



**Poor self-rated health and its associations with health anxiety in two Australian national surveys**

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2013-002965
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	28-Mar-2013
Complete List of Authors:	Mewton, Louise; University of New South Wales, Clinical Research Unit for Anxiety and Depression Andrews, Gavin; University of New South Wales, Clinical Research Unit for Anxiety and Depression
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Epidemiology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Mental health
Keywords:	EPIDEMIOLOGY, MENTAL HEALTH, PUBLIC HEALTH

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 **Poor self-rated health and its associations with health anxiety in two Australian national**  
4  
5 **surveys**  
6  
7

8 Louise Mewton <sup>1,2</sup> & Gavin Andrews <sup>1,2</sup>  
9

10  
11 1. School of Psychiatry, University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW, Australia.  
12

13  
14 2. Clinical Research Unit for Anxiety and Depression (CRUfAD), St. Vincent's Hospital,  
15  
16 Sydney, NSW, Australia.  
17  
18

19  
20 **Corresponding Author:** Dr Louise Mewton, Clinical Research Unit for Anxiety and  
21  
22 Depression, Level 4, O'Brien Centre, St. Vincent's Hospital, 394-404 Victoria Street,  
23  
24 Darlinghurst, NSW, Australia. Ph: (+612) 8382 1437. Email: [louisem@unsw.edu.au](mailto:louisem@unsw.edu.au)  
25  
26

27 **Key words:** self-rated health, neurasthenia, health anxiety, epidemiology  
28

29 **Conflict of interest:** None  
30

31 **Word count:** 3951 (excluding abstract, tables and references)  
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

*Objectives:* Poor self-rated health is predictive of increased mortality and morbidity that is not explained by measures of physical health status. It is therefore of medical interest. It is hypothesised that across two national surveys poor self-rated health will be independently associated with somatisation and will result in high rates of service use after adjusting for established diagnoses.

*Design:* Two cross-sectional population-based surveys conducted in 1997 and 2007. The use of both surveys allowed replication of results.

*Setting:* Australia.

*Participants:* The 1997 and 2007 National Surveys of Mental Health and Well-Being were based on stratified, multistage area probability samples of persons living in private dwellings in Australia. The 1997 survey included 10641 respondents aged 18 to 75, a response rate of 78%. The 2007 survey included 8841 respondents aged 16 to 85, a response rate of 60%.

*Main outcome measures:* Global ratings of perceived health.

*Results:* Approximately 15% of the Australian population rated their health as fair or poor in both surveys. The independent relationship between self-rated health and somatisation was replicated across both surveys in multivariate analyses. Individuals with negative self-rated health were 4.1 times as likely to screen positive for health anxiety (OR: 4.1; 95% CI 2.8 to 5.9) and 3.4 times as likely to be diagnosed with neurasthenia (OR: 3.4; 95% CI 2.2 to 5.2), when compared with individuals who rated their health positively. Individuals with negative self-rated health were twice as likely to use health services after controlling for demographics, mental and physical illness, neuroticism, suicidality, cognitive impairment and psychological distress.

1  
2  
3 *Conclusions:* The current findings indicate that subjective concerns regarding perceived poor  
4 health must be considered an important public health issue. Medically unexplained negative  
5 self-rated health, associated with increased mortality and morbidity, should be conceptualised  
6 as a variant of hypochondriasis/health anxiety and proactively treated.  
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

## Article focus

The current study tests the relationship between self-rated health and somatisation, specifically neurasthenia and health anxiety, in two national surveys of the Australian population conducted in 1997 and 2007.

## Key points

These results confirm both of the study hypotheses:

- 1) that negative self-rated health was powerfully and independently associated with somatisation; and
- 2) that negative self-rated health was associated with general health service use, hospitalisation and medication use, even after adjusting for an extensive range of psychiatric and physical conditions.

## Strengths and limitations of the study

The use of the two Australian national surveys conferred many advantages in terms of replication, sample representativeness, fully structured diagnoses of all the common psychiatric disorders, extensive assessment of service utilisation and the inclusion of a broad range of other clinical measures.

The study relied on subjective rather than objective assessments of physical morbidity

Health anxiety was based on screening questions rather than full diagnostic assessment

The surveys were cross-sectional in nature, precluding an investigation of the direction of the relationships identified in the current study.

## 1 Introduction

Rating your health as excellent, very good, good, fair or poor seems a simple concept that is unlikely to contain surprises, but ratings of health as fair or poor are predictors of morbidity and mortality after adjusting for clinical health status. The 15-20% of the population who rate their health negatively have mortality risks 2-7 times higher than individuals with excellent self-reported health, even after adjustment for medical history (1). For example, self-rated health has been found to be the best predictor of survival in advanced cancer patients in comparison with other important clinical indicators, such as clinician assessed health status, appetite, fatigue and quality of life (2). In the prospective US National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES), self-rated health was found to independently predict mortality and functional limitations over and above a comprehensive range of physical examinations, laboratory tests and self-reported mental and physical symptoms (1, 3). Individuals presenting with perceived poor health die younger than counterparts with equivalent health status.

No country can provide all the health services its citizens want (4), yet, in western countries, we worry that we are medicalising the normal risks of life, at great cost and with little health gain (5, 6). If the purpose of medicine is to reduce the burden of disease then negative self-rated health, because of the increased mortality and morbidity, should be a focus of medical attention, especially if a low cost remedy is a possibility. Four possible hypothetical explanations for the independent association between global self-rated health and increased morbidity and mortality have been proposed (7): 1) Even when extensive clinical investigations and self-reported histories are collected, such as in the NHANES study (1, 3), it is possible that difficult to operationalise, undiagnosed or prodromal conditions may explain the independent effects of self-rated health on morbidity and mortality; 2) self-rated health may reflect additional information about health trajectories, or changes in health, that

1  
2  
3 are not captured in assessments of current health status; 3) self-perceptions of health may  
4 influence health and illness behaviours that increase the risk of morbidity and mortality; and  
5  
6  
7 4) self-rated health may reflect the perception of insufficient external resources, like income  
8 or social support, to maintain future health status.  
9  
10

11  
12 The four hypotheses above are not easy to explore. A fifth option is that perceived poor  
13 health is a reflection of a mental disorder. Self-ratings of overall health are only modestly  
14 correlated with clinical assessments of medical status, but appear more closely related to  
15 psychiatric illness, and aspects of personality such as neuroticism (8-10). These findings are  
16 surprising given the evidence that suggests that respondents mainly have physical health  
17 problems in mind when asked to rate their global health status (11). Thus, whilst the decision  
18 to rate global health positively or negatively is driven by psychological factors, it appears that  
19 respondents mainly consider physical health problems when rating their global health status.  
20 These findings suggest that psychiatric disorders based on physical health- and disease  
21 related-concerns (termed “somatisation” for ease of reading) may be particularly salient in the  
22 interpretation of global ratings of health status. Consistent with this hypothesis,  
23 hypochondriasis, somatisation and limitations in activities of daily living explain much of the  
24 variance in patient reports of overall health status (10).  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 The current study tests the relationship between self-rated health and somatisation,  
43 specifically neurasthenia and health anxiety, in two national surveys of the Australian  
44 population conducted in 1997 and 2007. The strength of the current study is therefore in the  
45 ability to replicate the findings across two large, epidemiological datasets that included  
46 structured diagnoses of the major mental disorders and similar measures of other clinical,  
47 demographic and service use variables. It is hypothesised that across both surveys: 1) poor  
48 self-rated health will be powerfully and independently associated with neurasthenia and  
49 health anxiety; and 2) that this strong association will also manifest itself in high rates of  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 service use after adjusting for established psychiatric and physical diagnoses. To our  
4  
5 knowledge, these hypotheses have not been tested using representative, population-based  
6  
7 samples, and never within the context of fully structured diagnoses of the major psychiatric  
8  
9 disorders.  
10

## 11 12 **2 Method**

### 13 14 15 Sample

16  
17  
18 The 1997 and 2007 National Surveys of Mental Health and Well-Being (NSMHWB) were  
19  
20 based on stratified, multistage area probability samples of persons living in private dwellings  
21  
22 in Australia, excluding very remote dwellings (12, 13). The 1997 survey included 10641  
23  
24 respondents aged 18 to 75, representing a response rate of 78%. Characteristics of non-  
25  
26 responders were not explicitly examined in the 1997 survey. The 2007 survey included 8841  
27  
28 respondents aged 16 to 85, representing a response rate of 60%. A small, non-random follow-  
29  
30 up study of the 2007 survey indicated that while the response rate had little effect at the  
31  
32 aggregate level, there may have been some under-estimation in the prevalence estimates for  
33  
34 mental disorders in males and young people. The age and gender characteristics of both  
35  
36 samples were weighted to match the age and gender distributions in Australia. Both surveys  
37  
38 were designed to provide accurate estimates of the population prevalence of selected major  
39  
40 mental disorders, the level of disability associated with these disorders and the related service  
41  
42 utilisation. The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), the national government statistics  
43  
44 agency, conducted both the 1997 and 2007 surveys. The ABS provided ethical review and  
45  
46 approval for the surveys, including voluntary recruitment, rigorous confidentiality provisions,  
47  
48 and written informed consent. The ABS operates under Australian National Legislation that  
49  
50 mandates strict provisions for the ethical conduct of the agency's research. The methods for  
51  
52 both surveys have been discussed in more detail elsewhere (12, 13).  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## Measures

### *Self-rated health*

For the 1997 survey each respondent was administered the 12 item Short Form Health Survey (SF-12), a widely used measure of health and well-being (14). The first item of the SF-12 required the respondent to rate their health in general, with responses categorised as “excellent”, “very good”, “good”, “fair” or “poor”. This question informs the physical component scale of the SF-12 (15) and, for the purposes of the current study, constituted the main outcome variable for the 1997 survey. In the 2007 NSMHWB, respondents were asked to rate their overall physical health and overall mental health in two separate questions, with responses to both questions categorised as above. Given that the item used in the 1997 survey is weighted heavily towards physical well-being, the query regarding self-rated physical health was selected as the main outcome variable for the 2007 survey. Respondents were to rate their physical health before they were asked to rate their mental health in the 2007 survey. In both surveys, the questions regarding self-rated health were administered before questions about mental disorders and service use. To ensure sufficient power to detect differences in statistical analyses, the main outcome variables for both surveys were dichotomized into negative (“fair” or “poor”) and positive (“good”, “very good” and “excellent”) self-rated health. Grouping of these responses in such a manner is common practice in the self-rated health literature due to the similar survival probabilities within these collapsed categories (2).

### *12-month ICD-10 psychiatric disorders*

Psychiatric diagnoses were assessed using the Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI version 2.1 in 1997 and version 3.0 in 2007) (16, 17). Both surveys included fully structured ICD-10 12-month diagnoses (18) of panic disorder, agoraphobia, social phobia,

1  
2  
3 generalised anxiety disorder (GAD), obsessive compulsive disorder (OCD), post-traumatic  
4 stress disorder (PTSD), major depression, dysthymia, bipolar disorder, alcohol use disorders  
5 (dependence and harmful use) and substance use disorders (dependence and harmful use).  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 The 1997 survey included a module on neurasthenia (19) and a seven item psychosis  
11 screener. For both surveys, 12-month ICD-10 diagnoses were coded as absent or present  
12 based on standard CIDI diagnostic algorithms that fully operationalized ICD-10 inclusion and  
13 exclusion criteria, as well as ICD-10 hierarchical decision rules.  
14  
15

16  
17  
18  
19 The 2007 survey collected additional information on health anxiety (20, 21). The respondent  
20 was first asked whether they had ever worried a lot about serious illness, despite having  
21 reassurance from a doctor or medical specialist. If endorsed, the respondents were asked  
22 whether they ever had a period of worry like this that lasted for 6 months or longer in the  
23 previous 12 months. These screening questions are most consistent with the DSM-IV  
24 diagnosis of hypochondriasis (22), addressing Criteria A, B and E for this disorder. In the  
25 current study, it was not possible to address the criteria related to differential diagnosis  
26 (Criteria C and F), or establish clinically significant impairment or distress specific to this  
27 disorder (Criterion D). Consistent with a previous study of the 2007 NSMHWB (20), we refer  
28 to these questions as a screener for health anxiety, rather than a proxy diagnosis of  
29 hypochondriasis.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 The 1997 survey also included a screener for personality disorders (composed of screening  
45 questions for 12-month ICD-10 paranoid, schizoid, dissocial, emotionally unstable, histrionic,  
46 anankastic, anxious and dependent personality disorders). In the current analyses, individuals  
47 who screened positive for one or more personality disorder were compared with those who  
48 did not.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55  
56  
57 *Neuroticism*  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The neuroticism scale of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) (23) was also  
4  
5 included in the 1997 survey. In the current analyses, those reporting a score of six or more on  
6  
7 the EPQ (the top ten percentile for neuroticism) were compared with the rest of the sample.  
8  
9

#### 10 *Distress and Disability*

11  
12  
13 The K10, a commonly used measure of psychological distress, was included in both surveys  
14  
15 (24). According to established norms, a score of 15 or greater on the K10 was indicative of  
16  
17 medium to high psychological distress (25). Days out of role in the previous month were also  
18  
19 queried in both surveys and individuals with one or more days out of role were compared to  
20  
21 those who reported no days out of role.  
22  
23

#### 24 *Physical disorders*

25  
26  
27  
28 The 1997 survey included information on self-reported physical disorders: asthma, chronic  
29  
30 bronchitis, anaemia, high blood pressure, heart trouble, arthritis, kidney disease, diabetes,  
31  
32 cancer, stomach or duodenal cancer, gallbladder or liver trouble and hernia or rupture. The  
33  
34 chronicity of these conditions was not recorded. In the 2007 survey a wider range of self-  
35  
36 reported physical conditions were recorded: asthma, cancer, stroke, gout, rheumatism,  
37  
38 arthritis, diabetes, heart or circulatory conditions, hay fever, sinusitis, emphysema, bronchitis,  
39  
40 anaemia, epilepsy, oedema, hernias, kidney problems, migraine, psoriasis, stomach ulcer,  
41  
42 thyroid trouble, tuberculosis and back or neck problems. In the 2007 survey these conditions  
43  
44 were only recorded if the respondent had experienced them for a period of six months or  
45  
46 longer, therefore taking into account chronicity. For both surveys, respondents reporting one  
47  
48 or more physical conditions were compared with those who reported none.  
49  
50  
51

#### 52 *Cognitive impairment*

1  
2  
3 Both surveys included the Mini Mental State Examination (MMSE), a screener for cognitive  
4 impairment (26). Following standard scoring protocols, possible cognitive impairment was  
5 coded as present if the respondent scored less than 23 on the MMSE (27). The interview was  
6 terminated if the respondent scored less than 15 on the MMSE.  
7  
8  
9  
10

### 11 12 *Suicidality*

13  
14  
15 Both surveys included questions regarding suicidal ideation, plans or attempts. The current  
16 analyses compared respondents who reported any suicidality (thoughts, plans or attempts) in  
17 the 12 months prior to the interview with those who did not.  
18  
19  
20  
21

### 22 *Service use*

23  
24  
25 In the 1997 survey, respondents were asked whether they had consulted with the following  
26 health professionals in the 12 months prior to the interview: general practitioners,  
27 radiologists, pathologists, physicians or other medical specialists, surgical specialists or  
28 gynaecologists, psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers or welfare officers, drug and  
29 alcohol counsellors, other counsellors, nurses, mental health teams, chemists for professional  
30 advice, ambulance officers or other health professionals. In the 2007 survey, respondents  
31 were asked about consultations with the following health professionals in the 12 months prior  
32 to the interview: general practitioners, psychiatrists, psychologists, mental health nurses,  
33 other professionals providing specialist mental health services, specialist doctors or surgeons,  
34 other professionals providing general services and complementary or alternative therapists.  
35 For both surveys these service providers were dichotomised into general health service  
36 providers (i.e., general practitioners and specialist doctors) and mental health service  
37 providers (i.e., psychiatrists and psychologists). In both surveys, respondents were also asked  
38 about hospitalisations (overnight admissions) in the 12 months prior to the interview.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### *Medications*

In the 1997 survey, the respondents were asked about their use of 23 separate medications in the 12 months prior to the interview, including pain relievers, sleeping tablets, prescription medications with abuse potential and medications for psychiatric illness. In the 2007 survey respondents were asked about their use of medications in the 2 weeks prior to the interview including: sleeping tablets/capsules, tablets/capsules for anxiety or nerves, tranquillisers, antidepressants, mood stabilisers, and other medications for mental health. For both surveys, respondents using one or more medication were compared to those who had used none.

