

1 **The impact of the initial and 2nd national COVID-19 lockdown on mental**
2 **health in young people with and without pre-existing depressive symptoms**
3

4 Andrea Joensen* ([0000-0003-1877-9174](#)), Stine Danielsen¹ ([0000-0003-2179-8894](#)), Per
5 Kragh Andersen² ([0000-0003-0490-0885](#)), Jonathan Groot³ ([0000-0002-8610-0963](#)), Katrine
6 Strandberg-Larsen⁴ ([0000-0001-7061-3767](#))
7

8 **Author affiliations, addresses, and positions:**

9 ***Corresponding author:** Andrea Joensen PhD fellow

10 Section of Epidemiology, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of
11 Copenhagen. Postal address: Øster Farimagsgade 5, bd. 24, PO Box 2099, DK - 1014
12 Copenhagen K.

13 Position: PhD Fellow

14 e-mail: anjo@sund.ku.dk
15

16 ¹Section of Epidemiology, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of
17 Copenhagen. Postal address: Øster Farimagsgade 5, bd. 24, PO Box 2099, DK - 1014
18 Copenhagen K.

19 Position: MScPH student

20 e-mail: stda@sund.ku.dk
21

22 ²Section of Biostatistics, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of Copenhagen.
23 Postal address: Øster Farimagsgade 5, bd. 5, PO Box 2099, DK - 1014 Copenhagen K.

24 Position: Professor

25 e-mail: pka@biostat.ku.dk
26

27 ³Section of Epidemiology, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of
28 Copenhagen. Postal address: Øster Farimagsgade 5, bd. 24, PO Box 2099, DK - 1014
29 Copenhagen K.

30 Position: PhD Fellow

31 e-mail: jgro@sund.ku.dk
32

33 ⁴Section of Epidemiology, University of Copenhagen, Faculty of Health and Medical
34 Sciences. Postal address: Øster Farimagsgade 5, bd. 24, PO Box 2099, DK - 1014
35 Copenhagen K.

36 Position: Associate Professor

37 Telephone: +45 35 32 60 78

38 Fax number: N/A

39 e-mail: ksla@sund.ku.dk

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

40 **Author contributions:** AJ, PKA, and KSL conceived and designed the study. AJ, KSL, and
41 SD were involved in the data collection and data management of the COVID-19 survey. AJ
42 conducted the analyses and together with KSL drafted the first draft of the manuscript. JG
43 was involved in data visualisation. KSL was responsible for funding acquisition and
44 supervision. All authors contributed to the analytical approach, interpretation of the data,
45 revisions of the manuscript, and submission of the final manuscript. The corresponding
46 author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the
47 criteria have been omitted. AJ is the guarantor of the manuscript and was primarily
48 responsible for the formal analyses, data curation, methodology, drafting of the original
49 manuscript, writing/editing the manuscript, and data visualisation. KSL has additionally
50 verified the underlying dataset.

51 **Declaration of interest:** All authors declare no competing interests.

52 **Data sharing:** According to European law (General Data Protection Regulation), data
53 containing potentially identifying or sensitive personal information are restricted. However,
54 for academic researcher, data could be available on request via DNBC dnbc-research@ssi.dk

55 **Funding:** This study was made possible by a grant from the Velux Foundation (grant number
56 36336, ‘Standing together at a distance – how Danes are handling the corona crisis’). The
57 funders of the study had no part in the conception or design of the study, or in the decision to
58 publish.

59 **Ethics:** This study was approved by the Danish Data Protection Agency via a joint
60 notification to the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences – University of Copenhagen (ref.
61 514-0497/20-3000, ‘Standing together at a distance: how are Danish National Birth Cohort
62 participants experiencing the corona crisis?’). The cohort is approved by the Danish Data
63 Protection Agency and the Committee on Health Research Ethics under case no. (KF) 01-
64 471/94. Data handling in the DNBC has been approved by Statens Serum Institut (SSI) under
65 ref. no 18/04608 and is covered by the general approval (Fællesanmeldelse) given to SSI. The
66 18-year follow-up was approved under ref. no 2015-41-3961. The DNBC participants were
67 enrolled by informed consent.

68 **Acknowledgment:** The Danish National Birth Cohort (DNBC) was established with a
69 significant grant from the Danish National Research Foundation. Additional support was
70 obtained from the Danish Regional Committees, the Pharmacy Foundation, the Egmont
71 Foundation, the March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation, the Health Foundation, and other
72 minor grants. The DNBC Biobank has been supported by the Novo Nordisk Foundation and
73 the Lundbeck Foundation. Follow-up of mothers and children has been supported by the

74 Danish Medical Research Council (SSVF 0646, 271-08-0839/06-066023, O602-01042B,
75 0602-02738B), the Lundbeck Foundation (195/04, R100-A9193), The Innovation Fund
76 Denmark 0603-00294B (09-067124), the Nordea Foundation (02-2013-2014), Aarhus Ideas
77 (AU R9-A959-13-S804), a University of Copenhagen Strategic Grant (IFSV 2012) and the
78 Danish Council for Independent Research (DFF – 4183-00594 and DFF – 4183-00152). We
79 thank Professor Lau Caspar Thygesen for a valuable discussion of the analytical model and
80 interpretation of results.
81 **Key words:** COVID-19, lockdown, mental health, young people, depressive symptoms,
82 longitudinal data

