

Psychological distress and compliance with sanitary measures during the Covid-19 pandemic: effect modification by participants' gender and socioeconomic characteristics, an IPD meta-analysis

Irwin Hecker¹, Solène Wallez¹, Honor Scarlett¹, José Luis Ayuso-Mateos^{2,3,4}, Richard Bryant⁵, Giulia Caggiu^{6,7,8}, Claudia Conflitti^{6,7}, Katalin Gémes⁹, Josep Maria Haro^{10,11}, Vincent Lorant¹², Roberto Mediavilla^{2,3,4}, Ellenor Mittendorfer-Rutz⁹, Anna Monistrol-Mula^{4,11,13}, Matteo Monzio Compagnoni^{6,7}, Papoula Petri-Romão¹⁴, Irene Pinucci¹⁵, Marit Sijbrandij¹⁶, Jutta Stoffers-Winterling^{14,17}, Henrik Walter¹⁸, Murielle Mary-Krause¹, Maria Melchior^{1*}

1 Sorbonne Université, INSERM, Institut Pierre Louis d'Épidémiologie et de Santé Publique, IPLESP, Équipe de Recherche en Épidémiologie Sociale, ERES, F75012, Paris, France

2 Department of Psychiatry, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

3 Department of Psychiatry, Hospital Universitario La Princesa - Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria, Madrid, Spain

4 Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Salud Mental (CIBERSAM), Instituto de Salud Carlos III, Madrid, Spain

5 University of New South Wales, Australia

6 Department of Statistics and Quantitative Methods, University of Milano-Bicocca, Milan, Italy

7 National Centre for Healthcare Research and Pharmacoepidemiology, Department of Statistics and Quantitative Methods, University of Milano-Bicocca, Milan, Italy

8 Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services, Lecco, Italy

9 Department of Clinical Neuroscience, Division of Insurance Medicine, Karolinska Institutet, 17177 Stockholm, Sweden

10 Parc Sanitari Sant Joan de Déu, Sant Joan de Déu Research Institute, Esplugues de Llobregat, (Barcelona) Spain

11 Department of Medicine, Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

12 Institute of Health and Society, UCLouvain, Belgium

13 Group of Epidemiology of Mental Disorders and Ageing, Sant Joan de Déu Research Institute, Esplugues de Llobregat, (Barcelona) Spain

14 Leibniz Institute for Resilience Research (LIR), Mainz, Germany

15 Department of Human Neurosciences, Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy

16 Department of Clinical, Neuro and Developmental Psychology, WHO Collaborating Centre for Research and Dissemination of Psychological Interventions, Amsterdam Public Health research institute, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

17 University Medical Center of the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, Mainz, Germany

18 Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin, corporate member of Freie Universität Berlin and Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

*Corresponding author ; maria.melchior@inserm.fr

Abstract

Background:

This study aims to understand how psychological distress is related to compliance with COVID-19 sanitary measures. In addition, we explored whether gender and socioeconomic status (i.e educational level and employment status) can modify this relationship.

Methods:

Data from four European cohort studies (n=13,635), were analysed using an Individual Participant Data (IPD) meta-analytic approach. Mixed effect models were employed to examine associations between mental health difficulties and compliance with sanitary measures, as well as effect modification by socioeconomic status. Statistical models were additionally stratified by gender.

Results:

We found a statistically significant positive association between mental health difficulties and compliance with sanitary measures in women, while amongst men the statistically significant association observed was negative. Moreover, there was a statistically significant interaction between participants' educational level and mental health difficulties amongst men only, indicating even lower compliance levels with COVID-19 sanitary measures amongst individuals with only primary schooling.

Conclusion:

The association between psychological distress and compliance with sanitary measures is complex - positive in women, negative in male. Men experiencing mental health difficulties, especially those with lower educational attainment, exhibit low levels of compliance with sanitary measures.

Introduction

Echoing patterns seen during prior epidemics [1], the COVID-19 pandemic showed widespread adverse impacts on global mental health globally [2–6]. The implementation of sanitary measures played a crucial role in mitigating the pandemic [7]. People’s compliance with sanitary measures is also very important as it impacts their effectiveness regarding the epidemiological impact [8].

The relationship between psychological distress and compliance with sanitary is uncertain from a theoretical perspective, with very few studies having compliance as the outcome. Two possibilities, positive and negative relationships, might arise. It could be positive, assuming increased compliance due to anxiety as it has been shown that people with mental health problems had lesser tendency to stop social distancing even as the pandemic subsided. They may surpass the recommended precautions and take them to an extreme [9]. Or negative, as compliance with sanitary measures might be a challenge too difficult to face for people with psychological distress that might already face gendered socioeconomic difficulties. Indeed, evidence shows that mental health follows a socioeconomic gradient [10–12]. Having a lower socioeconomic position affects mental health through both material and psychosocial factors [12]. This was also the case during the COVID-19 pandemic, where people experiencing financial difficulties or unemployment were at higher risk of experiencing symptoms of anxiety/depression compared to those who did not [13,14]. Gender inequalities were also aggravated within the context of the pandemic. Women were already more likely to endure psychological distress, such as anxiety and depression [15], before the pandemic, which further aggravated pre-existing gender inequalities (e.g., unpaid work disparities, disproportionate caregiving burden) compared to men [16,17]. For instance, on the one hand, employed women were particularly at risk for their mental health given that they often carried the burden of domestic responsibilities, such as caring for children and the elderly, as well as changes in work-life balance [16,17]. On the other hand, women aged 35-39 years experienced higher levels of pandemic-induced unemployment, with less educated women with young children particularly at risk [18].

