Trajectories of depression and anxiety during enforced isolation due to COVID-19: longitudinal analyses of 36,520 adults in England

Daisy Fancourt PhD [a]*, Andrew Steptoe DSc DPhil [a], & Feifei Bu PhD [a]

[a] Department of Behavioural Science and Health, University College London,

1-19 Torrington Place, London WC1E 7HB

*Corresponding author: Dr Daisy Fancourt, 1-19 Torrington Place, London, WC1E 7HB, d.fancourt@ucl.ac.uk

Word count: 3,057

Number of tables: 2

Number of figures: 3

Abstract

Background: There is currently major concern about the impact of the global COVID-19 outbreak on mental health. A number of studies suggest that mental health deteriorated in many countries prior to and during enforced isolation ("lockdown"), but it remains unknown how mental health has changed week by week over the course of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Aims: This study explored trajectories of anxiety and depression over the 20 weeks after lockdown was announced using data from England, and compared the growth trajectories by individual characteristics.

Methods: Data from 36,520 adults in the UCL COVID -19 Social Study (a well-stratified panel study weighted to population proportions collecting data weekly during the COVID-19 pandemic) were analysed from 23/03/2020-09/08/2020. Latent growth models were fitted accounting for socio-demographic and health covariates.

Results: 22.6% of the sample had scores indicating moderate-severe anxiety, and 25.1% indicating moderate-severe depressive symptoms. Anxiety and depression levels both declined across the first 20 weeks following the introduction of lockdown in the England. The fastest decreases were seen across the strict lockdown period, with symptoms plateauing as further lockdown easing measures were introduced. Being female or younger, having lower educational attainment, lower income or pre-existing mental health conditions, and living alone or with children were all risk factors for higher levels of anxiety and depression at the start of lockdown. Many of these inequalities in experiences were reduced as lockdown continued, but differences were still evident 20 weeks after the start of lockdown.

Conclusions: As countries face potential future lockdowns, these data suggest that the highest levels of depression and anxiety are in the early stages of lockdown but decline fairly rapidly as individuals adapt to circumstances. They also suggest the importance of supporting individuals in the lead-up to lockdown measures being brought in to try and reduce distress and highlight that emotionally vulnerable groups have remained at risk throughout lockdown and its aftermath.

Keywords: COVID -19, mental health, depression, anxiety, social isolation, lockdown, pandemic

Research in context

Evidence before this study: Data from representative cohort studies have highlighted the substantial impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on levels of depression, anxiety and mental distress, showing increases in average scores of symptoms of psychological distress from before to during the pandemic as well as a rise in the proportion of people experiencing clinically significant levels of mental illness. But it remains unknown how mental health has changed week by week over the course of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Added value of this study: This study finds that anxiety and depression levels both declined across the first 20 weeks following the introduction of lockdown in the England. The fastest decreases were seen across the strict lockdown period, with symptoms plateauing as further lockdown easing measures were introduced. Specific risk factors for poorer trajectories of mental health during the pandemic are identified.

Implications of all the available evidence: This study is the first globally to look longitudinally at trajectories of anxiety and depression across the COVID-19 pandemic. Overall, these findings suggest that the highest levels of depression and anxiety in England were in the early stages of lockdown but declined fairly rapidly following the introduction of lockdown. Many known risk factors for poorer mental health were apparent at the start of lockdown, but some groups experienced faster improvements in symptoms, thereby reducing the differences over time. Nevertheless, many inequalities in mental health experiences did remain and emotionally vulnerable groups have remained at risk throughout lockdown and its aftermath. This has implications for planning and support for individuals during potential future waves of the virus.

Introduction

There has been wide-spread concern for how people's mental health is affected by the COVID-19 pandemic [1], and a call for urgent mental health research [2]. These concerns have been driven by the multiple different psychological challenges caused by the pandemic. "Stay-at-home" and quarantine orders issued by governments led to the largest enforced isolation period in human history. Infections and deaths from the virus led to psychological stress and bereavement. Further, many individuals globally have faced high levels of adversities, from challenges meeting basic needs (such as accessing food, water and safe accommodation), to financial adversities (including job losses, cuts in household income, and inability to pay bills) [3].

