



Non-response to postal survey is related to excess mortality: A register-based analysis of the Health and Social Support (HeSSup) Cohort Study, Finland

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2011-000657
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	25-Nov-2011
Complete List of Authors:	Suominen, Sakari; University of Turku, Department of Public Health Koskenvuo, Karoliina; The Social Insurance Institution of Finland, Sillanmaki, Lauri; University of Helsinki, Hjelt Institute, Department of Public Health Vahtera, Jussi; University of Turku, Department of Public Health Korkeila, Katariina; City of Raisio, Kivimaki, Mika; London Medical School, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, Mattila, Kari; University of Tampere, Center of General Practice Virtanen, Pekka; Tampere School of Public Health, University of Tampere Sumanen, Markku; University of Tampere, Rautava, Paivi; University of Turku, Department of Public Health Koskenvuo, Markku; University of Helsinki, Hjelt Institute, Department of Public Health
Primary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Research methods
Keywords:	EPIDEMIOLOGY, PUBLIC HEALTH, SOCIAL MEDICINE

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Non-response to postal survey is related to excess mortality: A**
4 **register-based analysis of the Health and Social Support (HeSSup) Cohort**
5 **Study, Finland**
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 Sakari Suominen contributed substantially to acquisition of data, the design of
13 the study and to the interpretation of the data, wrote the first draft of the ms and
14 revised it several times critically for important intellectual content. He has
15 approved the final version of the ms.
16
17

18
19
20 Karoliina Koskenvuo contributed substantially to acquisition of data, the design of
21 the study, carried out the first data analyses, contributed substantially to the
22 interpretation of the data and revised the ms critically several times for important
23 intellectual content. She has approved the final version of the ms.
24
25

26
27
28 Lauri Sillanmäki contributed substantially to acquisition of data, the design of the
29 study, carried out data analyses, contributed substantially to the interpretation of
30 the data and revised the ms critically several times for important intellectual
31 content. He has approved the final version of the ms.
32
33

34
35
36 Jussi Vahtera contributed substantially to the design of the study and to the
37 interpretation of the data and revised the ms critically several times for important
38 intellectual content. He has approved the final version of the ms.
39
40

41
42
43 Katariina Korkeila contributed substantially to acquisition of data, the design of
44 the study and to the interpretation of the data and revised the ms critically several
45 times for important intellectual content. She has approved the final version of the
46 ms.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Mika Kivimäki contributed substantially to design of the study and to the interpretation of the data and revised the ms critically several times for important intellectual content. He has approved the final version of the ms.

Kari J. Mattila contributed substantially to acquisition of data, the design of the study and to the interpretation of the data and revised the ms critically several times for important intellectual content. He has approved the final version of the ms.

Pekka J. Virtanen contributed substantially to the interpretation of the data and revised the ms critically several times for important intellectual content. He has approved the final version of the ms.

Markku Sumanen contributed substantially to the interpretation of the data and revised the ms critically several times for important intellectual content. He has approved the final version of the ms.

Päivi Rautava contributed substantially to acquisition of data, the interpretation of the data and revised the ms critically several times for important intellectual content. She has approved the final version of the ms.

Markku Koskenvuo contributed substantially to acquisition of data, to the design of the study and to the interpretation of the data and revised the ms critically several times for important intellectual content. He has approved the final version of the ms.

ABSTRACT

Objective

To examine difference in mortality between postal survey respondents and non-respondents.

Design

A prospective cohort study with baseline survey in 1998 and comprehensive linkage to national mortality registers until 2005, the Health and Social Support (HeSSup) study.

Setting

A population based postal survey of the working aged population in Finland in 1998

Participants

The original random sample comprised 64,797 working-aged individuals in Finland (20-24, 30-34, 40-44, 50-54 years of age; 32,059 women and 32,716 men), yielding 25,898 (40.0%) responses in the baseline postal survey in 1998.

Primary outcome measure

Registry based primary causes of death encoded with the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-10)

Results

In women, hazard ratio for total mortality was 1.75 (95% confidence interval 1.40 - 2.19) times higher among the non-respondents compared to the respondents. In men, non-response was associated with a 1.41 fold (1.21 - 1.65) excess risk of total mortality. Non-response associated in certain age groups with deaths due to diseases in women and with deaths due to external causes in men. The most prominent excess mortality was seen for total mortality for both genders and for mortality due to external causes among men.

Conclusions

Postal surveys can still be considered a valid method for population based health research, but they result in slight underestimation of illness prevalence, especially illness involving mental health in men.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Word Count of Abstract 220

Keywords

Follow-up Studies, Non-respondents, Mortality, Health Surveys, Registries

Article summary

Article focus

Women and individuals from upper social strata tend to participate more actively in postal health surveys

What this exactly means in terms of health selection among respondents is unclear

Postal health surveys are believed to produce underestimates of illness prevalence

Key message

Total mortality was significantly higher among non-respondents compared to respondents during a 7 year follow-up among a total Finnish nationwide sample in working age comprising almost 65 000 individuals

The excess mortality observed was moderate. Among men it was explained by external causes, whereas among women it was due to diseases and was only seen in the age group 50 – 54 years

Postal surveys can still be considered a valid method for population based health research, but they result in slight underestimation of illness prevalence, especially illness involving mental health in men

Strengths and limitations of the study

The linkage to mortality data was successful for virtually all individuals of the original sample comprising nearly 65 000 individuals. The sample size secures the reliability of the conclusions drawn. Furthermore, the registry data on mortality in Finland can be considered as reliable. To the best of the authors' knowledge a corresponding study based on a as large a sample as in this study has not previously been carried out.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Inaccuracy of the final diagnosis of death is possible but nevertheless the data can be considered as reliable as registry data based on clinical work generally can become. Moreover, there is no support for the view that inaccuracy of diagnosis of death would systematically be associated with the response status of the study members.

For peer review only

INTRODUCTION

Word count without Abstract, Tables and References 1791

Response rates in health related postal surveys are declining in the Western world. In the Nordic countries the situation has been somewhat better compared to the rest of Europe and the U.S.A., but recently even there declining trends have been observed [1, 2]. Previous studies have suggested that women, older persons and persons from upper social strata tend to participate more actively in health surveys compared with the rest [3 - 11]. However, not all studies have consistently supported these observations [10, 12, 13]. Furthermore, recent studies have extended analysis of non-response beyond demographic variables showing a lower rate of hospital admissions [2] and mortality among the respondents [14, 15].

Studies on causes for non-participation to health surveys have revealed incorrect address or incorrect delivery by post to contribute to some of the drop out [5, 8, 16]. The non-respondents themselves have reported various kinds of reasons for their behaviour, such as gaining no benefit for participation [5, 16], no interest in the topic [7, 8, 16, 17], feeling of intrusion of privacy [8], lack of time [7, 8, 17], forgetfulness [8], and present illness [17]. Surveys including questions on issues perceived as intimate have often decreased participation rates [18]. It has also been speculated that late respondents might resemble more the non-participants [5, 17, 19] but to date decisive evidence for this pattern is lacking [20]. In follow-up studies, participation has been explored according to the number of rounds

1
2
3 the individual has taken part in [14] and more occasions of non-response found
4
5 to be positively associated with subsequent mortality rates. On the whole, health
6
7 selection among participants might decrease the generalizability of prevalence
8
9 estimates but this effect is until now not satisfactorily described [21]. However,
10
11 even in the case of health selection the results related to the strength of
12
13 association between the variables studied need not necessarily be biased [21].
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 A non-response analysis of the postal survey of the population-based Health and
21
22 Social Support (HeSSup) study - which achieved a relatively modest (40 %)
23
24 response rate [9] - replicated previous findings on the differences in demographic
25
26 characteristics between respondents and non-respondents. The aim of the
27
28 present study was to extend these analyses to explore whether survey non-
29
30 respondents differ from the respondents in terms of mortality (all-cause, disease
31
32 mortality, mortality for external causes).
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

40
41
42
43 The study is based on the complete sample (N=64, 797) of the Health and Social
44
45 Support (HeSSup) prospective mail survey initiated in 1998. The concurrent joint
46
47 Ethics Committee of the University of Turku and the Turku University Central
48
49 Hospital considered approval not necessary for a normal cohort study, but all
50
51 participants were requested to sign a consent form containing information about
52
53 the study and to grant permission to allow subsequent studies with the same
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 data set and possibility to link with national health registries. The sample
4
5 represented the concurrent age groups of 20-24, 30-34, 40-44 and 50-54 years
6
7 of age in Finland [9]. However, by purpose the Swedish speaking Finns (5% of
8
9 the general population) as well as the Turku region were slightly
10
11 overrepresented. Of the 64,797 persons, 22 could not be included in the present
12
13 study since the follow-up had to be set to begin from the first death among
14
15 respondents which was September 22nd 1998. Certain cases of deaths among
16
17 non respondents had occurred already earlier and potentially before sending out
18
19 the initial questionnaire. Totally 25,898 satisfactory responses were returned. In
20
21 2007, the survey material was by means of an unique social security number
22
23 linked to Statistics Finland data on mortality between the years 1998 and 2005.
24
25 Totally 1 174 cases of deaths among 25,290 observations that could be linked
26
27 with registry data were identified. Moreover, mortality data of non-respondents
28
29 from the same time period was likewise as for respondents obtained from
30
31 Statistics Finland and further analyzed by age group and gender.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 The outcome variable was primary causes of death encoded with the
42
43 International Classification of Diseases (ICD-10). Mortality for external causes
44
45 (S00 - Y98) and disease mortality (A00 – R99) were examined separately. The
46
47 differences in mortality between non-respondents and respondents were
48
49 analysed separately for women and men using Cox proportional hazards
50
51 regression. The analyses were carried out by the research group. Hazard ratios
52
53 (HR) with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) for mortality (total, external causes,
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 disease) of non-respondents vs. respondents according to age (1998) were
4
5 reported. Cox proportional hazard assumptions were tested by visual
6
7 examination of log-minus-log plots showing parallelism among the selected strata
8
9 variable (responding status). The statistical analysis was performed by the SAS
10
11
12
13 ® software 9.2. for Windows.

14 15 16 17 **RESULTS**

18
19
20
21
22 Between the years 1998 to 2005, 1,174 individuals belonging to the complete
23
24 sample died (Table 1). Of the deaths, 70% occurred in men.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Demographics of respondents and non-respondents and number of deaths during follow-up from 1998 to 2005 (N and %).