- 83 **Word count:** 3,421
- 84 **Abstract word count:** 249
- 85 **Number of References:** 30
- 86 **Number of tables:** 0
- 87 **Number of figures:** 5
- 88 **Number of supplementary tables:** 2
- 89 **Number of supplementary figures:** 4

90 **Research in context**

91

92 **Evidence before this study**

93 We searched PubMed, PsycINFO, MedrXiv, and PsyArXiv with the terms (“Mental*” OR
94 “Psychological*” OR “Emotional*”) AND (“Youth” OR “Young Adult*”) AND (“COVID*”
95 OR “Coronavirus” OR “Lockdown*”) for articles published in English between January 1st
96 2020 and October 1st 2021. Included studies varied in terms of quality of data used but
97 overall studies reported a detrimental impact of the lockdowns on young people’s mental
98 health. However, the evidence on mental well-being and loneliness has shown to be
99 inconsistent and with signs of resilience. Young people, women, and those with a pre-existing
100 mental disorder have been identified as vulnerable subgroups, but only a few studies
101 investigating mental health in individuals with a pre-existing mental disorder included a pre-
102 lockdown measurement. The included studies also demonstrated that there is a gap in the
103 evidence in understanding how mental health changed week by week, as well as the long-
104 term impact over the course of the lockdowns.

105

106 **Added value of this study**

107 With longitudinal data, this study shows an interim impact of the initial and second lockdown
108 on mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic in young individuals without pre-existing
109 symptoms in Denmark. Since commencement of the initial lockdown, the levels of mental
110 health returned to before levels, but one year after the initial lockdown, the levels were still
111 lower than before lockdown in young people without pre-existing depressive symptoms.
112 Young individuals with pre-existing depressive symptoms did not experience more
113 detrimental impact of the lockdown, but rather indication of resilience or even improvements
114 in mental health were observed. A disproportional impact of the lockdown on women
115 compared to men was only observed for QoL, as women without pre-existing depressive
116 symptoms experienced a greater decline in QoL than men without pre-existing depressive
117 symptoms. However, findings based on the repeated cross-sectional data did not show similar
118 interim impact – but instead no – or clinically irrelevant impact. Thus, taken together our
119 findings do not suggest a substantial lasting impact of the lockdowns on mental health among
120 young individuals.

121

122 **Implications of all available evidence**

123 A great majority of earlier studies suggest that the lockdowns due to the COVID-19
124 pandemic have had substantial detrimental impact on mental health, and that women and
125 those with a pre-existing mental disorder constitute vulnerable subgroups. However, these
126 studies vary considerably in terms of method applied. Our findings emphasise the importance
127 of the use of different data setups, as well as methodology applied for the investigation of
128 mental health. More studies based on high-quality data used in different settings are needed
129 to fully understand the impact of the lockdowns on young people's mental health, including
130 potential disproportional impact on vulnerable subgroups.

131 **Summary**

132 **Background:** The evidence on mental well-being and loneliness among young people during
133 the initial lockdown is mixed, and little is known about the long-lasting impact of the
134 sequential lockdowns. We examine changes in young people's mental health from before to
135 during the initial and second more prolonged lockdown, and whether women and those with
136 pre-existing depressive symptoms were disproportionately impacted.

137

138 **Methods:** Participants reported on mental health indicators in an ongoing 18-year data
139 collection in the Danish National Birth Cohort and in a COVID-19 survey, including 8 data
140 points: 7 in the initial lockdown, and 1 year post. Changes in quality of life (QoL), mental
141 well-being, and loneliness were estimated with random effect linear regressions on
142 longitudinal data (N=32,985), and linear regressions on repeated cross-sections (N=28,579).

143

144 **Findings:** Interim deterioration in mental well-being and loneliness was observed during the
145 initial lockdown, and only in those without pre-existing depressive symptoms. During the
146 second lockdown, a modest deterioration was again observed for mental well-being and
147 loneliness. QoL likewise only declined among those without pre-existing symptoms, where
148 women showed a greater decline than men. QoL did not normalise during the initial
149 lockdown and remained at lower levels during the second lockdown. These findings were not
150 replicated in the repeated cross-sections.

151

152 **Interpretation:** Except for an interim decrease in mental health during lockdown, and only
153 in those without pre-existing depressive symptoms, this study's findings do not suggest a
154 substantial detrimental impact of the lockdowns. Potential methodological differences in-
155 between studies are a possible explanation for the mixed evidence.