### *Demographics*

For both surveys, the demographic variables of interest were sex, age (34 years and younger, 35 to 64 years, 65 years and over), country of birth (Australia, other English speaking country, non-English speaking country), marital status (married, separated/widowed/divorced, never married), education (post high school, no post high school education), employment (employed, unemployed, not in the labour force), and current smoking status (present, absent).

### *Statistical analysis*

Weighted means, frequencies and logistic regressions were computed using SAS SURVEY procedures in SAS 9.2 (28) which adjusted for the characteristics of the complex survey design using jackknife repeated replication methods for variance estimation. Univariate and multivariate logistic regressions were then conducted to investigate the relationship between negative self-reported health and the variables of interest (described above). Initial analyses focused on the univariate relationships between self-rated health and the demographic, physical, psychological and service use variables of interest. Multivariate analyses were then

1  
2  
3 conducted to further investigate the relationship between self-rated health and the presence of  
4 any physical condition whilst adjusting for demographics, psychiatric illness, suicidality,  
5  
6 any physical condition whilst adjusting for demographics, psychiatric illness, suicidality,  
7  
8 cognitive impairment and, in the 1997 survey only, neuroticism. To investigate the  
9  
10 independent relationships between self-rated health, health anxiety and the ICD-10  
11  
12 psychiatric disorders of interest, multivariate analyses adjusted for demographics, any  
13  
14 physical condition, all other psychiatric disorders, suicidality, cognitive impairment and  
15  
16 neuroticism. To investigate the relationship between negative self-rated health and disability,  
17  
18 separate multivariate regressions for the K10 and days out of role variables were conducted  
19  
20 after adjusting for demographics, any physical condition, psychiatric illness, suicidality,  
21  
22 cognitive impairment and neuroticism. Finally, multivariate analyses controlling for  
23  
24 demographics, any physical condition, psychiatric illness, suicidality, cognitive impairment,  
25  
26 neuroticism, psychological distress and days out of role were conducted to investigate the  
27  
28 independent relationship between service use and self-rated health.  
29  
30  
31

### 32 **3 Results**

#### 34 Prevalence of negative self-rated health

35  
36  
37  
38 14.6% (SE = 0.4) of respondents reported that their health was “fair” or “poor” in the 1997  
39  
40 survey, whilst 14.8% (SE = 0.5) responded similarly in the 2007 survey. In both samples,  
41  
42 approximately 30% of those with negative self-rated health reported one or more ICD-10 12-  
43  
44 month mental disorder, compared with approximately 17% of those with positive self-rated  
45  
46 health (see Table 2 for specific odds ratios). Of those with negative self-rated health, 5.4%  
47  
48 were diagnosed with ICD-10 neurasthenia in the 1997 survey, whilst 14.8% screened positive  
49  
50 for health anxiety in the 2007 survey. Physical conditions were common amongst individuals  
51  
52 reporting negative self-rated health (approximately 72% in the 1997 survey and 88% in the  
53  
54 2007 survey).  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Univariate relationships between self-rated health and the variables of interest  
4

5  
6 There were consistencies between the two surveys in terms of the relationships between  
7  
8 negative self-rated health and the demographic variables of interest (Table 1). When  
9  
10 compared with individuals with positive self-rated health, those with negative self-rated  
11  
12 health were more likely to be: older, separated/widowed/divorced, educated to the high  
13  
14 school level only, not in the labour force and current regular smokers (see Table 1 for  
15  
16 relevant odds ratios for both surveys).  
17

18  
19  
20 As can be seen from Table 2, the univariate associations between negative self-rated health  
21  
22 and all of the correlates of interest were statistically significant in both surveys.  
23

24  
25 Multivariate relationships between self-rated health and the variables of interest  
26

27  
28 After adjusting for demographics, psychiatric illness, suicidality, cognitive impairment and  
29  
30 neuroticism (the latter in the 1997 survey only), individuals who reported negative self-rated  
31  
32 health were 3.6 times as likely to report any listed physical condition in the 1997 survey  
33  
34 (95% CI: 3.1 to 4.2) and 2.5 times as likely to report any listed physical condition in the 2007  
35  
36 survey (95% CI: 1.9 to 3.3) when compared with individuals who reported positive self-rated  
37  
38 health (Table 2).  
39

40  
41  
42 Multivariate logistic regressions which included the effects of demographics, any physical  
43  
44 condition, all ICD-10 psychiatric disorders, suicidality, cognitive impairment and neuroticism  
45  
46 were then conducted. After adjusting for the other variables in the model, individuals with  
47  
48 negative self-rated health in the 1997 survey were more likely to be diagnosed with  
49  
50 agoraphobia, GAD, neurasthenia, and more likely to report any physical condition,  
51  
52 suicidality, cognitive impairment and neuroticism when compared to those with positive self-  
53  
54 rated health (see Table 2). In the 1997 survey, the strongest multivariate relationship was  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 between self-rated health, on the one hand, and any physical condition and neurasthenia, on  
4 the other. Individuals with negative self-rated health in the 2007 survey were more likely to  
5 be diagnosed with social phobia and affective disorders (major depression, dysthymia and  
6 bipolar disorder), and more likely to report any physical condition, health anxiety, suicidality  
7 and cognitive impairment when compared to those with positive self-rated health (see Table  
8 2). In the 2007 survey, the strongest relationship was between self-reported health and health  
9 anxiety after adjusting for the other variables in the model.  
10  
11

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19 In both surveys, after controlling for demographics, any physical condition, any mental  
20 disorder, suicidality, cognitive impairment and neuroticism (in the 1997 survey only)  
21 individuals with negative self-rated health were considerably more likely to report medium to  
22 high distress on the K10, and one or more days out of role.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28  
29 After controlling for demographics, any physical condition, psychiatric illness, suicidality,  
30 cognitive impairment, neuroticism, psychological distress and days out of role, individuals  
31 with negative self-rated health were more likely to use all health services when compared to  
32 those with positive self-rated health. The relationship between self-rated health and mental  
33 health service use was only significant in the 1997 survey. In both surveys, individuals with  
34 negative self-rated health were also more likely to have been hospitalized overnight, and to  
35 have used medications when compared to those with positive self-rated health.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

#### 45 **4 Discussion**

46  
47  
48 These results confirm both of the study hypotheses: 1) that negative self-rated health was  
49 powerfully and independently associated with somatisation; and 2) that negative self-rated  
50 health was associated with general health service use, hospitalisation and medication use,  
51 even after adjusting for an extensive range of psychiatric and physical conditions. The current  
52 study provided a strong test of these hypotheses by replicating these findings in two  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 epidemiological surveys of the Australian population. Negative perceptions of health status  
4  
5 were independently associated with the presence of any physical or mental disorder (as well  
6  
7 as neurasthenia and health anxiety), disability, psychopathology, suicidality, cognitive  
8  
9 impairment and high rates of service use. The current findings, combined with previous  
10  
11 research linking negative perceived health with increased rates of mortality, indicate that  
12  
13 subjective concerns regarding perceived poor health must be considered an important public  
14  
15 health issue.  
16  
17

### 18 19 Limitations

20  
21  
22 The use of the two Australian national surveys conferred many advantages in terms of  
23  
24 replication, sample representativeness, fully structured diagnoses of all the common  
25  
26 psychiatric disorders, extensive assessment of service utilisation and the inclusion of a broad  
27  
28 range of other clinical measures. The surveys focused on mental health rather than physical  
29  
30 health, which meant that objective assessments of physical morbidity were not available.  
31  
32 However, others have found very little discrepancy between self-reported physical conditions  
33  
34 and physician reported medical histories (9), and most previous research investigating the  
35  
36 correlates of negative self-rated health have relied upon similar self-reported measures of  
37  
38 physical health problems (7). Health anxiety in the 2007 survey was based on screening  
39  
40 questions rather than full diagnostic assessment (20). In particular, it was not possible to  
41  
42 determine whether respondents met full criteria for hypochondriasis. Both surveys were  
43  
44 cross-sectional in nature, precluding an investigation of the direction of the relationships  
45  
46 identified in the current study. To our knowledge, no prospective examination of self-rated  
47  
48 health and somatisation has been undertaken, and the current results suggest this may be a  
49  
50 fruitful avenue for future research.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The independent relationships between negative self-rated health and psychological distress  
4 highlight the nontrivial nature of these health complaints, whilst the consistent, independent  
5 relationships with suicidality and cognitive impairment have been identified and discussed  
6 previously (9, 29, 30). Negative self-rated health was also independently associated with  
7 neuroticism and anxiety disorders (agoraphobia and GAD) in the 1997 survey, and anxiety  
8 (social phobia) and affective disorders (major depression, dysthymia and bipolar disorder) in  
9 the 2007 survey. Whilst these findings were not replicated across the two surveys at the  
10 disorder level, they are consistent with previous research (9). The relationship between  
11 negative self-rated health and neurotic, or internalising disorders (31), may reflect an overall  
12 tendency towards negative self-evaluation and ruminative style that extends to perceptions of  
13 negative health status. The following discussion will focus on the novel aspects of the current  
14 study, including the independent relationships between negative self-rated health and  
15 somatisation, and the high rates of service use irrespective of the level of mental and physical  
16 illness.

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35 The majority of individuals with poor self-rated health reported the presence of at least one of  
36 the major physical conditions enquired about in either survey. These findings suggest that, in  
37 most cases, negative ratings of health may be partly justified in terms of physical illness.  
38 However, self-rated health was also related to psychopathology, even after adjusting for  
39 physical illness, suggesting that the perception of global self-rated health is also  
40 independently influenced by psychological factors. Whilst the current study found that  
41 negative self-rated health was independently associated with affective and anxiety disorders,  
42 only the relationship with somatisation was replicated across both surveys. This finding is  
43 consistent with previous research (8, 10). Perceived health is principally composed of  
44 physical symptoms (11) whilst the distinguishing feature of somatisation is a pathological  
45 preoccupation with health and disease-related concerns. The robust associations identified in  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the current study suggest that negative self-rated health may be a mild or prodromal symptom  
4  
5 of disorders related to health anxiety.  
6  
7

8  
9 The current study also indicated that, independently of physical and psychiatric conditions,  
10  
11 individuals with poor self-rated health used general health services and medications at  
12  
13 particularly high rates. Hospitalisations were also common. High rates of service use  
14  
15 independent of actual physical and mental problems need to be addressed. Given the strong  
16  
17 relationship between negative self-rated health and somatisation, the high rates of service use  
18  
19 amongst individuals with negatively perceived health may reflect reassurance-seeking, a  
20  
21 symptom central to hypochondriasis and related psychiatric disorders. Consistent with the  
22  
23 current findings, previous research has found that negative self-rated health, as well as  
24  
25 somatisation, hypochondriasis and medically unexplained physical symptoms, all contribute  
26  
27 disproportionately to the growing demand for health services (32). However, individuals  
28  
29 presenting with these symptoms and disorders are also more likely to be dissatisfied with the  
30  
31 services provided (33, 34). With regards to hypochondriasis specifically, high rates of service  
32  
33 use result in consultations that are unsatisfactory and exasperating for both the doctor and  
34  
35 patient (35). This tension most likely arises because patients are seeking physical  
36  
37 explanations for their concerns, which are largely psychological in nature. Treatment of  
38  
39 health anxiety has not been rewarding for either party, with anger on the patients part that  
40  
41 cure is not forthcoming and frustration on the clinicians part that reassurance and good advice  
42  
43 is not beneficial. Consultations are often fraught. Patient and physician education regarding  
44  
45 the psychological nature of health-related concerns, and the direction of patients to  
46  
47 appropriate treatment options with minimal clinician involvement, may lessen such tensions  
48  
49 in doctor-patient relationships. Internet-delivered cognitive behavioural therapy is effective  
50  
51 for the internalising disorders generally (36-38), and has been shown to be effective for  
52  
53 health anxiety specifically (39, 40). Internet delivered cognitive behavioural therapy, which  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 can be administered at low cost and with minimal clinician involvement may be one way  
4  
5 around the problems in the interaction between doctor and patient.  
6  
7

### 8 **Competing interests**

9  
10 All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at  
11  
12 [www.icmje.org/coi\\_disclosure.pdf](http://www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf) and declare: no support from any organisation for the  
13  
14 submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest  
15  
16 in the submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that  
17  
18 could appear to have influenced the submitted work.  
19  
20  
21

### 22 **Copyright**

23  
24 The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on  
25  
26 behalf of all authors, [a worldwide licence](#) to the Publishers and its licensees in perpetuity, in  
27  
28 all forms, formats and media (whether known now or created in the future), to i) publish,  
29  
30 reproduce, distribute, display and store the Contribution, ii) translate the Contribution into  
31  
32 other languages, create adaptations, reprints, include within collections and create summaries,  
33  
34 extracts and/or, abstracts of the Contribution, iii) create any other derivative work(s) based on  
35  
36 the Contribution, iv) to exploit all subsidiary rights in the Contribution, v) the inclusion of  
37  
38 electronic links from the Contribution to third party material where-ever it may be located;  
39  
40 and, vi) licence any third party to do any or all of the above.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

### 47 **Acknowledgements**

48  
49 The 1997 and 2007 NSMHWB was funded by the Australian Government Department of  
50  
51 Health and Ageing, and conducted by the Australian Bureau of Statistics.  
52  
53  
54

### 55 **Author Contributions**

1  
2  
3 LM and GA conceived the study and its design. LM conducted all statistical analyses. GA  
4  
5 and LM both contributed to the interpretation of the data. LM wrote the first draft and GA  
6  
7 contributed to all successive revisions. Both LM and GA approved the final manuscript to be  
8  
9 published.  
10

### 11 12 **Data sharing**

13  
14  
15 The data for the 1997 and 2007 NSMHWB are public access files that can be accessed  
16  
17 through consultation with the Australian Bureau of Statistics.  
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

## References

1. Idler EL, Russell LB, Davis D. Survival, functional limitations, and self-rated health in the NHANES I Epidemiologic Follow-up Study, 1992. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2000;152(9):874-83.
2. Shadbolt B, Barresi J, Craft P. Self-rated health as a predictor of survival among patients with advanced cancer. *J Clin Oncol.* 2002;20(10):2514-9.
3. Idler EL, Angel RJ. Self-rated health and mortality in the NHANES-I Epidemiologic Follow-up Study. *Am J Public Health.* 1990;80(4):446-52.
4. Frenk J, BOBADILLA JL, SEPUÚLVEDA J, CERVANTES ML. Health transition in middle-income countries: new challenges for health care. *Health Policy Plan.* 1989;4(1):29-39.
5. Moynihan R, Glasziou P, Woloshin S, Schwartz L, Santa J, Godlee F. Winding back the harms of too much medicine. *BMJ.* 2013;346.
6. Moynihan R, Smith R. Too much medicine?: Almost certainly. *BMJ.* 2002;324(7342):859.
7. Idler EL, Benyamini Y. Self-rated health and mortality: a review of twenty-seven community studies. *J Health Soc Behav.* 1997:21-37.
8. Gureje O, Üstün T, Simon G. The syndrome of hypochondriasis: a cross-national study in primary care. *Psychol Med.* 1997;27(05):1001-10.
9. Goodwin R, Olfson M. Self-perception of poor health and suicidal ideation in medical patients. *Psychol Med.* 2002;32(7):1293-9.
10. Barsky AJ, Cleary PD, Klerman GL. Determinants of perceived health status of medical outpatients. *Soc Sci Med.* 1992;34(10):1147-54.
11. Krause NM, Jay GM. What do global self-rated health items measure? *Med Care.* 1994;930-42.
12. Slade T, Johnston A, Oakley Browne M, Andrews G, Whiteford H. National Survey of Mental Health and Wellbeing: methods and key findings. *Aust NZJ Psychiatry.* 2009;43:594-605.
13. Andrews G, Henderson S, Hall W. Prevalence, comorbidity, disability and service utilisation Overview of the Australian National Mental Health Survey. *The British Journal of Psychiatry.* 2001;178(2):145-53.
14. Ware Jr JE, Kosinski M, Keller SD. A 12-Item Short-Form Health Survey: construction of scales and preliminary tests of reliability and validity. *Med Care.* 1996;34(3):220-33.
15. Andrews G. A brief integer scorer for the SF-12: validity of the brief scorer in Australian community and clinic settings. *Aust N Z J Public Health.* 2002;26(6):508-10.
16. Kessler RC, Ustun TB. The World Mental Health (WMH) Survey Initiative Version of the World Health Organization (WHO) Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI). *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research.* 2004;13(2):93-121.
17. World Health Organisation. Composite International Diagnostic Interview. Organisation WH, editor. Geneva, Switzerland 1990.
18. World Health Organisation. The ICD-10 Classification of Mental and Behavioural Disorders - Diagnostic Criteria for Research Geneva: World Health Organisation; 1993.
19. Hickie I, Davenport T, Issakidis C, Andrews G. Neurasthenia: prevalence, disability and health care characteristics in the Australian community. *Br J Psychiatry.* 2002;181(1):56-61.
20. Sunderland M, Newby JM, Andrews G. Health anxiety in Australia: prevalence, comorbidity, disability and service use. *The British Journal of Psychiatry.* 2012.
21. Asmundson GJ, Abramowitz JS, Richter AA, Whedon M. Health anxiety: Current perspectives and future directions. *Curr Psychiatry Rep.* 2010;12(4):306-12.
22. American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition (DSM-IV). Washington DC: American Psychiatric Association; 1994.
23. Eysenck HJ, Eysenck SBG. Manual for the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire:(EPQ-R Adult): Educational Industrial Testing Service; 1994.