	Respondents		Non-respondents		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender						
Women	14,922	59.0	17,137	43.4	32,059	49.5
Men	10,368	41.0	22,348	56.6	32,716	50.5
Total	25,290	100.0	39,485	100.0	64,775	100.0
Age in 1998						
20-24 y	6,783	26.8	9,405	23.8	16,188	25.0
30-34 y	5,981	23.7	10,267	26.0	16,248	25.1
40-44 y	6,073	24.0	10,198	25.8	16,271	25.1
50-54 y	6,453	25.5	9,615	24.4	16,068	24.8
Total	25,290	100.0	39,485	100.0	64,775	100.0
Number of deaths by gender	N	%	N	%	N	%
In women	110	0.7	240	1.4	350	1.1
In men	218	2.1	606	2.7	824	2.5
Total	328	1.3	846	2.1	1,174	1.8
Number of deaths by age in 1998						
20-24 y	21	0.3	47	0.5	68	0.4
30-34 y	38	0.6	105	1.0	143	0.8
40-44 y	85	1.4	252	2.5	337	2.1
50-54 y	184	2.9	442	4.6	626	3.9
Total	328	1.3	846	2.1	1,174	1.8
Number of deaths from external causes						
In women	26	0.2	48	0.3	74	0.2
In men	55	0.5	217	1.0	272	0.8
Total	81	0.3	265	0.7	346	0.5
Number of deaths from external causes by age in 1998						
20-24 y	10	<0.1	32	<0.1	42	<0.1
30-34 y	16	<0.1	66	0.2	82	0.1
40-44 y	22	<0.1	90	0.2	112	0.2
50-54 y	33	0.1	77	0.2	110	0.2
Total	81	0.3	265	0.7	346	0.5

Table 1 continued. Demographics of respondents and non-respondents and number of deaths during follow-up from 1998 to 2005 (N and %).

	Respondents		Non-respondents		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number of deaths due to diseases						
In women	84	0.6	192	1.1	276	0.9
In men	163	1.6	389	1.7	552	1.7
Total	247	1.0	581	1.5	828	1.3
Number of deaths due to diseases by age in 1998						
20-24 y	11	<0.1	15	<0.1	26	<0.1
30-34 y	22	<0.1	39	<0.1	61	<0.1
40-44 y	63	0.2	162	0.4	225	0.3
50-54 y	151	0.6	365	0.9	516	0.8
Total	247	1.0	581	1.5	828	1.3

Total mortality was higher for non-respondent women in age group 50-54 years and for non-respondent men in age group 40-44 and 50-54 years and for each gender with all age groups combined. In analyses combining women and men, excess total mortality associated with non-response was observed in age groups 40-44 and 50-54 when age groups were examined separately as well as when all observations were combined (Table 2). Non-respondent men had a higher mortality for external causes in age groups 30-34 and 40-44 years and with all age groups combined. In analyses with genders combined, this was seen in age groups 30-34 and 40-44 years and when all observations were combined. In women, no statistically significant differences in mortality for external causes were detected (Table 3). Non-respondent women showed significantly higher disease-related mortality in age group 50-54 years as well as when all age groups were combined. The same held true for both genders when age groups 40-44 and 50-54 years were examined separately as well as when all

observations were combined. On the other hand, in separate analyses for men non-respondents showed a slightly increased disease mortality compared to respondents only when all age groups were combined (Table 4).

Table 2. Hazard ratios for total mortality of non-respondents vs. respondents and the 95% CIs according to gender and age at the beginning of the follow-up in 1998.

Non-respondents vs. respondents (=1.00)	Age in 1998 20-24	Age in 1998 30-34	Age in 1998 40-44	Age in 1998 50-54	Total age or age & gender adjusted
Women	1.00 (0.34-2.97)	1.45 (0.77-2.73)	1.40 (0.93-2.10)	2.17 (1.58-2.98)	1.75 (1.40-2.19)
Men	1.28 (0.70-2.34)	1.41 (0.89-2.24)	1.71 (1.25-2.35)	1.31 (1.07-1.61)	1.41 (1.21-1.65)
Total gender or age & gender adjusted	1.21 (0.71-2.04)	1.42 (0.98-2.07)	1.59 (1.24-2.04)	1.54 (1.29-1.83)	1.52 (1.34-1.73)

Statistically significant associations are in bold.

Table 3. Hazard ratios for deaths due to external causes in non-respondents vs. respondents and the 95% CIs according to gender and age at the beginning of the follow-up in 1998.

Non-respondents vs. respondents (=1.00)	Age in 1998 20-24	Age in 1998 30-34	Age in 1998 40-44	Age in 1998 50-54	Total age or age & gender adjusted
Women	4.65 (0.52-41.62)	1.94 (0.68-5.50)	1.38 (0.58-3.28)	1.18 (0.57-2.45)	1.50 (0.93-2.42)
Men	1.36 (0.64-2.88)	2.04 (1.07-3.90)	2.42 (1.37-4.28)	1.63 (0.99-2.67)	1.87 (1.39-2.52)
Total gender or age & gender adjusted	1.61 (0.78-3.30)	2.01 (1.16-3.49)	2.07 (1.30-3.31)	1.47 (0.98-2.22)	1.78 (1.39-2.29)

Statistically significant associations are in bold.

Table 4. Hazard ratios for disease mortality of non-respondents vs. respondents and the 95% CIs according to gender and age at the beginning of the follow-up in 1998.

Non-respondents vs. respondents (=1.00)	Age in 1998 20-24	Age in 1998 30-34	Age in 1998 40-44	Age in 1998 50-54	Total age or age & gender adjusted
Women	0.39 (0.08-1.92)	1.21 (0.54-2.69)	1.41 (0.88-2.23)	2.46 (1.73-3.52)	1.83 (1.41-2.36)
Men	1.13 (0.40-3.18)	0.83 (0.42-1.66)	1.42 (0.97-2.07)	1.25 (0.99-1.56)	1.25 (1.04-1.50)
Total gender or age & gender adjusted	0.81 (0.37-1.80)	0.98 (0.58-1.67)	1.41 (1.05-1.89)	1.55 (1.28-1.87)	1.42 (1.23-1.65)

Statistically significant associations are in bold.

DISCUSSION

In this large population-based epidemiological study, comparison of mortality of non-respondents with respondents showed, as expected, a higher mortality among the former group. The differences between respondents and non-respondents, however, were not very large and of quite similar magnitude for both genders although with varying causes. Among women the greatest differences were seen in disease mortality in the oldest age group of initially 50–54 years of age. The greatest differences for men were caused by external causes of death and involved age groups 30- 34 and 40-44 years.

Postal surveys are frequently used in population based health research. The impact of health selection on the results has been studied but not very

1
2
3 extensively . An affirmative view on the potential demographic difference
4
5 between respondents and non-respondents is still lacking. According to previous
6
7 findings [3, 8, 9], respondents tend to be somewhat healthier and report a more
8
9 favourable health behaviour compared to non-respondents. However, the bias
10
11 caused by this was limited and applied mainly to health problems or risk
12
13 behaviours that generally are not eagerly communicated to others, such as
14
15 mental problems or binge drinking. From previous studies it is also known that
16
17 women as well as those well off in the society tend to participate more actively in
18
19 health related survey research on the whole. Hence, this might result in under-
20
21 estimation of the prevalence of health problems common among men as well as
22
23 individuals from lower social strata. Results from a previous non-response
24
25 analysis of the initial phase of this study supports this view [9]. Women as well as
26
27 individuals with high level of education were somewhat over represented among
28
29 respondents but no clear health-related selection could be shown. According to
30
31 our present results 7 years later the potential health-related selection can be
32
33 further clarified. In Finland, mortality for external causes is intimately associated
34
35 with alcohol consumption and alcoholism [22]. As could be expected, we could
36
37 see a significantly higher mortality for external causes among male non-
38
39 respondents as compared with the respondents.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Moreover, in previous studies [23] it has also been pointed out that non-
51
52 respondents are not necessarily a homogenic group but can differ internally, e.g.
53
54 depending on to which wave of the survey if any they have taken part in. Also the
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 correspondence between late respondents and total non-respondents has been
4 questioned [20].
5
6
7
8
9

10 Given the health selection related to postal surveys it has to be kept in mind that
11 population studies usually do not focus solely on prevalence estimates anymore
12 but more or less on potential risk or protective factors of certain health problems.
13 From previous research [21] there are indications that even if prevalence
14 estimates are not accurate the associations between the variables studies are
15 not necessarily biased. This gives further justification to continue postal surveys
16 in health research since the results can help us understand the etiology and
17 prevention process of a certain kind of disease.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **Strengths and limitations of the study**

33
34 A major strength of this study is that the linkage to mortality data was successful
35 for virtually all individuals of the original sample. Furthermore, the registry data
36 on mortality in Finland could be considered as quite reliable. All deaths with
37 suspicion of an external cause and in the age groups studied are investigated by
38 autopsy. Naturally, inaccuracy concerning the final diagnosis might be present
39 but nevertheless the data can be considered as reliable as registry data based
40 on clinical medical work generally can become. Moreover, there is no reason to
41 assume that problems in reliability of the diagnoses would systematically be
42 associated with the response status of the study members. The legislation in
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Finland enables use of mortality data for research purposes and thus we were
4
5 able by ourselves to perform a mortality analysis for all respondents.
6
7
8
9

10 The large sample size secures that the conclusions drawn from the statistical
11
12 analyses are reliable and can not have been caused by random effects. To the
13
14 best of our knowledge a corresponding study based on as large a sample as in
15
16 this study has previously not been carried out.
17
18
19

20 21 22 **Conclusions** 23 24 25

26
27 Total mortality was moderately higher for the non-respondents of a nationwide
28
29 mail survey compared to the respondents in both genders. For women this was
30
31 mostly due to disease mortality in age group 50-54 years but for men due to
32
33 mortality for external causes in age groups 30-34 and 40-44 years. The most
34
35 prominent excess mortality was seen for total mortality for both genders and for
36
37 mortality due to external causes among men. Selection by health, especially
38
39 mental health in men can cause bias in health related population surveys.
40
41
42

43 However, this applies to prevalence estimates and does not necessarily
44
45 jeopardize results from studies on risk and protective factors. Hence, it seems
46
47 justified to continue postal surveys in health research in order to improve
48
49 understanding of etiology and prevention of diseases.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

REFERENCES

1. Helakorpi S., Prättälä R., Uutela A. Suomalaisen aikuisväestön terveystäyttyminen ja terveys, kevät 2007. [Health Behaviour and Health among the Finnish Adult Population. Spring 2007] Publications of the National Public Health Institute. 2008;B 6.
2. Kjølner M, Thoning H. Characteristics of non-response in the Danish Health Interview Surveys, 1987-1994. *Eur J Public Health* 2005;**15**(5):528-35 doi: 10.1093/eurpub/cki023 [Advance Access published online July 28, 2005].
3. Cottler LB, Zipp JF, Robins LN, et al. Difficult-to-recruit respondents and their effect on prevalence estimates in an epidemiologic survey. *Am J Epidemiol* 1987;**125**(2):329-39.
4. Jacobsen BK, Thelle DS. The Tromsø Heart Study: responders and non-responders to a health questionnaire, do they differ? *Scand J Soc Med* 1988;**16**(2):101-4.
5. Bakke P, Gulsvik A, Lilleng P, et al. Postal survey on airborne occupational exposure and respiratory disorders in Norway: causes and consequences of non-response. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 1990;**44**(4):316-20.
6. Jooste PL, Yach D, Steenkamp HJ, et al. Drop-out and newcomer bias in a community cardiovascular follow-up study. *Int J Epidemiol* 1990;**19**(2):284-9.