Moreover, sanitary measures (e.g., lockdowns and business closures, remote work mandates, social distancing regulations, travel or healthcare access restrictions, school and university closures, and border closures)[19] also have uneven economic and social impacts on people [20]. Whilst these measures were proven to mitigate COVID-19 outcomes, they exacerbated socioeconomic inequalities [21,22] due to factors such as heterogeneity in one’s ability to work remotely or the probability of COVID-19 infection within the household [23]. Individuals with no formal education and those with only primary education appear less aware of available mental health care services [24]. Being employed [25] and having a low educational level [25–28] also associate with non-compliance with sanitary measures because of other priorities such as securing means of subsistence [25]. Then people may be exposed to unsafe work conditions or unstable income resources [25,29–31]. Regarding gender differences, behaviours also differ. More specifically women tend to be more compliant with preventive measures (e.g., reduced mobility or wearing masks) than men [32].

Based on this context, we anticipated that compliance with sanitary measures during the COVID-19 pandemic would be a challenge for certain populations. Drawing from the observed gender differences in compliance with sanitary measures during the COVID-19 period, and their association with psychological distress, we hypothesised that the association between compliance with sanitary measures and psychological distress would be different across genders. Also, educational level and employment status might have played a distinct role in shaping these dynamics for both men and women.

Methods

Study design and population

To investigate this, we combined data from multiple datasets collected during the COVID-19 pandemic into an Individual Participant Data (IPD) dataset. In our research, we employed IPD meta-analysis [33], utilising datasets exclusively sourced from partners within the RESPOND project. We carefully curated target variables and harmonised these partner datasets. Rigorous quality checks were conducted to ensure the reliability and integrity of the data. This approach enhances the depth and reliability of our findings, enabling robust conclusions to be drawn from the combined datasets contributed by RESPOND project partners.

The population for this study relied on data collected from four observational cohort studies: (i) the TEMPO (Trajectoires Épidémiologiques en Population)[34], (ii) MINDCOVID [35], (iii) COVID and I [36], and (iv) the COVID-19 Mental Health Survey (COMET)[37].

The TEMPO cohort began in 2009 with the aim of better understanding mental health patterns and addictive behaviours. Starting from 2020, TEMPO participants were contacted to collect data regarding their health status during the pandemic. Nine waves of data were collected using self-administered questionnaires from March 24, 2020 (one week after the beginning of the first lockdown), to the end of July 2021. All COVID-19 data waves have been included in this study.

A baseline survey of a cohort of general population adults was conducted as part of the MINDCOVID project. The target population consisted of non-institutionalised Spanish adults (i.e. aged 18 years or older) without Spanish language barriers. Professional interviewers carried out computer-assisted telephone interviews (1–30 June 2020) in a sample drawn using dual-frame random digit dialling. Only the first and second waves of data collection were included in this study as questions related to compliance were asked at these waves only.

An online web survey, named COVID and I, was distributed across Belgium through social media and national news outlets during the beginning of the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. The Belgian government implemented their first restriction measures on March 13th, the survey was launched on March 20th, two days after the start of the lockdown. The survey was aimed at the general population and was available in English, French, and Dutch. Only the fourth wave of data collection was included in this study as questions related to compliance were asked at that wave only.

The COMET study is an international, online longitudinal survey aimed at evaluating the course of mental health symptoms during the COVID-19 pandemic, as well as identifying individuals at greater or reduced risk of mental

illness. The COMET sample includes participants from 14 countries (The Netherlands, Italy, Switzerland, Turkey, Spain, Germany, France, the United Kingdom, Sweden, South Africa, Indonesia, China, Australia and the United States). Participants were recruited starting in May 2020 through a snowball sampling strategy using university mailing lists and different social media platforms. Only the fourth and fifth waves of data collection were included in this study as questions related to compliance were asked at these waves only.

Database data collection is detailed in Supplementary Figure 1 and population selection in Supplementary Figure 2. Other RESPOND databases (EDAD CON SALUD, HEROES, LORA, MARP, DYNACORE-L) were not included because they had no information regarding compliance (EDAD CON SALUD, HEROES, LORA, MARP) or mental health (DYNACORE-L).

Ethics

All studies have been approved by the appropriate ethics committee and have therefore been performed in accordance with the ethical standards laid down in the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki and its later amendments.

The COMET study was approved by the ethical review board of the Faculty of Behavioral and Movement Sciences of the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (VCWE-2020-077). Personal data is protected according to EU and national laws.

Covid and I's ethical review and approval was not required as it is a population-based, online survey without the collection of personal data, which is in accordance with the local legislation and institutional requirements. Participants were provided with the legal information relating to consent, and online informed consent was obtained from all participants.

The MINDCOVID study protocol was approved by the IRB Parc de Salut Mar (2020/9203/I) and by the corresponding IRBs of all the participating centres. The study is registered at ClinicalTrials.gov (<https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04556565>).