Data from representative cohort studies have highlighted the substantial impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on levels of depression, anxiety and mental distress. Comparisons of data collected prior to the pandemic to data collected in the first few weeks of lockdowns in the UK and internationally have shown increases in average scores of symptoms of psychological distress as well as a rise in the proportion of people experiencing clinically significant levels of mental illness [4–7]. These findings echo those from studies of previous epidemics such as SARS (severe acute respiratory syndrome), during which individuals who had to quarantine experienced increases in symptoms of depression and PTSD [8,9 10 11,12]. However, what remains unclear is the trajectory of mental health across the course of the COVID-19 pandemic. The previous studies on SARS have suggested that mental health worsened *during* periods of quarantine or enforced isolation. However, a number of sources suggested that during COVID-19, mental health deteriorated *prior* to stay-at-home orders ("lockdown") coming in. For example, a mood poll in Britain showed a large decrease in happiness in early March (from 50% on 6th-9th March to 25% on 20th-23rd March), prior to lockdown coming in, alongside an increase in fear and boredom [13,14]. Similarly, a cross-sectional general public survey also found that 62% of UK adults felt anxious, 22% felt panicked and 18% felt hopeless in the week preceding lockdown [15]. Given these findings, what remains to be understood is how mental health was affected in the weeks and months following the introduction of lockdown. Did mental health continued to worsen as lockdown continued, or were there any patterns of stabilisation or returns to people's usual mental health levels prior to COVID-19? Further, as lockdown measures were eased, did mental health improve or did new stressors arise for individuals. These are vital questions to ask as countries are facing second waves of the virus. Understanding the patterns of mental health across periods of strict lockdown and as measures are eased could help mental health services and voluntary organisations to plan for their provision of support. Further, understanding how humans respond to periods of enforced isolation could enhance our understanding of the impact of social isolation on mental health.

Finally, an important question is whether certain individuals were more adversely affected during the COVID-19 pandemic. There are well-reported inequalities in mental health reported over the previous decade. Women, younger adults, individuals of lower educational attainment and socio-economic position, individuals from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) backgrounds, and individuals living alone are all more likely to experience higher levels of depression and anxiety [16–20]. Data from previous epidemics have suggested that many of these factors have also been risk factors for worse mental health during periods of isolation [21], and data from COVID-19 has echoed this too [6,22–27]. However, previous research has focused on cross-sectional data or single time-points during the pandemic. The effect of such factors on trajectories of mental health remains unknown. Further, in previous studies of epidemics, there has been some indication that pre-existing psychiatric conditions are a risk factor for poorer outcomes[28]; also echoed by

data during COVID-19 [6,23]. But again the impact of mental illness on trajectories of mental health is unclear. Identifying these risk factors is important so as to be able to ascertain who is most in need of support both during the ongoing pandemic and in preparing for future pandemics.

Therefore, this study involved analyses of data from a longitudinal study of over 70,000 adults living in the UK during the government-enforced lockdown in the COVID-19 pandemic. The study had two main aims: (i) to explore trajectories of anxiety and depression over the "strict" lockdown period and as lockdown was eased, and (ii) to identify who was most at risk of poorer trajectories of mental health across this period. We used longitudinal weekly data across 20 weeks involving well-established validated questionnaire measures of depression and anxiety to avoid the limitations of cross-sectional and single item assessments included in some previous reports.

Methods

Participants

Data were drawn from the UCL COVID-19 Social Study; a large panel study of the psychological and social experiences of over 70,000 adults (aged 18+) in the UK during the COVID-19 pandemic. The study commenced on 21st March 2020 involving online weekly data collection from participants during the COVID-19 pandemic. Whilst not random, the study has a well-stratified sample that was recruited using three primary approaches. First, snowballing was used, including promoting the study through existing networks and mailing lists (including large databases of adults who had previously consented to be involved in health research across the UK), print and digital media coverage, and social media. Second, more targeted recruitment was undertaken focusing on (i) individuals from a low-income background, (ii) individuals with no or few educational qualifications, and (iii) individuals who were unemployed. Third, the study was promoted via partnerships with third sector organisations to vulnerable groups, including adults with pre-existing mental illness, older adults, and carers. The study was approved by the UCL Research Ethics Committee [12467/005] and all participants gave informed consent. Full detail on the recruitment, sampling, retention, and weighting of the sample is available in Supplementary Material and in the study User Guide (see Supplementary Material).

For these analyses, in order to examine trajectories of mental health in relation to specific measures relating to lockdown, we focused solely on participants who lived in England. Participants included in the analysis had at least three repeated measures between 23rd March when lockdown started in the UK and 9th August 2020 (20 weeks later). This provided us with data from 40,520 respondents who were followed over a maximum of 20 weeks since the beginning of the lockdown. Of these, 10% participants withheld data on demographic factors including gender and income so were excluded, providing a final analytic sample size of 36,520.