- 1
2
3 7. Brussaard JH, Brants HA, Bouman M, et al. The study population: general
4 characteristics and potential confounding factors. *Eur J Clin Nutr* 1997;**51** Suppl
5 3:S19-24.
6
7
- 8
9
10
11 8. Rönmark E, Lundqvist A, Lundbäck B, et al. Non-responders to a postal
12 questionnaire on respiratory symptoms and diseases. *Eur J Epidemiol*
13 1999;**15**(3):293-9.
14
15
16
17
- 18
19
20 9. Korkeila K, Suominen S, Ahvenainen J, et al. Non-response and related
21 factors in a nation-wide health survey. *Eur J Epidemiol*. 2001;**17**(11):991-9.
22
23
24
- 25
26 10. van den Akker M, Buntinx F, Metsemakers JF, et al. Morbidity in responders
27 and non-responders in a register-based population survey. *Fam Pract*
28 1998;**15**(3):261-3.
29
30
31
32
- 33
34 11. Sonne-Holm S, Sørensen TI, Jensen G, et al. Influence of fatness,
35 intelligence, education and sociodemographic factors on response rate in a
36 health survey. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 1989;**43**(4):369-74.
37
38
39
- 40
41 12. Asch DA, Jedrzewski MK, Christakis NA. Response rates to mail surveys
42 published in medical journals. *J Clin Epidemiol* 1997;**50**(10):1129-36.
43
44
45
46
47
- 48
49 13. Heilbrun LK, Ross PD, Wasnich RD, et al. Characteristics of respondents and
50 nonrespondents in a prospective study of osteoporosis. *J Clin Epidemiol*
51 1991;**44**(3):233-9.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 14. Ferrie JE, Kivimäki M, Singh-Manoux A, et al. Non-response to baseline,
4 non-response to follow-up and mortality in the Whitehall II cohort. *Int J Epidemiol*
5
6 2009;**38**(3):831-7 doi:10.1093/ije/dyp153 [Advance Access publication 5 March
7
8 2009].
9
10
11
12
13
14 15. Mattila VM, Parkkari J, Rimpelä A. Adolescent survey non-response and later
15 risk of death. A prospective cohort study of 78 609 persons with 11-year follow-
16
17 up. *BMC Public Health* 2007;**7**(1):87 doi:10.1186/1471-2458-7-87 [Published: 22
18
19 May 2007].
20
21
22
23
24
25 16. Foster K, Campbell D, Crum J, et al. Non-response in a population study
26 after an environmental disaster. *Public Health* 1995;**109**(4):267-73.
27
28
29
30
31 17. Janzon L, Hanson BS, Isacson SO, et al. Factors influencing participation in
32 health surveys. Results from prospective population study 'Men born in 1914' in
33 Malmö, Sweden. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 1986;**40**(2):174-7.
34
35
36
37
38
39 18. Dunne MP, Martin NG, Bailey JM, et al. Participation bias in a sexuality
40 survey: psychological and behavioural characteristics of responders and non-
41 responders. *Int J Epidemiol* 1997;**26**(4):844-54.
42
43
44
45
46
47 19. Tennant A, Badley EM. A confidence interval approach to investigating non-
48 response bias and monitoring response to postal questionnaires. *J Epidemiol*
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 20. Lahaut, V. M. H. C. J., Jansen HAM, van de Mheen D, et al. Estimating non-
4 response bias in a survey on alcohol consumption: comparison of response
5 waves. *Alcohol Alcohol* 2003;**38**(2):128-34 [doi:10.1093/alcalc/agg044].
6
7

8
9
10
11 21. Martikainen P, Laaksonen M, Piha K, et al. Does survey non-response bias
12 the association between occupational social class and health? *Scand J Public*
13 *Health* 2007;**35**(2):212-5 [doi:10.1080/14034940600996563].
14
15
16

17
18
19 22. Koskenvuo M, Kaprio J, Kesaniemi A, et al. Alcohol-related diseases
20 associated with ischaemic heart disease: a three-year follow-up of middle-aged
21 male hospital patients. *Alcohol Alcohol* 1986;**21**(3):251-6.
22
23
24

25
26
27 23. Boersma F, Eefsting JA, van den Brink W, et al. Characteristics of non-
28 responders and the impact of non-response on prevalence estimates of
29 dementia. *Int J Epidemiol* 1997;**26**(5):1055-62.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Acknowledgements
5
6
7

8 The study was supported by the Academy of Finland (three different decisions on
9
10 funding)
11

12
13
14 The authors do not declare any competing interests
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cohort studies*

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	3
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	3
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any pre-specified hypotheses	6
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	7-8
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	7-8
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	7-8
		(b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	8
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	8
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	7-8
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	7-8
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	8
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	8-9
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	8
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	7-8
		(d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	7-8
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	
Results			

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—e.g. numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	7-8
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	7-8
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (e.g. demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	Table 1, 10-11
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	Table 1, 10-11
		(c) Summarise follow-up time (e.g., average and total amount)	7-8, Table 1, 10-11
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	Table 1, 10-11
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (e.g., 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	Table 2-4, 12-13
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	7-8
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—e.g. analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	13
Limitations			
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	13-16
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	14-16
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	21

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.



Non-response in a nationwide follow-up postal survey in Finland: A register-based mortality analysis of respondents and non-respondents of the Health and Social Support (HeSSup) Study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2011-000657.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	09-Jan-2012
Complete List of Authors:	Suominen, Sakari; University of Turku, Department of Public Health Koskenvuo, Karoliina; The Social Insurance Institution of Finland, Sillanmaki, Lauri; University of Helsinki, Hjelt Institute, Department of Public Health Vahtera, Jussi; University of Turku, Department of Public Health Korkeila, Katariina; City of Raisio, Kivimaki, Mika; London Medical School, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, Mattila, Kari; University of Tampere, Center of General Practice Virtanen, Pekka; Tampere School of Public Health, University of Tampere Sumanen, Markku; University of Tampere, Rautava, Paivi; University of Turku, Department of Public Health Koskenvuo, Markku; University of Helsinki, Hjelt Institute, Department of Public Health
Primary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Research methods
Keywords:	EPIDEMIOLOGY, PUBLIC HEALTH, SOCIAL MEDICINE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Non-response in a nationwide follow-up postal survey in Finland: A register-based mortality analysis of respondents and non-respondents of the Health and Social Support (HeSSup) Study.

All authors critically revised the paper for important intellectual content and approved the final version.

Deleted: Non-response to postal survey is related to excess mortality: A register-based analysis of the Health and Social Support (HeSSup) Cohort Study, Finland ¶

Deleted: Sakari Suominen contributed substantially to acquisition of data, the design of the study and to the interpretation of the data, wrote the first draft of the ms and revised it several times critically for important intellectual content. He has approved the final version of the ms.¶

Karoliina Koskenvuo contributed substantially to acquisition of data, the design of the study, carried out the first data analyses, contributed substantially to the interpretation of the data and revised the ms critically several times for important intellectual content. She has approved the final version of the ms.¶

Lauri Sillanmäki contributed substantially to acquisition of data, the design of the study, carried out data analyses, contributed substantially to the interpretation of the data and revised the ms critically several times for important intellectual content. He has approved the final version of the ms.¶

Jussi Vahtera contributed substantially to the design of the study and to the interpretation of the data and revised the ms critically several times for important intellectual content. He has approved the final version of the ms.¶

Katariina Korkeila contributed substantially to acquisition of data, the design of the study and to the interpretation of the data and revised the ms critically several times for important intellectual content. She has approved the final version of the ms.¶

Mika Kivimäki contributed substantially to design of the study and to the interpretation of the data and revised the ms critically several times for important intellectual content. He has approved the final version of the ms.¶

Kari J. Mattila contributed substantially to acquisition of data, the design of the study and to the interpretation of the data and revised the ms critically several times for important intellectual content. He has approved the final version of the ms.¶

Pekka J. Virtanen contributed substantially to the interpretation of the data and revised the ms critically several times for important intellectual content. He has approved the final version of the ms.¶

Markku Sumanen contributed substantially to the interpretation of the data and revised the ms critically several times for important intellectual content. He has approved the final version of the ms.¶

Päivi Rautava contributed substantially to acquisition of data, the interpretation of the data and revised the ms critically several times for important intellectual content. She has approved the final version of the ms.¶

Markku Koskenvuo contributed substantially to acquisition of data, to the design of the study and to the interpretation of the data and revised the ms critically several times for important intellectual content. He has approved the final version of the ms.¶

ABSTRACT

Objective

To examine difference in mortality between postal survey non-respondents and respondents.

Deleted: non-

Design

A prospective cohort study with baseline survey in 1998 and comprehensive linkage to national mortality registers until 2005, the Health and Social Support (HeSSup) study.

