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

- ¹ School of Medicine, Western Sydney University, Campbelltown, NSW, Australia. 10
- 11 19064172@student.westernsvdnev.edu.au; 19062860@student.westernsvdnev.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,
- NSW, Australia; R.Vines@westernsydney.edu.au; 14
- 15 Tegan.Dutton@westernsydney.edu.au; K.Cockrell@westernsydney.edu.au;;
- 16 l.osuagwu@westernsydney.edu.au;
- ³ Translational Health Research Institute (THRI), School of Medicine, Western Sydney 17
- 18 University, Campbelltown, Australia; l.osuagwu@westernsydney.edu.au;

19 *Corresponding author

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

2

22

Abstract 23

24 Background: The Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has caused 25 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. **Methods:** The associations between psychological distress and changes in SNAPS 33 34 health behaviours (smoking, nutrition, alcohol, physical activity, sleep) since the onset of COVID-19 in rural Australia were examined. A cross-sectional anonymous online 35 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 old, 86.4% female). High distress on the K5 scale was present in over one-third of 42

3

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

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 environment has had on lifestyle behaviours - smoking, nutrition, consumption of 78 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

5

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	

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

6

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

7

122	in the context of both	drought and COVID-19	may improve our une	derstanding of	f
-----	------------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------	---

- 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
- 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
- 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 and136 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
- 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	
147 148	Study design and setting
149	Cross-sectional study in the Western New South Wales (NSW) Primary Health
150	Network Region.
151	
152 153	Survey respondents
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

months of online study. University campuses limited or ceased face-to-face teaching 163

ſ	٦	١	
2	-		
Ś	-	,	

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			
168 160	Survey Tool		
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			
181 182 183	Assessing the impact of COVID-19 on the lives of respondents and mental welfare		

184 Details of the response structure are also available in the supplementary file (S1185 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

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	
210 211	Global Lifestyle Score (GLS)
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	

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	Recommended intake of	Recommended intake of
	vegetables and fruit	vegetables or fruit, but not	vegetables and fruit
		both	(5+2/day)
Alcohol*	AUDIT-C≥9	AUDIT-C 5-8	AUDIT-C≤4

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

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

220

221

222

Mental health and wellbeing measures

To assess mental wellbeing, the Kessler-5 (K5) for psychological distress and 223 224 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 point scale. The scores ranged from 1 for "Definitely untrue" to 8 for "Definitely true". 230 231 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 levels. 234

236	The impact of drought
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'
243 244 245 246	Data Analysis 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 <i>t</i> -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

and the GLS and THS. The associations between overall COVID-19 impact and
demographics and reported impact of COVID-19 on individual lifestyle factors were
determined using Chi-square tests. Appropriate statistics (Pearson's r, t, F values, df)
were reported for all tests. All tests were two-tailed and $P < 0.05$ was considered
statistically significant.
Respondents' qualitative comments were analysed by brief thematic analysis to
identify key themes regarding the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on lifestyle.
Results
Characteristics of the respondents
The sociodemographic characteristics of respondents are reported in Table 2 and
in Figures 1, 2 and 3. Most respondents were females (86.4%), aged between 45-54
years old (27.6%) and were working in a non-agricultural industry (76.2%) at the time
of this study. For the mood and disposition measures, over one-third of respondents
(34.3%) reported symptoms of psychological distress and the mean AHS was 44.1
±10.7.
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 (±SD)	10.5 ± 4.5
Low/moderate (5-11)	188 (65.7)
High/very high (12-25)	98 (34.3)
AHS, n=269	
Mean score (±SD)	44.1 ± 10.7

278

Perceived Impact of COVID-19 and drought 279

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

impacted by the drought (n=145, 48.7%), 11.1% (n=33) reported a positive impact 286

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.

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

17

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

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
- were significantly higher in respondents who slept for 7 hours or less a night, compared 313
- 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 at rest per minute, 500 MET is equivalent to 150 minutes of moderate physical activity 323 324 (at approximately 3.33 MET) or 75 minutes vigorous activity (at approximately 6.66 325 MET).

Lifestyle Factor	N (%)	K-5 mean (±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)			

18

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

COVID-19 pandemic. Error bars are shown. 328

329

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

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
- scores varied significantly with changes in all lifestyle behavioural factors except for 336
- alcohol consumption. The scores were significantly higher in those who reported 337

338	increase in sm	oking than thos	e who reported no	o change (P	<0.001).	Respondents	who
-----	----------------	-----------------	-------------------	-------------	----------	-------------	-----

- reported either increased or decreased sleep, people who reported less exercise, and 339
- 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).