The TEMPO cohort received approval of bodies supervising ethical data collection in France, the Advisory Committee on the Treatment of Information for Health Research (Comité consultatif sur le traitement de l'information en matière de recherche dans le domaine de la santé, CCTIRS) and the French regulatory data protection authority (Commission Nationale de l'Informatique et des Libertés, CNIL, n° 908163).

All data included in the present analyses were fully anonymized.

Measures

Outcome

Compliance with sanitary measures was measured using different self report items (handwashing, social distancing, physical contact, wearing a mask, lockdown, working from home, limiting small and/or large gatherings, curfew, hosting people at home, quarantine, and taking extra precautions with at risk people). These items were harmonised by summing them (Supplementary Table 1) and calculating z-scores within each sample.

Exposure

Psychological distress were measured using different scales according to each considered cohort study (COMET: Patient Health Questionnaire Anxiety and Depression Scale (PHQ-ADS)[38]; COVID and I: General Health Questionnaire-12 (GHQ-12)[39]; MINDCOVID: Patient Health Questionnaire-8 and the Anxiety and Depression Scale (PHQ8-ADS)[40]; TEMPO: Adult Self-Report (ASR))[41] and harmonised using a standard procedure: first, for each scale, the different items (Supplementary Table 2) were summed up, and after the corresponding z-scores were calculated. In this way, the individual values of each single scale across the four studies were transformed into a measure of the same order of magnitude (numeric, with specific minimum and maximum), making them comparable. For each individual, regardless of the cohort he or she belongs to, the corresponding z-score obtained from the cohort-specific evaluation scale was considered as the exposure.

Covariates

Sociodemographic characteristics were collected across the four studies, encoded consistently using the same names, values, and formats and included: gender (“Female”; “Male”), age, education (“Tertiary”; “Primary”; “Secondary”), employment status (“In employment”; “Unemployed”), and number of children (“No children”; “One”; “Two or three”; “Four or more”).

All variables accounted for in this study had previously been reported as factors associated with compliance with sanitary measures: female gender [28,42–46], old or young age [26,43,44,46–50], education [25–28], employment status [51] and number of children [52].

A “stringency” variable was also included, based on the Stringency Index [53]. The Stringency Index incorporates nine metrics: school, workplace, or public transport closures, the cancellation of public events, restrictions on public gatherings, restrictions on internal movements, stay-at-home requirements, public information campaigns, and international travel controls. The score corresponds to the mean score of these nine metrics, with each metric ranging from 0 to 100. A higher number on the Stringency Index represents a stricter response from the country where the participant resides, with 100 indicating the strictest possible measures.

Statistical analysis

To test associations between participants’ psychological distress, socioeconomic status (i.e educational level and employment status) and compliance with the sanitary measures implemented during the COVID-19 pandemic, individual participant data from relevant studies was merged and analysed. Due to the longitudinal nature of the data, mixed effect models were used to calculate adjusted odds ratios (aOR), and the corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CI). Multivariate mixed effect models were adjusted for the above-listed covariates (please see the “Covariates” subsection). Analyses were conducted individually for each database, as well as for the merged dataset. Data were stratified by gender to consider gender-specific patterns related to the outcome, exposure, and socioeconomic status. Additionally, interactions between socioeconomic status and exposure were explored. P-values of less than 0.05 were considered to be statistically significant. Collinearity of model variables was explored and measured using Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) derivatives, namely generalised VIF (GVIF) and $GVIF^{1/(2 \cdot Df)}$ [54–57]. After removing incomplete cases for both the outcome and exposure, 19,143 longitudinal

observations (from 13,635 participants) had data sufficient for analyses. Incomplete data on covariates, with an average of 5% missing data, were imputed using Multiple Imputations by Chained Equations (MICE) with Fully Conditional Specification (FCS), based on five multiple imputations [58,59]. All statistical analyses were performed using R version 4.2.3 and Rstudio version 2023.6.1.524 [60].

Results

The four included cohorts showed many similarities, including a higher proportion of women (68.9%), and higher rates of both employment (83.5%) and tertiary education (83.7%). The mean age in each cohort ranged from 40 to 46 years. Among TEMPO participants, there was a high proportion of individuals with two or three children (57.9%), while most participants of COMET, COVID and I and MINDCOVID, had no children (respectively 56.6%, 40.9%, 54.8%). The mean stringency score ranged from 55 for COMET to 81 for TEMPO (Table 1).

Before stratifying by gender, the association between psychological distress and compliance with sanitary measures was statistically non-significant (aOR 1.01, 95%CI: 0.99 - 1.02).

When stratifying data by gender and adjusting for covariates, the association between psychological distress and compliance with sanitary measures was negative in men (aOR: 0.93, 95%CI: 0.90 - 0.97) and positive in women (aOR: 1.03, 95%CI: 1.01 - 1.06) (Figure 1).

Additionally, we found a statistically significant interaction between psychological distress and primary education among men (aOR: 0.82, 95%CI: 0.68 - 0.99) (Figure 2), but not for the other categories of education and employment status (Figure 3).

Discussion

Main findings of this study

Data collected among the 13,635 participants of the COMET, COVID and I, MINDCOVID and TEMPO cohorts from March 2020 to August 2022, revealed an association between psychological distress and compliance with sanitary measures during the COVID-19 period when stratified by gender. These gender differences revealed that women experiencing psychological distress showed higher compliance with sanitary measures, whereas the opposite relationship was observed amongst men. Additionally, an interaction between psychological distress and educational level among men in the association with compliance with sanitary measures was observed, indicating an even lower level of compliance for this group.