Setting

A population based postal survey of the working aged population in Finland in 1998

Participants

The original random sample comprised 64,797 working-aged individuals in Finland (20-24, 30-34, 40-44, 50-54 years of age; 32,059 women and 32,716 men), yielding 25,898 (40.0%) responses in the baseline postal survey in 1998.

Primary outcome measure

Registry based primary causes of death encoded with the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-10)

Results

In women, hazard ratio for total mortality was 1.75 (95% confidence interval 1.40 - 2.19) times higher among the non-respondents compared to the respondents.

In men, non-response was associated with a 1.41 fold (1.21 - 1.65) excess risk of total mortality. Non-response associated in certain age groups with deaths due to diseases in women and with deaths due to external causes in men. The most prominent excess mortality was seen for total mortality for both genders and for mortality due to external causes among men.

Conclusions

Postal surveys result in slight underestimation of illness prevalence, especially illness involving mental health in men.

Deleted: can still be considered a valid method for population based health research, but they

Word Count of Abstract 207,

Deleted: 20

Keywords

Follow-up Studies, Non-respondents, Mortality, Health Surveys, Registries

Article summary

Article focus

Women and individuals from upper social strata tend to participate more actively in postal health surveys

What this exactly means in terms of health selection among respondents is unclear

Postal health surveys are believed to produce underestimates of illness prevalence

Key message

Total mortality was consistently and for women in the age group ≥ 50 years and for men in the age groups ≥ 40 years significantly higher among non-respondents compared to respondents during a 7 year follow-up among a total Finnish nationwide sample in working age comprising almost 65 000 individuals

The excess mortality observed was 1.5 – 2 fold. Among men it was explained by external causes, whereas among women it was due to diseases and was statistically significant only in the age group 50 – 54 years

Deleted: moderate

Deleted: only seen

Postal surveys result in slight underestimation of illness prevalence, especially illness involving mental health in men

Deleted: can still be considered a valid method for population based health research, but they

Strengths and limitations of the study

The linkage to mortality data was successful for virtually all individuals of the original sample comprising nearly 65 000 individuals. The sample size secures the reliability of the conclusions drawn. Furthermore, the registry data on mortality in Finland can be considered as reliable. To the best of the authors' knowledge a corresponding study based on a as large a sample as in this study has not previously been carried out.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Some inaccuracy concerning the final diagnosis of death is possible. A further study limitation is that data of socioeconomic status or educational level of non-respondents was not available and hence adjustments of the statistical analyses for these variables was not possible.

Deleted: Inaccuracy of the final diagnosis of death is possible but nevertheless the data can be considered as reliable as registry data based on clinical work generally can become. Moreover, there is no support for the view that inaccuracy of diagnosis of death would systematically be associated with the response status of the study members.¶

For peer review only

INTRODUCTION

Word count without Abstract, Tables and References 1703

Deleted: 91

Response rates in health related postal surveys are declining in the Western world. In the Nordic countries the situation has been somewhat better compared to the rest of Europe and the U.S.A., but recently even there declining trends have been observed [1, 2]. Previous studies have suggested that women, older persons and persons from upper social strata tend to participate more actively in health surveys compared with the rest [3 - 11] However, not all studies have consistently supported these observations [10, 12, 13]. Furthermore, recent studies have extended analysis of non-response beyond demographic variables showing lower rate of hospital admissions [2], mortality and maternal smoking during pregnancy among the participants as compared to non-participants [14, 15].

Deleted: a

Deleted: and

Deleted: responden

Studies on causes for non-participation to health surveys have revealed incorrect address or incorrect delivery by post to contribute to some of the drop out [5, 8, 16]. The non-respondents themselves have reported various kinds of reasons for their behaviour, such as gaining no benefit for participation [5, 16], no interest in the topic [7, 8, 16, 17], feeling of intrusion of privacy [8], lack of time [7, 8, 17], forgetfulness [8], and present illness [17]. Surveys including questions on issues perceived as intimate have often decreased participation rates [18]. It has also been speculated that late respondents might resemble more the non-participants [5, 17, 19] but to date decisive evidence for this pattern is lacking [20]. In follow-

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 up studies, participation has been explored according to the number of rounds
9 the individual has taken part in [14] and more occasions of non-response found
10 to be positively associated with subsequent mortality rates. On the whole, health
11 selection among participants might decrease the generalizability of prevalence
12 estimates but this effect is until now not satisfactorily described [21]. However,
13 even in the case of health selection the results related to the strength of
14 association between the variables studied need not necessarily be biased [15,
15 21].
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 A non-response analysis of the postal survey of the population-based Health and
26 Social Support (HeSSup) study - which achieved a relatively modest (40 %)
27 response rate [9] - replicated previous findings on the differences in demographic
28 characteristics between respondents and non-respondents. The aim of the
29 present study was to extend these analyses to explore whether survey non-
30 respondents differ from the respondents in terms of mortality (all-cause, disease
31 mortality, mortality for external causes).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

42
43
44
45 The study is based on the complete sample (N=64, 797) of the Health and Social
46 Support (HeSSup) prospective mail survey initiated in 1998. The concurrent joint
47 Ethics Committee of the University of Turku and the Turku University Central
48 Hospital considered approval not necessary for a normal cohort study, but all
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 participants were requested to sign a consent form containing information about
9 the study and to grant permission to allow subsequent studies with the same
10 data set and possibility to link with national health registries. The sample
11 represented the concurrent age groups of 20-24, 30-34, 40-44 and 50-54 years
12 of age in Finland [9]. However, by purpose the Swedish speaking Finns (5% of
13 the general population) as well as the Turku region were slightly
14 overrepresented. Of the 64,797 persons, 22 could not be included in the present
15 study since the follow-up had to be set to begin from the first death among
16 respondents which was September 22nd 1998. Certain cases of deaths among
17 non-respondents had occurred already earlier and potentially before sending out
18 the initial questionnaire. Totally 25,898 satisfactory responses were returned. In
19 2007, the survey material was by means of an unique social security number
20 linked to Statistics Finland data on mortality between the years 1998 and 2005.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Totally 1,174 cases of deaths among 25,290 observations that could be linked with registry data were identified. Moreover, mortality data of non-respondents from the same time period was likewise as for respondents obtained from Statistics Finland and further analyzed by age group and gender.

Deleted:

Deleted:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 regression. The analyses were carried out by the research group. Hazard ratios
9 (HR) with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) for mortality (total, external causes,
10 disease) of non-respondents vs. respondents according to age (1998) were
11 reported. Cox proportional hazard assumptions were tested by visual
12 examination of log-minus-log plots showing parallelism among the selected strata
13 variable (responding status). The statistical analysis was performed by the SAS
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

® software 9.2. for Windows.

RESULTS

Between the years 1998 to 2005, 1,174 individuals belonging to the complete sample died (Table 1). Of the deaths, 70% occurred in men.

Table 1. Demographics of respondents and non-respondents and number of deaths during follow-up from 1998 to 2005 (N and %).

	Respondents		Non-respondents		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender						
Women	14,922	59.0	17,137	43.4	32,059	49.5
Men	10,368	41.0	22,348	56.6	32,716	50.5
Total	25,290	100.0	39,485	100.0	64,775	100.0
Age in 1998						
20-24 y	6,783	26.8	9,405	23.8	16,188	25.0
30-34 y	5,981	23.7	10,267	26.0	16,248	25.1
40-44 y	6,073	24.0	10,198	25.8	16,271	25.1
50-54 y	6,453	25.5	9,615	24.4	16,068	24.8
Total	25,290	100.0	39,485	100.0	64,775	100.0
Number of deaths by gender	N	%	N	%	N	%
In women	110	0.7	240	1.4	350	1.1
In men	218	2.1	606	2.7	824	2.5
Total	328	1.3	846	2.1	1,174	1.8
Number of deaths by age in 1998						
20-24 y	21	0.3	47	0.5	68	0.4
30-34 y	38	0.6	105	1.0	143	0.8
40-44 y	85	1.4	252	2.5	337	2.1
50-54 y	184	2.9	442	4.6	626	3.9
Total	328	1.3	846	2.1	1,174	1.8
Number of deaths from external causes						
In women	26	0.2	48	0.3	74	0.2
In men	55	0.5	217	1.0	272	0.8
Total	81	0.3	265	0.7	346	0.5
Number of deaths from external causes by age in 1998						
20-24 y	10	<0.1	32	<0.1	42	<0.1
30-34 y	16	<0.1	66	0.2	82	0.1
40-44 y	22	<0.1	90	0.2	112	0.2
50-54 y	33	0.1	77	0.2	110	0.2
Total	81	0.3	265	0.7	346	0.5

Table 1 continued. Demographics of respondents and non-respondents and number of deaths during follow-up from 1998 to 2005 (N and %).

	Respondents		Non-respondents		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number of deaths due to diseases						
In women	84	0.6	192	1.1	276	0.9
In men	163	1.6	389	1.7	552	1.7
Total	247	1.0	581	1.5	828	1.3
Number of deaths due to diseases by age in 1998						
20-24 y	11	<0.1	15	<0.1	26	<0.1
30-34 y	22	<0.1	39	<0.1	61	<0.1
40-44 y	63	0.2	162	0.4	225	0.3
50-54 y	151	0.6	365	0.9	516	0.8
Total	247	1.0	581	1.5	828	1.3

Total mortality was higher for non-respondent women in age group 50-54 years and for non-respondent men in age group 40-44 and 50-54 years and for each gender with all age groups combined. In analyses combining women and men, excess total mortality associated with non-response was observed in age groups 40-44 and 50-54 when age groups were examined separately as well as when all observations were combined (Table 2). Non-respondent men had a higher mortality for external causes in age groups 30-34 and 40-44 years and with all age groups combined. In analyses with genders combined, this was seen in age groups 30-34 and 40-44 years and when all observations were combined. In women, no statistically significant differences in mortality for external causes were detected (Table 3). Non-respondent women showed significantly higher disease-related mortality in age group 50-54 years as well as when all age groups were combined. The same held true for both genders when age groups 40-44 and 50-54 years were examined separately as well as when all

observations were combined. On the other hand, in separate analyses for men non-respondents showed a slightly increased disease mortality compared to respondents only when all age groups were combined (Table 4).

Table 2. Hazard ratios for total mortality of non-respondents vs. respondents and the 95% CIs according to gender and age at the beginning of the follow-up in 1998.

