

## Commentary

# The Unintended Environmental Consequences on Public during Covid

Chenghai Behzadmehr\*

*Department of Public Health, University of Melbourne, Australia*

*\*Address Correspondence to Chenghai behzadmehr, E-mail:chenghaib123@hotmail.com*

**Received:** 31-January-2023; Manuscript No: JEM-23-93136; **Editor assigned:** 02-February-2023; PreQC No: JEM-23-93136 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 16-February-2023; QC No: JEM-23-93136; **Revised:** 21-February-2023; Manuscript No JEM-23-93136 (R); **Published:** 28-February-2023; **DOI:** 10.4303/JEM/236006

**Copyright:** © 2023 Chenghai behzadmehr. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

### Description

Multiple intricate and interrelated genetic, psychological, societal, and environmental variables affect mental health. As a result, cooperation between academic disciplines, involving environmental science, is necessary to create cutting-edge expertise in the field of mental health. A scoping survey of the articles on environmental impacts on mental health (which incorporates conditions of cognitive growth and decline) was carried out to determine the present addition of environmental science to this area. With input from specialists in environmental science and mental health, the evaluation process was created. 26 systematic analyzes on climate change, flooding, air pollution, and urban green space had been also taken into consideration. The scoping review included 202 English-language papers published between 2010 and 2020 (prior to the COVID-19 pandemic) on environmental themes that had not yet been the subject of recent systematic reviews.

Studies with little involvement from environmental scientists mainly concentrated on people in the USA, China, or Europe. The majority of environmental science study methodologies use quantitative strategies that draw on secondary databases or outdoor data. Self-report psychometric scales predominated in the assessment of mental wellness. Measures of ambient conditions or risks were frequently too general. (e.g., limited to the presence or absence of an environmental state). A study plan for environmental science's potential future addition to the field of mental health studies is laid out based on the results of the scoping review and our summary of the most recent reviews. This also contains suggestions. Governments all over the world have implemented a variety of measures to stop the spread of the SARS-CoV-2 virus since the COVID-19 pandemic began in early 2020. These measures

include both pharmacological and non-pharmaceutical initiatives. NPIs are non-pharmaceutical interventions in public health that include measures like lockdowns, stay-at-home directives, school closings, and travel limitations. Despite the fact that the goal of these NPIs was to reduce viral spread, new study suggests that they also had unintended effects on other facets of public health.

In order to better understand these unintended effects of NPIs, we conducted a narrative review of studies looking into them. We focused especially on mental health and lifestyle risk aspects for Non-Communicable Diseases (NCD), such as Physical Activity (PA), being overweight and obese, alcohol use, and tobacco use. Utilization of search terms like "COVID-19," "pandemic," "lockdowns," "mental health," "physical activity," and "obesity" were used to examine the scholarly literature. It was discovered that NPIs had serious negative effects on mental health, physical exercise, and overweight and obesity.

The effects on drinking and smoking varied significantly both within and between trials. Increased health disparities by age, sex/gender, financial position, pre-existing lifestyle, and place of living are implied by the variation in outcomes for various groups. In order to effectively evaluate the use of NPIs in pandemic control efforts, it is important to consider the possible negative effects on other facets of public health. Our results ought to be useful to upcoming pandemic reaction and preparation teams.

Following the affirmation of a Public Health Emergency Of International Concern (PHEIC) in accordance with the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020, governments all over the world implemented a variety of control measures, some

of which far exceeded the recommendations of the World Health Organization's (WHO's) Strategic and Technical Advisory Group on Infectious Hazards (STAG-IH) with respect to personal protective hygiene, social seclusion, and the wearing of face masks. These procedures, also characterized as Non-Pharmaceutical Interventions (NPIs), included "lock-downs," "stay-at-home" directives, "school closures," and "travel restrictions." These frequently involved strict restrictions on freedom of movement and, as a result, frequently restricted access to recreation and exercise facilities, green and blue areas (such as parks and beaches), shopping stores, job possibilities, and family members who lived far away.

Unprecedented and still partly continuing at the time of this writing, the use of NPIs to stop the transmission of a virus throughout the COVID-19 pandemic has endured pervasive.

Therefore, if equivalent initiatives are taken into account for future pandemics, we think it is crucial to take into account both the wider effects that these strategies have had for public health as well as their potential effects. In order to inform health policy decisions and maximise the net benefits to their respective populations and constituents, public health practitioners and policymakers should balance the risks of negative health consequences towards the likely assists of the same NPIs in the prevention of infectious diseases.

#### **Acknowledgement**

Authors do not have acknowledgments currently.

#### **Conflict of Interest**

There are no conflicts of interest.