

1 **SUPPLEMENTARY**

2 **Young Healthcare Workers' Employment Status and Mental Distress over**

3 **SARS-CoV-2 in Bolivia**

4 Table A1. Sensitivity analysis: Results of Generalized Estimating Equations models
 5 for mental distress with threshold score 5/6 between baseline and follow-up.

Characteristics		Mental distress	
		N = 663 ⁰	
		Crude OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)
Sex	Male	1	1
	Female	1.13 (1.04–1.22)	1.62 (1.17–2.24)
Economic situation	Good	1	1
	Neither good nor bad	1.05 (0.96–1.15)	1.15 (0.80–1.65)
	Bad	1.17 (1.04–1.32)	1.85 (1.10–3.09)
Employment	No	1	1
	Yes	1.02 (0.72–1.44)	1.10 (0.75–1.62)
Study phase	Baseline: 2018	1	1
	Follow-up: 2022	1.31 (0.88–1.96)	1.70 (0.93–3.14)
Interaction	Not employed at baseline*	1	1
	Formally employed as HCW at follow-up	1.05 (0.11–9.78)	1.03 (0.15–6.86)

HCW: Healthcare workers; Mental distress: 12-item General Health Questionnaire threshold above 5 indicates a clinically relevant level of mental distress (range 0–12); Estimates are bold if CI excludes 1; ⁰Follow-up data available for N = 116; Adjusted for sex and economic situation; *Participants were still in academic training (medicine or nursing); Imputed data.

8 Table A2. Sensitivity analysis: Results of Generalized Estimating Equations models
 9 for mental distress with threshold score 4/5 between baseline and follow-up with
 10 identical exposure definition at both time points.

Characteristics		Mental distress	
		N = 663 ⁰	
		Crude OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)
Sex	Male	1	1
	Female	1.36 (0.56–3.31)	1.34 (0.62–2.89)
Economic situation	Good	1	1
	Neither good nor bad	1.44 (0.90–2.10)	1.39 (0.96–2.01)
	Bad	1.83 (0.91–3.69)	1.79 (0.92–3.42)
Employment	No	1	1
	Yes	0.89 (0.32–2.47)	1.01 (0.46–2.20)
Study phase	Baseline: 2018	1	1
	Follow-up: 2022	1.75 (0.73–4.17)	2.06 (0.66–6.46)
Interaction	Unemployed/insecurely employed at baseline*	1	1
	Formally employed as HCW at follow-up	1.65 (0.20–13.52)	1.79 (0.14–22.42)

HCW: Healthcare workers; Mental distress: 12-item General Health Questionnaire threshold above 4 indicates a clinically relevant level of mental distress (range 0–12); Estimates are bold if CI excludes 1; ⁰Follow-up data available for N = 116; Adjusted for sex and economic situation; *Employment was defined the same as at follow-up as an affirmative response to the question 'Is your work related to your profession?'; Imputed data.

11

12

13 Table A3. Sensitivity analysis: Results of Generalized Estimating Equations models
 14 for mental distress with threshold score 4/5 between baseline and follow-up,
 15 excluding those studying or being in training at follow-up.

Characteristics		Mental distress	
		N = 663 ⁰	
		Crude OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)
Sex	Male	1	1
	Female	1.71 (1.23–2.38)	1.67 (1.20–2.33)
Economic situation	Good	1	1
	Neither good nor bad	1.71 (1.19–2.45)	1.58 (1.09–2.28)
	Bad	2.07 (1.21–3.54)	1.94 (1.12–3.35)
Employment	No	1	1
	Yes	1.09 (0.76–1.57)	1.29 (0.86–1.94)
Study phase	Baseline: 2018	1	1
	Follow-up: 2022	1.38 (0.87–2.21)	3.37 (1.20–9.46)
Interaction	Not employed at baseline*	1	1
	Formally employed as HCW at follow-up	0.91 (0.12–7.03)	0.91 (0.09–8.76)

HCW: Healthcare workers; Mental distress: 12-item General Health Questionnaire threshold above 4 indicates a clinically relevant level of mental distress (range 0–12); Estimates are bold if CI excludes 1; ⁰Follow-up data available for N = 100 (excluding n = 16, who were studying or being in training at follow-up); Adjusted for sex and economic situation; *Participants were still in academic training (medicine or nursing); Imputed data.

18 Table A4. Sensitivity analysis: Results of Generalized Estimating Equations models
 19 for mental distress with mean GHQ-12 score between baseline and follow-up.

Characteristics		Mental distress	
		N = 663 ⁰	
		Crude OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)
Sex	Male	0	0
	Female	1.78 (0.79–2.76)	1.76 (0.79–2.72)
Economic situation	Good	0	0
	Neither good nor bad	0.99 (-0.13–2.12)	0.82 (-0.30–1.94)
	Bad	2.63 (1.09–4.17)	2.56 (1.02–4.10)
Employment	No	0	0
	Yes	-0.17 (-1.19–0.86)	0.09 (-1.02–1.20)
Study phase	Baseline: 2018	0	0
	Follow-up: 2022	1.07 (-0.75–2.21)	2.04 (0.48–3.61)
Interaction	Not employed at baseline*	0	0
	Formally employed as HCW at follow-up	0.11 (-2.56–2.80)	-0.04 (-3.18–3.10)

HCW: Healthcare workers; Mental distress: Higher scores of the mean 12-item General Health Questionnaire score (range 0–36) representing a higher level of mental distress; Estimates are bold if CI excludes 0; ⁰Follow-up data available for N = 116; Adjusted for sex and economic situation; *Participants were still in academic training (medicine or nursing); Imputed data.

22 Table A5. Sensitivity analysis: Results of Generalized Estimating Equations models
 23 for mental distress with threshold score 4/5 between baseline and follow-up with full
 24 data imputation.

Characteristics		Mental distress	
		N = 663 ^o	
		Crude OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)
Sex	Male	1	1
	Female	1.43 (0.58–3.56)	1.43 (0.61–3.33)
Economic situation	Good	1	1
	Neither good nor bad	1.34 (0.82–2.19)	1.27 (0.80–2.03)
	Bad	1.54 (0.67–3.58)	1.47 (0.67–3.25)
Employment	No	1	1
	Yes	1.08 (0.66–1.78)	1.33 (0.88–2.02)
Study phase	Baseline: 2018	1	1
	Follow-up: 2022	1.81 (0.73–4.50)	2.22 (0.77–6.43)
Interaction	Not employed at baseline*	1	1
	Formally employed as HCW at follow-up	1.70 (0.24–11.82)	1.78 (0.21–15.18)

HCW: Healthcare workers; Mental distress: 12-item General Health Questionnaire threshold above 4 indicates a clinically relevant level of mental distress (range 0–12); ^oComplete data available for baseline and follow-up; Adjusted for sex and economic situation; *Participants were still in academic training (medicine or nursing); Imputed data.