Measures

Depression was measured using the Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9); a standard instrument for diagnosing depression in primary care [29]. The questionnaire involves nine items, with responses ranging from "not at all" to "nearly every day". Higher overall scores indicate more depressive symptoms, with scores of 0-4 suggesting minimal depression, 5-9 mild depression, 10-14 moderate depression, 15-19 moderately severe depression, and 20-27 severe depression [30].

Anxiety was measured using the Generalised Anxiety Disorder assessment (GAD-7); a well-validated tool used to screen and diagnose generalised anxiety disorder in clinical practice and research [31]. There are 7 items with 4-point responses ranging from "not at all" to "nearly every day", with higher overall scores indicating more symptoms of anxiety. Scores of 5-9 are thought to represent mild anxiety, 10-14 moderate anxiety, and 15 and above severe [31].

We included socio-demographic variables as time-invariant covariates, including gender (men vs. women), age groups (18-29, 30-45, 46-59 and 60+), ethnicity (white vs. BAME), education (GCSE or below [equivalent to education to age 16], A levels or equivalent [equivalent to education to age 18], degree or above [further education after the age of 18]), low income (household income <£30,000 vs higher) and living arrangement (alone, living with others, but no children in the household, living with others, including children). Finally, we assessed diagnosed mental illness through participants "Do you have any of the following medical conditions", with the responses including "clinically-diganosed depression", "clinically-diagnosed anxiety" and "another clinically-diagnosed mental health problem". Participants could select as many categories as applied and the responses were binarised into "diagnosed mental illness" or "no diagnosed mental illness". Further detail on the measures is available in the study User Guide (see Supplementary Material).

Analysis

Data were analysed using latent growth modelling (LGM). We used unspecified LGM which allows the shape of growth trajectories to be determined by data by using free time scores. Given anxiety and depression might be related, these two outcomes were modelled simultaneously (multi-process LGM). See Figure S1 in the Supplement for an illustration of the model specification. The general equations were presented as below:

$$Y_{it}^{m} = \eta_{0i}^{m} + \gamma_{t}^{m}\eta_{1i}^{m} + \varepsilon_{it}^{m} \quad (1\text{-}1)$$

$$\eta_{0i}^{m} = \eta_{0}^{m} + \sum\gamma_{0k}^{m}X_{k} + \zeta_{0i}^{m} \quad (1\text{-}2)$$

$$\eta_{1i}^{m} = \eta_{1}^{m} + \sum\gamma_{1k}^{m}X_{k} + \zeta_{1i}^{m} \quad (1\text{-}3)$$

Equation 1-1 addressed intra-individual changes where Y_{it}^{m}, outcome *m* (depression or anxiety) for the individual *i* at time *t*, was a function of the intercept η_{0i}^{m} and slope η_{1i}^{m}. ε_{it}^{m} was the residual term. Equation 1-2, and 1-3 addressed inter-individual differences in the intercept and slope. η_{0}^{m} and η_{1}^{m}represented the population average intercept and slope for outcome *m*. X_k represented a vector of time-invariant variables that hypothetically influence the intercept and slope. ζ_{0i}^{m} and ζ_{1i}^{m}were parameter residuals.

Our 36,520 participants provided a total of 436,522 observations (12 repeated measures per participant on average, ranging from 3 to 20). To account for the non-random nature of the sample, all data were weighted to the proportions of gender, age, ethnicity and education obtained from the Office for National Statistics [32]. Unweighted and weighted descriptive statistics by week are shown in Table S1. Descriptive analyses were carried out using Stata version 15 [33]. The LGM models were fitted in Mplus version 8 [34].

Role of the funding source

The funders had no final role in the study design; in the collection, analysis and interpretation of data; in the writing of the report; or in the decision to submit the paper for publication. All researchers listed as authors are independent from the funders and all final decisions about the research were taken by the investigators and were unrestricted.

Results

Demographics

Table 1 presents the characteristics of participants. In the raw data, 76% of participants were women and there was an over-representation of people with a degree or above (70%) and an under-representation of people from BAME backgrounds (5%). After weighting, the sample was well balanced, reflecting population proportions, with 51% of women, 35% of participants with a degree or above, and 14% of BAME ethnicity. About 20% of the sample reported having a diagnosed mental illness.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of the explanatory variables for participants at Wave 1

	Raw data	**Weighted data**
Gender, women	75.8%	51.0%
Age		
18-29	7.5%	19.5%
30-45	29.2%	26.4%
46-59	33.0%	24.1%
60+	30.4%	30.0%
Ethnicity, BAME	5.0%	13.5%
Education		
GCSE or below	13.0%	32.4%
A-levels or equivalent	16.8%	32.9%
Degree or above	70.2%	34.7%
Household income <30k (VS. ≥30k)	36.7%	46.1%
Living status		
Alone	19.7%	18.3%
With others (not children)	53.2%	56.1%
With others (including children)	27.1%	25.6%
Diagnosed mental illness	18.3%	19.9%