Non-respondents vs. respondents (=1.00)	Age in 1998 20-24	Age in 1998 30-34	Age in 1998 40-44	Age in 1998 50-54	Total age or age & gender adjusted
Women	1.00 (0.34-2.97)	1.45 (0.77-2.73)	1.40 (0.93-2.10)	2.17 (1.58-2.98)	1.75 (1.40-2.19)
Men	1.28 (0.70-2.34)	1.41 (0.89-2.24)	1.71 (1.25-2.35)	1.31 (1.07-1.61)	1.41 (1.21-1.65)
Total gender or age & gender adjusted	1.21 (0.71-2.04)	1.42 (0.98-2.07)	1.59 (1.24-2.04)	1.54 (1.29-1.83)	1.52 (1.34-1.73)

Statistically significant associations are in bold.

Table 3. Hazard ratios for deaths due to external causes in non-respondents vs. respondents and the 95% CIs according to gender and age at the beginning of the follow-up in 1998.

Non-respondents vs. respondents (=1.00)	Age in 1998 20-24	Age in 1998 30-34	Age in 1998 40-44	Age in 1998 50-54	Total age or age & gender adjusted
Women	4.65 (0.52-41.62)	1.94 (0.68-5.49)	1.38 (0.58-3.28)	1.18 (0.57-2.45)	1.50 (0.93-2.42)
Men	1.36 (0.64-2.88)	2.04 (1.07-3.90)	2.42 (1.37-4.28)	1.62 (0.99-2.67)	1.87 (1.39-2.52)
Total gender or age & gender adjusted	1.61 (0.78-3.30)	2.01 (1.16-3.49)	2.07 (1.30-3.31)	1.47 (0.98-2.22)	1.78 (1.39-2.29)

Statistically significant associations are in bold.

Table 4. Hazard ratios for disease mortality of non-respondents vs. respondents and the 95% CIs according to gender and age at the beginning of the follow-up in 1998.

Non-respondents vs. respondents (=1.00)	Age in 1998 20-24	Age in 1998 30-34	Age in 1998 40-44	Age in 1998 50-54	Total age or age & gender adjusted
Women	0.39 (0.08-1.92)	1.21 (0.54-2.69)	1.41 (0.88-2.23)	2.46 (1.73-3.52)	1.83 (1.41-2.36)
Men	1.13 (0.40-3.18)	0.83 (0.42-1.66)	1.43 (0.98-2.09)	1.25 (1.00-1.57)	1.25 (1.04-1.51)
Total gender or age & gender adjusted	0.81 (0.37-1.80)	0.98 (0.58-1.67)	1.42 (1.06-1.90)	1.55 (1.28-1.88)	1.43 (1.23-1.66)

Statistically significant associations are in bold.

DISCUSSION

In this large population-based epidemiological study, comparison of mortality of non-respondents with respondents showed, as expected, consistently higher mortality rates among the former group. The differences between non-respondents and respondents were 1.5 – 2 fold and of quite similar magnitude for both genders although with varying causes. Among women the greatest statistically significant differences were seen in disease mortality in the oldest age group of initially 50–54 years of age. The greatest significant differences for men were caused by external causes of death and involved age groups 30- 34 and 40-44 years.

- Deleted: 2
- Formatted: English (U.S.)
- Formatted: English (U.S.)
- Deleted: 7
- Deleted: 7
- Deleted: 0.99
- Deleted: 6
- Formatted: English (U.S.)
- Deleted: 0
- Formatted: English (U.S.)
- Formatted: English (U.S.)
- Formatted: English (U.S.)
- Formatted: English (U.S.)
- Formatted: English (U.S.)
- Deleted: 1
- Formatted: English (U.S.)
- Deleted: 2
- Formatted: English (U.S.)
- Deleted: 5
- Formatted: English (U.S.)
- Deleted: 89
- Formatted: English (U.S.)
- Deleted: 7
- Formatted: English (U.S.)
- Deleted: 5
- Deleted: a
- Deleted: non-
- Deleted: , however,
- Deleted: not very large

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Postal surveys are frequently used in population based health research. The
9 impact of health selection on the results has been studied but not very
10 extensively. An affirmative view on the potential demographic difference between
11 respondents and non-respondents is still lacking. According to previous findings
12 [3, 8, 9], respondents tend to be somewhat healthier and report a more
13 favourable health behaviour compared to non-respondents. However, the bias
14 caused by this was limited and applied mainly to health problems or risk
15 behaviours that generally are not eagerly communicated to others, such as
16 mental problems or binge drinking. From previous studies it is also known that
17 women as well as those well off in the society tend to participate more actively in
18 health related survey research on the whole. Hence, this might result in under-
19 estimation of the prevalence of health problems common among men as well as
20 individuals from lower social strata. Results from a previous non-response
21 analysis of the initial phase of this study supports this view [9]. Women as well as
22 individuals with high level of education were somewhat over represented among
23 respondents but no clear health-related selection could be shown. According to
24 our present results 7 years later the potential health-related selection can be
25 further clarified. In Finland, mortality for external causes is intimately associated
26 with alcohol consumption and alcoholism [22]. As could be expected, we could
27 see a significantly higher mortality for external causes among male non-
28 respondents as compared with the respondents.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Deleted:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Moreover, in previous studies [23] it has also been pointed out that non-
9 respondents are not necessarily a homogenic group but can differ internally, e.g.
10 depending on to which wave of the survey if any they have taken part in. Also the
11 correspondence between late respondents and total non-respondents has been
12 questioned [20].
13
14
15
16
17
18

19
20 Given the health selection related to postal surveys it has to be kept in mind that
21 population studies usually do not focus solely on prevalence estimates anymore
22 but more or less on potential risk or protective factors of certain health problems.
23
24 From previous research [21] there are indications that even if prevalence
25 estimates are not accurate the associations between the variables studies are
26 not necessarily biased.
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **Strengths and limitations of the study**

34
35 A major strength of this study is that the linkage to mortality data was successful
36 for virtually all individuals of the original sample. Furthermore, the registry data
37 on mortality in Finland could be considered as quite reliable. All deaths with
38 suspicion of an external cause and in the age groups studied are investigated by
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Deleted: This gives further justificaton to continue postal surveys in health research since the results can help us understand the etiology and prevention process of a certain kind of disease. ¶

Deleted: Naturally, inaccuracy concerning the final diagnosis might be present but nevertheless the data can be considered as reliable as registry data based on clinical medical work generally can become. Moreover, there is no reason to assume that problems in reliability of the diagnoses would systematically be associated with the response status of the study members. The legislation in Finland enables use of mortality data for research purposes and thus we were able by ourselves to perform a mortality analysis for all respondents.

Deleted: ¶

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Some inaccuracy concerning the final diagnosis of death is possible. Another
10 study limitation is that data of socioeconomic status or educational level of non-
11 respondents was not available and hence adjustments of the statistical analyses
12 for these variables was not possible.
13
14
15
16
17

18 Conclusions

19
20
21
22 Total mortality was consistently 1.5 – 2 fold and for women in the age group >=
23 50 years and for men in the age groups >=40 years significantly higher for the
24 non-respondents of a nationwide mail survey compared to the respondents. For
25 women this was mostly due to disease mortality in age group 50-54 years but for
26 men due to mortality for external causes in age groups 30-34 and 40-44 years.
27
28 The most prominent excess mortality was seen for total mortality for both
29 genders and for mortality due to external causes among men. Selection by
30 health, especially mental health in men can cause bias in health related
31 population surveys. However, this applies to prevalence estimates and does not
32 necessarily jeopardize results from studies on risk and protective factors.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

Deleted: moderately higher

Deleted:

Deleted: in both genders

Deleted: Hence, it seems justified to continue postal surveys in health research in order to improve understanding of etiology and prevention of diseases.

45 REFERENCES

46
47 1. Helakorpi S., Prättälä R., Uutela A. Suomalaisen aikuisväestön
48 terveystilanne ja terveys, kevät 2007. [Health Behaviour and Health
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 among the Finnish Adult Population. Spring 2007] Publications of the National
9 Public Health Institute. 2008;B 6.

10
11
12
13 2. Kjølner M, Thoning H. Characteristics of non-response in the Danish Health
14 Interview Surveys, 1987-1994. *Eur J Public Health* 2005;**15**(5):528-35 doi:
15 10.1093/eurpub/cki023 [Advance Access published online July 28, 2005].
16
17

18
19
20 3. Cottler LB, Zipp JF, Robins LN, et al. Difficult-to-recruit respondents and their
21 effect on prevalence estimates in an epidemiologic survey. *Am J Epidemiol*
22 1987;**125**(2):329-39.
23
24

25
26
27 4. Jacobsen BK, Thelle DS. The Tromsø Heart Study: responders and non-
28 responders to a health questionnaire, do they differ? *Scand J Soc Med*
29 1988;**16**(2):101-4.
30
31

32
33
34 5. Bakke P, Gulsvik A, Lilleng P, et al. Postal survey on airborne occupational
35 exposure and respiratory disorders in Norway: causes and consequences of non-
36 response. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 1990;**44**(4):316-20.
37
38

39
40 6. Jooste PL, Yach D, Steenkamp HJ, et al. Drop-out and newcomer bias in a
41 community cardiovascular follow-up study. *Int J Epidemiol* 1990;**19**(2):284-9.
42
43

44
45 7. Brussaard JH, Brants HA, Bouman M, et al. The study population: general
46 characteristics and potential confounding factors. *Eur J Clin Nutr* 1997;**51** Suppl
47 3:S19-24.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 8. Rönmark E, Lundqvist A, Lundbäck B, et al. Non-responders to a postal
9 questionnaire on respiratory symptoms and diseases. *Eur J Epidemiol*
10 1999;**15**(3):293-9.
11
12
13
14
15 9. Korkeila K, Suominen S, Ahvenainen J, et al. Non-response and related
16 factors in a nation-wide health survey. *Eur J Epidemiol*. 2001;**17**(11):991-9.
17
18
19
20 10. van den Akker M, Buntinx F, Metsemakers JF, et al. Morbidity in responders
21 and non-responders in a register-based population survey. *Fam Pract*
22 1998;**15**(3):261-3.
23
24
25
26
27 11. Sonne-Holm S, Sørensen TI, Jensen G, et al. Influence of fatness,
28 intelligence, education and sociodemographic factors on response rate in a
29 health survey. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 1989;**43**(4):369-74.
30
31
32
33 12. Asch DA, Jedrzejewski MK, Christakis NA. Response rates to mail surveys
34 published in medical journals. *J Clin Epidemiol* 1997;**50**(10):1129-36.
35
36
37
38 13. Heilbrun LK, Ross PD, Wasnich RD, et al. Characteristics of respondents and
39 nonrespondents in a prospective study of osteoporosis. *J Clin Epidemiol*
40 1991;**44**(3):233-9.
41
42
43
44
45 14. Ferrie JE, Kivimäki M, Singh-Manoux A, et al. Non-response to baseline,
46 non-response to follow-up and mortality in the Whitehall II cohort. *Int J Epidemiol*
47 2009;**38**(3):831-7 doi:10.1093/ije/dyp153 [Advance Access publication 5 March
48 2009].
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

15. ~~Greene N, Greenland S, Olsen J, Aagard Nohr E. Estimating Bias From Loss to Follow-up in the Danish National Birth Cohort. *Epidemiology* 2011;**22**:815–822.~~

16. Foster K, Campbell D, Crum J, et al. Non-response in a population study after an environmental disaster. *Public Health* 1995;**109**(4):267-73.