What is already known on this topic

The influence of both gender and socioeconomic characteristics on the association between psychological distress and compliance with sanitary measures is not yet well documented. Still, previous studies can explain how psychological distress has different effects on compliance across genders. Indeed, gender disparities in risk-taking behaviours [61] and health-related decision-making patterns during the COVID-19 pandemic have been documented [62]. Globally, men are more likely to engage in risky behaviours, and less inclined to seek preventive medical care,

or support for health issues [63–65]. During the pandemic, men perceived the consequences of COVID-19 to be less severe compared to women, despite objective evidence suggesting otherwise. Traditional masculinity norms appear to moderate this perception, which, in turn, negatively affects adherence to protective measures [66].

What this study adds

Our study has a number of strengths worth highlighting. A significant strength of our study lies in the IPD meta-analytical approach, with which we were able to include four large cohort studies. IPD meta-analyses are recognized for providing a more comprehensive assessment of pooled data when compared to aggregate data analyses [67]. This methodology also allowed us to extract and analyse raw data from each individual study, including diverse spatial and temporal contexts throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, and thus enhance the precision and robustness of our findings by taking into account various contexts of data collection.

An interaction between psychological distress and educational level in terms of compliance with COVID-19 sanitary measures was observed among men in our study. This suggests an even lower level of compliance within this group. It is known that bi-directional effects between academic achievement and social withdrawal exist in boys thereby increasing the risk of psychosocial maladjustment, depression, loneliness and anxiety [68]. This may partially explain the subsequent difficulty in complying with measures later in life for this population of low educated men.

Containment policies have resulted in a reduction of the impact of COVID-19 [69,70]. Sanitary measures have been proven to contain the spread of the virus [70,71], showing a linear, inverse relationship between the incidence of COVID-19 and degree of observed prevention measures [72]. During a health crisis, awareness of groups with low compliance levels can significantly help in proactively intervening, especially considering that shorter lockdown periods can be compensated for by high adherence to interventions, leading to similar epidemiological impacts [8]. It is, then, indeed important to educate the public about the negative consequences of the virus and the effectiveness of sanitary measures [73]. Regarding mental health, recommendations should aim to reduce mental health inequalities between vulnerable groups and the general population using measures targeted and adapted to specific contexts [74].

As it has already been recommended, a gender-specific response to a new health risk emphasises the need for targeted public health messaging [32]. In a recent scoping review [62], it was revealed that people's perceptions of COVID-19 health information and recommendations, as well as their decision-making regarding health matters, are significantly influenced by their level of education and health literacy. This is particularly important since the effectiveness of COVID-19 containment measures relies on widespread public understanding and support. Targeting low educated men with tailored mental health interventions would not only help tackle psychological distress related to the pandemic but also promote compliance with sanitary measures, thus reducing the risk of infection [75]. Mental health interventions for vulnerable groups are currently being tested within the context of the COVID-19 pandemic and its aftermath [76–79].

Limitations of this study

We need to acknowledge some limitations to our study. As the data has been self-reported, it may contain biases stemming from social desirability and memory recall issues [80]. Some key variables, such as participants' income [27,44,47,50,81], chronic illness [82], or COVID-19-related worries [26] were excluded due to their heterogeneity across all included studies. However, this selective inclusion was a deliberate choice aimed at maintaining methodological consistency across studies and ensuring rigorous analysis. By focusing on shared variables, we enhanced the internal validity of our study, thereby providing a more reliable synthesis of the available evidence. Both outcome and exposure data were derived from distinct validated scales and questions within each survey, which were subsequently pooled post-collection using methods distinct from the standard approaches for the respective scales. This set of data is not comprehensive as it was not identified and selected systematically; rather, it was included from the datasets provided by the partners of the RESPOND project. Nevertheless, this approach allowed a harmonised comparison of different datasets.

Conclusion

Our study underscores the need for targeted interventions related to compliance with preventive measures among persons experiencing psychological distress, particularly during health crises like the COVID-19 pandemic. Our findings highlight the importance of tailoring messaging and strategies to address the unique challenges faced by different populations. Targeting specific groups with lower rates of compliance through tailored messaging is essential for effective management of health crises, such as the COVID-19 pandemic. Men experiencing psychological distress, especially those with lower educational attainment, had a lower compliance with sanitary measures. This involves a targeted approach towards men experiencing psychological distress, especially those with lower educational attainment. By promoting the well-being of all individuals, taking into account mental health, gender, and socioeconomic factors, we may better prepare for future health crises.

Funding

COMET received no external funding.

Covid and I is supported by a grant from the King Baudouin Foundation, Grant No.: 2020-J1812640-216406.

MINDCOVID is supported by Instituto de Salud Carlos III (Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación)/FEDER (COV20/00711); ISCIII (Sara Borrell, CD18/00049) (PM); FPU (FPU 15/05728)); ISCIII (PFIS, FI18/00012); Generalitat de Catalunya (2017SGR452).

The TEMPO cohort is supported by the French National Research Agency (ANR), the French Institute for Public Health Research-IReSP (TGIR Cohortes), the French Inter-departmental Mission for the Fight against Drugs and Drug Addiction (MILDeCA), the French Institute of Cancer (INCa) and the Pfizer Foundation.