156

157 **Funding:** The Velux Foundation

158 **Introduction**

159 The COVID-19 pandemic became a global reality in early 2020 with enormous impact on
160 society and daily living. Like many other countries worldwide, lockdowns, quarantine
161 requirements and recommendations, social restrictions, and physical distancing were
162 implemented in Denmark in March 2020 to mitigate the spread of the virus. The Danish
163 lockdown demanded all public employees with no critical function to work from home,
164 closing of national borders, schools, day-care centers, sports facilities, and restaurants.
165 Moreover, private companies were strongly recommended to let their employees work from
166 home.¹ This initial lockdown was eased during late spring, but then gradually reinforced
167 during the autumn 2020 in response to rising numbers of cases and deaths attributed to
168 COVID-19. Mid December, a 2nd national strict lockdown was implemented that lasted to
169 March 2021, from which a gradually reopening began. Several studies have documented
170 acutely deteriorations of mental health and increased loneliness during the initial lockdowns
171 compared with pre-pandemic periods.²⁻⁵ However, according to the Lancet's COVID-19
172 Commission Mental Health Task Force the evidence up to December 2020 regarding the
173 impact of COVID-19 on well-being and loneliness was inconsistent and with signs of
174 resilience.⁶ Several studies have also investigated whether women and young people have
175 been disproportionally impacted by the lockdown.^{2,3,7-18} The majority of these studies did
176 identify women and young people as vulnerable subgroups.^{2,3,7-9,14,15,17,18} Further, patient
177 organisations, case stories, and health professionals have raised concerns about marked
178 worsening of pre-existing mental disorders during the lockdowns. Studies support that people
179 with pre-existing mental disorders were impacted more detrimentally by the lockdown.^{7,8}
180 Contrary, other studies, all with before and during measures of mental health, have shown
181 that the changes in mental health were minimal or even slightly improved in people with
182 severe and chronic mental disorders, whereas the deteriorations in mental health were among
183 people without pre-existing mental disorders.^{15,19,20}

184

185 Research on the mental health impact of COVID-19 and related lockdowns is evolving fast,
186 but not many studies are based on high-quality data and only a few studies in young people
187 include a before measure and up to several measures during the lockdown. Additionally, we
188 lack knowledge on how the full picture will unfold, and how the sequential and prolonged
189 lockdowns have impacted young people's mental health. The aim of this study was to
190 quantify changes in quality of life (QoL), mental well-being, and loneliness in young people

191 following and through the initial lockdown, and during the second and more prolonged
192 lockdown. We further examined whether women and individuals with pre-existing depressive
193 symptoms were disproportionately impacted by the lockdowns, as we hypothesised these to be
194 most vulnerable.

195 **Methods**

196 **Participants**

197 In the mid-nineties, the nationwide national birth cohort, the Danish National Birth Cohort
198 (DNBC) was established, into which 30% of children born in Denmark in 1996-2003 were
199 enrolled.²¹ Longitudinal data exist from prenatal life unto early adulthood collected in the
200 latest data sweep, the 18-year data collection (DNBC-18). The DNBC-18 was initiated in
201 2016 and will be completed ultimo 2021. Further information is available: www.dnbc.dk. To
202 document the public health impact of the national COVID-19 lockdown, we invited
203 participants to complete a COVID-19 survey. Only participants who had earlier provided
204 either their private mail or phone number were invited. Further eligibility criteria were an
205 active security number and not having withdrawn participation. The initial COVID-19
206 survey, determined wave 1, was launched in the 3rd week of the initial lockdown, Figure 1.
207 All participants who responded within a week were re-invited to up to six subsequent
208 consecutive online surveys, i.e. wave 2-7.¹ Approximately one year later, i.e. April/May
209 2021, all participants with identical eligible criteria were re-invited to wave 8 of the COVID-
210 19 survey.

211
212 The populations, in the present study, were restricted to participants with information on
213 household-socio-occupational status, maternal age at childbirth, parity, and maternal smoking
214 collected during pregnancy. In the analyses including the DNBC-18 and the COVID-19
215 survey, we further restricted our population to those eligible for the DNBC-18 before the
216 initial lockdown, Figure S1. In total, 32,985 participants had complete data in the DNBC-18.
217 Of these, 7,431 and 8,808, respectively participated in wave 1 and wave 8 of the COVID-19
218 survey, Figure S1. We also estimated the year-to-year and seasonal variation in mental health
219 by utilising the DNBC-18 collected in 2018 to March 2021 (N=28,579) as repeated cross-
220 sections divided into year and five periods, Figure S2. The periods reflected the initiation,
221 reopening, and reinforcements of the lockdowns in Denmark, Figure 1.

222

223 **Primary mental health outcome measures**

224 Primary mental health measures in this study, include two widely used measures of QoL and
225 mental well-being, that have shown good reliability and validity.^{22,23} The measure of
226 loneliness in this study, was only based on a single item.

227

228 *QoL*

229 We used an adaptation of the Cantril Ladder scale, in which respondents rate their life from 0
230 for the worst life to 10 for the best possible life, to measure QoL.²² This adaption of the
231 Cantril Ladder scale is widely used internationally among adolescents and has shown good
232 reliability and convergent validity with other emotional well-being measures.²²

233

234 *Mental well-being*

235 We used the 7-item Short Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale (SWEMWBS),²⁴
236 which is a validated instrument, also in a Danish age-appropriate sample, to measure mental
237 well-being.²³ The response-option for each item is a five-point likert scale. Thus, the total
238 scale ranges from 7-35, with higher values indicating better well-being. In the DNBC-18 and
239 wave 8, the items referred to the previous two weeks, whereas in wave 1-7 of the COVID-19
240 survey, the items were rephrased to the specific week. A 1-point change on the scale is
241 considered to represent a clinically meaningful change.