Mental health

In total, 23% of the sample had a score ≥10 indicating moderate or severe anxiety at their first wave of data collection (average score 5.7 ± 5.6), and 25% of the sample had a score ≥10 indicating moderate or severe depressive symptoms (average score 6.6 ± 6.0) (Supplementary Table S2). Amongst people with a pre-existing diagnosed mental illness, 54% had a score ≥10 indicating at least moderate anxiety (average score 10.6 ± 5.8) and 61% had a score ≥10 indicating moderate or severe depression (average score 12.3 ± 6.7). Amongst people without a pre-existing diagnosed mental illness, these figures were 16% for anxiety (average score 4.6 ± 4.9) and 17% for depression (average score 5.1 ± 5.0). Further descriptive statistics are shown in Supplementary Table S2.

Trajectories of depression and anxiety

Over the 20 weeks following the introduction of lockdown, there was a significant decrease in both anxiety and depression levels (Figure 1). The growth trajectories of anxiety and depression showed a non-linear pattern (see Table S3). The slopes varied across different stages. For instance, there was a sharp decline in depression and anxiety between weeks two and five, but little change was observed between weeks 16 and 20. The growth trajectories of anxiety and depression were positively associated with each other as evidenced by the significant covariance between the two intercepts (20.46, $p<0.001$) and slopes (18.64, $p<0.001$) (See Table S3).



Figure 1. Predicted growth trajectories from the multi-process LGM model

Note: dotted lines show key dates in the release of lockdown. From weeks 1-8, individuals could only leave their home for exercise once a day, purchasing essentials, and essential work. On 10/05/20, strict lockdown was first eased, with unlimited outdoor exercise permitted, more movement around the country permitted, and some returns to work allowed. On 15/06/20, non-essential retail was reopened, with individuals allowed to go shopping again, secondary schools were opened for pupils in some years, and individuals living alone could form a 'support bubble' with another household. On 04/07/20, further public amenities reopened such as places of worship, museums, hairdressers, holiday accommodation, and cafes, pubs and restaurants, and individuals from two households could meet socially indoors.

Risk factors for poorer experiences

At the start of lockdown being introduced, women, younger adults, people with lower levels of educational attainment, people from lower income households, and people with pre-existing mental health conditions reported higher levels of anxiety and depression (Table 3). Individuals living with children had higher levels of anxiety but lower levels of

depression compared to individuals living alone, whilst individuals living alone had higher levels of depression but comparable levels of anxiety to people living with other adults (but no children). No evidence was found that ethnicity was associated with baseline mental health.

Across the 20 weeks, women, younger adults, people with lower levels of educational attainment, and people living with children had faster improvements in symptoms of depression and anxiety, narrowing some of the gaps in experiences present at the start of lockdown (Table 3 and Figures 2-3). People living alone experienced the same trajectories of anxiety and depression as people living with other adults (but no children), but their overall levels of depression were consistently higher. There was no evidence that the rate of change was related to ethnicity, household income, or pre-existing mental health conditions.

Table 2: Estimated effects of the covariates on the intercepts and slopes from the conditional multi-process LGM model