17. Janzon L, Hanson BS, Isacson SO, et al. Factors influencing participation in health surveys. Results from prospective population study 'Men born in 1914' in Malmö, Sweden. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 1986;**40**(2):174-7.

18. Dunne MP, Martin NG, Bailey JM, et al. Participation bias in a sexuality survey: psychological and behavioural characteristics of responders and non-responders. *Int J Epidemiol* 1997;**26**(4):844-54.

19. Tennant A, Badley EM. A confidence interval approach to investigating non-response bias and monitoring response to postal questionnaires. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 1991;**45**(1):81-5.

20. Lahaut, V. M. H. C. J., Jansen HAM, van de Mheen D, et al. Estimating non-response bias in a survey on alcohol consumption: comparison of response waves. *Alcohol Alcohol* 2003;**38**(2):128-34 [doi:10.1093/alcalc/agg044].

21. Martikainen P, Laaksonen M, Piha K, et al. Does survey non-response bias the association between occupational social class and health? *Scand J Public Health* 2007;**35**(2):212-5 [doi:10.1080/14034940600996563].

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Deleted: Mattila VM, Parkkari J, Rimpelä A. Adolescent survey non-response and later risk of death. A prospective cohort study of 78 609 persons with 11-year follow-up. *BMC Public Health* 2007;**7**(1):87 doi:10.1186/1471-2458-7-87 [Published: 22 May 2007].

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Normal, Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 12 pt, English (U.S.), Check spelling and grammar

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Check spelling and grammar

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 12 pt, English (U.S.), Check spelling and grammar

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 12 pt, Check spelling and grammar

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 12 pt, Bold, Check spelling and grammar

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 12 pt, Check spelling and grammar

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, English (U.S.), Check spelling and grammar

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 22. Koskenvuo M, Kaprio J, Kesaniemi A, et al. Alcohol-related diseases
9 associated with ischaemic heart disease: a three-year follow-up of middle-aged
10 male hospital patients. *Alcohol Alcohol* 1986;**21**(3):251-6.
11
12

13
14
15 23. Boersma F, Eefsting JA, van den Brink W, et al. Characteristics of non-
16 responders and the impact of non-response on prevalence estimates of
17 dementia. *Int J Epidemiol* 1997;**26**(5):1055-62.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Acknowledgements

10
11
12 The study was supported by the Academy of Finland (three different decisions on
13
14 funding)

15
16
17 The authors do not declare any competing interests
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of cohort studies

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	4
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	6-7
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any pre-specified hypotheses	7
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	8-9
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	8-9
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	8-9
		(b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	8-9
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	8-9
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	8-9
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	9
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	9-10
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	9-10
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	9-10
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	9
		(d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	8-9
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	
Results			

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—e.g. numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	8-9
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	8-9
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (e.g. demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	Table 1, 11-12
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	Table 1, 11-12
		(c) Summarise follow-up time (e.g., average and total amount)	8-9, Table 1, 11-12
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	Table 1, 11-12
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (e.g., 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	Table 2-4, 13-14
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	8-9
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—e.g. analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	14
Limitations			
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	15-18
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	15-18
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	22

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.



Non-response in a nationwide follow-up postal survey in Finland: A register-based mortality analysis of respondents and non-respondents of the Health and Social Support (HeSSup) Study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2011-000657.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	27-Jan-2012
Complete List of Authors:	Suominen, Sakari; University of Turku, Department of Public Health Koskenvuo, Karoliina; The Social Insurance Institution of Finland, Sillanmaki, Lauri; University of Helsinki, Hjelt Institute, Department of Public Health Vahtera, Jussi; University of Turku, Department of Public Health Korkeila, Katariina; City of Raisio, Kivimaki, Mika; University College London, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health Mattila, Kari; Hospital District of Pirkanmaa, Centre of General Practice Virtanen, Pekka; Tampere School of Public Health, University of Tampere Sumanen, Markku; University of Tampere, Rautava, Paivi; University of Turku, Department of Public Health Koskenvuo, Markku; University of Helsinki, Hjelt Institute, Department of Public Health
Primary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Research methods, Occupational and environmental medicine
Keywords:	EPIDEMIOLOGY, PUBLIC HEALTH, SOCIAL MEDICINE

1
2
3 **Non-response in a nationwide follow-up postal survey in Finland: A**
4
5 **register-based mortality analysis of respondents and non-respondents of**
6
7 **the Health and Social Support (HeSSup) Study**
8
9

10
11
12 Sakari Suominen contributed substantially to acquisition of data, the design of
13 the study and to the interpretation of the data, wrote the first draft of the ms and
14 revised it several times critically for important intellectual content.
15
16
17

18
19
20 Karoliina Koskenvuo contributed substantially to acquisition of data, the design of
21 the study, carried out the first data analyses, contributed substantially to the
22 interpretation of the data and revised the ms critically several times for important
23 intellectual content.
24
25
26

27
28
29 Lauri Sillanmäki contributed substantially to acquisition of data, the design of the
30 study, carried out data analyses, contributed substantially to the interpretation of
31 the data and revised the ms critically several times for important intellectual
32 content.
33
34
35

36
37
38 Jussi Vahtera and Mika Kivimäki contributed substantially to the design of the
39 study and to the interpretation of the data and revised the ms critically several
40 times for important intellectual content.
41
42
43

44
45
46 Katariina Korkeila, Kari J. Mattila and Markku Koskenvuo contributed substantially
47 to acquisition of data, the design of the study and to the interpretation of the data
48 and revised the ms critically several times for important intellectual content.
49
50
51

1
2
3 Pekka J. Virtanen and Markku Sumanen contributed substantially to the
4
5 interpretation of the data and revised the ms critically several times for important
6
7 intellectual content.
8
9

10 Päivi Rautava contributed substantially to acquisition of data, the interpretation of
11
12 the data and revised the ms critically several times for important intellectual
13
14 content.
15
16

17 All the authors have read and approved the final version of the ms.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT**Objective**

To examine difference in mortality between postal survey non-respondents and respondents.

Design

A prospective cohort study with baseline survey in 1998 and comprehensive linkage to national mortality registers until 2005, the Health and Social Support (HeSSup) study.

Setting

A population based postal survey of the working aged population in Finland in 1998

Participants

The original random sample comprised 64,797 working-aged individuals in Finland (20-24, 30-34, 40-44, 50-54 years of age; 32,059 women and 32,716 men), yielding 25,898 (40.0%) responses in the baseline postal survey in 1998.

Primary outcome measure

Registry based primary causes of death encoded with the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-10)

Results

In women, hazard ratio for total mortality was 1.75 (95% confidence interval 1.40 - 2.19) times higher among the non-respondents compared to the respondents. In men, non-response was associated with a 1.41 fold (1.21 - 1.65) excess risk of total mortality. Non-response associated in certain age groups with deaths due to diseases in women and with deaths due to external causes in men. The most prominent excess mortality was seen for total mortality for both genders and for mortality due to external causes among men.

Conclusions

Postal surveys result in slight underestimation of illness prevalence.

Word Count of Abstract 201

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Keywords

Follow-up Studies, Non-respondents, Mortality, Health Surveys, Registries

Article summary

Article focus

Women and individuals from upper social strata tend to participate more actively in postal health surveys

What this exactly means in terms of health selection among respondents is unclear

Postal health surveys are believed to produce underestimates of illness prevalence

Key message

Total mortality was consistently and for women in the age group ≥ 50 years and for men in the age groups ≥ 40 years significantly higher among non-respondents compared to respondents during a 7 year follow-up among a total Finnish nationwide sample in working age comprising almost 65 000 individuals

The excess mortality observed was 1,5 – 2 fold. Among men it was explained by external causes, whereas among women it was due to diseases and was statistically significant only in the age group 50 – 54 years

Postal surveys result in slight underestimation of illness prevalence

Strengths and limitations of the study

The linkage to mortality data was successful for virtually all individuals of the original sample comprising nearly 65 000 individuals. The sample size secures the reliability of the conclusions drawn. Furthermore, the registry data on mortality in Finland can be considered as reliable. To the best of the authors' knowledge a corresponding study based on a as large a sample as in this study has not previously been carried out.

Some inaccuracy concerning the final diagnosis of death is possible. A further study limitation is that data of socioeconomic status or educational level of non-

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

respondents was not available and hence adjustments of the statistical analyses for these variables was not possible.

For peer review only

INTRODUCTION

Word count without Abstract, Tables and References 1735

Response rates in health related postal surveys are declining in the Western world. In the Nordic countries the situation has been somewhat better compared to the rest of Europe and the U.S.A., but recently even there declining trends have been observed [1, 2]. Previous studies have suggested that women, older persons and persons from upper social strata tend to participate more actively in health surveys compared with the rest [3 - 11]. However, not all studies have consistently supported these observations [10, 12, 13]. Furthermore, recent studies have extended analysis of non-response beyond demographic variables showing lower rate of hospital admissions [2], mortality and maternal smoking during pregnancy among the participants as compared to non-participants [14, 15].