242

243 *Loneliness*

244 In the DNBC-18, participants were asked ‘How often do you feel lonely?’ with the response
245 options ‘Never’, ‘Occasionally’, ‘Often’, ‘Very often’ or ‘Do not know’ (excluded). In the
246 COVID-19 survey the item on loneliness was: ‘In the last week, how often have you felt
247 lonely?’ with response options: ‘Seldom or not at all (less than 1 day)’, ‘Some or a little (1-2
248 days)’, ‘Occasionally or often (3-4 days)’ or ‘Most of the time (5-7 days)’. The two highest,
249 i.e. at least ‘Often’ and ‘Occasionally or often (3-4 days)’ were categorised as lonely, and
250 otherwise participants were categorised as not lonely.

251

252 **Measure of pre-existing depressive symptoms**

253 *Pre-existing depressive symptoms*

254 Measure of pre-existing depressive symptoms was assessed in the DNBC-18 by the Major
255 Depression Inventory (MDI). The MDI is a validated instrument referring to feelings in the
256 past two weeks and ranging from 0-50, with higher scores indicating more severe
257 depression.²⁵ Pre-existing depressive symptoms was categorised as scoring ≥ 26 , and we
258 further categorised severity of depressive symptoms: severe (31-50), moderate (26-30), mild
259 (21-25), and no depression (0-20).²⁵

260

261

262 **Covariates**

263 Participants reported their current educational enrolment and housing composition in the
264 DNBC-18. We also included information on gender, age, household-socio-occupational
265 status, maternal age at childbirth, parity, and maternal smoking collected during pregnancy.
266 These covariates were categorised as shown in Table S1.

267 268 **Statistical analysis**

269 To account for differential attrition, we estimated inverse probability weights (IPW) by
270 logistic regressions with having data as outcome and the following predictors: gender,
271 household-socio-occupational status, maternal age at childbirth, parity, and maternal smoking
272 collected during pregnancy. Separate analyses were performed for each data point and on the
273 appropriate baseline population, Figure S1 and S2. Age at time of wave 1 was additionally
274 included in the models for the COVID-19 waves. These IPWs were included in all analyses
275 including the specific data points.

276
277 Using the longitudinal data, we estimated the mean changes with corresponding 95%
278 confidence intervals (CI), in QoL, mental well-being, and proportion of change in loneliness
279 by subtracting the pre-lockdown measurement from the lockdown measurement. For the
280 periods in 2018-2021 in the repeated cross-sectional setup, we estimated the mean of QoL
281 and mental well-being and the proportion being lonely, with corresponding 95% CI. These
282 calculations were stratified on gender and pre-existing depressive symptoms, respectively.
283 Next, we performed random effects linear regressions on the longitudinal data and linear
284 regressions on the repeated cross-sectional data to estimate the changes in mean QoL and
285 mental well-being, as well as the proportion being lonely, respectively, from before to during
286 lockdown. In the longitudinal setup, we examined the changes from before to during
287 lockdown by including wave 1-8. We contrasted before with during lockdown in a model
288 with a binary variable for lockdown, gender, and pre-existing depressive symptoms. To test
289 for disproportional impact of the lockdown among women vs. men and young people with vs.
290 without pre-existing depressive symptoms, we gradually expanded the models with
291 interactions. First with the interaction between lockdown and gender and then the interaction
292 with pre-existing symptoms. Interactions were included if disproportional impacts were
293 observed for at least one of the mental health outcomes. Additionally, we investigated
294 whether severity of pre-existing depressive symptoms mattered by including the four
295 categories of severity in the analyses. To examine whether the impact of the lockdown varied

296 across the waves of the COVID-19 survey, we exchanged the binary lockdown variable with
297 a variable indicating wave 1-8. Lastly, we restricted the before measure in the longitudinal
298 analyses to participants who completed DNBC-18 in year 2019 and period 2 or 3, to address
299 whether our results were biased by seasonal variation or the time gap between the pre- and
300 during lockdown measurement.

301

302 In the repeated cross-sectional setup, the during lockdown period was defined as the second
303 period in 2020 and onwards. We started out testing for interaction between lockdown and
304 period and omitted it if insignificant. We subsequently examined the disproportional impact
305 of lockdown on gender and depressive symptoms by including interaction terms as described
306 above. We performed these analyses unadjusted and adjusted for household-socio-
307 occupational status, maternal age at childbirth, maternal smoking collected during pregnancy,
308 educational enrolment, and household composition.

309

310 The analyses were performed with SAS Software, version 9.4 (SAS Institute, North Carolina,
311 US) using the commands proc survey means, proc mixed/GLM and applying the weight
312 statement for IPW and random statement for random effect.

313

314 **Role of the funding source**

315 The funder of this study had no role in the study design, data collection, data analysis, data
316 interpretation, writing of the article, or in decision to publish.