This study is supported by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program RESPOND (The RESPOND project is funded under Horizon 2020 – the Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014–2020). The content of this article reflects only the authors' views and the European Community is not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained therein).

Ethics declarations

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Ethical considerations

All studies have been approved by the appropriate ethics committee and have therefore been performed in accordance with the ethical standards laid down in the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki and its later amendments.

The COMET study was approved by the ethical review board of the Faculty of Behavioral and Movement Sciences of the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (VCWE-2020-077). Personal data is protected according to EU and national laws.

Covid and I's ethical review and approval was not required as it is a population-based, online survey without the collection of personal data, which is in accordance with the local legislation and institutional requirements. Participants were provided with the legal information relating to consent, and online informed consent was obtained from all participants.

The MINDCOVID study protocol was approved by the IRB Parc de Salut Mar (2020/9203/I) and by the corresponding IRBs of all the participating centres. The study is registered at ClinicalTrials.gov (<https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04556565>).

The TEMPO cohort received approval of bodies supervising ethical data collection in France, the Advisory Committee on the Treatment of Information for Health Research (Comité consultatif sur le traitement de l'information en matière de recherche dans le domaine de la santé, CCTIRS) and the French regulatory data protection authority (Commission Nationale de l'Informatique et des Libertés, CNIL, n° 908163).

Bibliography

- [1] Shah K, Kamrai D, Mekala H, Mann B, Desai K, Patel RS. Focus on Mental Health During the Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic: Applying Learnings from the Past Outbreaks. *Cureus* 2020. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.7405>.
- [2] Dalila Talevi, Valentina Socci, Margherita Carai, Giulia Carnaghi, Serena Faleri, Edoardo Trebbi, et al. Mental health outcomes of the CoViD-19 pandemic. *Riv Psichiatr* 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1708/3382.33569>.
- [3] Serafini G, Parmigiani B, Amerio A, Aguglia A, Sher L, Amore M. The psychological impact of COVID-19 on the mental health in the general population. *QJM Int J Med* 2020;113:531–7. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qjmed/hcaa201>.
- [4] Xiang Y-T, Yang Y, Li W, Zhang L, Zhang Q, Cheung T, et al. Timely mental health care for the 2019 novel coronavirus outbreak is urgently needed. *Lancet Psychiatry* 2020;7:228–9. <https://doi.org/10/ggpxwg>.
- [5] Xiong J, Lipsitz O, Nasri F, Lui LMW, Gill H, Phan L, et al. Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on mental health in the general population: A systematic review. *J Affect Disord* 2020;277:55–64. <https://doi.org/10/gg7nkk>.
- [6] Witteveen AB, Young SY, Cuijpers P, Ayuso-Mateos JL, Barbui C, Bertolini F, et al. COVID-19 and common mental health symptoms in the early phase of the pandemic: An umbrella review of the evidence. *PLOS Med* 2023;20:e1004206. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1004206>.
- [7] Paulo MS, Peyroteo M, Maia MR, Pries C, Habl C, Lapão LV. Impacts of public health and social measures on COVID-19 in Europe: a review and modified Delphi technique. *Front Public Health* 2023;11:1226922. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1226922>.
- [8] Chen J, Vullikanti A, Santos J, Venkatramanan S, Hoops S, Mortveit H, et al. Epidemiological and economic impact of COVID-19 in the US. *Sci Rep* 2021;11. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-99712-z>.
- [9] Lee ATC, Cheng GWH, Lin C, Wong BHC, Lam LCW. Do people with mental health problems have lower adherence to precautionary measures in COVID-19 pandemic? A cross-sectional observational study in Hong Kong. *BMJ Open* 2021;11:e046658. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-046658>.
- [10] Allen J, Balfour R, Bell R, Marmot M. Social determinants of mental health. *Int Rev Psychiatry* 2014;26:392–407. <https://doi.org/10.3109/09540261.2014.928270>.
- [11] Bartoll-Roca X, Palència L, Gotsens M, Borrell C. Socioeconomic inequalities in self-assessed health and mental health in Barcelona, 2001–2016. *Gac Sanit* 2021;S0213911121000510. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaceta.2021.02.009>.
- [12] Marmot M. Psychosocial and material pathways in the relation between income and health: a response to Lynch et al. *BMJ* 2001;322:1233–6. <https://doi.org/10/fjc3gq>.
- [13] Hecker I, El Aarbaoui T, Wallez S, Andersen AJ, Ayuso-Mateos JL, Bryant R, et al. Impact of work arrangements during the COVID-19 pandemic on mental health in France. *SSM - Popul Health* 2022;20:101285. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2022.101285>.
- [14] Melchior M, Florence A-M, Davisse-Paturet C, Falissard B, Galéra C, Hazo J-B, et al. Labor market participation and depression during the COVID-19 pandemic among young adults (18 to 30 years): A nationally representative study in France. *Front Public Health* 2022;10:904665. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.904665>.
- [15] Rosenfield S, Mouzon D. Gender and Mental Health. In: Aneshensel CS, Phelan JC, Bierman A, editors. *Handb. Sociol. Ment. Health*, Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands; 2013, p. 277–96. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4276-5_14.
- [16] Almeida M, Shrestha AD, Stojanac D, Miller LJ. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on women’s mental health. *Arch Womens Ment Health* 2020;23:741–8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00737-020-01092-2>.
- [17] European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. COVID-19 pandemic and the gender divide at work and home. LU: Publications Office; 2022.
- [18] Kang M, Yu S, Choe S-A, Moon D, Ki M, Chun BC. Gender Inequalities in Mental Health During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Population-based Study in Korea. *J Prev Med Pub Health* 2023;56:413–21. <https://doi.org/10.3961/jpmph.23.170>.
- [19] Smit J, Nacer E, Sikorski A, Godard C, Magdziarz W. Social and Economic Consequences of COVID-19. European Parliament, Policy Department for Economic, Scientific and Quality of Life Policies; 2023.
- [20] Osterrieder A, Cuman G, Pan-Ngum W, Cheah PK, Cheah P-K, Peerawaranun P, et al. Economic and social impacts of COVID-19 and public health measures: results from an anonymous online survey in Thailand, Malaysia, the UK, Italy and Slovenia. *BMJ Open* 2021;11:e046863. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-046863>.
- [21] Akech JG. Exacerbated inequalities: Implications of COVID-19 for the socio-economic rights of women and