- 1
- 2
- 3 24. Kessler RC, Andrews G, Colpe LJ, Hiripi E, Mroczek DK, Normand SLT, et al. Short screening
- 4 scales to monitor population prevalences and trends in non-specific psychological distress. *Psychol*
- 5 *Med.* 2002;32(6):959-76.
- 6 25. Andrews G, Slade T. Interpreting scores on the Kessler Psychological Distress Scale (K10).
- 7 *Aust N Z J Public Health.* 2001;25(6):494-7.
- 8 26. Folstein MF, Robins LN, Helzer JE. The mini-mental state examination. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.*
- 9 1983;40(7):812.
- 10 27. Lezak MD, Howieson DB, Loring DW. *Neuropsychological assessment: Oxford University*
- 11 *Press, USA; 2004.*
- 12 28. SAS Institute Inc. *SAS version 9.2. Cary, NC: SAS Intsitute Inc; 2008.*
- 13 29. Barsky AJ, Ahern DK, Bailey ED, Saintfort R, Liu EB, Peekna HM. Hypochondriacal patients'
- 14 appraisal of health and physical risks. *Am J Psychiatry.* 2001;158(5):783-7.
- 15 30. Walker JD, Maxwell CJ, Hogan DB, Eby EM. Does Self-Rated Health Predict Survival in Older
- 16 Persons with Cognitive Impairment? *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2004;52(11):1895-900.
- 17 31. Goldberg D, Krueger R, Andrews G, Hobbs M. Emotional disorders: cluster 4 of the proposed
- 18 meta-structure for DSM-V and ICD-11. *Psychol Med.* 2009;39(12):2043-59.
- 19 32. Little P, Somerville J, Williamson I, Warner G, Moore M, Wiles R, et al. Psychosocial, lifestyle,
- 20 and health status variables in predicting high attendance among adults. *The British Journal of*
- 21 *General Practice.* 2001;51(473):987.
- 22 33. Luccock M, Morley S, White C, Peake M. Responses of consecutive patients to reassurance
- 23 after gastroscopy: results of self administered questionnaire survey. *BMJ.* 1997;315(7108):572-5.
- 24 34. Speckens A, Spinhoven P, Van Hemert A, Bolk J. The Reassurance Questionnaire (RQ):
- 25 psychometric properties of a self-report questionnaire to assess reassurability. *Psychol Med.*
- 26 2000;30(4):841-7.
- 27 35. Conradt M, Cavanagh M, Franklin J, Rief W. Dimensionality of the Whiteley Index:
- 28 Assessment of hypochondriasis in an Australian sample of primary care patients. *J Psychosom Res.*
- 29 2006;60(2):137-43.
- 30 36. Andrews G, Cuijpers P, Craske MG, McEvoy P, Titov N. Computer therapy for the anxiety and
- 31 depressive disorders is effective, acceptable and practical health care: A meta-analysis. *PloS one.*
- 32 2010;5(10):e13196.
- 33 37. Newton L, Wong N, Andrews G. The effectiveness of internet cognitive behavioural therapy
- 34 for generalized anxiety disorder in clinical practice. *Depression and Anxiety.* 2012;59(10):843-9.
- 35 38. Williams AD, Andrews G. The Effectiveness of Internet Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (iCBT)
- 36 for Depression in Primary Care: A Quality Assurance Study. *PloS one.* 2013;8(2):e57447.
- 37 39. Hedman E, Ljótsson B, Andersson E, Rück C, Andersson G, Lindefors N. Effectiveness and cost
- 38 offset analysis of group CBT for hypochondriasis delivered in a psychiatric setting: An open trial.
- 39 *Cogn Behav Ther.* 2010;39(4):239-50.
- 40 40. Jones FA. The role of bibliotherapy in health anxiety: An experimental study. *British Journal*
- 41 *of Community Nursing.* 2002;7(10):498-504.
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

Table 1. Prevalence and demographic correlates of negative self-rated health in the 1997 (n = 10641) and 2007 (n = 8841) Australian National Surveys of Mental Health and Well-Being

	1997 NATIONAL SURVEY OF MENTAL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING			2007 NATIONAL SURVEY OF MENTAL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING		
	Negative self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Positive self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) <i>OR (95% CI)</i>	Negative self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Positive self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) <i>OR (95% CI)</i>
<b>Sex</b>						
Male	51.9 (1.1)	48.8 (0.2)	Ref	50.5 (1.9)	49.5 (0.4)	Ref
Female	48.1 (1.1)	51.2 (0.2)	0.9 (0.8-1.0) <sup>a</sup>	49.5 (1.9)	50.5 (0.4)	1.0 (0.8-1.1)
<b>Age</b>						
18-34	19.4 (1.2)	36.8 (0.3)	Ref	18.6 (1.4)	36.0 (0.3)	Ref
35-64	49.9 (1.3)	50.4 (0.3)	1.9 (1.6-2.2) <sup>a</sup>	57.0 (2.0)	50.6 (0.4)	2.2 (1.7-2.7) <sup>a</sup>
65-85	30.7 (1.1)	12.8 (0.3)	4.6 (3.8-5.5) <sup>a</sup>	24.4 (1.2)	13.4 (0.2)	3.5 (2.9-4.3) <sup>a</sup>
<b>Country of birth</b>						
Australia	72.1 (1.7)	75.3 (0.5)	Ref	73.3 (2.0)	72.8 (0.8)	Ref
Other English speaking country	10.4 (0.9)	11.5 (0.4)	0.9 (0.8-1.2)	11.3 (1.4)	11.3 (0.4)	1.0 (0.7-1.3)
Other non-English speaking country	17.5 (1.1)	13.1 (0.5)	1.4 (1.2-1.7) <sup>a</sup>	15.4 (1.8)	15.9 (0.8)	1.0 (0.7-1.3)
<b>Marital status</b>						
Married/de facto	62.1 (1.1)	65.7 (0.7)	Ref	54.4 (1.8)	52.8 (0.7)	Ref
Separated/widowed/divorced	21.6 (1.2)	12.2 (0.3)	1.9 (1.6-2.2) <sup>a</sup>	21.6 (1.4)	13.3 (0.4)	1.6 (1.3-1.9) <sup>a</sup>
Never married	16.2 (1.2)	22.1 (0.5)	0.8 (0.7-0.9) <sup>a</sup>	24.0 (1.5)	34.0 (9.7)	0.7 (0.6-0.8) <sup>a</sup>
<b>Education</b>						
Higher education	34.7 (1.6)	49.6 (0.7)	Ref	56.2 (2.1)	56.3 (0.6)	Ref
No higher education	65.3 (1.6)	50.4 (0.7)	1.8 (1.6-2.1) <sup>a</sup>	53.8 (2.1)	43.7 (0.6)	1.5 (1.3-1.8) <sup>a</sup>
<b>Employment</b>						
Employed	33.6 (1.6)	68.6 (0.5)	Ref	45.5 (1.6)	68.7 (0.3)	Ref
Unemployed	5.6 (0.6)	3.9 (0.2)	3.0 (2.3-3.9) <sup>a</sup>	1.9 (0.5)	2.7 (0.1)	1.1 (0.6-1.9)
Not in labour force	60.8 (1.7)	27.5 (0.5)	4.5 (3.9-5.3) <sup>a</sup>	52.6 (1.6)	28.6 (0.3)	2.8 (2.4-3.2) <sup>a</sup>
<b>Regular smoker (current)</b>	30.7 (1.0)	21.9 (0.6)	1.6 (1.4-1.8) <sup>a</sup>	25.1 (1.8)	17.1 (0.7)	1.6 (1.3-2.0) <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ 

Table 2. Prevalence and correlates of negative self-rated health in the 1997 (n = 10641) and 2007 (n = 8841) Australian National Surveys of Mental Health and Well-Being



	1997 NATIONAL SURVEY OF MENTAL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING				2007 NATIONAL SURVEY OF MENTAL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING			
	Negative self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Positive self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) <i>OR (95% CI)</i>	Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) <i>Adjusted OR (95% CI)</i>	Negative self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Positive self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) <i>OR (95% CI)</i>	Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) <i>Adjusted OR (95% CI)</i>
<b>Physical disorder</b>								
Any physical disorders	72.0 (1.2)	32.7 (0.6)	5.3 (4.6-6.0) <sup>a</sup>	3.6 (3.1-4.2) <sup>b</sup>	87.9 (1.4)	65.6 (0.8)	3.8 (2.9-5.0)	2.5 (1.9-3.3) <sup>b</sup>
<b>12 month ICD-10 psychiatric disorders</b>								
Panic disorder	2.8 (0.5)	0.9 (0.1)	3.3 (2.1-5.3) <sup>a</sup>	1.8 (0.9-3.5)	5.6 (0.9)	2.0 (0.2)	2.8 (2.0-4.0) <sup>a</sup>	1.3 (0.9-2.0)
Agoraphobia	3.3 (0.4)	0.7 (0.1)	4.7 (3.1-7.1) <sup>a</sup>	1.9 (1.2-3.2) <sup>c</sup>	7.8 (1.2)	1.9 (0.2)	4.3 (2.9-6.3) <sup>a</sup>	1.1 (0.6-2.0)
Social phobia	5.0 (0.6)	2.4 (0.2)	2.2 (1.7-2.8) <sup>a</sup>	1.4 (0.9-2.1)	11.6 (1.4)	3.6 (0.2)	3.5 (2.6-4.7) <sup>a</sup>	2.1 (1.1-3.9) <sup>c</sup>
Generalised anxiety disorder	7.8 (0.8)	2.2 (0.2)	3.7 (3.1-4.5) <sup>a</sup>	1.6 (1.3-2.1) <sup>c</sup>	6.0 (0.7)	2.1 (0.3)	2.9 (2.0-4.2) <sup>a</sup>	0.8 (0.5-1.3)
Obsessive compulsive disorder	0.7 (0.2)	0.3 (0.1)	2.8 (1.4-5.6) <sup>a</sup>	0.6 (0.3-1.4)	3.5 (0.7)	1.6 (0.2)	2.1 (1.3-3.4) <sup>a</sup>	0.8 (0.4-1.6)
Post-traumatic stress disorder	6.8 (0.7)	2.6 (0.2)	2.7 (2.1-3.5) <sup>a</sup>	1.3 (0.9-1.7)	11.1 (1.1)	5.6 (0.3)	2.1 (1.6-2.7) <sup>a</sup>	1.2 (0.8-1.7)
Major depression	13.2 (0.9)	5.6 (0.3)	2.6 (2.1-3.1) <sup>a</sup>	1.2 (0.9-1.6)	7.5 (1.0)	1.9 (0.3)	4.2 (2.8-6.3) <sup>a</sup>	1.8 (1.1-3.1) <sup>c</sup>
Dysthymia	4.1 (0.7)	0.8 (0.1)	5.1 (3.4-7.8) <sup>a</sup>	1.2 (0.7-2.0)	4.7 (0.7)	0.7 (0.1)	7.1 (4.5-11.1) <sup>a</sup>	2.4 (1.4-4.2) <sup>c</sup>
Bipolar disorder	-	-	-	-	4.9 (0.7)	1.2 (0.2)	4.1 (2.7-6.2) <sup>a</sup>	2.5 (1.4-4.5) <sup>c</sup>
Alcohol use disorder	7.0 (0.5)	6.3 (0.3)	1.1 (0.9-1.4)	0.8 (0.6-1.0)	5.8 (0.9)	4.1 (0.4)	1.4 (1.0-2.2) <sup>a</sup>	1.2 (0.7-2.1)
Substance use disorder	3.5 (0.5)	1.9 (0.2)	2.0 (1.4-2.8) <sup>a</sup>	1.1 (0.7-1.9)	3.0 (0.6)	1.2 (0.1)	2.6 (1.5-4.4) <sup>a</sup>	1.5 (0.8-3.0)
Neurasthenia	5.4 (0.6)	0.8 (0.1)	7.1 (4.8-10.6) <sup>a</sup>	3.4 (2.2-5.2) <sup>c</sup>	-	-	-	-
Any 12-month ICD disorder	30.7 (1.5)	16.9 (0.6)	2.2 (1.9-2.6) <sup>a</sup>	1.7 (1.4-2.1) <sup>c</sup>	35.0 (1.7)	17.3 (0.6)	2.6 (2.2-3.0) <sup>a</sup>	2.1 (1.6-2.6) <sup>c</sup>
<b>Other measures</b>								
Illness anxiety disorder	-	-	-	-	14.8 (1.4)	2.4 (0.2)	7.1 (5.3-9.6) <sup>a</sup>	4.1 (2.8-5.9) <sup>c</sup>
Any personality disorder	12.4 (1.0)	5.4 (0.3)	2.5 (2.0-3.0) <sup>a</sup>	1.2 (0.9-1.6)	-	-	-	-
Psychosis	1.2 (0.3)	0.3 (0.1)	4.0 (2.3-7.2) <sup>a</sup>	2.3 (0.9-5.9)	-	-	-	-
Suicidality	7.3 (0.6)	2.1 (0.1)	3.6 (2.9-4.6) <sup>a</sup>	1.8 (1.1-2.9) <sup>c</sup>	7.2 (1.0)	1.5 (0.2)	4.9 (3.4-7.1) <sup>a</sup>	2.3 (1.4-3.7) <sup>c</sup>
Cognitive impairment (≤ 23 on MMSE)	3.7 (0.6)	0.9 (0.1)	4.5 (2.9-7.0) <sup>a</sup>	1.5 (1.1-2.1) <sup>c</sup>	21.6 (1.1)	12.8 (0.2)	1.9 (1.6-2.2) <sup>a</sup>	2.4 (1.5-4.1) <sup>c</sup>
Neuroticism (top 10 percentile of EPQ)	22.7 (1.3)	7.7 (0.4)	3.5 (3.0-4.2) <sup>a</sup>	2.3 (1.8-2.8) <sup>c</sup>	-	-	-	-
<b>Distress and impairment</b>								
High psychological distress	61.6 (1.2)	27.3 (0.6)	4.3 (3.8-4.8) <sup>a</sup>	3.6 (3.1-4.1) <sup>d</sup>	55.1 (1.7)	24.4 (0.7)	3.8 (3.3-4.4) <sup>a</sup>	2.8 (2.4-3.4) <sup>d</sup>
One or more days out of role	36.5 (1.6)	14.9 (0.5)	3.3 (2.8-3.8) <sup>a</sup>	3.0 (2.5-3.5) <sup>d</sup>	56.3 (2.1)	22.4 (0.7)	4.5 (3.6-5.5) <sup>a</sup>	3.1 (2.5-3.9) <sup>d</sup>
<b>Service use in past 12 months</b>								
Mental health service	10.5 (0.9)	4.1 (0.3)	2.7 (2.1-3.6) <sup>a</sup>	2.1 (1.5-2.9) <sup>e</sup>	13.1 (1.5)	6.3 (0.4)	2.3 (1.7-3.0) <sup>a</sup>	1.2 (0.8-1.7)
General health service	93.5 (0.5)	84.2 (0.5)	2.7 (2.3-3.2) <sup>a</sup>	1.9 (1.6-2.3) <sup>e</sup>	90.9 (1.4)	81.5 (0.9)	2.3 (1.6-3.2) <sup>a</sup>	1.5 (1.0-2.1) <sup>e</sup>
Mental or general health service	93.8 (0.5)	84.5 (0.5)	2.8 (2.3-3.4) <sup>a</sup>	1.9 (1.6-2.3) <sup>e</sup>	91.3 (1.3)	82.0 (0.9)	2.3 (1.6-3.3) <sup>a</sup>	1.5 (1.0-2.1) <sup>e</sup>
Hospitalisations	25.4 (1.1)	10.6 (0.3)	2.9 (2.5-3.3) <sup>a</sup>	2.2 (1.8-2.6) <sup>e</sup>	18.5 (1.4)	9.0 (0.5)	2.3 (1.9-2.8) <sup>a</sup>	1.5 (1.2-1.9) <sup>e</sup>
Medications	38.5 (1.5)	13.5 (0.5)	4.0 (3.5-4.7) <sup>a</sup>	2.6 (2.2-3.1) <sup>e</sup>	24.1 (1.4)	9.5 (0.6)	3.0 (2.5-3.7) <sup>a</sup>	1.6 (1.2-2.0) <sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$

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

<sup>b</sup> Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ . Multivariate analysis adjusting for demographics, psychiatric illness, suicidality, cognitive impairment and, in the 1997 survey only, neuroticism.