	Anxiety			Depression		
	b	se	p	b	se	p
Predictors of the intercept						
Women (VS. men)	**1.34**	**0.13**	**<0.001**	**1.08**	**0.13**	**<0.001**
Age: 30-45 (VS. 18-29)	**-1.38**	**0.22**	**<0.001**	**-1.86**	**0.23**	**<0.001**
Age: 46-59 (VS. 18-29)	**-2.63**	**0.23**	**<0.001**	**-2.86**	**0.24**	**<0.001**
Age: 60+ (VS. 18-29)	**-4.02**	**0.23**	**<0.001**	**-4.57**	**0.25**	**<0.001**
BAME (VS. white)	0.19	0.24	0.434	0.45	0.24	0.064
Education: low (VS. high)	**0.75**	**0.14**	**<0.001**	**1.13**	**0.16**	**<0.001**
Education: medium (VS. high)	**0.50**	**0.13**	**<0.001**	**0.90**	**0.13**	**<0.001**
Household income <30k (VS. ≥30k)	**0.65**	**0.12**	**<0.001**	**1.09**	**0.13**	**<0.001**
Living with others, no children (VS. alone)	0.16	0.13	0.212	**-0.81**	**0.14**	**<0.001**
Living with others, incl. children (VS. alone)	**0.70**	**0.15**	**<0.001**	**-0.37**	**0.17**	**0.029**
Mental health diagnosis (VS. none)	**5.18**	**0.18**	**<0.001**	**5.83**	**0.18**	**<0.001**
Predictors of the Slope						
Women (VS. men)	**-0.86**	**0.13**	**<0.001**	**-0.63**	**0.14**	**<0.001**
Age: 30-45 (VS. 18-29)	**0.98**	**0.28**	**<0.001**	**1.40**	**0.29**	**<0.001**
Age: 46-59 (VS. 18-29)	**1.50**	**0.27**	**<0.001**	**1.63**	**0.29**	**<0.001**
Age: 60+ (VS. 18-29)	**1.75**	**0.27**	**<0.001**	**2.06**	**0.28**	**<0.001**
BAME (VS. white)	0.18	0.27	0.507	-0.01	0.29	0.980
Education: low (VS. high)	**-0.45**	**0.15**	**0.003**	**-0.60**	**0.16**	**<0.001**
Education: medium (VS. high)	**-0.23**	**0.14**	**0.112**	**-0.39**	**0.15**	**0.011**
Household income <30k (VS. ≥30k)	0.17	0.13	0.186	0.13	0.14	0.342
Living with others, no child (VS. alone)	-0.27	0.13	0.036	0.04	0.14	0.773
Living with others, incl. children (VS. alone)	**-0.93**	**0.18**	**<0.001**	**-0.63**	**0.19**	**0.001**
Mental health diagnosis (VS. none)	-0.32	0.20	0.117	0.28	0.22	0.193



Figure 2. Predicted growth trajectories of anxiety by individual characteristics



Figure 3. Predicted growth trajectories of depression by individual characteristics

Discussion

This study is the first globally to look longitudinally at trajectories of anxiety and depression across the COVID-19 pandemic. Results show that anxiety and depression levels both declined across the first 20 weeks following the introduction of lockdown in England. The fastest decreases were seen across the strict lockdown period, with symptoms plateauing as further lockdown easing measures were introduced. Being female or younger, having lower educational attainment, lower income or pre-existing mental health conditions, and living alone or with children were all risk factors for higher levels of anxiety and depression at the start of lockdown. Many of these inequalities in experiences were reduced as lockdown continued, but differences were still evident 20 weeks after the start of lockdown.

The study did not use a random population sample, and therefore our reported statistics are not presented as prevalence levels for anxiety or depression. However, this study does give detailed time series data on trajectories of mental health during lockdown. The findings of improvements, in particular across the early weeks following the

introduction of lockdown measures in England, is echoed by polling data showing improvements in many aspects of mood in repeated cross-sectional samples over the same period [13,14]. The fact that levels of mental health did not continue to worsen even further in this period is slightly at odds with data from previous epidemics, in which mental health was found to worsen *during* (or as a result of) quarantine [21]. However, there are several key differences between this pandemic and previous epidemics. First, for the majority of people in England during lockdown, some trips outside of the home were permissible, compared to quarantines studied in previous epidemics where movement has been even more restricted, albeit typically for much smaller numbers of people, which may have led to a harsher psychological experience. Second, there was substantial prior warning in England that a lockdown was likely to come in given patterns in countries across Europe, so individuals appear to have become psychologically affected prior to the lockdown announcement coming in (and many individuals even locked down voluntarily before lockdown officially commenced), meaning that much of the psychological toll was already being experienced before individuals were forced to isolate [21]. Third, the proliferation of online and home-based leisure activities and the extensive use of virtual and digital communication during COVID-19 may have helped to ease the burden of lockdown itself, in contrast to previous epidemics where 'fear of missing out' was reported to be a challenge. Indeed, this fear of missing (which is linked with depression, distraction, and somatic symptoms [35]) out may also have been minimised due to the global nature of the pandemic, compared to the restricted nature of quarantines in previous epidemics. The improvements in mental health over this period also suggest a process of adaptation that bears similarities to literature on other types of isolation such as incarceration, where some studies have shown that depression levels can stabilise and even decrease on average month on month as new coping strategies emerge [36]. It is further possible that measures to safeguard jobs and finances taken in the UK may have helped to settle specific anxieties. The lockdown itself may also have reduced worries about individuals or their friends or families catching the virus, especially after the first two weeks of lockdown once individuals could be more confident they were outside of the incubation period.