I

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

Variables	N (%)	Mean(±SD)	F value	<i>P</i> -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)		

20

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

impact of COVID-19 (43.4 ± 10.4 and 43.0 ± 11.6 vs 48.9 ± 8.9 , *P*=0.008) in this study. 357

358

Association Between Subjective COVID-19 Impact and 359 Lifestyle Change, Disposition, Income Loss and Drought 360 Impact 361 362

- 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), a	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

22

.8)
5)
0.103
.5)
)
0.072
.4)
5)
0.005
.9)
2)
0.005
.8)
)
<u>)</u>

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

Qualitative Data 389

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 and support, which was occasionally related to increased feelings of depression. Others 395 396 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	 "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." "Stress from COVID, winter, familyhas made me depressed and has led to lethargy." "Becoming more isolated" "Visitors from coast don't visit as often" "Mental health anxiety, lots of rules etc. Stress as a business owner."
Smoking	 "2 weeks into quitting and have reduced by half. COVID has had a part in stronger motivation to quit." "I was trying to quit but gave up trying when the panic was declared."
Alcohol	 "[I drink] more due to work stress than COVID but COVID created the extra work stress" "Since the pubs closed I feel like I have not been able to get my drinking under control" "I am a social drinker so COVID has made me drink substantially less" "Drinking alcohol made [stress] worse, so I stopped [drinking] in June
Exercise	 "I am avoiding the gym because I can't risk catching COVID and passing it on to elderly people" "Gyms either closing or having reduced operating hours impacts my exercise regime" "My year of planned running events was cancelled." "With working from home during the lockdown, I was able to fit more exercise into my day."
Sleep	 "I can't switch off" "I wake up through the night worrying about the future" "If everyone complied life will be able to move forward" "During the first lockdown I had trouble sleeping but now I'm ok" "Other issues are causing sleep deprivation" "I have young children"

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	
420 421	Discussion
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 most impacted by the drought before the pandemic. Notably, loss in income was 436 437 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

27

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 distress. Ingram et al.'s UK cohort also had no correlation between change in alcohol 470 471 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 the time of the current survey, over 206,000 people were unemployed due to COVID-484

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

29

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

above) appear to be more dominant; nonetheless, as poor lifestyle continues to correlate

with overall psychological distress, it remains important for mental health even in the

508

509

30

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 alone or were living in poorly-resourced areas, were providing care to dependent family 525 526 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

Limitations and strengths

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 the Internet on a smartphone or computer. Furthermore, the study design did not 548

32

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 been incorrectly recalled or exaggerated. Cross-sectional studies such as the current one 557 558 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 needed to address these limitations. The current study developed a GLS based on 561 562 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 inpredicting other established lifestyle-dependent conditions, such as cardiovascular

33

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

572

571

Future directions for research

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 drought relief initiatives may build resilience within communities to prepare them for 575 576 future crises. The relationship between previous crises such as drought and the COVID-19 pandemic may also be informative. To the best of the authors' knowledge, a GLS 577 578 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 organisations and has been shown to correlate well with high levels of distress in this 580 581 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.

34

588 589	Community Engagement
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

Conclusion 601

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 accor	rdingly. As a	contextual t	factor that	continues to	o evolve at t	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**

- There are no conflicts of interest to declare. The authors received no external funding. 615
- **Authors' Contributions** 616
- 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
- analysis was conducted by JC, KC, JG, HX, with input from JB. All authors contributed 619
- 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

protocol conformed with the tenets of the declaration of Helsinki for studies involving 627

- 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.				

perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Sareen J, Afifi TO, McMillan KA, Asmundson GJ. Relationship between household
income and mental disorders: findings from a population-based longitudinal study. Arch Gen
Psychiatry. 2011;68(4):419-27.

16. NSW State Seasonal Update - September 2020 [press release]. New South Wales: NSW
Department of Primary Industries2020.

17. LV OB, Berry HL, Coleman C, Hanigan IC. Drought as a mental health exposure.
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.

Brown W, Bauman A, Bull F, Burton N. Australian Government Department of Health.
2012. Development of Evidence-based Physical Activity Recommendations for Adults (18–64
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.

Bradley KA, DeBenedetti AF, Volk RJ, Williams EC, Frank D, Kivlahan DR. AUDITC as a brief screen for alcohol misuse in primary care. Alcohol Clin Exp Res. 2007;31(7):120817.

Wallace TC, Bailey RL, Blumberg JB, Burton-Freeman B, Chen CO, Crowe-White
KM, et al. Fruits, vegetables, and health: A comprehensive narrative, umbrella review of the
science and recommendations for enhanced public policy to improve intake. Critical reviews in
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.

Hu Z, Lin X, Kaminga AC, Xu H. Impact of the COVID-19 epidemic on lifestyle
behaviors and their association with subjective well-being among the general population in
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

Psychosocial Context of Financial Stress: Implications for Inflammation and Psychological
 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 Phillips B, Gray M, Biddle N. COVID-19 JobKeeper and JobSeeker impacts on poverty 31. 711 and housing stress under current and alternative economic and policy scenarios. 2020.

712 Bower M, Donohoe-Bales A, Smout S, Ngyuen AQH, Boyle J, Barrett E, et al. In their 32.

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



Participants (%)

Lifestyle behaviour

Figure 1



Figure 2



Figure 3