<sup>c</sup> Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ . Multivariate analysis adjusting for demographics, any physical condition, all other psychiatric disorders, suicidality, cognitive impairment and neuroticism (1997 survey only).

<sup>d</sup> Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ . Multivariate analysis adjusting for demographics, any physical condition, psychiatric illness, suicidality, cognitive impairment and neuroticism (1997 survey only).

<sup>e</sup> Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ . Multivariate analysis adjusting for demographics, any physical condition, psychiatric illness, suicidality, cognitive impairment, neuroticism (1997 survey only), psychological distress and days out of role.

For peer review only

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

	Item No	Recommendation
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract ( <b>pg. 1</b> ) (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found ( <b>pg. 2-3</b> )
<b>Introduction</b>		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported ( <b>pg. 4-5</b> )
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses ( <b>pg. 5-6</b> )
<b>Methods</b>		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper ( <b>pg. 6</b> )
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection ( <b>pg.6</b> )
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants ( <b>pg.6</b> )
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable ( <b>pg.7-11</b> )
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 ( <b>pg.7-11</b> )
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias ( <b>pg.6</b> )
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at ( <b>pg.6</b> )
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why ( <b>pg.7-12</b> )
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding ( <b>pg.11-12</b> ) (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions ( <b>pg.11-12</b> ) (c) Explain how missing data were addressed ( <b>n/a</b> ) (d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy ( <b>pg.11-12</b> ) (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses ( <b>n/a</b> )
<b>Results</b>		
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed ( <b>pg.6</b> ) (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage ( <b>pg.6</b> ) (c) Consider use of a flow diagram ( <b>n/a</b> )
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders ( <b>Tables 1-2</b> ) (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures ( <b>Tables 1-2</b> )
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included ( <b>Tables 1-2</b> ) (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized ( <b>pg. 7-</b>

		<b>11 &amp; Tables 1-2)</b>
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period ( <b>n/a</b> )
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses ( <b>Tables 1-2</b> )
<b>Discussion</b>		
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives ( <b>pg. 14-15</b> )
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias ( <b>pg.15</b> )
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence ( <b>pg. 16-18</b> )
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results ( <b>pg. 6</b> )
<b>Other information</b>		
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 ( <b>pg. 18, Acknowledgments</b> )

\*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

**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](http://www.strobe-statement.org).



**Poor self-rated health and its associations with somatisation in two Australian national surveys**

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2013-002965.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	13-May-2013
Complete List of Authors:	Mewton, Louise; University of New South Wales, Clinical Research Unit for Anxiety and Depression Andrews, Gavin; University of New South Wales, Clinical Research Unit for Anxiety and Depression
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Epidemiology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Mental health
Keywords:	EPIDEMIOLOGY, MENTAL HEALTH, PUBLIC HEALTH

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 **Poor self-rated health and its associations with somatisation in two Australian national**  
4  
5 **surveys**  
6  
7

8 Louise Mewton<sup>1,2</sup> & Gavin Andrews<sup>1,2</sup>  
9

10  
11 1. School of Psychiatry, University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW, Australia.  
12

13  
14 2. Clinical Research Unit for Anxiety and Depression (CRUfAD), St. Vincent's Hospital,  
15  
16 Sydney, NSW, Australia.  
17

18  
19 **Corresponding Author:** Dr Louise Mewton, Clinical Research Unit for Anxiety and  
20  
21 Depression, Level 4, O'Brien Centre, St. Vincent's Hospital, 394-404 Victoria Street,  
22  
23 Darlinghurst, NSW, Australia. Ph: (+612) 8382 1437. Email: [louisem@unsw.edu.au](mailto:louisem@unsw.edu.au)  
24  
25

26  
27 **Key words:** self-rated health, neurasthenia, health anxiety, epidemiology  
28

29 **Conflict of interest:** None  
30

31 **Word count:** 2887 (excluding abstract, tables and references)  
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

*Objectives:* It is hypothesised that across two national surveys poor self-rated health will be independently associated with somatisation and will result in high rates of service use after adjusting for established diagnoses.

*Design:* Two cross-sectional population-based surveys conducted in 1997 and 2007. The use of both surveys allowed replication of results.

*Setting:* Australia.

*Participants:* The 1997 and 2007 National Surveys of Mental Health and Well-Being were based on stratified, multistage area probability samples of persons living in private dwellings in Australia. The 1997 survey included 10641 respondents aged 18 to 75, a response rate of 78%. The 2007 survey included 8841 respondents aged 16 to 85, a response rate of 60%.

*Main outcome measures:* Self-rated health.

*Results:* Approximately 15% of the Australian population rated their health as fair or poor in both surveys. The independent relationship between self-rated health and somatisation was replicated across both surveys in multivariate analyses. Individuals with negative self-rated health were 4.1 times as likely to screen positive for health anxiety (OR: 4.1; 95% CI 2.8 to 5.9) and 3.4 times as likely to be diagnosed with neurasthenia (OR: 3.4; 95% CI 2.2 to 5.2), when compared with individuals who rated their health positively. Individuals with negative self-rated health were also more likely to use health services after controlling for demographics, mental and physical illness.

*Conclusions:* These results confirm both of the study hypotheses: 1) that negative self-rated health was powerfully and independently associated with somatisation; and 2) that this

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

relationship manifested itself in high rates of service use, even after adjusting for an extensive range of demographics, psychiatric and physical conditions.

For peer review only



## 1 Introduction

Rating your health as excellent, very good, good, fair or poor seems a simple concept that is unlikely to contain surprises, but ratings of health as fair or poor are predictors of morbidity and mortality after adjusting for clinical health status (1). Self-ratings of overall health are only modestly correlated with clinical assessments of medical status, but appear more closely related to psychiatric illness, and aspects of personality such as neuroticism (2-4). These findings are surprising given the evidence that suggests that respondents mainly have physical health problems in mind when asked to rate their global health status (5). Thus, whilst the decision to rate global health positively or negatively is driven by psychological factors, it appears that respondents mainly consider physical health problems when rating their global health status. These findings suggest that a dysfunctional preoccupation with physical health and disease related concerns (termed “somatisation” for ease of reading) may be particularly salient in the interpretation of global ratings of health status. Consistent with this hypothesis, hypochondriasis, somatisation and limitations in activities of daily living explain much of the variance in patient reports of overall health status (4).

The current study tests the relationship between self-rated health and somatisation, specifically neurasthenia and health anxiety, in two national surveys of the Australian population conducted in 1997 and 2007. The strength of the current study is therefore in the ability to replicate the findings across two large, epidemiological datasets that included structured diagnoses of the major mental disorders and similar measures of other clinical, demographic and service use variables. It is hypothesised that across both surveys: 1) poor self-rated health will be powerfully and independently associated with neurasthenia and health anxiety; and 2) that this association will also manifest itself in high rates of reassurance-seeking, reflected by high rates of service use independent of established psychiatric and physical diagnoses. To our knowledge, these hypotheses have not been tested

1  
2  
3 using representative, population-based samples, and never within the context of fully  
4  
5 structured diagnoses of the major psychiatric disorders.  
6  
7

## 8 **2 Method**

### 9 10 Sample

11  
12  
13 The 1997 and 2007 National Surveys of Mental Health and Well-Being (NSMHWB) were  
14 based on stratified, multistage area probability samples of persons living in private dwellings  
15 in Australia, excluding very remote dwellings (6, 7). The 1997 survey included 10641  
16 respondents aged 18 to 75, representing a response rate of 78%. Characteristics of non-  
17 responders were not explicitly examined in the 1997 survey. The 2007 survey included 8841  
18 respondents aged 16 to 85, representing a response rate of 60%. A small, non-random follow-  
19 up study of the 2007 survey indicated that while the response rate had little effect at the  
20 aggregate level, there may have been some under-estimation in the prevalence estimates for  
21 mental disorders in males and young people. The age and gender characteristics of both  
22 samples were weighted to match the age and gender distributions in Australia. Both surveys  
23 were designed to provide accurate estimates of the population prevalence of selected major  
24 mental disorders and the related service utilisation. The Australian Bureau of Statistics  
25 (ABS), the national government statistics agency, conducted both the 1997 and 2007 surveys.  
26 The ABS provided ethical review and approval for the surveys, including voluntary  
27 recruitment, rigorous confidentiality provisions, and written informed consent. The ABS  
28 operates under Australian National Legislation that mandates strict provisions for the ethical  
29 conduct of the agency's research. The methods for both surveys have been discussed in more  
30 detail elsewhere (6, 7).  
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 Measures

1  
2  
3 The dependent variable in the current study was self-rated health, whilst the main  
4  
5 independent variables were neurasthenia, health anxiety and service use (including  
6  
7 medication use). In order to investigate the independence of the relationships between self-  
8  
9 rated health and somatisation, several possible covariates were also examined. These  
10  
11 included demographics and psychiatric disorders which have been shown to be related to  
12  
13 health anxiety in a previous study of the 2007 NSMHWB (8), as well as physical disorders to  
14  
15 ensure that any relationships identified were not simply a reflection of actual health status.  
16  
17

18  
19 Independent variable  
20

### 21 22 *Self-rated health* 23

24  
25 For the 1997 survey each respondent was administered the 12 item Short Form Health Survey  
26  
27 (SF-12), a widely used measure of health and well-being (9). The first item of the SF-12  
28  
29 required the respondent to rate their health in general, with responses categorised as  
30  
31 “excellent”, “very good”, “good”, “fair” or “poor”. This question informs the physical  
32  
33 component scale of the SF-12 (10) and, for the purposes of the current study, constituted the  
34  
35 main outcome variable for the 1997 survey. In the 2007 NSMHWB, respondents were asked  
36  
37 to rate their overall physical health and overall mental health in two separate questions, with  
38  
39 responses to both questions categorised as above. Given that the item used in the 1997 survey  
40  
41 is weighted heavily towards physical well-being, the query regarding self-rated physical  
42  
43 health was selected as the main outcome variable for the 2007 survey. Respondents were to  
44  
45 rate their physical health before they were asked to rate their mental health in the 2007  
46  
47 survey. In both surveys, the questions regarding self-rated health were administered before  
48  
49 questions about mental disorders and service use. To ensure sufficient power to detect  
50  
51 differences in statistical analyses, the main outcome variables for both surveys were  
52  
53 dichotomized into negative (“fair” or “poor”) and positive (“good”, “very good” and  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 “excellent”) self-rated health. Grouping of these responses in such a manner is common  
4  
5 practice in the self-rated health literature due to the similar survival probabilities within these  
6  
7 collapsed categories (11).  
8  
9

10 Dependent variables

### 11 12 13 *Health anxiety and neurasthenia*

14  
15  
16 The 1997 survey included a module on the ICD-10 diagnosis for neurasthenia (12).  
17  
18 Meanwhile, the 2007 survey collected additional information on health anxiety (8, 13). The  
19  
20 respondents were first asked whether they had ever worried a lot about serious illness, despite  
21  
22 having reassurance from a doctor or medical specialist. If endorsed, the respondents were  
23  
24 asked whether they ever had a period of worry like this that lasted for 6 months or longer in  
25  
26 the previous 12 months. These screening questions are most consistent with the DSM-IV  
27  
28 diagnosis of hypochondriasis (14), addressing Criteria A, B and E for this disorder. In the  
29  
30 current study, it was not possible to address the criteria related to differential diagnosis  
31  
32 (Criteria C and F), or establish clinically significant impairment or distress specific to this  
33  
34 disorder (Criterion D). Consistent with a previous study of the 2007 NSMHWB (20), we refer  
35  
36 to these questions as a screener for health anxiety, rather than a proxy diagnosis of  
37  
38 hypochondriasis.  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 44 *Service use*

45  
46 In the 1997 survey, respondents were asked whether they had consulted with the following  
47  
48 health professionals in the 12 months prior to the interview: general practitioners,  
49  
50 radiologists, pathologists, physicians or other medical specialists, surgical specialists or  
51  
52 gynaecologists, psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers or welfare officers, drug and  
53  
54 alcohol counsellors, other counsellors, nurses, mental health teams, chemists for professional  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 advice, ambulance officers or other health professionals. In the 2007 survey, respondents  
4  
5 were asked about consultations with the following health professionals in the 12 months prior  
6  
7 to the interview: general practitioners, psychiatrists, psychologists, mental health nurses,  
8  
9 other professionals providing specialist mental health services, specialist doctors or surgeons,  
10  
11 other professionals providing general services and complementary or alternative therapists.  
12  
13 For both surveys these service providers were dichotomised into general health service  
14  
15 providers (i.e., general practitioners and specialist doctors) and mental health service  
16  
17 providers (i.e., psychiatrists and psychologists). In both surveys, respondents were also asked  
18  
19 about hospitalisations (overnight admissions) in the 12 months prior to the interview.  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 Related to service use, the current study also investigated the relationship between  
25  
26 medication use and self-rated health. In the 1997 survey, the respondents were asked about  
27  
28 their use of 23 separate medications in the 12 months prior to the interview, including pain  
29  
30 relievers, sleeping tablets, prescription medications with abuse potential and medications for  
31  
32 psychiatric illness. In the 2007 survey respondents were asked about their use of medications  
33  
34 in the 2 weeks prior to the interview including: sleeping tablets/capsules, tablets/capsules for  
35  
36 anxiety or nerves, tranquillisers, antidepressants, mood stabilisers, and other medications for  
37  
38 mental health. For both surveys, respondents using one or more medication were compared to  
39  
40 those who had used none.  
41  
42  
43

44  
45 Covariates

#### 46 47 *12-month ICD-10 psychiatric disorders*

48  
49  
50 Psychiatric diagnoses were assessed using the Composite International Diagnostic Interview  
51  
52 (CIDI version 2.1 in 1997 and version 3.0 in 2007) (15, 16). Both surveys included fully  
53  
54 structured ICD-10 12-month diagnoses (17) of panic disorder, agoraphobia, social phobia,  
55  
56 generalised anxiety disorder (GAD), obsessive compulsive disorder (OCD), post-traumatic  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 stress disorder (PTSD), major depression, dysthymia, bipolar disorder, alcohol use disorders  
4  
5 (dependence and harmful use) and substance use disorders (dependence and harmful use).  
6

7 For both surveys, 12-month ICD-10 diagnoses were coded as absent or present based on  
8  
9 standard CIDI diagnostic algorithms that fully operationalized ICD-10 inclusion and  
10  
11 exclusion criteria, as well as ICD-10 hierarchical decision rules. The 1997 survey also  
12  
13 included a screener for personality disorders (composed of screening questions for 12-month  
14  
15 ICD-10 paranoid, schizoid, dissocial, emotionally unstable, histrionic, anankastic, anxious  
16  
17 and dependent personality disorders). In the current analyses, individuals who screened  
18  
19 positive for one or more personality disorder were compared with those who did not.  
20  
21  
22

### 23 *Physical disorders*

24  
25  
26 The 1997 survey included information on self-reported physical disorders: asthma, chronic  
27  
28 bronchitis, anaemia, high blood pressure, heart trouble, arthritis, kidney disease, diabetes,  
29  
30 cancer, stomach or duodenal cancer, gallbladder or liver trouble and hernia or rupture. The  
31  
32 chronicity of these conditions was not recorded. In the 2007 survey a wider range of self-  
33  
34 reported physical conditions were recorded: asthma, cancer, stroke, gout, rheumatism,  
35  
36 arthritis, diabetes, heart or circulatory conditions, hay fever, sinusitis, emphysema, bronchitis,  
37  
38 anaemia, epilepsy, oedema, hernias, kidney problems, migraine, psoriasis, stomach ulcer,  
39  
40 thyroid trouble, tuberculosis and back or neck problems. In the 2007 survey these conditions  
41  
42 were only recorded if the respondent had experienced them for a period of six months or  
43  
44 longer, therefore taking into account chronicity. For both surveys, respondents reporting one  
45  
46 or more physical conditions were compared with those who reported none.  
47  
48  
49  
50

### 51 *Demographics*

52  
53  
54 For both surveys, the demographic variables of interest were sex, age (34 years and younger,  
55  
56 35 to 64 years, 65 years and over), country of birth (Australia, other English speaking  
57  
58  
59  
60

country, non-English speaking country), marital status (married, separated/widowed/divorced, never married), education (post high school, no post high school education), employment (employed, unemployed, not in the labour force), and current smoking status (present, absent).