317 **Results**

318 Slightly more than half of the participants were 18-20 years of age during the initial
319 lockdown. Moreover, more women than men participated in the DNBC-18, and were
320 undertaking education, living with parents, and from educated households. In the COVID-19
321 survey, seven out of ten participants were women in wave 1 and wave 8, while this
322 proportion slightly increased in wave 2-7, Table S1. Moreover, participants in wave 2-7 were
323 more often without pre-existing depressive symptoms, under education, living with parents,
324 from educated households, nulliparous, non-smoking, and older mothers than participants
325 within the DNBC-18 and wave 1 and 8, Table S1.

326

327 Before lockdown, women and young people with depressive symptoms reported lower
328 mental health than men and those without depressive symptoms, Table S2.

329 Deteriorations in QoL, mental well-being, and loneliness was observed in the strictest phase
330 of the initial lockdown. Mental well-being and loneliness reached the before levels during the
331 initial lockdown, while the QoL never normalised, Figure 2. One year post the initial
332 lockdown (wave 8), reflecting the easing up after the second more prolonged lockdown, the
333 QoL and mental well-being were at same levels as observed early during the initial
334 lockdown. Loneliness was only slightly increased at wave 8 compared to before. Similar
335 patterns were seen for women and men, while it was young people without pre-existing
336 depressive symptoms who experienced the deteriorations.

337

338 For QoL, the lockdown had a disproportional impact on gender and pre-existing depressive
339 symptoms groups, Figure 3. The biggest decline in QoL following lockdown was observed
340 for women without pre-existing depressive symptoms [-1·12, 95% CI:-1·17;-1·07], while QoL
341 declined -0·85 point [95% CI:-0·90;-0·80] among men without pre-existing depressive
342 symptoms. The lowest level of QoL was at wave 2-5 for both groups, and then slightly
343 increased later in the initial lockdown. The level of QoL was still lower compared with before
344 lockdown for both groups in spring 2021. Contrary, the QoL improved in young people with
345 pre-existing depressive symptoms, especially in men. For mental well-being and loneliness, it
346 was likewise people without-pre-existing depressive symptoms who experienced the
347 deteriorations, while those with pre-existing depressive symptoms improved. Women and
348 men without pre-existing depressive symptoms were not disproportionately impacted by the
349 lockdown, as the drop in mental well-being was -0·63 point [95% CI:-0·71;-0·55] for women

350 and -0.59 point [95% CI:-0.67;-0.50] for men and the proportion feeling lonely increased by
351 8.0% [95% CI:7.0;9.0%] for women and 6.0% [95% CI:5.0;7.0%] for men. The
352 deteriorations in well-being and loneliness were greatest early in the initial lockdown. In
353 spring 2021, the overall changes in mental well-being and loneliness from before lockdown
354 were approximately the same as the change observed during the initial lockdown. When
355 investigating the degree of pre-existing symptoms, the deteriorations were greatest for the no
356 depressive symptom group and greatest improvements were seen for the severe group, Figure
357 S3. Restricting the before measure to data collected in spring and summer 2019 did not
358 change the overall conclusion, Figure S4.

359
360 No clear changes were observed in QoL, mental well-being, or loneliness when analysing the
361 repeated cross-sections, Figure 4. In the regression analyses, the period effect was equal
362 before and after lockdown. For QoL and loneliness, the lockdown had a minor
363 disproportional impact on the depressive symptoms groups, as the QoL only dropped slightly
364 [-0.17, 95% CI:-0.22;-0.13] in people without depressive symptoms, Figure 5. Similarly, a
365 minor improvement was observed in mental well-being among people without depressive
366 symptoms [0.09, 95% CI:0.01;0.17], whereas no improvements were seen in those with
367 depressive symptoms. Contrary, a 3.0% [95% CI:1.0;6.0%] increase in loneliness was
368 observed in young people with depressive symptoms, while no changes were observed
369 among people without depressive symptoms.

370 Discussion

371 Within the longitudinal setup, this study demonstrates an interim deterioration in mental well-
372 being and loneliness during the initial lockdown, and only in young people without pre-
373 existing depressive symptoms. During the gradual re-opening of the second lockdown, the
374 mental well-being was equivalent to early in the initial lockdown, while the proportion of
375 loneliness was at levels during the reopening of the initial lockdown, thereby only slightly
376 increased. QoL likewise only declined following lockdown among young people without pre-
377 existing symptoms, but women had a bigger decline in QoL than men. QoL did not normalise
378 among young people without pre-existing symptoms during the initial lockdown and
379 remained at lower levels in spring 2021. Overall, these deterioration in mental health seemed
380 rather modest, and were not replicated in repeated cross-sectional setup. Thus, taken together
381 our findings do not suggest a substantial lasting impact of the lockdowns on mental health
382 among young individuals.