Studies on causes for non-participation to health surveys have revealed incorrect address or incorrect delivery by post to contribute to some of the drop out [5, 8, 16]. The non-respondents themselves have reported various kinds of reasons for their behaviour, such as gaining no benefit for participation [5, 16], no interest in the topic [7, 8, 16, 17], feeling of intrusion of privacy [8], lack of time [7, 8, 17], forgetfulness [8], and present illness [17]. Surveys including questions on issues perceived as intimate have often decreased participation rates [18]. It has also been speculated that late respondents might resemble more the non-participants [5, 17, 19] but to date decisive evidence for this pattern is lacking [20]. In follow-

1
2
3 up studies, participation has been explored according to the number of rounds
4
5 the individual has taken part in [14] and more occasions of non-response found
6
7 to be positively associated with subsequent mortality rates. On the whole, health
8
9 selection among participants might decrease the generalizability of prevalence
10
11 estimates but this effect is until now not satisfactorily described [21]. However,
12
13 even in the case of health selection the results related to the strength of
14
15 association between the variables studied need not necessarily be biased [15,
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A non-response analysis of the postal survey of the population-based Health and Social Support (HeSSup) study - which achieved a relatively modest (40 %) response rate [9] - replicated previous findings on the differences in demographic characteristics between respondents and non-respondents. The aim of the present study was to extend these analyses to explore whether survey non-respondents differ from the respondents in terms of mortality (all-cause, disease mortality, mortality for external causes).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study is based on the complete sample (N=64, 797) of the Health and Social Support (HeSSup) prospective mail survey initiated in 1998. The concurrent joint Ethics Committee of the University of Turku and the Turku University Central Hospital considered approval not necessary for a normal cohort study, but all

1
2
3 participants were requested to sign a consent form containing information about
4
5 the study and to grant permission to allow subsequent studies with the same
6
7 data set and possibility to link with national health registries. The sample
8
9 represented the concurrent age groups of 20-24, 30-34, 40-44 and 50-54 years
10
11 of age in Finland [9]. However, by purpose the Swedish speaking Finns (5% of
12
13 the general population) as well as the Turku region were slightly
14
15 overrepresented. Of the 64,797 persons, 22 could not be included in the present
16
17 study since the follow-up had to be set to begin from the first death among
18
19 respondents which was September 22nd 1998. Certain cases of deaths among
20
21 non-respondents had occurred already earlier and potentially before sending out
22
23 the initial questionnaire. Totally 25,898 satisfactory responses were returned. In
24
25 2007, the survey material was by means of an unique social security number
26
27 linked to Statistics Finland data on mortality between the years 1998 and 2005.
28
29 Totally 1,174 cases of deaths among 25,290 observations that could be linked
30
31 with registry data were identified. Moreover, mortality data of non-respondents
32
33 from the same time period was likewise as for respondents obtained from
34
35 Statistics Finland and further analyzed by age group and gender.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 The outcome variable was primary causes of death encoded with the
47
48 International Classification of Diseases (ICD-10). Mortality for external causes
49
50 (S00 - Y98) and disease mortality (A00 – R99) were examined separately. The
51
52 differences in mortality between non-respondents and respondents were
53
54 analysed separately for women and men using Cox proportional hazards
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 regression. The analyses were carried out by the research group. Hazard ratios
4 (HR) with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) for mortality (total, external causes,
5 disease) of non-respondents vs. respondents according to age (1998) were
6 reported. Cox proportional hazard assumptions were tested by visual
7 examination of log-minus-log plots showing parallelism among the selected strata
8 variable (responding status). The statistical analysis was performed by the SAS
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

® software 9.2. for Windows.

RESULTS

Between the years 1998 to 2005, 1,174 individuals belonging to the complete sample died (Table 1). Of the deaths, 70% occurred in men.

Table 1. Demographics of respondents and non-respondents and number of deaths during follow-up from 1998 to 2005 (N and %).

	Respondents		Non-respondents		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender						
Women	14,922	59.0	17,137	43.4	32,059	49.5
Men	10,368	41.0	22,348	56.6	32,716	50.5
Total	25,290	100.0	39,485	100.0	64,775	100.0
Age in 1998						
20-24 y	6,783	26.8	9,405	23.8	16,188	25.0
30-34 y	5,981	23.7	10,267	26.0	16,248	25.1
40-44 y	6,073	24.0	10,198	25.8	16,271	25.1
50-54 y	6,453	25.5	9,615	24.4	16,068	24.8
Total	25,290	100.0	39,485	100.0	64,775	100.0
Number of deaths by gender	N	%	N	%	N	%
In women	110	0.7	240	1.4	350	1.1
In men	218	2.1	606	2.7	824	2.5
Total	328	1.3	846	2.1	1,174	1.8
Number of deaths by age in 1998						
20-24 y	21	0.3	47	0.5	68	0.4
30-34 y	38	0.6	105	1.0	143	0.8
40-44 y	85	1.4	252	2.5	337	2.1
50-54 y	184	2.9	442	4.6	626	3.9
Total	328	1.3	846	2.1	1,174	1.8
Number of deaths from external causes						
In women	26	0.2	48	0.3	74	0.2
In men	55	0.5	217	1.0	272	0.8
Total	81	0.3	265	0.7	346	0.5
Number of deaths from external causes by age in 1998						
20-24 y	10	<0.1	32	<0.1	42	<0.1
30-34 y	16	<0.1	66	0.2	82	0.1
40-44 y	22	<0.1	90	0.2	112	0.2
50-54 y	33	0.1	77	0.2	110	0.2
Total	81	0.3	265	0.7	346	0.5

Table 1 continued. Demographics of respondents and non-respondents and number of deaths during follow-up from 1998 to 2005 (N and %).

	Respondents		Non-respondents		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number of deaths due to diseases						
In women	84	0.6	192	1.1	276	0.9
In men	163	1.6	389	1.7	552	1.7
Total	247	1.0	581	1.5	828	1.3
Number of deaths due to diseases by age in 1998						
20-24 y	11	<0.1	15	<0.1	26	<0.1
30-34 y	22	<0.1	39	<0.1	61	<0.1
40-44 y	63	0.2	162	0.4	225	0.3
50-54 y	151	0.6	365	0.9	516	0.8
Total	247	1.0	581	1.5	828	1.3

Total mortality was higher for non-respondent women in age group 50-54 years and for non-respondent men in age group 40-44 and 50-54 years and for each gender with all age groups combined. In analyses combining women and men, excess total mortality associated with non-response was observed in age groups 40-44 and 50-54 when age groups were examined separately as well as when all observations were combined (Table 2). Non-respondent men had a higher mortality for external causes in age groups 30-34 and 40-44 years and with all age groups combined. In analyses with genders combined, this was seen in age groups 30-34 and 40-44 years and when all observations were combined. In women, no statistically significant differences in mortality for external causes were detected (Table 3). Non-respondent women showed significantly higher disease-related mortality in age group 50-54 years as well as when all age groups were combined. The same held true for both genders when age groups 40-44 and 50-54 years were examined separately as well as when all

observations were combined. On the other hand, in separate analyses for men non-respondents showed a slightly increased disease mortality compared to respondents only when all age groups were combined (Table 4).

Table 2. Hazard ratios for total mortality of non-respondents vs. respondents and the 95% CIs according to gender and age at the beginning of the follow-up in 1998.

Non-respondents vs. respondents (=1.00)	Age in 1998 20-24	Age in 1998 30-34	Age in 1998 40-44	Age in 1998 50-54	Total age or age & gender adjusted
Women	1.00 (0.34-2.97)	1.45 (0.77-2.73)	1.40 (0.93-2.10)	2.17 (1.58-2.98)	1.75 (1.40-2.19)
Men	1.28 (0.70-2.34)	1.41 (0.89-2.24)	1.71 (1.25-2.35)	1.31 (1.07-1.61)	1.41 (1.21-1.65)
Total gender or age & gender adjusted	1.21 (0.71-2.04)	1.42 (0.98-2.07)	1.59 (1.24-2.04)	1.54 (1.29-1.83)	1.52 (1.34-1.73)

Statistically significant associations are in bold.

Table 3. Hazard ratios for deaths due to external causes in non-respondents vs. respondents and the 95% CIs according to gender and age at the beginning of the follow-up in 1998.

Non-respondents vs. respondents (=1.00)	Age in 1998 20-24	Age in 1998 30-34	Age in 1998 40-44	Age in 1998 50-54	Total age or age & gender adjusted
Women	4.65 (0.52-41.62)	1.94 (0.68-5.49)	1.38 (0.58-3.28)	1.18 (0.57-2.45)	1.50 (0.93-2.42)
Men	1.36 (0.64-2.88)	2.04 (1.07-3.90)	2.42 (1.37-4.28)	1.62 (0.99-2.67)	1.87 (1.39-2.52)
Total gender or age & gender adjusted	1.61 (0.78-3.30)	2.01 (1.16-3.49)	2.07 (1.30-3.31)	1.47 (0.98-2.22)	1.78 (1.39-2.29)

Statistically significant associations are in bold.

Table 4. Hazard ratios for disease mortality of non-respondents vs. respondents and the 95% CIs according to gender and age at the beginning of the follow-up in 1998.

Non-respondents vs. respondents (=1.00)	Age in 1998 20-24	Age in 1998 30-34	Age in 1998 40-44	Age in 1998 50-54	Total age or age & gender adjusted
Women	0.39 (0.08-1.92)	1.21 (0.54-2.69)	1.41 (0.88-2.23)	2.46 (1.73-3.52)	1.83 (1.41-2.36)
Men	1.13 (0.40-3.18)	0.83 (0.42-1.66)	1.43 (0.98-2.09)	1.25 (1.00-1.57)	1.25 (1.04-1.51)
Total gender or age & gender adjusted	0.81 (0.37-1.80)	0.98 (0.58-1.67)	1.42 (1.06-1.90)	1.55 (1.28-1.88)	1.43 (1.23-1.66)

Statistically significant associations are in bold.

DISCUSSION

In this large population-based epidemiological study, comparison of mortality of non-respondents with respondents showed, as expected, consistently higher mortality rates among the former group. The differences between non-respondents and respondents were 1.5 – 2 fold and of quite similar magnitude for both genders although with varying causes. Among women the greatest statistically significant differences were seen in disease mortality in the oldest age group of initially 50–54 years of age. The greatest significant differences for men were caused by external causes of death and involved age groups 30- 34 and 40-44 years. However, it is worth to notice that an increase of total mortality of the magnitude seen in this study implies approximately 300 extra deaths among non-respondents during the follow-up of 7 years.