### Statistical analysis

Weighted means, frequencies and logistic regressions were computed using SAS SURVEY procedures in SAS 9.2 (18) which adjusted for the characteristics of the complex survey design using jackknife repeated replication methods for variance estimation. In order to select an appropriate multivariate model, the univariate relationships between self-rated health and the covariates of interest were investigated. In this initial phase, a comparatively liberal unadjusted p-value of 0.05 was selected despite multiple comparisons, because the aim was to adjust for all possible covariates that may explain the relationships between self-rated health, somatization and service use in the multivariate analysis. Those covariates that were significantly related to self-rated health were included in multivariate models investigating the relationships between self-rated health, somatisation and service use. To control for multiple comparisons, a more conservative p-value of 0.01 was selected for use in the multivariate analyses.

## 3 Results

### Prevalence of negative self-rated health

14.6% (SE = 0.4) of respondents reported that their health was “fair” or “poor” in the 1997 survey, whilst 14.8% (SE = 0.5) responded similarly in the 2007 survey. In both samples, approximately 30% of those with negative self-rated health reported one or more ICD-10 12-month mental disorder, compared with approximately 17% of those with positive self-rated

1  
2  
3 health. Of those with negative self-rated health, 5.4% were diagnosed with ICD-10  
4  
5 neurasthenia in the 1997 survey, whilst 14.8% screened positive for health anxiety in the  
6  
7 2007 survey. Physical conditions were common amongst individuals reporting negative self-  
8  
9 rated health (approximately 72% in the 1997 survey and 88% in the 2007 survey).  
10

11  
12  
13 Univariate relationships between self-rated health and the covariates of interest  
14

15  
16 There were consistencies between the two surveys in terms of the relationships between  
17  
18 negative self-rated health and the demographic variables of interest (Table 1). When  
19  
20 compared with individuals with positive self-rated health, those with negative self-rated  
21  
22 health were more likely to be: older, separated/widowed/divorced, educated to the high  
23  
24 school level only, not in the labour force and current regular smokers (see Table 1 for  
25  
26 relevant odds ratios for both surveys). As can be seen from Table 2, the univariate  
27  
28 associations between negative self-rated health and all of the covariates of interest were  
29  
30 statistically significant in both surveys.  
31  
32

33  
34 Multivariate relationships between self-rated health, somatisation and service use  
35

36  
37 Multivariate logistic regressions which included the effects of demographics, any physical  
38  
39 condition and all ICD-10 psychiatric disorders were then conducted. After adjusting for the  
40  
41 other variables in the model, individuals with negative self-rated health in the 1997 survey  
42  
43 were 3.4 (OR: 3.4; 95% CI 2.2 to 5.2;  $p<0.01$ ) times more likely to meet criteria for  
44  
45 neurasthenia, and 4.1 (OR: 4.1; 95% CI 2.8 to 5.9;  $p<0.01$ ) times more likely to meet criteria  
46  
47 for health anxiety in the 2007 survey (Table 3). In both surveys, after adjusting for  
48  
49 demographics, any physical condition and all ICD-10 psychiatric disorders, individuals with  
50  
51 negative self-rated health were more likely to have been hospitalized overnight and to have  
52  
53 used mental health medications when compared to those with positive self-rated health. The  
54  
55 multivariate relationship between self-rated health and the other service use variables (mental  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 health service use and/or general health service use) was only statistically significant in the  
4  
5 1997 survey.  
6  
7

#### 8 **4 Discussion**

9

10  
11 These results confirm both of the study hypotheses: 1) that negative self-rated health was  
12  
13 powerfully and independently associated with somatisation; and 2) that negative self-rated  
14  
15 health was associated with high rates of service use, even after adjusting for an extensive  
16  
17 range of demographics, psychiatric and physical conditions. The current study provided a  
18  
19 strong test of these hypotheses by replicating these findings in two epidemiological surveys  
20  
21 of the Australian population.  
22  
23

#### 24 25 Limitations

26

27  
28 The use of the two Australian national surveys conferred many advantages in terms of  
29  
30 replication, sample representativeness, fully structured diagnoses of all the common  
31  
32 psychiatric disorders and extensive assessment of service. However the surveys focused on  
33  
34 mental health rather than physical health, which meant that objective assessments of physical  
35  
36 morbidity were not available. However, others have found very little discrepancy between  
37  
38 self-reported physical conditions and physician reported medical histories (3), and most  
39  
40 previous research investigating the correlates of negative self-rated health have relied upon  
41  
42 similar self-reported measures of physical health problems (1). Health anxiety in the 2007  
43  
44 survey was based on screening questions rather than full diagnostic assessment (8), whilst  
45  
46 personality disorders in the 1997 survey were also based on screening questions. Both  
47  
48 surveys were cross-sectional in nature, precluding an investigation of the direction of the  
49  
50 relationships identified in the current study. To our knowledge, no prospective examination  
51  
52 of self-rated health and somatisation has been undertaken, and the current results suggest this  
53  
54 may be a fruitful avenue for future research.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The majority of individuals with poor self-rated health reported the presence of at least one of  
4 the major physical conditions enquired about in either survey. These findings suggest that, in  
5 most cases, negative ratings of health may be partly justified in terms of physical illness.  
6  
7

8  
9 However, self-rated health was also related to somatisation, even after adjusting for physical  
10 illness and other psychiatric illnesses, suggesting that the perception of global self-rated  
11 health is also independently influenced by psychological factors. This finding is consistent  
12 with previous research (2, 4). One of the distinguishing features of somatisation is a  
13 pathological preoccupation with health and disease-related concerns, and negative self-rated  
14 health in the absence of physical and psychiatric diagnoses may reflect this aspect of  
15 somatisation.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25  
26 The current study also indicated that, independently of physical and psychiatric conditions,  
27 individuals with poor self-rated health used health services and medications at particularly  
28 high rates. High rates of service use independent of actual physical and mental problems need  
29 to be addressed. Given the relationship between negative self-rated health and somatisation,  
30 the high rates of service use amongst individuals with negatively perceived health may reflect  
31 reassurance-seeking, a symptom central to hypochondriasis and related psychiatric disorders.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 Consistent with the current findings, previous research has found that negative self-rated  
40 health, as well as somatisation, hypochondriasis and medically unexplained physical  
41 symptoms, all contribute disproportionately to the growing demand for health services (19).  
42  
43 However, individuals presenting with these symptoms and disorders are also more likely to  
44 be dissatisfied with the services provided (20, 21). With regards to hypochondriasis  
45 specifically, high rates of service use result in consultations that are unsatisfactory and  
46 exasperating for both the doctor and patient (22). This tension most likely arises because  
47 patients are seeking physical explanations for their concerns, which are largely psychological  
48 in nature. Treatment of health anxiety has not been rewarding for either party, with anger on  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the patients part that cure is not forthcoming and frustration on the clinicians part that  
4  
5 reassurance and good advice is not beneficial. Consultations are often fraught. Patient and  
6  
7 physician education regarding the psychological nature of health-related concerns, and the  
8  
9 direction of patients to appropriate treatment options with minimal clinician involvement,  
10  
11 may lessen such tensions in doctor-patient relationships. Internet-delivered cognitive  
12  
13 behavioural therapy is effective for the internalising disorders generally (23-25), and has been  
14  
15 shown to be effective for health anxiety specifically (26, 27). Internet delivered cognitive  
16  
17 behavioural therapy, which can be administered at low cost and with minimal clinician  
18  
19 involvement may be one way around the problems in the interaction between doctor and  
20  
21 patient.  
22  
23  
24  
25

### 26 **Competing interests**

27  
28 All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at  
29  
30 [www.icmje.org/coi\\_disclosure.pdf](http://www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf) and declare: no support from any organisation for the  
31  
32 submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest  
33  
34 in the submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that  
35  
36 could appear to have influenced the submitted work.  
37  
38  
39  
40

### 41 **Copyright**

42  
43 The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on  
44  
45 behalf of all authors, [a worldwide licence](#) to the Publishers and its licensees in perpetuity, in  
46  
47 all forms, formats and media (whether known now or created in the future), to i) publish,  
48  
49 reproduce, distribute, display and store the Contribution, ii) translate the Contribution into  
50  
51 other languages, create adaptations, reprints, include within collections and create summaries,  
52  
53 extracts and/or, abstracts of the Contribution, iii) create any other derivative work(s) based on  
54  
55 the Contribution, iv) to exploit all subsidiary rights in the Contribution, v) the inclusion of  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 electronic links from the Contribution to third party material where-ever it may be located;  
4  
5 and, vi) licence any third party to do any or all of the above.  
6  
7

### 8 **Acknowledgements**

9  
10  
11 The 1997 and 2007 NSMHWB was funded by the Australian Government Department of  
12  
13 Health and Ageing, and conducted by the Australian Bureau of Statistics.  
14  
15

### 16 **Author Contributions**

17  
18 LM and GA conceived the study and its design. LM conducted all statistical analyses. GA  
19  
20 and LM both contributed to the interpretation of the data. LM wrote the first draft and GA  
21  
22 contributed to all successive revisions. Both LM and GA approved the final manuscript to be  
23  
24 published.  
25  
26  
27

### 28 **Data sharing**

29  
30  
31 The data for the 1997 and 2007 NSMHWB are public access files that can be accessed  
32  
33 through consultation with the Australian Bureau of Statistics.  
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

## References

1. Idler EL, Benyamini Y. Self-rated health and mortality: a review of twenty-seven community studies. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*. 1997;21-37.
2. Gureje O, Üstün T, Simon G. The syndrome of hypochondriasis: a cross-national study in primary care. *Psychol Med*. 1997;27(05):1001-10.
3. Goodwin R, Olfson M. Self-perception of poor health and suicidal ideation in medical patients. *Psychol Med*. 2002;32(7):1293-9.
4. Barsky AJ, Cleary PD, Klerman GL. Determinants of perceived health status of medical outpatients. *Soc Sci Med*. 1992;34(10):1147-54.
5. Krause NM, Jay GM. What do global self-rated health items measure? *Med Care*. 1994;930-42.
6. Slade T, Johnston A, Oakley Browne M, Andrews G, Whiteford H. National Survey of Mental Health and Wellbeing: methods and key findings. *Aust NZJ Psychiatry*. 2009;43:594-605.
7. Andrews G, Henderson S, Hall W. Prevalence, comorbidity, disability and service utilisation Overview of the Australian National Mental Health Survey. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*. 2001;178(2):145-53.
8. Sunderland M, Newby JM, Andrews G. Health anxiety in Australia: prevalence, comorbidity, disability and service use. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*. 2012.
9. Ware Jr JE, Kosinski M, Keller SD. A 12-Item Short-Form Health Survey: construction of scales and preliminary tests of reliability and validity. *Med Care*. 1996;34(3):220-33.
10. Andrews G. A brief integer scorer for the SF-12: validity of the brief scorer in Australian community and clinic settings. *Aust N Z J Public Health*. 2002;26(6):508-10.
11. Shadbolt B, Barresi J, Craft P. Self-rated health as a predictor of survival among patients with advanced cancer. *J Clin Oncol*. 2002;20(10):2514-9.
12. Hickie I, Davenport T, Issakidis C, Andrews G. Neurasthenia: prevalence, disability and health care characteristics in the Australian community. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2002;181(1):56-61.
13. Asmundson GJ, Abramowitz JS, Richter AA, Whedon M. Health anxiety: Current perspectives and future directions. *Curr Psychiatry Rep*. 2010;12(4):306-12.
14. American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition (DSM-IV)*. Washington DC: American Psychiatric Association; 1994.
15. Kessler RC, Ustun TB. The World Mental Health (WMH) Survey Initiative Version of the World Health Organization (WHO) Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI). *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*. 2004;13(2):93-121.
16. World Health Organisation. *Composite International Diagnostic Interview*. Organisation WH, editor. Geneva, Switzerland 1990.
17. World Health Organisation. *The ICD-10 Classification of Mental and Behavioural Disorders - Diagnostic Criteria for Research* Geneva: World Health Organisation; 1993.
18. SAS Institute Inc. *SAS version 9.2*. Cary, NC: SAS Intsitute Inc; 2008.
19. Little P, Somerville J, Williamson I, Warner G, Moore M, Wiles R, et al. Psychosocial, lifestyle, and health status variables in predicting high attendance among adults. *The British Journal of General Practice*. 2001;51(473):987.
20. Lucock M, Morley S, White C, Peake M. Responses of consecutive patients to reassurance after gastroscopy: results of self administered questionnaire survey. *BMJ*. 1997;315(7108):572-5.

- 1  
2  
3 21. Speckens A, Spinhoven P, Van Hemert A, Bolk J. The Reassurance Questionnaire  
4 (RQ): psychometric properties of a self-report questionnaire to assess reassurability. *Psychol*  
5 *Med.* 2000;30(4):841-7.  
6 22. Conradt M, Cavanagh M, Franklin J, Rief W. Dimensionality of the Whiteley Index:  
7 Assessment of hypochondriasis in an Australian sample of primary care patients. *J*  
8 *Psychosom Res.* 2006;60(2):137-43.  
9 23. Andrews G, Cuijpers P, Craske MG, McEvoy P, Titov N. Computer therapy for the  
10 anxiety and depressive disorders is effective, acceptable and practical health care: A meta-  
11 analysis. *PloS one.* 2010;5(10):e13196.  
12 24. Mewton L, Wong N, Andrews G. The effectiveness of internet cognitive behavioural  
13 therapy for generalized anxiety disorder in clinical practice. *Depression and Anxiety.*  
14 2012;59(10):843-9.  
15 25. Williams AD, Andrews G. The Effectiveness of Internet Cognitive Behavioural  
16 Therapy (iCBT) for Depression in Primary Care: A Quality Assurance Study. *PloS one.*  
17 2013;8(2):e57447.  
18 26. Hedman E, Ljótsson B, Andersson E, Rück C, Andersson G, Lindfors N.  
19 Effectiveness and cost offset analysis of group CBT for hypochondriasis delivered in a  
20 psychiatric setting: An open trial. *Cogn Behav Ther.* 2010;39(4):239-50.  
21 27. Jones FA. The role of bibliotherapy in health anxiety: An experimental study. *British*  
22 *Journal of Community Nursing.* 2002;7(10):498-504.  
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

Table 1. Univariate relationships between demographics and self-rated health in the 1997 (n = 10641) and 2007 (n = 8841) Australian National Surveys of Mental Health and Well-Being

	1997 NATIONAL SURVEY OF MENTAL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING			2007 NATIONAL SURVEY OF MENTAL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING		
	Negative self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence</i> % (SE)	Positive self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence</i> % (SE)	Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) <i>OR (95% CI)</i>	Negative self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence</i> % (SE)	Positive self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence</i> % (SE)	Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) <i>OR (95% CI)</i>
<b>Sex</b>						
Male	51.9 (1.1)	48.8 (0.2)	Ref	50.5 (1.9)	49.5 (0.4)	Ref
Female	48.1 (1.1)	51.2 (0.2)	0.9 (0.8-1.0) <sup>a</sup>	49.5 (1.9)	50.5 (0.4)	1.0 (0.8-1.1)
<b>Age</b>						
18-34	19.4 (1.2)	36.8 (0.3)	Ref	18.6 (1.4)	36.0 (0.3)	Ref
35-64	49.9 (1.3)	50.4 (0.3)	1.9 (1.6-2.2) <sup>a</sup>	57.0 (2.0)	50.6 (0.4)	2.2 (1.7-2.7) <sup>a</sup>
65-85	30.7 (1.1)	12.8 (0.3)	4.6 (3.8-5.5) <sup>a</sup>	24.4 (1.2)	13.4 (0.2)	3.5 (2.9-4.3) <sup>a</sup>
<b>Country of birth</b>						
Australia	72.1 (1.7)	75.3 (0.5)	Ref	73.3 (2.0)	72.8 (0.8)	Ref
Other English speaking country	10.4 (0.9)	11.5 (0.4)	0.9 (0.8-1.2)	11.3 (1.4)	11.3 (0.4)	1.0 (0.7-1.3)
Other non-English speaking country	17.5 (1.1)	13.1 (0.5)	1.4 (1.2-1.7) <sup>a</sup>	15.4 (1.8)	15.9 (0.8)	1.0 (0.7-1.3)
<b>Marital status</b>						
Married/de facto	62.1 (1.1)	65.7 (0.7)	Ref	54.4 (1.8)	52.8 (0.7)	Ref
Separated/widowed/divorced	21.6 (1.2)	12.2 (0.3)	1.9 (1.6-2.2) <sup>a</sup>	21.6 (1.4)	13.3 (0.4)	1.6 (1.3-1.9) <sup>a</sup>
Never married	16.2 (1.2)	22.1 (0.5)	0.8 (0.7-0.9) <sup>a</sup>	24.0 (1.5)	34.0 (9.7)	0.7 (0.6-0.8) <sup>a</sup>
<b>Education</b>						
Higher education	34.7 (1.6)	49.6 (0.7)	Ref	56.2 (2.1)	56.3 (0.6)	Ref
No higher education	65.3 (1.6)	50.4 (0.7)	1.8 (1.6-2.1) <sup>a</sup>	53.8 (2.1)	43.7 (0.6)	1.5 (1.3-1.8) <sup>a</sup>
<b>Employment</b>						
Employed	33.6 (1.6)	68.6 (0.5)	Ref	45.5 (1.6)	68.7 (0.3)	Ref
Unemployed	5.6 (0.6)	3.9 (0.2)	3.0 (2.3-3.9) <sup>a</sup>	1.9 (0.5)	2.7 (0.1)	1.1 (0.6-1.9)
Not in labour force	60.8 (1.7)	27.5 (0.5)	4.5 (3.9-5.3) <sup>a</sup>	52.6 (1.6)	28.6 (0.3)	2.8 (2.4-3.2) <sup>a</sup>
<b>Regular smoker (current)</b>	30.7 (1.0)	21.9 (0.6)	1.6 (1.4-1.8) <sup>a</sup>	25.1 (1.8)	17.1 (0.7)	1.6 (1.3-2.0) <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$