- children in South Sudan. *Afr Hum Rights Law J* 2020;20:584–606. <https://doi.org/10.17159/1996-2096/2020/v20n2a10>.
- [22] Fiske A, Galasso I, Eichinger J, McLennan S, Radhuber I, Zimmermann B, et al. The second pandemic: Examining structural inequality through reverberations of COVID-19 in Europe. *Soc Sci Med* 2022;292:114634. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114634>.
- [23] Laajaj R, Webb D, Aristizabal D, Behrentz E, Bernal R, Buitrago G, et al. Understanding How Socioeconomic Inequalities Drive Inequalities in SARS-CoV-2 Infections. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network; 2021. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3841746>.
- [24] Lemuel AM, Usman IM, Kasozi KI, Alghamdi S, Aigbogun EO, Archibong V, et al. COVID-19-Related Mental Health Burdens: Impact of Educational Level and Relationship Status Among Low-Income Earners of Western Uganda. *Front Public Health* 2021;9:739270. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2021.739270>.
- [25] Gerber MM, Cuadrado C, Figueiredo A, Crispi F, Jiménez-Moya G, Andrade V. Taking Care of Each Other: How Can We Increase Compliance with Personal Protective Measures During the COVID-19 Pandemic in Chile? *Polit Psychol* 2021;42:863–80. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12770>.
- [26] Håkansson A, Claesdotter E. Fear of COVID-19, compliance with recommendations against virus transmission, and attitudes towards vaccination in Sweden. *Heliyon* 2022;8:e08699. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e08699>.
- [27] Lee GB, Jung SJ, Yang Y, Yang JW, Hoang TM, Kim HC. Socioeconomic inequality in precautions compliance and health behavior changes during COVID-19 outbreak: analysis of the Korean Community Health Survey 2020. *Epidemiol Health* 2022:e2022013. <https://doi.org/10.4178/epih.e2022013>.
- [28] Qanche Q, Asefa A, Nigussie T, Hailemariam S, Duguma T. Knowledge of COVID-19 and preventive behaviors among waiters working in food and drinking establishments in Southwest Ethiopia. *PLOS ONE* 2021;16:e0245753. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0245753>.
- [29] Bodas M, Peleg K. Income assurances are a crucial factor in determining public compliance with self-isolation regulations during the COVID-19 outbreak – cohort study in Israel. *Isr J Health Policy Res* 2020;9:54. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13584-020-00418-w>.
- [30] Carranza A, Goic M, Lara E, Olivares M, Weintraub GY, Covarrubia J, et al. The Social Divide of Social Distancing: Shelter-in-Place Behavior in Santiago During the Covid-19 Pandemic. *Manag Sci* 2022;68:2016–27. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2021.4240>.
- [31] Carreras M, Vera S, Visconti G. A Tale of Two Pandemics: Economic Inequality and Support for Containment Measures in Peru. *J Polit Lat Am* 2021;13:358–75. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1866802X211035393>.
- [32] Galasso V, Pons V, Profeta P, Becher M, Brouard S, Foucault M. Gender differences in COVID-19 attitudes and behavior: Panel evidence from eight countries. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2020;117:27285–91. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2012520117>.
- [33] Maxwell L, Shreedhar P, Carabali M, Levis B. How to plan and manage an individual participant data meta-analysis. An illustrative toolkit. *Res Synth Methods* 2024;15:166–74. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1670>.
- [34] Mary-Krause M, Herranz Bustamante JJ, Bolze C, Galéra C, Fombonne EJ, Melchior M. Cohort profile: The TEMPO cohort study. *Int J Epidemiol* 2021:dyab026. <https://doi.org/10/gk3gvc>.
- [35] Alonso J. MIND/COVID-19: Mental health impact and Needs associated with COVID-19: a comprehensive national evaluation in Spain 2020.
- [36] Lorant V, Smith P, Van Den Broeck K, Nicaise P. Psychological distress associated with the COVID-19 pandemic and suppression measures during the first wave in Belgium. *BMC Psychiatry* 2021;21:112. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-021-03109-1>.
- [37] Laham S, Bertuzzi L, Deguen S, Hecker I, Melchior M, Patané M, et al. Impact of Longitudinal Social Support and Loneliness Trajectories on Mental Health during the COVID-19 Pandemic in France. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2021;18:12677. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph182312677>.
- [38] Kroenke K, Wu J, Yu Z, Bair MJ, Kean J, Stump T, et al. Patient Health Questionnaire Anxiety and Depression Scale: Initial Validation in Three Clinical Trials. *Psychosom Med* 2016;78:716–27. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PSY.0000000000000322>.
- [39] Goldberg DP, Williams P. A user's guide to the General health questionnaire. Reprint. London: GL Assessment; 2006.
- [40] Kroenke K, Strine TW, Spitzer RL, Williams JBW, Berry JT, Mokdad AH. The PHQ-8 as a measure of current depression in the general population. *J Affect Disord* 2009;114:163–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2008.06.026>.
- [41] Achenbach TM, Rescorla LA. Manual for the ASEBA adult forms & profiles. Burlington: University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth, and Families; 2003.
- [42] Nivette A, Ribeaud D, Murray A, Steinhoff A, Bechtiger L, Hepp U, et al. Non-compliance with COVID-19-related