383

384 The longitudinal data allow us to quantify the week-to-week variation in impact across the
385 entire span of the initial lockdown. In contrast, in the repeated cross-sections, the initial
386 lockdown is represented by one longer period. Mental well-being and loneliness seemed to
387 normalise during the gradual reopening of the initial lockdown, and this might explain why
388 we only observe deteriorations in QoL in young people without depressive symptoms in the
389 cross-sectional analyses. Feelings of loneliness and social isolation since the implementation
390 of the initial lockdown have been very dynamic and responsive to the government's
391 actions.^{1,18} Additionally, in the COVID-19 survey it was explicitly stated that the aim was to
392 investigate how the COVID-19 pandemic impacted our living, which was not the case in the
393 ongoing DNBC-18, where COVID-19 was not mentioned and no adaptations were made. The
394 DNBC participants are regularly invited to complete age specific follow ups. Thus, it is
395 likely, however untestable, that the participants in the DNBC-18 deliberately compensated, so
396 their responses reflected their overall health and not solely their current lockdown situation.

397

398 Studies that have suggested a decline in young people's mental health are cross-sectional or
399 do not include a pre-lockdown measurement.^{9,11-14,16} Most of the earlier findings do also
400 indicate that women were more detrimentally impacted by the lockdown than men,^{2,3,7-}
401 ^{9,14,15,17,18} but for individuals with a pre-existing mental disorder, the findings are
402 mixed.^{5,7,8,10,11,15,18-20} One possible explanation for the mixed findings can be the

403 methodological differences. Regression to the mean is of concern, and longitudinal studies in
404 which adjustment for pre-lockdown mental health was performed, documented greater
405 deteriorations following the lockdown in individuals with pre-existing mental health
406 disorders.^{7,8} Contrary, studies without adjustment for baseline values, as in our study,
407 document slightly improved or unchanged mental health following lockdown among those
408 with a pre-existing mental disorder.^{10,15,19,20} Observational studies examining change and
409 adjusting for baseline values can lead to bias in the direction of the cross-sectional association
410 between pre-existing depressive symptoms and the pre-lockdown measure of mental
411 health.²⁶⁻²⁸ Individuals with pre-existing depressive symptoms scored substantially lower on
412 QoL, well-being, and loneliness, and thus the association between pre-existing depressive
413 symptoms and these mental health indicators reverses after adjustment for the pre-lockdown
414 levels.²⁹

415

416 Findings from the longitudinal setup showed that young people with pre-existing depressive
417 symptoms experienced a resilience or an improvement during lockdown, for which there
418 could be multiple possible explanations. The lockdown and the social isolation might have
419 given individuals with depressive symptoms more calmness, as the new circumstances were
420 in line with their normal daily life. Young people without pre-existing depressive symptoms
421 however showed a deterioration in mental health which might represent a normal fear in
422 response to an unpredicted crisis such as the COVID-19 pandemic. The results from wave 8
423 suggest a more long-term impact of the lockdown, as the levels of mental health were lower
424 than before lockdown. However, wave 8 was during the gradual re-opening of the second
425 lockdown, and if we presume it likely to follow same responsiveness as during the initial
426 lockdown, we find it plausible it would have been higher if measured later in the re-opening
427 phase. Although this study did not show any deteriorations among young people with pre-
428 existing depressive symptoms, it is important to clarify that the mental health of these
429 individuals was and remained systematically worse compared to those without pre-existing
430 depressive symptoms.

431

432 **Strengths and limitations**

433 Strength's worth highlighting, is the tandem use of longitudinal data on individuals aged 18-
434 24 and repeated samples of individuals aged 18 years originating from the same baseline
435 population. Moreover, our data collection during the initial lockdown included up to 7
436 measurements spanning the reopening phases, as well as one measurement subsequent to a

437 second and more prolonged lockdown. The repeated cross-sections allow us to quantify
438 seasonal variations and is only vulnerable to attrition if the participation in DNBC-18
439 systematically changed over year of birth or season, as opposed to the longitudinal setup
440 which is more vulnerable to attrition due to loss to follow-up. We attempted to reduce bias
441 from differential attrition by inverse probability weighting. The validity of this method relies
442 on a correctly specified model including all relevant predictors for loss to follow-up, which
443 cannot be assumed.

444

445 Interpretation of our findings likewise deserves consideration of a few limitations. In the
446 longitudinal setup, the baseline data was collected at age 18 years and three months for all
447 participants, whereas the participants' ages during lockdown was 18-24 years. Thus, the
448 timespan between the before and during lockdown measurement was greater for the older
449 participants. For older participants, changes in mental health may be underestimated, since
450 the pre-lockdown measurement represent a younger age than the follow-up measures, and on
451 average reporting on mental health instruments improves with age.¹⁷ As an attempt to
452 preclude this, a sensitivity analyses was conducted to ensure that any observed deterioration
453 in mental health was likely attributable to the lockdown. Finally, the DNBC has previously
454 been shown to be healthier and more often from households with higher occupational levels
455 than the background population, and our population was mainly living with their parents and
456 studying.³⁰ Thus, the findings from this study cannot necessarily be generalised to all 18–24-
457 year-olds or to other countries.

458

459 In summary, the findings from the longitudinal setup did reveal a modest intermittent
460 deterioration in mental health during the initial lockdown in young individuals without
461 depressive symptoms prior to lockdown, as well as lower QoL and well-being 1 year post the
462 initial lockdown than before lockdown. The mental health of young individuals with
463 depressive symptoms prior to lockdown did not show similar deteriorations but remained
464 unchanged or even slightly improved. Only for QoL, women without pre-existing depressive
465 symptoms experienced a greater decline compared than men. These findings interpreted
466 simultaneously with the findings from the repeated cross-sections, indicating no or clinical
467 meaning less change do not support a substantial and lasting impact of the lockdown on the
468 mental health in young individuals.


