry HL, Coleman C, Hanigan IC. Drought as a mental health exposure.
670 *Environ Res*. 2014;131:181-7.
- 671 18. Mark Harris, Nigel Stocks, Nick Zwar, Danielle Mazza, Tania Winzenberg, Karen
672 Booth, et al. Smoking, nutrition, alcohol, physical activity (SNAP): A population health guide
673 to behavioural risk factors in general practice. 2nd ed. Melbourne: The Royal Australian
674 College of General Practitioners; 2015. 159-65 p.
- 675 19. Brown W, Bauman A, Bull F, Burton N. Australian Government Department of Health.
676 2012. Development of Evidence-based Physical Activity Recommendations for Adults (18–64
677 years)[Google Scholar]. 2018.
- 678 20. Ainsworth BE, Haskell WL, Herrmann SD, Meckes N, Bassett DR, Jr., Tudor-Locke C,
679 et al. 2011 Compendium of Physical Activities: a second update of codes and MET values. *Med*
680 *Sci Sports Exerc*. 2011;43(8):1575-81.
- 681 21. Bradley KA, DeBenedetti AF, Volk RJ, Williams EC, Frank D, Kivlahan DR. AUDIT-
682 C as a brief screen for alcohol misuse in primary care. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. 2007;31(7):1208-
683 17.
- 684 22. Wallace TC, Bailey RL, Blumberg JB, Burton-Freeman B, Chen CO, Crowe-White
685 KM, et al. Fruits, vegetables, and health: A comprehensive narrative, umbrella review of the
686 science and recommendations for enhanced public policy to improve intake. *Critical reviews in*
687 *food science and nutrition*. 2020;60(13):2174-211.
- 688 23. Government A. Primary mental health care minimum dataset. Canberra: Department of
689 Health; 2018 1 September.
- 690 24. DiGasbarro D, Midden A, Van Haitsma K, Meeks S, Mast B. Reliability and validity of
691 the adult hope scale among nursing home residents with and without cognitive impairment.
692 *Clinical gerontologist*. 2020;43(3):340-9.
- 693 25. Nutt D, Wilson S, Paterson L. Sleep disorders as core symptoms of depression.
694 *Dialogues in clinical neuroscience*. 2022.
- 695 26. Pan K-Y, Kok AA, Eikelenboom M, Horsfall M, Jörg F, Luteijn RA, et al. The mental
696 health impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on people with and without depressive, anxiety, or
697 obsessive-compulsive disorders: a longitudinal study of three Dutch case-control cohorts. *The*
698 *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2021;8(2):121-9.
- 699 27. Hu Z, Lin X, Kaminga AC, Xu H. Impact of the COVID-19 epidemic on lifestyle
700 behaviors and their association with subjective well-being among the general population in
701 mainland China: cross-sectional study. *Journal of medical Internet research*. 2020;22(8):e21176.
- 702 28. Sturgeon JA, Arewasikporn A, Okun MA, Davis MC, Ong AD, Zautra AJ. The
703 Psychosocial Context of Financial Stress: Implications for Inflammation and Psychological
704 Health. *Psychosom Med*. 2016;78(2):134-43.
- 705 29. Golberstein E. The effects of income on mental health: evidence from the social
706 security notch. *J Ment Health Policy Econ*. 2015;18(1):27-37.

- 707 30. Austin EK, Handley T, Kiem AS, Rich JL, Perkins D, Kelly B. Drought, wellbeing and
708 adaptive capacity: why do some people stay well? *International Journal of Environmental*
709 *Research and Public Health*. 2020;17(19):7214.
- 710 31. Phillips B, Gray M, Biddle N. COVID-19 JobKeeper and JobSeeker impacts on poverty
711 and housing stress under current and alternative economic and policy scenarios. 2020.
- 712 32. Bower M, Donohoe-Bales A, Smout S, Ngyuen AQH, Boyle J, Barrett E, et al. In their
713 own words: An Australian community sample's priority concerns regarding mental health in the
714 context of COVID-19. *PloS one*. 2022;17(5):e0268824.
- 715
- 716




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3