This study also found there were substantial differences in experiences of mental health across the first 20 weeks following the introduction of lockdown amongst different groups. Previous studies during the COVID-19 pandemic have already highlighted that women and younger adults have experienced higher levels of anxiety and depression [4,23,24], but our data show that these groups have also had faster improvements in their symptoms. This could indicate a more challenging psychological experience early on in lockdown (e.g. as many women balanced childcare and working from home) or a higher initial reactivity to events initially during lockdown amongst these groups. Adults living alone, on the other hand, experienced consistently worse levels of anxiety and depression, which could be related to higher levels of loneliness due to social restrictions [37]. However, individuals living with children had higher levels of anxiety and depression initially than individuals living with other adults, but a faster rate of improvement, potentially due to the growing public awareness of research suggesting that children were less at risk from the virus [38]. Similarly, individuals with lower household income experienced consistently worse mental health, which has been proposed as related to higher experiences of adversities such as job losses, decreases in household income, and challenges paying bills [3]. It is also notable that although we found that individuals with mental illness had higher levels of depression and anxiety at the start of lockdown (echoing in studies from various countries of COVID-19 [39]), they experienced the same trajectories over the subsequent weeks. This suggests that mental illness did not necessarily predispose individuals to greater levels of emotional reactivity. It is possible that prior experience of mental illness meant individuals had experience of applying coping strategies. But this remains to be explored further. Further, future

studies are recommended to look at specific type of psychiatric diagnosis in relation to mental health to identify if there are particular psychopathologies associated with poorer trajectories over this period. Our models suggested that ethnicity was not a risk factor for worse mental health. But it is important to note here that the models adjusted simultaneously for multiple different demographic factors including socio-economic position (SEP). Ethnicity itself might not have been related to mental health experiences, but lower socio-economic position was related, and individuals from ethnic minority groups are disproportionately more likely to be from these lower SEP groups [40]. Therefore, social inequalities in mental health experiences during the pandemic may still have disproportionately affected ethnic minority groups more than white ethnic groups.

Strengths of this study include its large sample size and longitudinal design, providing weekly data across 20 weeks of lockdown, enabling the assessment of trajectories of mental health during the pandemic. The sample had wide heterogeneity, including good stratification across all major socio-demographic groups. Further, analyses were weighted on the basis of population estimates of core demographics, with the weighted data showing good alignment with population demographics. The study also used established measures of anxiety and depression. But it is possible that the study inadvertently attracted individuals experiencing more extreme psychological experiences, with subsequent weighting for demographic factors failing to fully compensate for these differences. Therefore, this study does not claim to provide data on prevalence of mental illness during the pandemic: this question has been addressed through other representative studies. Further, as the study was internet based, participants without home access to internet were not represented. As this group is likely to include individuals who may be especially vulnerable, the estimates here may not be fully representative of experiences during the pandemic. Additionally, we relied on participant self-report of diagnosed mental illness. As such, we were unable to confirm diagnoses, nor identify specifically the type of problem participants had previously been diagnosed with. We also asked about current diagnoses, so we do not know how trajectories were affected by previous histories of mental illness, and as participants have entered the study continuously throughout the 20-week follow-up period reported here, it is possible that diagnoses have arisen since lockdown began. As this study involved repeated weekly assessment of mental health, regression to the mean is a further source of bias that warrants acknowledgement. However, if this is the case, we might have expected it to work both ways, with higher anxiety and depression scores declining and lower scores increasing. Yet all groups showed decreases across the study period. Further, a decrease in average scores due to non-random attrition is unlikely to have substantially biased results as all participants in the analysis provided at least three data points, so their trajectories were estimated even in the absence of complete 20 weeks of data. Finally, the validated measures of mental health used have been shown to have good test-retest reliability.

Overall, these findings suggest that the highest levels of depression and anxiety in England were in the early stages of lockdown but declined fairly rapidly following the introduction of lockdown, with improvements continuing as lockdown easing measures were introduced but plateauing after the first four months. Many known risk factors for poorer mental health were apparent at the start of lockdown, but some groups, including women, younger adults, and individuals with lower educational attainment experienced faster improvements in symptoms, thereby reducing the differences over time. Nevertheless, many inequalities in mental health experiences did remain and emotionally vulnerable groups have remained at risk throughout lockdown and its aftermath. As countries face potential future lockdowns, these data suggest the importance of supporting individuals in the lead-up to lockdown measures being

brought in to try and reduce distress but also suggest that individuals may be able to adapt relatively fast to the new psychological demands of life in lockdown. But as inequalities in mental health have persisted, it is key to find ways of supporting vulnerable groups across this pandemic.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Ethical approval for the COVID-19 Social Study was granted by the UCL Ethics Committee. All participants provided fully informed consent. The study is GDPR compliant.