Table 2. Univariate relationships between physical and psychiatric disorders and self-rated health in the 1997 (n = 10641) and 2007 (n = 8841) Australian National Surveys of Mental Health and Well-Being

	1997 NATIONAL SURVEY OF MENTAL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING			2007 NATIONAL SURVEY OF MENTAL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING		
	Negative self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Positive self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) <i>OR (95% CI)</i>	Negative self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Positive self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) <i>OR (95% CI)</i>
<b>Physical disorders</b>						
Any physical disorder	72.0 (1.2)	32.7 (0.6)	5.3 (4.6-6.0) <sup>a</sup>	87.9 (1.4)	65.6 (0.8)	3.8 (2.9-5.0) <sup>a</sup>
<b>12 month ICD-10 psychiatric disorders</b>						
Panic disorder	2.8 (0.5)	0.9 (0.1)	3.3 (2.1-5.3) <sup>a</sup>	5.6 (0.9)	2.0 (0.2)	2.8 (2.0-4.0) <sup>a</sup>
Agoraphobia	3.3 (0.4)	0.7 (0.1)	4.7 (3.1-7.1) <sup>a</sup>	7.8 (1.2)	1.9 (0.2)	4.3 (2.9-6.3) <sup>a</sup>
Social phobia	5.0 (0.6)	2.4 (0.2)	2.2 (1.7-2.8) <sup>a</sup>	11.6 (1.4)	3.6 (0.2)	3.5 (2.6-4.7) <sup>a</sup>
Generalised anxiety disorder	7.8 (0.8)	2.2 (0.2)	3.7 (3.1-4.5) <sup>a</sup>	6.0 (0.7)	2.1 (0.3)	2.9 (2.0-4.2) <sup>a</sup>
Obsessive compulsive disorder	0.7 (0.2)	0.3 (0.1)	2.8 (1.4-5.6) <sup>a</sup>	3.5 (0.7)	1.6 (0.2)	2.1 (1.3-3.4) <sup>a</sup>
Post-traumatic stress disorder	6.8 (0.7)	2.6 (0.2)	2.7 (2.1-3.5) <sup>a</sup>	11.1 (1.1)	5.6 (0.3)	2.1 (1.6-2.7) <sup>a</sup>
Major depression	13.2 (0.9)	5.6 (0.3)	2.6 (2.1-3.1) <sup>a</sup>	7.5 (1.0)	1.9 (0.3)	4.2 (2.8-6.3) <sup>a</sup>
Dysthymia	4.1 (0.7)	0.8 (0.1)	5.1 (3.4-7.8) <sup>a</sup>	4.7 (0.7)	0.7 (0.1)	7.1 (4.5-11.1) <sup>a</sup>
Bipolar disorder	-	-	-	4.9 (0.7)	1.2 (0.2)	4.1 (2.7-6.2) <sup>a</sup>
Alcohol use disorder	7.0 (0.5)	6.3 (0.3)	1.1 (0.9-1.4)	5.8 (0.9)	4.1 (0.4)	1.4 (1.0-2.2) <sup>a</sup>
Substance use disorder	3.5 (0.5)	1.9 (0.2)	2.0 (1.4-2.8) <sup>a</sup>	3.0 (0.6)	1.2 (0.1)	2.6 (1.5-4.4) <sup>a</sup>
Any personality disorder	12.4 (1.0)	5.4 (0.3)	2.5 (2.0-3.0) <sup>a</sup>	-	-	-

<sup>a</sup> Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$



Table 3. Univariate and multivariate relationships between somatisation and service use and self-rated health in the 1997 (n = 10641) and 2007 (n = 8841) Australian National Surveys of Mental Health and Well-Being

	1997 NATIONAL SURVEY OF MENTAL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING				2007 NATIONAL SURVEY OF MENTAL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING			
	Negative self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Positive self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Univariate Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) <i>OR (95% CI)</i>	Multivariate Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) <i>Adjusted OR (95% CI)</i>	Negative self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Positive self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Univariate Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) <i>OR (95% CI)</i>	Multivariate Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) <i>Adjusted OR (95% CI)</i>
<b>Somatisation</b>								
Neurasthenia	5.4 (0.6)	0.8 (0.1)	7.1 (4.8-10.6) <sup>a</sup>	3.4 (2.2-5.2) <sup>b</sup>	-	-	-	-
Health anxiety	-	-	-	-	14.8 (1.4)	2.4 (0.2)	7.1 (5.3-9.6) <sup>a</sup>	4.1 (2.9-5.9) <sup>b</sup>
<b>Service use in past 12 months</b>								
Mental health service	10.5 (0.9)	4.1 (0.3)	2.7 (2.1-3.6) <sup>a</sup>	2.5 (1.8-3.4) <sup>b</sup>	13.1 (1.5)	6.3 (0.4)	2.3 (1.7-3.0) <sup>a</sup>	1.3 (0.9-1.8)
General health service	93.5 (0.5)	84.2 (0.5)	2.7 (2.3-3.2) <sup>a</sup>	1.9 (1.6-2.4) <sup>b</sup>	90.9 (1.4)	81.5 (0.9)	2.3 (1.6-3.2) <sup>a</sup>	1.5 (1.0-2.2)
Mental or general health service	93.8 (0.5)	84.5 (0.5)	2.8 (2.3-3.4) <sup>a</sup>	2.0 (1.6-2.4) <sup>b</sup>	91.3 (1.3)	82.0 (0.9)	2.3 (1.6-3.3) <sup>a</sup>	1.5 (1.0-2.2)
Hospitalisations	25.4 (1.1)	10.6 (0.3)	2.9 (2.5-3.3) <sup>a</sup>	2.2 (1.9-2.7) <sup>b</sup>	18.5 (1.4)	9.0 (0.5)	2.3 (1.9-2.8) <sup>a</sup>	1.5 (1.2-1.9) <sup>b</sup>
Medications	38.5 (1.5)	13.5 (0.5)	4.0 (3.5-4.7) <sup>a</sup>	2.7 (2.3-3.2) <sup>b</sup>	24.1 (1.4)	9.5 (0.6)	3.0 (2.5-3.7) <sup>a</sup>	1.7 (1.3-2.1) <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ .

<sup>b</sup> Statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$ . Multivariate analysis adjusting for demographics, any physical condition and ICD-10 psychiatric disorders.

Poor self-rated health and its associations with health anxiety somatisation in two  
Australian national surveys

Louise Mewton<sup>1,2</sup> & Gavin Andrews<sup>1,2</sup>

1. School of Psychiatry, University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW, Australia.
2. Clinical Research Unit for Anxiety and Depression (CRUfAD), St. Vincent's Hospital,  
Sydney, NSW, Australia.

**Corresponding Author:** Dr Louise Mewton, Clinical Research Unit for Anxiety and  
Depression, Level 4, O'Brien Centre, St. Vincent's Hospital, 394-404 Victoria Street,  
Darlinghurst, NSW, Australia. Ph: (+612) 8382 1437. Email: [louisem@unsw.edu.au](mailto:louisem@unsw.edu.au)

**Key words:** self-rated health, neurasthenia, health anxiety, epidemiology

**Conflict of interest:** None

**Word count:** 3951 (excluding abstract, tables and references)

## Abstract

*Objectives:* ~~Poor self-rated health is predictive of increased mortality and morbidity that is not explained by measures of physical health status. It is therefore of medical interest.~~ It is hypothesised that across two national surveys poor self-rated health will be independently associated with somatisation and will result in high rates of service use after adjusting for established diagnoses.

*Design:* Two cross-sectional population-based surveys conducted in 1997 and 2007. The use of both surveys allowed replication of results.

*Setting:* Australia.

*Participants:* The 1997 and 2007 National Surveys of Mental Health and Well-Being were based on stratified, multistage area probability samples of persons living in private dwellings in Australia. The 1997 survey included 10641 respondents aged 18 to 75, a response rate of 78%. The 2007 survey included 8841 respondents aged 16 to 85, a response rate of 60%.

*Main outcome measures:* ~~Self-rated health. Global ratings of perceived health.~~

*Results:* Approximately 15% of the Australian population rated their health as fair or poor in both surveys. The independent relationship between self-rated health and somatisation was replicated across both surveys in multivariate analyses. Individuals with negative self-rated health were 4.1 times as likely to screen positive for health anxiety (OR: 4.1; 95% CI 2.8 to 5.9) and 3.4 times as likely to be diagnosed with neurasthenia (OR: 3.4; 95% CI 2.2 to 5.2), when compared with individuals who rated their health positively. Individuals with negative self-rated health were ~~twice as also more~~ likely to use health services after controlling for demographics, mental and physical illness, neuroticism, suicidality, cognitive impairment and psychological distress.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 *Conclusions:* These results confirm both of the study hypotheses: 1) that negative self-rated  
8 health was powerfully and independently associated with somatisation; and 2) that this  
9 relationship manifested itself in high rates of service use, even after adjusting for an extensive  
10 range of demographics, psychiatric and physical conditions. The current findings indicate that  
11 subjective concerns regarding perceived poor health must be considered an important public  
12 health issue. Medically unexplained negative self-rated health, associated with increased  
13 mortality and morbidity, should be conceptualised as a variant of hypochondriasis/health  
14 anxiety and proactively treated.  
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

### Article focus

The current study tests the relationship between self-rated health and somatisation, specifically neurasthenia and health anxiety, in two national surveys of the Australian population conducted in 1997 and 2007.

### Key points

These results confirm both of the study hypotheses:

- 1) that negative self-rated health was powerfully and independently associated with somatisation; and
- 2) that negative self-rated health was associated with general health service use, hospitalisation and medication use, even after adjusting for an extensive range of psychiatric and physical conditions.

### Strengths and limitations of the study

The use of the two Australian national surveys conferred many advantages in terms of replication, sample representativeness, fully structured diagnoses of all the common psychiatric disorders, extensive assessment of service utilisation and the inclusion of a broad range of other clinical measures.

The study relied on subjective rather than objective assessments of physical morbidity

Health anxiety was based on screening questions rather than full diagnostic assessment

The surveys were cross-sectional in nature, precluding an investigation of the direction of the relationships identified in the current study.

## 1 Introduction

Rating your health as excellent, very good, good, fair or poor seems a simple concept that is unlikely to contain surprises, but ratings of health as fair or poor are predictors of morbidity and mortality after adjusting for clinical health status. ~~The 15-20% of the population who rate their health negatively have mortality risks 2-7 times higher than individuals with excellent self-reported health, even after adjustment for medical history (1). For example, self-rated health has been found to be the best predictor of survival in advanced cancer patients in comparison with other important clinical indicators, such as clinician-assessed health status, appetite, fatigue and quality of life (2). In the prospective US National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES), self-rated health was found to independently predict mortality and functional limitations over and above a comprehensive range of physical examinations, laboratory tests and self-reported mental and physical symptoms (1, 3). Individuals presenting with perceived poor health die younger than counterparts with equivalent health status.~~

~~No country can provide all the health services its citizens want (4), yet, in western countries, we worry that we are medicalising the normal risks of life, at great cost and with little health gain (5, 6). If the purpose of medicine is to reduce the burden of disease then negative self-rated health, because of the increased mortality and morbidity, should be a focus of medical attention, especially if a low cost remedy is a possibility. Four possible hypothetical explanations for the independent association between global self-rated health and increased morbidity and mortality have been proposed (7): 1) Even when extensive clinical~~

~~investigations and self reported histories are collected, such as in the NHANES study (1, 3), it is possible that difficult to operationalise, undiagnosed or prodromal conditions may explain the independent effects of self-rated health on morbidity and mortality; 2) self-rated health may reflect additional information about health trajectories, or changes in health, that are not captured in assessments of current health status; 3) self-perceptions of health may influence health and illness behaviours that increase the risk of morbidity and mortality; and 4) self-rated health may reflect the perception of insufficient external resources, like income or social support, to maintain future health status.~~

~~The four hypotheses above are not easy to explore. A fifth option is that perceived poor health is a reflection of a mental disorder.~~ Self-ratings of overall health are only modestly correlated with clinical assessments of medical status, but appear more closely related to psychiatric illness, and aspects of personality such as neuroticism (1-3). These findings are surprising given the evidence that suggests that respondents mainly have physical health problems in mind when asked to rate their global health status (4). Thus, whilst the decision to rate global health positively or negatively is driven by psychological factors, it appears that respondents mainly consider physical health problems when rating their global health status. These findings suggest that ~~a dysfunctional preoccupation with psychiatric disorders based on physical health-~~ and disease related ~~-~~concerns (termed “somatisation” for ease of reading) may be particularly salient in the interpretation of global ratings of health status. Consistent with this hypothesis, hypochondriasis, somatisation and limitations in activities of daily living explain much of the variance in patient reports of overall health status (3).

The current study tests the relationship between self-rated health and somatisation, specifically neurasthenia and health anxiety, in two national surveys of the Australian population conducted in 1997 and 2007. The strength of the current study is therefore in the ability to replicate the findings across two large, epidemiological datasets that included

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 structured diagnoses of the major mental disorders and similar measures of other clinical,  
8 demographic and service use variables. It is hypothesised that across both surveys: 1) poor  
9 self-rated health will be powerfully and independently associated with neurasthenia and  
10 health anxiety; and 2) that this strong association will also manifest itself in high rates of  
11 service use after adjusting for established psychiatric and physical diagnoses. To our  
12 knowledge, these hypotheses have not been tested using representative, population-based  
13 samples, and never within the context of fully structured diagnoses of the major psychiatric  
14 disorders.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

## 22 **2 Method**

### 23 **Sample**

24  
25  
26  
27  
28 The 1997 and 2007 National Surveys of Mental Health and Well-Being (NSMHWB) were  
29 based on stratified, multistage area probability samples of persons living in private dwellings  
30 in Australia, excluding very remote dwellings (5, 6). The 1997 survey included 10641  
31 respondents aged 18 to 75, representing a response rate of 78%. Characteristics of non-  
32 responders were not explicitly examined in the 1997 survey. The 2007 survey included 8841  
33 respondents aged 16 to 85, representing a response rate of 60%. A small, non-random follow-  
34 up study of the 2007 survey indicated that while the response rate had little effect at the  
35 aggregate level, there may have been some under-estimation in the prevalence estimates for  
36 mental disorders in males and young people. The age and gender characteristics of both  
37 samples were weighted to match the age and gender distributions in Australia. Both surveys  
38 were designed to provide accurate estimates of the population prevalence of selected major  
39 mental disorders, the level of disability associated with these disorders and the related service  
40 utilisation. The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), the national government statistics  
41 agency, conducted both the 1997 and 2007 surveys. The ABS provided ethical review and  
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 approval for the surveys, including voluntary recruitment, rigorous confidentiality provisions,  
8 and written informed consent. The ABS operates under Australian National Legislation that  
9 mandates strict provisions for the ethical conduct of the agency's research. The methods for  
10 both surveys have been discussed in more detail elsewhere (5, 6).  
11  
12  
13

#### 14 Measures

15  
16  
17 The dependent variable in the current study was self-rated health, whilst the main  
18 independent variables were neurasthenia, health anxiety and service use (including  
19 medication use). In order to investigate the independence of the relationships between self-  
20 rated health and somatisation, several possible covariates were also examined. These  
21 included demographics and psychiatric disorders which have been shown to be related to  
22 health anxiety in a previous study of the 2007 NSMHWB (7), as well as physical disorders to  
23 ensure that any relationships identified were not simply a reflection of actual health status.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

#### 31 Independent variable

##### 32 *Self-rated health*

33  
34  
35  
36  
37 For the 1997 survey each respondent was administered the 12 item Short Form Health Survey  
38 (SF-12), a widely used measure of health and well-being (8). The first item of the SF-12  
39 required the respondent to rate their health in general, with responses categorised as  
40 “excellent”, “very good”, “good”, “fair” or “poor”. This question informs the physical  
41 component scale of the SF-12 (9) and, for the purposes of the current study, constituted the  
42 main outcome variable for the 1997 survey. In the 2007 NSMHWB, respondents were asked  
43 to rate their overall physical health and overall mental health in two separate questions, with  
44 responses to both questions categorised as above. Given that the item used in the 1997 survey  
45 is weighted heavily towards physical well-being, the query regarding self-rated physical  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 health was selected as the main outcome variable for the 2007 survey. Respondents were to  
8 rate their physical health before they were asked to rate their mental health in the 2007  
9 survey. In both surveys, the questions regarding self-rated health were administered before  
10 questions about mental disorders and service use. To ensure sufficient power to detect  
11 differences in statistical analyses, the main outcome variables for both surveys were  
12 dichotomized into negative (“fair” or “poor”) and positive (“good”, “very good” and  
13 “excellent”) self-rated health. Grouping of these responses in such a manner is common  
14 practice in the self-rated health literature due to the similar survival probabilities within these  
15 collapsed categories (10).