- public health measures among young adults in Switzerland: Insights from a longitudinal cohort study. *Soc Sci Med* 2021;268:113370. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113370>.
- [43] Padidar S, Liao S, Magagula S, Mahlaba TAM, Nhlabatsi NM, Lukas S. Assessment of early COVID-19 compliance to and challenges with public health and social prevention measures in the Kingdom of Eswatini, using an online survey. *PLOS ONE* 2021;16:e0253954. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0253954>.
- [44] Rosha BC, Suryaputri IY, Irawan IR, Arfines PP, Triwinarto A. Factors Affecting Public Non-compliance With Large-scale Social Restrictions to Control COVID-19 Transmission in Greater Jakarta, Indonesia. *J Prev Med Pub Health* 2021;54:221–9. <https://doi.org/10.3961/jpmph.21.101>.
- [45] Sobol M, Blachnio A, Przepiórka A. Time of pandemic: Temporal perspectives related to compliance with public health regulations concerning the COVID-19 pandemic. *Soc Sci Med* 2020;265:113408. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113408>.
- [46] Solomou I, Constantinidou F. Prevalence and Predictors of Anxiety and Depression Symptoms during the COVID-19 Pandemic and Compliance with Precautionary Measures: Age and Sex Matter. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2020;17:4924. <https://doi.org/10/gg4rsv>.
- [47] Atchison C, Bowman LR, Vrinten C, Redd R, Pristerà P, Eaton J, et al. Early perceptions and behavioural responses during the COVID-19 pandemic: a cross-sectional survey of UK adults. *BMJ Open* 2021;11:e043577. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-043577>.
- [48] Binte Aamir F, Ahmad Zaidi SM, Abbas S, Aamir SR, Ahmad Zaidi SN, Kanhya Lal K, et al. Non-compliance to social distancing during COVID-19 pandemic: A comparative cross-sectional study between the developed and developing countries. *J Public Health Res* 2021. <https://doi.org/10.4081/jphr.2021.2614>.
- [49] Wright L, Steptoe A, Fancourt D. Patterns of compliance with COVID-19 preventive behaviours: a latent class analysis of 20 000 UK adults. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2022;76:247–53. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech-2021-216876>.
- [50] Wright L, Fancourt D. Do predictors of adherence to pandemic guidelines change over time? A panel study of 22,000 UK adults during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Prev Med* 2021;153:106713. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2021.106713>.
- [51] Consolazio D, Murtas R, Tunesi S, Gervasi F, Benassi D, Russo AG. Assessing the Impact of Individual Characteristics and Neighborhood Socioeconomic Status During the COVID-19 Pandemic in the Provinces of Milan and Lodi. *Int J Health Serv* 2021;51:311–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020731421994842>.
- [52] Aksoy O. Within-family influences on compliance with social-distancing measures during COVID-19 lockdowns in the United Kingdom. *Nat Hum Behav* 2022;6:1660–8. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-022-01465-w>.
- [53] Hale T, Angrist N, Goldszmidt R, Kira B, Petherick A, Phillips T, et al. A global panel database of pandemic policies (Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker). *Nat Hum Behav* 2021;5:529–38. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01079-8>.
- [54] Fox J. *Applied Regression Analysis and Generalized Linear Models*. Third Ed Sage 2016.
- [55] Fox J, Monette G. Generalized collinearity diagnostics. *JASA*, vol. 87, *JASA*; 1992, p. 178–83.
- [56] Fox J, Welsberg S. *An R Companion to Applied Regression*. Third Ed Sage 2018.
- [57] James G, Witten D, Hastie T, Tibshirani R. *An Introduction to Statistical Learning*. vol. 103. New York, NY: Springer New York; 2013. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-7138-7>.
- [58] Bodner TE. What Improves with Increased Missing Data Imputations? *Struct Equ Model Multidiscip J* 2008;15:651–75. <https://doi.org/10/c9dgr4>.
- [59] White IR, Royston P, Wood AM. Multiple imputation using chained equations: Issues and guidance for practice. *Stat Med* 2011;30:377–99. <https://doi.org/10/cmwhzt>.
- [60] R Core Team. *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2023.
- [61] Byrnes JP, Miller DC, Schafer WD. Gender differences in risk taking: A meta-analysis. *Psychol Bull* 1999;125:367–83. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.125.3.367>.
- [62] Sayfi S, Alayche I, Magwood O, Gassanov M, Motilall A, Dewidar O, et al. Identifying Health Equity Factors That Influence the Public's Perception of COVID-19 Health Information and Recommendations: A Scoping Review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2022;19:12073. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191912073>.
- [63] Galdas PM, Cheater F, Marshall P. Men and health help-seeking behaviour: literature review. *J Adv Nurs* 2005;49:616–23. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2004.03331.x>.
- [64] Hiller J, Schatz K, Drexler H. Gender influence on health and risk behavior in primary prevention: a systematic review. *J Public Health* 2017;25:339–49. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10389-017-0798-z>.
- [65] Weber EU, Blais A, Betz NE. A domain-specific risk-attitude scale: measuring risk perceptions and risk behaviors. *J Behav Decis Mak* 2002;15:263–90. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.414>.
- [66] Roccato M, Pacilli MG, Orlando G, Russo S. Masculinity, Perceived Vulnerability to COVID-19, and Adoption of