Data availability

Anonymous data will be made publicly available following the end of the pandemic.

Declaration of interest

All authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Funding

This Covid-19 Social Study was funded by the Nuffield Foundation [WEL/FR-000022583], but the views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily the Foundation. The study was also supported by the MARCH Mental Health Network funded by the Cross-Disciplinary Mental Health Network Plus initiative supported by UK Research and Innovation [ES/S002588/1], and by the Wellcome Trust [221400/Z/20/Z]. DF was funded by the Wellcome Trust [205407/Z/16/Z]. The researchers are grateful for the support of a number of organisations with their recruitment efforts including: the UKRI Mental Health Networks, Find Out Now, UCL BioResource, SEO Works, FieldworkHub, and Optimal Workshop. The study was also supported by HealthWise Wales, the Health and Care Research Wales initiative, which is led by Cardiff University in collaboration with SAIL, Swansea University.

Author contributions

DF, AS and FB conceived and designed the study. FB analysed the data and DF wrote the first draft. All authors provided critical revisions. All authors read and approved the submitted manuscript.

References

1 Holmes EA, O'Connor RC, Perry VH, *et al.* Multidisciplinary research priorities for the COVID-19 pandemic: a call for action for mental health science. *The Lancet Psychiatry* 2020; **0**. DOI:10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30168-1.

2 Mahase E. Covid-19: Mental health consequences of pandemic need urgent research, paper advises. *BMJ* 2020; **369**. DOI:10.1136/bmj.m1515.

3 Wright L, Steptoe A, Fancourt D. Are we all in this together? Longitudinal assessment of cumulative adversities by socio-economic position in the first 3 weeks of lockdown in the UK. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health* 2020.

4 Pierce M, Hope H, Ford T, *et al.* Mental health before and during the COVID-19 pandemic: a longitudinal probability sample survey of the UK population. *The Lancet Psychiatry* 2020; **0**. DOI:10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30308-4.

5 Shanahan L, Steinhoff A, Bechtiger L, *et al.* Emotional distress in young adults during the COVID-19 pandemic: evidence of risk and resilience from a longitudinal cohort study. *Psychological Medicine* undefined/ed; : 1–10.

6 Kwong ASF, Pearson RM, Adams MJ, *et al.* Mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic in two longitudinal UK population cohorts. *medRxiv* 2020; : 2020.06.16.20133116.

7 Huckins JF, DaSilva AW, Wang W, *et al.* Mental Health and Behavior of College Students During the Early Phases of the COVID-19 Pandemic: Longitudinal Smartphone and Ecological Momentary Assessment Study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research* 2020; **22**: e20185.

8 Hawryluck L, Gold WL, Robinson S, Pogorski S, Galea S, Styra R. SARS Control and Psychological Effects of Quarantine, Toronto, Canada. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2004; **10**: 1206–12.

9 Reynolds DL, Garay JR, Deamond SL, Moran MK, Gold W, Styra R. Understanding, compliance and psychological impact of the SARS quarantine experience. *Epidemiology & Infection* 2008; **136**: 997–1007.

10 Mihashi M, Otsubo Y, Yinjuan X, Nagatomi K, Hoshiko M, Ishitake T. Predictive factors of psychological disorder development during recovery following SARS outbreak. *Health Psychology* 2009; **28**: 91–100.

11 Liu X, Kakade M, Fuller CJ, *et al.* Depression after exposure to stressful events: lessons learned from the severe acute respiratory syndrome epidemic. *Comprehensive Psychiatry* 2012; **53**: 15–23.

12 Wu P, Fang Y, Guan Z, *et al.* The Psychological Impact of the SARS Epidemic on Hospital Employees in China: Exposure, Risk Perception, and Altruistic Acceptance of Risk. *Can J Psychiatry* 2009; **54**: 302–11.

13 YouGov. Britain's mood, measured weekly. https://yougov.co.uk/topics/science/trackers/britains-mood-measured-weekly (accessed April 20, 2020).

14 Layard R, Clark A, De Neve J-E, *et al.* When to release the lockdown: A wellbeing framework for analysing costs and benefits. Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics, 2020.

15 Millions of UK adults have felt panicked, afraid and unprepared as a result of the coronavirus pandemic - new poll data reveal impact on mental health. Mental Health Foundation. 2020; published online March 26. https://www.mentalhealth.org.uk/news/millions-uk-adults-have-felt-panicked-afraid-and-unprepared-result-coronavirus-pandemic-new (accessed April 24, 2020).