469

470 References

- 471 1 Clotworthy A, Dissing N, Nguyen L, *et al.* ‘Standing together - at a distance’:
472 Documenting changes in mental-health indicators in Denmark during the COVID-19
473 pandemic. *Scand J Public Health* 2020; **49**: 79–87.
- 474 2 Niedzwiedz CL, Green MJ, Benzeval M, *et al.* Mental health and health behaviours
475 before and during the initial phase of the COVID-19 lockdown: Longitudinal analyses
476 of the UK Household Longitudinal Study. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2021; **75**:
477 224–31.
- 478 3 Lee CM, Cadigan JM, Rhew IC. Increases in Loneliness Among Young Adults During
479 the COVID-19 Pandemic and Association With Increases in Mental Health Problems.
480 *J Adolesc Heal* 2020; **67**: 714–7.
- 481 4 Bueno-Notivol J, Gracia-García P, Olaya B, Lasheras I, López-Antón R, Santabárbara
482 J. Prevalence of depression during the COVID-19 outbreak: A meta-analysis of
483 community-based studies. *Int J Clin Heal Psychol* 2021; **21**: 100196.
- 484 5 Vindegaard N, Benros ME. COVID-19 pandemic and mental health consequences:
485 Systematic review of the current evidence. *Brain Behav Immun* 2020; **89**: 531–42.
- 486 6 Aknin, L., De Neve, J.-E., Dunn, E., Fancourt, D., Goldberg, E., Helliwell, J. F., Jones,
487 S. P., Karam, E., Layard, R., Lyubomirsky, S., Rzepa, A., Saxena, S., Thornton, E. M.,
488 VanderWeele, T. J., Whillans, A. V., Zaki, J., Karadag Caman, O., & Ben Amor Y.
489 Mental Health During the First Year of the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Review and
490 Recommendations for Moving Forward. *Perspect Psychol Sci (in Press Press)* 2021.
- 491 7 Kwong ASF, Pearson RM, Smith D, Northstone K, Lawlor DA, Timpson NJ.
492 Longitudinal evidence for persistent anxiety in young adults through COVID-19
493 restrictions. *Wellcome Open Res* 2020; **5**: 195.
- 494 8 Kwong ASF, Pearson RM, Adams MJ, *et al.* Mental health before and during the
495 COVID-19 pandemic in two longitudinal UK population cohorts. *Br J Psychiatry*
496 2021; **24**: 1–10.
- 497 9 Chodkiewicz J, Miniszewska J, Krajewska E, Biliński P. Mental health during the
498 second wave of the covid-19 pandemic—polish studies. *Int J Environ Res Public*
499 *Health* 2021; **18**: 3423.
- 500 10 Thygesen LC, Møller SP, Ersbøll AK, *et al.* Decreasing mental well-being during the
501 COVID-19 pandemic: A longitudinal study among Danes before and during the
502 pandemic. *J Psychiatr Res* 2021; **144**: 151–7.
- 503 11 Bäuerle A, Steinbach J, Schweda A, *et al.* Mental Health Burden of the COVID-19
504 Outbreak in Germany: Predictors of Mental Health Impairment. *J Prim Care*
505 *Community Heal* 2020; **11**: 1–8.
- 506 12 McGinty EE, Presskreischer R, Han H, Barry CL. Psychological Distress and
507 Loneliness Reported by US Adults in 2018 and April 2020. *JAMA - J Am Med Assoc*
508 2020; **324**: 93–4.
- 509 13 Soest T V, Bakken A, Pedersen W, Sletten MA. Life satisfaction among adolescents
510 before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Tidsskr Den Nor Laegeforening* 2020;
511 **140**.
- 512 14 Fancourt D, Steptoe A, Bu F. Trajectories of anxiety and depressive symptoms during
513 enforced isolation due to COVID-19 in England: a longitudinal observational study.
514 *The Lancet Psychiatry* 2020; **8**: 141–9.
- 515 15 Daly M, Sutin A, Robinson E. Longitudinal changes in mental health and the COVID-
516 19 pandemic: Evidence from the UK Household Longitudinal Study. *Psychol Med*
517 2020; **13**: 1–10.
- 518 16 Daly M, Sutin AR, Robinson E. Depression reported by US adults in 2017–2018 and
519 March and April 2020. *J Affect Disord* 2021; **278**: 131–5.