#### Dependent variables

##### *Health anxiety and neurasthenia*

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

The 1997 survey included a module on the ICD-10 diagnosis for neurasthenia (11).

Meanwhile, the 2007 survey collected additional information on health anxiety (7, 12). The respondents were first asked whether they had ever worried a lot about serious illness, despite having reassurance from a doctor or medical specialist. If endorsed, the respondents were asked whether they ever had a period of worry like this that lasted for 6 months or longer in the previous 12 months. These screening questions are most consistent with the DSM-IV diagnosis of hypochondriasis (13), addressing Criteria A, B and E for this disorder. In the current study, it was not possible to address the criteria related to differential diagnosis (Criteria C and F), or establish clinically significant impairment or distress specific to this disorder (Criterion D). Consistent with a previous study of the 2007 NSMHWB (20), we refer to these questions as a screener for health anxiety, rather than a proxy diagnosis of hypochondriasis.

##### *Service use*

In the 1997 survey, respondents were asked whether they had consulted with the following health professionals in the 12 months prior to the interview: general practitioners, radiologists, pathologists, physicians or other medical specialists, surgical specialists or gynaecologists, psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers or welfare officers, drug and alcohol counsellors, other counsellors, nurses, mental health teams, chemists for professional advice, ambulance officers or other health professionals. In the 2007 survey, respondents were asked about consultations with the following health professionals in the 12 months prior to the interview: general practitioners, psychiatrists, psychologists, mental health nurses, other professionals providing specialist mental health services, specialist doctors or surgeons, other professionals providing general services and complementary or alternative therapists. For both surveys these service providers were dichotomised into general health service providers (i.e., general practitioners and specialist doctors) and mental health service providers (i.e., psychiatrists and psychologists). In both surveys, respondents were also asked about hospitalisations (overnight admissions) in the 12 months prior to the interview.

In the 1997 survey, the respondents were asked about their use of 23 separate medications in the 12 months prior to the interview, including pain relievers, sleeping tablets, prescription medications with abuse potential and medications for psychiatric illness. In the 2007 survey respondents were asked about their use of medications in the 2 weeks prior to the interview including: sleeping tablets/capsules, tablets/capsules for anxiety or nerves, tranquillisers, antidepressants, mood stabilisers, and other medications for mental health. For both surveys, respondents using one or more medication were compared to those who had used none.

#### Covariates

*12-month ICD-10 psychiatric disorders*

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

Psychiatric diagnoses were assessed using the Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI version 2.1 in 1997 and version 3.0 in 2007) (14, 15). Both surveys included fully structured ICD-10 12-month diagnoses (16) of panic disorder, agoraphobia, social phobia, generalised anxiety disorder (GAD), obsessive compulsive disorder (OCD), post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), major depression, dysthymia, bipolar disorder, alcohol use disorders (dependence and harmful use) and substance use disorders (dependence and harmful use).

~~The 1997 survey included a module on neurasthenia (11) and a seven-item psychosis screener.~~ For both surveys, 12-month ICD-10 diagnoses were coded as absent or present based on standard CIDI diagnostic algorithms that fully operationalized ICD-10 inclusion and exclusion criteria, as well as ICD-10 hierarchical decision rules.

~~The 2007 survey collected additional information on health anxiety (7, 12). The respondent was first asked whether they had ever worried a lot about serious illness, despite having reassurance from a doctor or medical specialist. If endorsed, the respondents were asked whether they ever had a period of worry like this that lasted for 6 months or longer in the previous 12 months. These screening questions are most consistent with the DSM-IV diagnosis of hypochondriasis (13), addressing Criteria A, B and E for this disorder. In the current study, it was not possible to address the criteria related to differential diagnosis (Criteria C and F), or establish clinically significant impairment or distress specific to this disorder (Criterion D). Consistent with a previous study of the 2007 NSMHWB (20), we refer to these questions as a screener for health anxiety, rather than a proxy diagnosis of hypochondriasis.~~

The 1997 survey also included a screener for personality disorders (composed of screening questions for 12-month ICD-10 paranoid, schizoid, dissocial, emotionally unstable, histrionic, anankastic, anxious and dependent personality disorders). In the current analyses, individuals

who screened positive for one or more personality disorder were compared with those who did not.

### *Neuroticism*

The neuroticism scale of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) (17) was also included in the 1997 survey. In the current analyses, those reporting a score of six or more on the EPQ (the top ten percentile for neuroticism) were compared with the rest of the sample.

### *Distress and Disability*

The K10, a commonly used measure of psychological distress, was included in both surveys (18). According to established norms, a score of 15 or greater on the K10 was indicative of medium to high psychological distress (19). Days out of role in the previous month were also queried in both surveys and individuals with one or more days out of role were compared to those who reported no days out of role.

### *Physical disorders*

The 1997 survey included information on self-reported physical disorders: asthma, chronic bronchitis, anaemia, high blood pressure, heart trouble, arthritis, kidney disease, diabetes, cancer, stomach or duodenal cancer, gallbladder or liver trouble and hernia or rupture. The chronicity of these conditions was not recorded. In the 2007 survey a wider range of self-reported physical conditions were recorded: asthma, cancer, stroke, gout, rheumatism, arthritis, diabetes, heart or circulatory conditions, hay fever, sinusitis, emphysema, bronchitis, anaemia, epilepsy, oedema, hernias, kidney problems, migraine, psoriasis, stomach ulcer, thyroid trouble, tuberculosis and back or neck problems. In the 2007 survey these conditions were only recorded if the respondent had experienced them for a period of six months or

longer, therefore taking into account chronicity. For both surveys, respondents reporting one or more physical conditions were compared with those who reported none.

#### *Cognitive impairment*

Both surveys included the Mini Mental State Examination (MMSE), a screener for cognitive impairment (20). Following standard scoring protocols, possible cognitive impairment was coded as present if the respondent scored less than 23 on the MMSE (21). The interview was terminated if the respondent scored less than 15 on the MMSE.

#### *Suicidality*

Both surveys included questions regarding suicidal ideation, plans or attempts. The current analyses compared respondents who reported any suicidality (thoughts, plans or attempts) in the 12 months prior to the interview with those who did not.

#### *Service use*

In the 1997 survey, respondents were asked whether they had consulted with the following health professionals in the 12 months prior to the interview: general practitioners, radiologists, pathologists, physicians or other medical specialists, surgical specialists or gynaecologists, psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers or welfare officers, drug and alcohol counsellors, other counsellors, nurses, mental health teams, chemists for professional advice, ambulance officers or other health professionals. In the 2007 survey, respondents were asked about consultations with the following health professionals in the 12 months prior to the interview: general practitioners, psychiatrists, psychologists, mental health nurses, other professionals providing specialist mental health services, specialist doctors or surgeons, other professionals providing general services and complementary or alternative therapists. For both surveys these service providers were dichotomised into general health service

providers (i.e., general practitioners and specialist doctors) and mental health service providers (i.e., psychiatrists and psychologists). In both surveys, respondents were also asked about hospitalisations (overnight admissions) in the 12 months prior to the interview.

### *Medications*

In the 1997 survey, the respondents were asked about their use of 23 separate medications in the 12 months prior to the interview, including pain relievers, sleeping tablets, prescription medications with abuse potential and medications for psychiatric illness. In the 2007 survey respondents were asked about their use of medications in the 2 weeks prior to the interview including: sleeping tablets/capsules, tablets/capsules for anxiety or nerves, tranquillisers, antidepressants, mood stabilisers, and other medications for mental health. For both surveys, respondents using one or more medication were compared to those who had used none.

### *Demographics*

For both surveys, the demographic variables of interest were sex, age (34 years and younger, 35 to 64 years, 65 years and over), country of birth (Australia, other English speaking country, non-English speaking country), marital status (married, separated/widowed/divorced, never married), education (post high school, no post high school education), employment (employed, unemployed, not in the labour force), and current smoking status (present, absent).

### *Statistical analysis*

Weighted means, frequencies and logistic regressions were computed using SAS SURVEY procedures in SAS 9.2 (22) which adjusted for the characteristics of the complex survey design using jackknife repeated replication methods for variance estimation.

In order to select an appropriate multivariate model, the univariate relationships between self-rated health and the covariates of interest were investigated. In this initial phase, a comparatively liberal unadjusted p-value of 0.05 was selected despite multiple comparisons, because the aim was to adjust for all possible covariates that may explain the relationships between self-rated health, somatization and service use in the multivariate analysis. Those covariates that were significantly related to self-rated health were included in multivariate models investigating the relationships between self-rated health, somatisation and service use. To control for multiple comparisons, a more conservative p-value of 0.01 was selected for use in the multivariate analyses.

Univariate and multivariate logistic regressions were then conducted to investigate the relationship between negative self-reported health and the variables of interest (described above). Initial analyses focused on the univariate relationships between self-rated health and the demographic, physical, psychological and service use variables of interest. Multivariate analyses were then conducted to further investigate the relationship between self-rated health and the presence of any physical condition whilst adjusting for demographics, psychiatric illness, suicidality, cognitive impairment and, in the 1997 survey only, neuroticism. To investigate the independent relationships between self-rated health, health anxiety and the ICD-10 psychiatric disorders of interest, multivariate analyses adjusted for demographics, any physical condition, all other psychiatric disorders, suicidality, cognitive impairment and neuroticism. To investigate the relationship between negative self-rated health and disability, separate multivariate regressions for the K10 and days out of role variables were conducted after adjusting for demographics, any physical condition, psychiatric illness, suicidality, cognitive impairment and neuroticism. Finally, multivariate analyses controlling for demographics, any physical condition, psychiatric illness, suicidality, cognitive impairment,



~~neuroticism, psychological distress and days out of role were conducted to investigate the independent relationship between service use and self-rated health.~~

### 3 Results

#### Prevalence of negative self-rated health

14.6% (SE = 0.4) of respondents reported that their health was “fair” or “poor” in the 1997 survey, whilst 14.8% (SE = 0.5) responded similarly in the 2007 survey. In both samples, approximately 30% of those with negative self-rated health reported one or more ICD-10 12-month mental disorder, compared with approximately 17% of those with positive self-rated health (see Table 2 for specific odds ratios). Of those with negative self-rated health, 5.4% were diagnosed with ICD-10 neurasthenia in the 1997 survey, whilst 14.8% screened positive for health anxiety in the 2007 survey. Physical conditions were common amongst individuals reporting negative self-rated health (approximately 72% in the 1997 survey and 88% in the 2007 survey).

#### Univariate relationships between self-rated health and the variables of interest

There were consistencies between the two surveys in terms of the relationships between negative self-rated health and the demographic variables of interest (Table 1). When compared with individuals with positive self-rated health, those with negative self-rated health were more likely to be: older, separated/widowed/divorced, educated to the high school level only, not in the labour force and current regular smokers (see Table 1 for relevant odds ratios for both surveys).

As can be seen from Table 2, the univariate associations between negative self-rated health and all of the correlates of interest were statistically significant in both surveys.

#### Multivariate relationships between self-rated health and the variables of interest

Multivariate logistic regressions which included the effects of demographics, any physical condition and all ICD-10 psychiatric disorders were then conducted. After adjusting for the other variables in the model, individuals with negative self-rated health in the 1997 survey were 3.4 (OR: 3.4; 95% CI 2.2 to 5.2;  $p < 0.01$ ) times more likely to meet criteria for neurasthenia, and 4.1 (OR: 4.1; 95% CI 2.8 to 5.9;  $p < 0.01$ ) times more likely to meet criteria for health anxiety in the 2007 survey (Table 3). In both surveys, after adjusting for demographics, any physical condition and all ICD-10 psychiatric disorders, individuals with negative self-rated health were more likely to have been hospitalized overnight and to have used mental health medications when compared to those with positive self-rated health. The multivariate relationship between self-rated health and the other service use variables (mental health service use and/or general health service use) was only statistically significant in the 1997 survey.

After adjusting for demographics, psychiatric illness, suicidality, cognitive impairment and neuroticism (the latter in the 1997 survey only), individuals who reported negative self-rated health were 3.6 times as likely to report any listed physical condition in the 1997 survey (95% CI: 3.1 to 4.2) and 2.5 times as likely to report any listed physical condition in the 2007 survey (95% CI: 1.9 to 3.3) when compared with individuals who reported positive self-rated health (Table 2).

Multivariate logistic regressions which included the effects of demographics, any physical condition, all ICD-10 psychiatric disorders, suicidality, cognitive impairment and neuroticism were then conducted. After adjusting for the other variables in the model, individuals with negative self-rated health in the 1997 survey were more likely to be diagnosed with agoraphobia, GAD, neurasthenia, and more likely to report any physical condition, suicidality, cognitive impairment and neuroticism when compared to those with positive self-rated health (see Table 2). In the 1997 survey, the strongest multivariate relationship was

between self-rated health, on the one hand, and any physical condition and neurasthenia, on the other. Individuals with negative self-rated health in the 2007 survey were more likely to be diagnosed with social phobia and affective disorders (major depression, dysthymia and bipolar disorder), and more likely to report any physical condition, health anxiety, suicidality and cognitive impairment when compared to those with positive self-rated health (see Table 2). In the 2007 survey, the strongest relationship was between self-reported health and health anxiety after adjusting for the other variables in the model.

In both surveys, after controlling for demographics, any physical condition, any mental disorder, suicidality, cognitive impairment and neuroticism (in the 1997 survey only) individuals with negative self-rated health were considerably more likely to report medium to high distress on the K10, and one or more days out of role.

After controlling for demographics, any physical condition, psychiatric illness, suicidality, cognitive impairment, neuroticism, psychological distress and days out of role, individuals with negative self-rated health were more likely to use all health services when compared to those with positive self-rated health. The relationship between self-rated health and mental health service use was only significant in the 1997 survey. In both surveys, individuals with negative self-rated health were also more likely to have been hospitalized overnight, and to have used medications when compared to those with positive self-rated health.