- Protective Behaviors. *Sex Cult* 2022;26:2171–86. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-022-09991-5>.
- [67] Cooper H, Patall EA. The relative benefits of meta-analysis conducted with individual participant data versus aggregated data. *Psychol Methods* 2009;14:165–76. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015565>.
- [68] Stenseng F, Tingstad EB, Wichstrøm L, Skalicka V. Social withdrawal and academic achievement, intertwined over years? Bidirectional effects from primary to upper secondary school. *Br J Educ Psychol* 2022;92:1354–65. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12504>.
- [69] Castex G, Dechter E, Lorca M. COVID-19: The impact of social distancing policies, cross-country analysis. *Econ Disasters Clim Change* 2021;5:135–59. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41885-020-00076-x>.
- [70] Chaudhry R, Dranitsaris G, Mubashir T, Bartoszko J, Riazi S. A country level analysis measuring the impact of government actions, country preparedness and socioeconomic factors on COVID-19 mortality and related health outcomes. *EClinicalMedicine* 2020;25:100464. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100464>.
- [71] Ganser I, Buckeridge DL, Heffernan J, Prague M, Thiébaud R. Estimating the population effectiveness of interventions against COVID-19 in France: A modelling study. *Epidemics* 2024;46:100744. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epidem.2024.100744>.
- [72] Lotfollahzadeh A, Rastgoo L, Shirinzadeh I, Kharghani Moghadam SM, Ebrahimi H. Investigating the compliance of COVID-19 protocols in the workplaces of Ardabil, Iran. *Work* 2021;70:1031–7. <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-210551>.
- [73] Sturman D, Auton JC, Thacker J. Knowledge of social distancing measures and adherence to restrictions during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Health Promot J Austr* 2021;32:344–51. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hpja.443>.
- [74] RESPOND. Policy recommendations on short-term impact of COVID-19 pandemic 2021.
- [75] Chu DK, Akl EA, Duda S, Solo K, Yaacoub S, Schünemann HJ, et al. Physical distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet* 2020;395:1973–87. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)31142-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31142-9).
- [76] Mediavilla R, McGreevy KR, Felez-Nobrega M, Monistrol-Mula A, Bravo-Ortiz M-F, Bayón C, et al. Effectiveness of a stepped-care programme of internet-based psychological interventions for healthcare workers with psychological distress: Study protocol for the RESPOND healthcare workers randomised controlled trial. *Digit Health* 2022;8:205520762211290. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20552076221129084>.
- [77] Melchior M, Figueiredo N, Roversi A, Dubanchet A, Bui E, Vadell-Martínez J, et al. Addressing mental health problems among persons without stable housing in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic: study protocol for a randomised trial. RESPOND – France. *BMC Public Health* 2023;23:2275. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-17238-7>.
- [78] Purgato M, Turrini G, Tedeschi F, Serra R, Tarsitani L, Compri B, et al. Effectiveness of a stepped-care programme of WHO psychological interventions in migrant populations resettled in Italy: Study protocol for the RESPOND randomized controlled trial. *Front Public Health* 2023;11:1100546. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1100546>.
- [79] Roos R, Witteveen AB, Ayuso-Mateos JL, Barbui C, Bryant RA, Felez-Nobrega M, et al. Effectiveness of a scalable, remotely delivered stepped-care intervention to reduce symptoms of psychological distress among Polish migrant workers in the Netherlands: study protocol for the RESPOND randomised controlled trial. *BMC Psychiatry* 2023;23:801. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-023-05288-5>.
- [80] Choi BCK, Pak AWP. A catalog of biases in questionnaires. *Prev Chronic Dis* 2005;2:A13.
- [81] Yechezkel M, Weiss A, Rejwan I, Shahmoon E, Ben-Gal S, Yamin D. Human mobility and poverty as key drivers of COVID-19 transmission and control. *BMC Public Health* 2021;21:596. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-10561-x>.
- [82] Kaso AW, Hareru HE, Agero G, Ashuro Z. Assessment of practice of Covid-19 preventive measures and associated factors among residents in Southern, Ethiopia. *PLOS ONE* 2021;16:e0261186. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0261186>.