- 520 17 Pierce M, Hope H, Ford T, *et al.* Mental health before and during the COVID-19
521 pandemic: a longitudinal probability sample survey of the UK population. *The Lancet*
522 *Psychiatry* 2020; **7**: 883–92.
- 523 18 Varga T V., Bu F, Dissing AS, *et al.* Loneliness, worries, anxiety, and precautionary
524 behaviours in response to the COVID-19 pandemic: a longitudinal analysis of 200,000
525 Western and Northern Europeans. *Lancet Reg Heal - Eur* 2021; **2**: 100020.
- 526 19 Pan KY, Kok AAL, Eikelenboom M, *et al.* The mental health impact of the COVID-19
527 pandemic on people with and without depressive, anxiety, or obsessive-compulsive
528 disorders: a longitudinal study of three Dutch case-control cohorts. *The Lancet*
529 *Psychiatry* 2020; **8**: 121–9.
- 530 20 Pinkham AE, Ackerman RA, Depp CA, Harvey PD, Moore RC. A Longitudinal
531 Investigation of the Effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the Mental Health of
532 Individuals with Pre-existing Severe Mental Illnesses. *Psychiatry Res* 2020; **294**:
533 113493.
- 534 21 Olsen J, Melbye M, Olsen SF, *et al.* The Danish National Birth Cohort - its
535 background, structure and aim. *Scand J Public Health* 2001; **29**: 300–7.
- 536 22 Levin KA, Currie C. Reliability and Validity of an Adapted Version of the Cantril
537 Ladder for Use with Adolescent Samples. *Soc Indic Res* 2014; **119**: 1047–63.
- 538 23 Koushede V, Lasgaard M, Hinrichsen C, *et al.* Measuring mental well-being in
539 Denmark: Validation of the original and short version of the Warwick-Edinburgh
540 mental well-being scale (WEMWBS and SWEMWBS) and cross-cultural comparison
541 across four European settings. *Psychiatry Res* 2019; **271**: 502–9.
- 542 24 Stewart-Brown S, Platt S, Tennant A, *et al.* The Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-
543 being Scale (WEMWBS): a valid and reliable tool for measuring mental well-being in
544 diverse populations and projects. *J Epidemiol Community Heal* 2011; **65**: A38–9.
- 545 25 Bech P, Timmerby N, Martiny K, Lunde M, Soendergaard S. Psychometric evaluation
546 of the Major Depression Inventory (MDI) as depression severity scale using the LEAD
547 (Longitudinal Expert Assessment of All Data) as index of validity. *BMC Psychiatry*
548 2015; **15**: 190.
- 549 26 Barnett AG, van der Pols JC, Dobson AJ. Regression to the mean: What it is and how
550 to deal with it. *Int J Epidemiol* 2005; **34**: 215–20.
- 551 27 Glymour MM, Weuve J, Berkman LF, Kawachi I, Robins JM. When is baseline
552 adjustment useful in analyses of change? An example with education and cognitive
553 change. *Am J Epidemiol* 2005; **162**: 267–78.
- 554 28 Van Breukelen GJP. ANCOVA versus change from baseline had more power in
555 randomized studies and more bias in nonrandomized studies. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2006;
556 **59**: 920–5.
- 557 29 Tu YK, Gunnell D, Gilthorpe MS. Simpson’s Paradox, Lord’s Paradox, and
558 Suppression Effects are the same phenomenon - The reversal paradox. *Emerg Themes*
559 *Epidemiol* 2008; **5**: 1.
- 560 30 Jacobsen TN, Nohr EA, Frydenberg M. Selection by socioeconomic factors into the
561 Danish National Birth Cohort. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2010; **25**: 349–55.
- 562

Figure 1. The data set up presented according to the development of the COVID-19 pandemic and following lockdowns in Denmark.



Statistics on hospitalization and deaths related to COVID-19 are based on official numbers from the Danish Health Authority and the Statens Serum Institut

Figure 2. Mean change from pre- to during lockdown [95% CI] in QoL and mental well-being, and proportion of change in loneliness stratified by gender and pre-existing depressive symptoms, respectively (longitudinal setup)






Figure 3. Regression of changes in QoL, mental well-being, and loneliness from pre- to during lockdown (longitudinal setup)


Quality of life



Mental well-being



Loneliness



*Repeated measures

Random effect estimates and 95% CI presented (N=32,985)


(Total number including repeated measures N=62,081)

All models were weighted by IPW baseline population 1, Figure S2 (N=67,346)

p-value for interaction between lockdown, gender, and pre-existing depressive symptoms (wave 1-8):

QoL (p<0.001), mental well-being (p<0.001), and loneliness (p<0.001)


Figure 4. Mean/ proportion [95% CI] of QoL, mental well-being, and loneliness stratified by gender and depressive symptoms, respectively (repeated cross-sectional setup)




P1= 1st period (January 1st to March 11th) / (January 1st to March 1st in 2021)
 P2= 2nd period (March 12th to May 26th)
 P3= 3rd period (May 27th to August 9th)
 P4= 4th period (August 10th to November 4th)
 P5= 5th period (November 5th to December 31st)

Figure 5. Regression of changes in QoL, mental well-being, and loneliness from pre- to during lockdown (repeated cross-sectional setup)


Quality of life



Mental well-being



Loneliness



Crude and adjusted estimates and 95% CI are presented (N=28,579)

*Adjusted for gender, period, household socio-occupational status, maternal age at childbirth, maternal smoking during pregnancy, educational enrolment, and housing composition.

All models were weighted by IPW baseline population 2, Figure S2 (N=58,638)

p-value for interaction between lockdown and depressive symptoms:

QoL (p<0.001), mental well-being (p=0.3365), and loneliness (p<0.001)