16 Weich S, Blanchard M, Prince M, Burton E, Erens BOB, Sproston K. Mental health and the built environment: Cross–sectional survey of individual and contextual risk factors for depression. *The British Journal of Psychiatry* 2002; **180**: 428–433.

17 Djernes JK. Prevalence and predictors of depression in populations of elderly: a review. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica* 2006; **113**: 372–387.

18 Regier DA, Farmer ME, Rae DS, *et al.* One-month prevalence of mental disorders in the United States and sociodemographic characteristics: the Epidemiologic Catchment Area study. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica* 1993; **88**: 35–47.

19 Ansseau M, Fischler B, Dierick M, Albert A, Leyman S, Mignon A. Socioeconomic correlates of generalized anxiety disorder and major depression in primary care: the GADIS II study (Generalized Anxiety and Depression Impact Survey II). *Depression and Anxiety* 2008; **25**: 506–513.

20 Hölzel L, Härter M, Reese C, Kriston L. Risk factors for chronic depression—a systematic review. *Journal of affective disorders* 2011; **129**: 1–13.

21 Brooks SK, Webster RK, Smith LE, *et al.* The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. *The Lancet* 2020; **395**: 912–20.

22 Huang Y, Zhao N. Mental health burden for the public affected by the COVID-19 outbreak in China: Who will be the high-risk group? *Psychology, Health & Medicine* 2020; **0**: 1–12.

23 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. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 2020; **17**: 4924.

24 Pieh C, Budimir S, Probst T. The effect of age, gender, income, work, and physical activity on mental health during coronavirus disease (COVID-19) lockdown in Austria. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research* 2020; **136**: 110186.

25 Pierce M, Hope H, Ford T, *et al.* Mental Health Before and During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Longitudinal Probability Sample Survey of the UK Population. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network, 2020 https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3624264 (accessed July 9, 2020).

26 Wang C, Pan R, Wan X, *et al.* Immediate Psychological Responses and Associated Factors during the Initial Stage of the 2019 Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Epidemic among the General Population in China. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 2020; **17**: 1729.

27 Ausín B, González-Sanguino C, Castellanos MÁ, Muñoz M. Gender-related differences in the psychological impact of confinement as a consequence of COVID-19 in Spain. *Journal of Gender Studies* 2020; **0**: 1–10.

28 Jeong H, Yim HW, Song Y-J, *et al.* Mental health status of people isolated due to Middle East Respiratory Syndrome. *Epidemiol Health* 2016; **38**. DOI:10.4178/epih.e2016048.

29 Löwe B, Kroenke K, Herzog W, Gräfe K. Measuring depression outcome with a brief self-report instrument: sensitivity to change of the Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9). *Journal of Affective Disorders* 2004; **81**: 61–6.

30 Kroenke K, Spitzer RL. The PHQ-9: A New Depression Diagnostic and Severity Measure. *Psychiatr Ann* 2002; **32**: 509–15.

31 Spitzer RL, Kroenke K, Williams JB, Löwe B. A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder: the GAD-7. *Archives of internal medicine* 2006; **166**: 1092–1097.

32 Population estimates for the UK, England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland - Office for National Statistics. https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/bulletins/annualmidyearpopulationestimates/mid2018 (accessed May 13, 2020).

33 StataCorp LLC. Stata statistical software: Release 15 (2017). *College Station, TX: StataCorp LP* 2017.

34 Muthén LK, Muthen B. Mplus user's guide: Statistical analysis with latent variables, user's guide. Muthén & Muthén, 2017.

35 Baker ZG, Krieger H, LeRoy AS. Fear of missing out: Relationships with depression, mindfulness, and physical symptoms. *Translational Issues in Psychological Science* 2016; **2**: 275.

36 Porter LC, DeMarco LM. Beyond the dichotomy: Incarceration dosage and mental health*. *Criminology* 2019; **57**: 136–56.

37 Bu F, Steptoe A, Fancourt D. Who is lonely in lockdown? Cross-cohort analyses of predictors of loneliness before and during the COVID-19 pandemic | medRxiv. *Public Health* 2020. https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.14.20101360v1 (accessed July 9, 2020).

38 Guan W, Ni Z, Hu Y, *et al.* Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2020; published online Feb 28. DOI:10.1056/NEJMoa2002032.

39 Newby J, O'Moore K, Tang S, Christensen H, Faasse K. Acute mental health responses during the COVID-19 pandemic in Australia. *medRxiv* 2020; : 2020.05.03.20089961.

40 Phillips C. Institutional Racism and Ethnic Inequalities: An Expanded Multilevel Framework. *Journal of Social Policy* 2011; **40**: 173–92.