1
2
3
4
5
6 Postal surveys are frequently used in population based health research. The
7
8 impact of health selection on the results has been studied but not very
9
10 extensively. An affirmative view on the potential demographic difference between
11
12 respondents and non-respondents is still lacking. According to previous findings
13
14 [3, 8, 9], respondents tend to be somewhat healthier and report a more
15
16 favourable health behaviour compared to non-respondents. However, the bias
17
18 caused by this was limited and applied mainly to health problems or risk
19
20 behaviours that generally are not eagerly communicated to others, such as
21
22 mental problems or binge drinking. From previous studies it is also known that
23
24 women as well as those well off in the society tend to participate more actively in
25
26 health related survey research on the whole. Hence, this might result in under-
27
28 estimation of the prevalence of health problems common among men as well as
29
30 individuals from lower social strata. Results from a previous non-response
31
32 analysis of the initial phase of this study supports this view [9]. Women as well as
33
34 individuals with high level of education were somewhat over represented among
35
36 respondents but no clear health-related selection could be shown. According to
37
38 our present results 7 years later the potential health-related selection can be
39
40 further clarified. In Finland, mortality for external causes is intimately associated
41
42 with alcohol consumption and alcoholism [22]. As could be expected, we could
43
44 see a significantly higher mortality for external causes among male non-
45
46 respondents as compared with the respondents.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Moreover, in previous studies [23] it has also been pointed out that non-
4
5 respondents are not necessarily a homogenic group but can differ internally, e.g.
6
7 depending on to which wave of the survey if any they have taken part in. Also the
8
9 correspondence between late respondents and total non-respondents has been
10
11 questioned [20].
12
13

14
15
16
17 Given the health selection related to postal surveys it has to be kept in mind that
18
19 population studies usually do not focus solely on prevalence estimates anymore
20
21 but more or less on potential risk or protective factors of certain health problems.
22
23 From previous research [21] there are indications that even if prevalence
24
25 estimates are not accurate the associations between the variables studies are
26
27 not necessarily biased.
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Strengths and limitations of the study**

35
36 A major strength of this study is that the linkage to mortality data was successful
37
38 for virtually all individuals of the original sample. Furthermore, the registry data
39
40 on mortality in Finland could be considered as quite reliable. All deaths with
41
42 suspicion of an external cause and in the age groups studied are investigated by
43
44 autopsy.
45
46

47
48 The large sample size secures that the conclusions drawn from the statistical
49
50 analyses are reliable and can not have been caused by random effects. To the
51
52 best of our knowledge a corresponding study based on as large a sample as in
53
54 this study has previously not been carried out.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Some inaccuracy concerning the final diagnosis of death is possible. Another
4
5 study limitation is that data of socioeconomic status or educational level of non-
6
7 respondents was not available and hence adjustments of the statistical analyses
8
9 for these variables was not possible.
10
11

12 13 14 15 **Conclusions**

16
17
18
19
20 Total mortality was consistently 1.5 – 2 fold and for women in the age group \geq
21
22 50 years and for men in the age groups \geq 40 years significantly higher for the
23
24 non-respondents of a nationwide mail survey compared to the respondents. For
25
26 women this was mostly due to disease mortality in age group 50-54 years but for
27
28 men due to mortality for external causes in age groups 30-34 and 40-44 years.
29
30 The most prominent excess mortality was seen for total mortality for both
31
32 genders and for mortality due to external causes among men. Selection by
33
34 health, especially mental health in men can cause bias in health related
35
36 population surveys. However, this applies to prevalence estimates and does not
37
38 necessarily jeopardize results from studies on risk and protective factors.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **REFERENCES**

50
51 1. Helakorpi S., Prättälä R., Uutela A. Suomalaisen aikuisväestön
52
53 terveyskäyttäytyminen ja terveys, kevät 2007. [Health Behaviour and Health
54
55

1
2
3 among the Finnish Adult Population. Spring 2007] Publications of the National
4 Public Health Institute. 2008;B 6.
5
6
7

8
9 2. Kjøller M, Thoning H. Characteristics of non-response in the Danish Health
10 Interview Surveys, 1987-1994. *Eur J Public Health* 2005;**15**(5):528-35 doi:
11 10.1093/eurpub/cki023 [Advance Access published online July 28, 2005].
12
13
14

15
16
17 3. Cottler LB, Zipp JF, Robins LN, et al. Difficult-to-recruit respondents and their
18 effect on prevalence estimates in an epidemiologic survey. *Am J Epidemiol*
19 1987;**125**(2):329-39.
20
21
22
23

24
25
26 4. Jacobsen BK, Thelle DS. The Tromsø Heart Study: responders and non-
27 responders to a health questionnaire, do they differ? *Scand J Soc Med*
28 1988;**16**(2):101-4.
29
30
31
32

33
34 5. Bakke P, Gulsvik A, Lilleng P, et al. Postal survey on airborne occupational
35 exposure and respiratory disorders in Norway: causes and consequences of non-
36 response. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 1990;**44**(4):316-20.
37
38
39
40

41
42 6. Jooste PL, Yach D, Steenkamp HJ, et al. Drop-out and newcomer bias in a
43 community cardiovascular follow-up study. *Int J Epidemiol* 1990;**19**(2):284-9.
44
45
46
47

48
49 7. Brussaard JH, Brants HA, Bouman M, et al. The study population: general
50 characteristics and potential confounding factors. *Eur J Clin Nutr* 1997;**51** Suppl
51 3:S19-24.
52
53
54
55

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
8. Rönmark E, Lundqvist A, Lundbäck B, et al. Non-responders to a postal questionnaire on respiratory symptoms and diseases. *Eur J Epidemiol* 1999;**15**(3):293-9.
 9. Korkeila K, Suominen S, Ahvenainen J, et al. Non-response and related factors in a nation-wide health survey. *Eur J Epidemiol*. 2001;**17**(11):991-9.
 10. van den Akker M, Buntinx F, Metsemakers JF, et al. Morbidity in responders and non-responders in a register-based population survey. *Fam Pract* 1998;**15**(3):261-3.
 11. Sonne-Holm S, Sørensen TI, Jensen G, et al. Influence of fatness, intelligence, education and sociodemographic factors on response rate in a health survey. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 1989;**43**(4):369-74.
 12. Asch DA, Jedrzejewski MK, Christakis NA. Response rates to mail surveys published in medical journals. *J Clin Epidemiol* 1997;**50**(10):1129-36.
 13. Heilbrun LK, Ross PD, Wasnich RD, et al. Characteristics of respondents and nonrespondents in a prospective study of osteoporosis. *J Clin Epidemiol* 1991;**44**(3):233-9.
 14. Ferrie JE, Kivimäki M, Singh-Manoux A, et al. Non-response to baseline, non-response to follow-up and mortality in the Whitehall II cohort. *Int J Epidemiol* 2009;**38**(3):831-7 doi:10.1093/ije/dyp153 [Advance Access publication 5 March 2009].

- 1
2
3 15. Greene N, Greenland S, Olsen J, Aagard Nohr E. Estimating Bias From Loss
4 to Follow-up in the Danish National Birth Cohort. *Epidemiology* 2011;**22**:815–
5 822.
6
7
8
9
10 16. Foster K, Campbell D, Crum J, et al. Non-response in a population study
11 after an environmental disaster. *Public Health* 1995;**109**(4):267-73.
12
13
14
15 17. Janzon L, Hanson BS, Isacsson SO, et al. Factors influencing participation in
16 health surveys. Results from prospective population study 'Men born in 1914' in
17 Malmö, Sweden. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 1986;**40**(2):174-7.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24 18. Dunne MP, Martin NG, Bailey JM, et al. Participation bias in a sexuality
25 survey: psychological and behavioural characteristics of responders and non-
26 responders. *Int J Epidemiol* 1997;**26**(4):844-54.
27
28
29
30
31
32 19. Tennant A, Badley EM. A confidence interval approach to investigating non-
33 response bias and monitoring response to postal questionnaires. *J Epidemiol*
34 *Community Health* 1991;**45**(1):81-5.
35
36
37
38
39
40 20. Lahaut, V. M. H. C. J., Jansen HAM, van de Mheen D, et al. Estimating non-
41 response bias in a survey on alcohol consumption: comparison of response
42 waves. *Alcohol Alcohol* 2003;**38**(2):128-34 [doi:10.1093/alcalc/agg044].
43
44
45
46
47
48
49 21. Martikainen P, Laaksonen M, Piha K, et al. Does survey non-response bias
50 the association between occupational social class and health? *Scand J Public*
51 *Health* 2007;**35**(2):212-5 [doi:10.1080/14034940600996563].
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 22. Koskenvuo M, Kaprio J, Kesaniemi A, et al. Alcohol-related diseases
4 associated with ischaemic heart disease: a three-year follow-up of middle-aged
5 male hospital patients. *Alcohol Alcohol* 1986;**21**(3):251-6.
6
7

8
9
10
11 23. Boersma F, Eefsting JA, van den Brink W, et al. Characteristics of non-
12 responders and the impact of non-response on prevalence estimates of
13 dementia. *Int J Epidemiol* 1997;**26**(5):1055-62.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgements

The study was supported by the Academy of Finland (three different decisions on funding)

The authors do not declare any competing interests

Data Sharing

At this point we are not willing to share data based on a totally open principle.

However, naturally we are willing to collaborate with other researchers based on plans approved by our research group.

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cohort studies*

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	4
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	6-7
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any pre-specified hypotheses	7
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	8-9
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	8-9
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	8-9
		(b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	8-9
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	8-9
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	8-9
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	9
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	9-10
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	9-10
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	9-10
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	9
		(d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	8-9
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	
Results			

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—e.g. numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	8-9
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	8-9
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (e.g. demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	Table 1, 11-12
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	Table 1, 11-12
		(c) Summarise follow-up time (e.g., average and total amount)	8-9, Table 1, 11-12
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	Table 1, 11-12
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (e.g., 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	Table 2-4, 13-14
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	8-9
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—e.g. analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	14
Limitations			
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	15-18
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	15-18
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	22

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.