#### 4 Discussion

These results confirm both of the study hypotheses: 1) that negative self-rated health was powerfully and independently associated with somatisation; and 2) that negative self-rated health was associated with general health service use, hospitalisation and medication use, even after adjusting for an extensive range of psychiatric and physical conditions. The current study provided a strong test of these hypotheses by replicating these findings in two

epidemiological surveys of the Australian population. ~~Negative perceptions of health status were independently associated with the presence of any physical or mental disorder (as well as neurasthenia and health anxiety), disability, psychopathology, suicidality, cognitive impairment and high rates of service use. The current findings, combined with previous research linking negative perceived health with increased rates of mortality, indicate that subjective concerns regarding perceived poor health must be considered an important public health issue.~~

#### Limitations

The use of the two Australian national surveys conferred many advantages in terms of replication, sample representativeness, fully structured diagnoses of all the common psychiatric disorders, extensive assessment of service utilisation and the inclusion of a broad range of other clinical measures. The surveys focused on mental health rather than physical health, which meant that objective assessments of physical morbidity were not available. However, others have found very little discrepancy between self-reported physical conditions and physician reported medical histories (2), and most previous research investigating the correlates of negative self-rated health have relied upon similar self-reported measures of physical health problems (23). Health anxiety in the 2007 survey was based on screening questions rather than full diagnostic assessment (7). In particular, it was not possible to determine whether respondents met full criteria for hypochondriasis. Both surveys were cross-sectional in nature, precluding an investigation of the direction of the relationships identified in the current study. To our knowledge, no prospective examination of self-rated health and somatisation has been undertaken, and the current results suggest this may be a fruitful avenue for future research.

The independent relationships between negative self-rated health and psychological distress highlight the nontrivial nature of these health complaints, whilst the consistent, independent relationships with suicidality and cognitive impairment have been identified and discussed previously (2, 24, 25). Negative self-rated health was also independently associated with neuroticism and anxiety disorders (agoraphobia and GAD) in the 1997 survey, and anxiety (social phobia) and affective disorders (major depression, dysthymia and bipolar disorder) in the 2007 survey. Whilst these findings were not replicated across the two surveys at the disorder level, they are consistent with previous research (2). The relationship between negative self-rated health and neurotic, or internalising disorders (26), may reflect an overall tendency towards negative self-evaluation and ruminative style that extends to perceptions of negative health status. The following discussion will focus on the novel aspects of the current study, including the independent relationships between negative self-rated health and somatisation, and the high rates of service use irrespective of the level of mental and physical illness.

The majority of individuals with poor self-rated health reported the presence of at least one of the major physical conditions enquired about in either survey. These findings suggest that, in most cases, negative ratings of health may be partly justified in terms of physical illness.

However, self-rated health was also related to psychopathologysomatisation, even after adjusting for physical illness, suggesting that the perception of global self-rated health is also independently influenced by psychological factors. Whilst the current study found that negative self-rated health was independently associated with affective and anxiety disorders, only the relationship with somatisation was replicated across both surveys. This finding is consistent with previous research (1, 3). One of the distinguishing features of somatisation is a pathological preoccupation with health and disease-related concerns, and negative self-rated

health in the absence of physical and psychiatric diagnoses may reflect this aspect of somatisation.

~~Perceived health is principally composed of physical symptoms (4) whilst the distinguishing feature of somatisation is a pathological preoccupation with health and disease-related concerns. The robust associations identified in the current study suggest that negative self-rated health may be a mild or prodromal symptom of disorders related to health anxiety.~~

The current study also indicated that, independently of physical and psychiatric conditions, individuals with poor self-rated health used general health services and medications at particularly high rates. Hospitalisations were also common. High rates of service use independent of actual physical and mental problems need to be addressed. Given the strong relationship between negative self-rated health and somatisation, the high rates of service use amongst individuals with negatively perceived health may reflect reassurance-seeking, a symptom central to hypochondriasis and related psychiatric disorders. Consistent with the current findings, previous research has found that negative self-rated health, as well as somatisation, hypochondriasis and medically unexplained physical symptoms, all contribute disproportionately to the growing demand for health services (27). However, individuals presenting with these symptoms and disorders are also more likely to be dissatisfied with the services provided (28, 29). With regards to hypochondriasis specifically, high rates of service use result in consultations that are unsatisfactory and exasperating for both the doctor and patient (30). This tension most likely arises because patients are seeking physical explanations for their concerns, which are largely psychological in nature. Treatment of health anxiety has not been rewarding for either party, with anger on the patients part that cure is not forthcoming and frustration on the clinicians part that reassurance and good advice is not beneficial. Consultations are often fraught. Patient and physician education regarding the psychological nature of health-related concerns, and the direction of patients to

appropriate treatment options with minimal clinician involvement, may lessen such tensions in doctor-patient relationships. Internet-delivered cognitive behavioural therapy is effective for the internalising disorders generally (31-33), and has been shown to be effective for health anxiety specifically (34, 35). Internet delivered cognitive behavioural therapy, which can be administered at low cost and with minimal clinician involvement may be one way around the problems in the interaction between doctor and patient.

### Competing interests

All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at [www.icmje.org/coi\\_disclosure.pdf](http://www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf) and declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

### Copyright

The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, [a worldwide licence](#) to the Publishers and its licensees in perpetuity, in all forms, formats and media (whether known now or created in the future), to i) publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store the Contribution, ii) translate the Contribution into other languages, create adaptations, reprints, include within collections and create summaries, extracts and/or, abstracts of the Contribution, iii) create any other derivative work(s) based on the Contribution, iv) to exploit all subsidiary rights in the Contribution, v) the inclusion of electronic links from the Contribution to third party material where-ever it may be located; and, vi) licence any third party to do any or all of the above.

### Acknowledgements

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 The 1997 and 2007 NSMHWB was funded by the Australian Government Department of  
8 Health and Ageing, and conducted by the Australian Bureau of Statistics.  
9

#### 10 11 **Author Contributions**

12  
13 LM and GA conceived the study and its design. LM conducted all statistical analyses. GA  
14 and LM both contributed to the interpretation of the data. LM wrote the first draft and GA  
15 contributed to all successive revisions. Both LM and GA approved the final manuscript to be  
16 published.  
17  
18  
19  
20

#### 21 22 **Data sharing**

23  
24 The data for the 1997 and 2007 NSMHWB are public access files that can be accessed  
25 through consultation with the Australian Bureau of Statistics.  
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



## References

1. Gureje O, Üstün T, Simon G. The syndrome of hypochondriasis: a cross-national study in primary care. *Psychol Med*. 1997;27(05):1001-10.
2. Goodwin R, Olfson M. Self-perception of poor health and suicidal ideation in medical patients. *Psychol Med*. 2002;32(7):1293-9.
3. Barsky AJ, Cleary PD, Klerman GL. Determinants of perceived health status of medical outpatients. *Soc Sci Med*. 1992;34(10):1147-54.
4. Krause NM, Jay GM. What do global self-rated health items measure? *Med Care*. 1994;930-42.
5. Slade T, Johnston A, Oakley Browne M, Andrews G, Whiteford H. National Survey of Mental Health and Wellbeing: methods and key findings. *Aust NZJ Psychiatry*. 2009;43:594-605.
6. Andrews G, Henderson S, Hall W. Prevalence, comorbidity, disability and service utilisation Overview of the Australian National Mental Health Survey. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*. 2001;178(2):145-53.
7. Sunderland M, Newby JM, Andrews G. Health anxiety in Australia: prevalence, comorbidity, disability and service use. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*. 2012.
8. Ware Jr JE, Kosinski M, Keller SD. A 12-Item Short-Form Health Survey: construction of scales and preliminary tests of reliability and validity. *Med Care*. 1996;34(3):220-33.
9. Andrews G. A brief integer scorer for the SF-12: validity of the brief scorer in Australian community and clinic settings. *Aust N Z J Public Health*. 2002;26(6):508-10.
10. Shadbolt B, Barresi J, Craft P. Self-rated health as a predictor of survival among patients with advanced cancer. *J Clin Oncol*. 2002;20(10):2514-9.
11. Hickie I, Davenport T, Issakidis C, Andrews G. Neurasthenia: prevalence, disability and health care characteristics in the Australian community. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2002;181(1):56-61.
12. Asmundson GJ, Abramowitz JS, Richter AA, Whedon M. Health anxiety: Current perspectives and future directions. *Curr Psychiatry Rep*. 2010;12(4):306-12.
13. American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition (DSM-IV)*. Washington DC: American Psychiatric Association; 1994.
14. Kessler RC, Ustun TB. The World Mental Health (WMH) Survey Initiative Version of the World Health Organization (WHO) Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI). *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*. 2004;13(2):93-121.
15. World Health Organisation. *Composite International Diagnostic Interview*. Organisation WH, editor. Geneva, Switzerland 1990.
16. World Health Organisation. *The ICD-10 Classification of Mental and Behavioural Disorders - Diagnostic Criteria for Research* Geneva: World Health Organisation; 1993.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

17. Eysenck HJ, Eysenck SBG. Manual for the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire:(EPQ-R Adult): Educational Industrial Testing Service; 1994.
18. Kessler RC, Andrews G, Colpe LJ, Hiripi E, Mroczek DK, Normand SLT, et al. Short screening scales to monitor population prevalences and trends in non-specific psychological distress. *Psychol Med.* 2002;32(6):959-76.
19. Andrews G, Slade T. Interpreting scores on the Kessler Psychological Distress Scale (K10). *Aust N Z J Public Health.* 2001;25(6):494-7.
20. Folstein MF, Robins LN, Helzer JE. The mini-mental state examination. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 1983;40(7):812.
21. Lezak MD, Howieson DB, Loring DW. *Neuropsychological assessment*: Oxford University Press, USA; 2004.
22. SAS Institute Inc. *SAS version 9.2*. Cary, NC: SAS Intsitute Inc; 2008.
23. Idler EL, Benyamini Y. Self-rated health and mortality: a review of twenty-seven community studies. *J Health Soc Behav.* 1997:21-37.
24. Barsky AJ, Ahern DK, Bailey ED, Saintfort R, Liu EB, Peekna HM. Hypochondriacal patients' appraisal of health and physical risks. *Am J Psychiatry.* 2001;158(5):783-7.
25. Walker JD, Maxwell CJ, Hogan DB, Eby EM. Does Self-Rated Health Predict Survival in Older Persons with Cognitive Impairment? *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2004;52(11):1895-900.
26. Goldberg D, Krueger R, Andrews G, Hobbs M. Emotional disorders: cluster 4 of the proposed meta-structure for DSM-V and ICD-11. *Psychol Med.* 2009;39(12):2043-59.
27. Little P, Somerville J, Williamson I, Warner G, Moore M, Wiles R, et al. Psychosocial, lifestyle, and health status variables in predicting high attendance among adults. *The British Journal of General Practice.* 2001;51(473):987.
28. Lucock M, Morley S, White C, Peake M. Responses of consecutive patients to reassurance after gastroscopy: results of self administered questionnaire survey. *BMJ.* 1997;315(7108):572-5.
29. Speckens A, Spinhoven P, Van Hemert A, Bolk J. The Reassurance Questionnaire (RQ): psychometric properties of a self-report questionnaire to assess reassurability. *Psychol Med.* 2000;30(4):841-7.
30. Conradt M, Cavanagh M, Franklin J, Rief W. Dimensionality of the Whiteley Index: Assessment of hypochondriasis in an Australian sample of primary care patients. *J Psychosom Res.* 2006;60(2):137-43.
31. Andrews G, Cuijpers P, Craske MG, McEvoy P, Titov N. Computer therapy for the anxiety and depressive disorders is effective, acceptable and practical health care: A meta-analysis. *PloS one.* 2010;5(10):e13196.
32. Mewton L, Wong N, Andrews G. The effectiveness of internet cognitive behavioural therapy for generalized anxiety disorder in clinical practice. *Depression and Anxiety.* 2012;59(10):843-9.
33. Williams AD, Andrews G. The Effectiveness of Internet Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (iCBT) for Depression in Primary Care: A Quality Assurance Study. *PloS one.* 2013;8(2):e57447.
34. Hedman E, Ljótsson B, Andersson E, Rück C, Andersson G, Lindfors N. Effectiveness and cost offset analysis of group CBT for hypochondriasis delivered in a psychiatric setting: An open trial. *Cogn Behav Ther.* 2010;39(4):239-50.
35. Jones FA. The role of bibliotherapy in health anxiety: An experimental study. *British Journal of Community Nursing.* 2002;7(10):498-504.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Cambria Math, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Table 1. Univariate relationships between demographics and self-rated health in the 1997 (n = 10641) and 2007 (n = 8841) Australian National Surveys of Mental Health and Well-Being

	1997 NATIONAL SURVEY OF MENTAL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING			2007 NATIONAL SURVEY OF MENTAL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING		
	Negative self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Positive self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) <i>OR (95% CI)</i>	Negative self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Positive self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) <i>OR (95% CI)</i>
<b>Sex</b>						
Male	51.9 (1.1)	48.8 (0.2)	Ref	50.5 (1.9)	49.5 (0.4)	Ref
Female	48.1 (1.1)	51.2 (0.2)	0.9 (0.8-1.0) <sup>a</sup>	49.5 (1.9)	50.5 (0.4)	1.0 (0.8-1.1)
<b>Age</b>						
18-34	19.4 (1.2)	36.8 (0.3)	Ref	18.6 (1.4)	36.0 (0.3)	Ref
35-64	49.9 (1.3)	50.4 (0.3)	1.9 (1.6-2.2) <sup>a</sup>	57.0 (2.0)	50.6 (0.4)	2.2 (1.7-2.7) <sup>a</sup>
65-85	30.7 (1.1)	12.8 (0.3)	4.6 (3.8-5.5) <sup>a</sup>	24.4 (1.2)	13.4 (0.2)	3.5 (2.9-4.3) <sup>a</sup>
<b>Country of birth</b>						
Australia	72.1 (1.7)	75.3 (0.5)	Ref	73.3 (2.0)	72.8 (0.8)	Ref
Other English speaking country	10.4 (0.9)	11.5 (0.4)	0.9 (0.8-1.2)	11.3 (1.4)	11.3 (0.4)	1.0 (0.7-1.3)
Other non-English speaking country	17.5 (1.1)	13.1 (0.5)	1.4 (1.2-1.7) <sup>a</sup>	15.4 (1.8)	15.9 (0.8)	1.0 (0.7-1.3)
<b>Marital status</b>						
Married/de facto	62.1 (1.1)	65.7 (0.7)	Ref	54.4 (1.8)	52.8 (0.7)	Ref
Separated/widowed/divorced	21.6 (1.2)	12.2 (0.3)	1.9 (1.6-2.2) <sup>a</sup>	21.6 (1.4)	13.3 (0.4)	1.6 (1.3-1.9) <sup>a</sup>
Never married	16.2 (1.2)	22.1 (0.5)	0.8 (0.7-0.9) <sup>a</sup>	24.0 (1.5)	34.0 (9.7)	0.7 (0.6-0.8) <sup>a</sup>
<b>Education</b>						
Higher education	34.7 (1.6)	49.6 (0.7)	Ref	56.2 (2.1)	56.3 (0.6)	Ref
No higher education	65.3 (1.6)	50.4 (0.7)	1.8 (1.6-2.1) <sup>a</sup>	53.8 (2.1)	43.7 (0.6)	1.5 (1.3-1.8) <sup>a</sup>
<b>Employment</b>						
Employed	33.6 (1.6)	68.6 (0.5)	Ref	45.5 (1.6)	68.7 (0.3)	Ref
Unemployed	5.6 (0.6)	3.9 (0.2)	3.0 (2.3-3.9) <sup>a</sup>	1.9 (0.5)	2.7 (0.1)	1.1 (0.6-1.9)
Not in labour force	60.8 (1.7)	27.5 (0.5)	4.5 (3.9-5.3) <sup>a</sup>	52.6 (1.6)	28.6 (0.3)	2.8 (2.4-3.2) <sup>a</sup>
<b>Regular smoker (current)</b>	30.7 (1.0)	21.9 (0.6)	1.6 (1.4-1.8) <sup>a</sup>	25.1 (1.8)	17.1 (0.7)	1.6 (1.3-2.0) <sup>a</sup>

Table 1. Prevalence and demographic correlates of negative self-rated health in the 1997 (n = 10641) and 2007 (n = 8841) Australian National Surveys of Mental Health and Well-Being

<sup>a</sup> Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$

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

1997 NATIONAL SURVEY OF MENTAL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING	2007 NATIONAL SURVEY OF MENTAL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING
--	--

For peer review only

Table 2. Univariate relationships between physical and psychiatric disorders and self-rated health in the 1997 (n = 10641) and 2007 (n = 8841) Australian National Surveys of Mental Health and Well-Being

	Negative self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Positive self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) <i>OR (95% CI)</i>	Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) <i>Adjusted OR (95% CI)</i>	Negative self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Positive self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) <i>OR (95% CI)</i>	Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) <i>Adjusted OR (95% CI)</i>
<b>Physical disorder</b>								
—Any physical disorders	72.0 (1.2)	32.7 (0.6)	5.3 (4.6-6.0) <sup>a</sup>	3.6 (3.1-4.2) <sup>b</sup>	87.9 (1.4)	65.6 (0.8)	3.8 (2.9-5.0)	2.5 (1.9-3.3) <sup>b</sup>
<b>12-month ICD-10 psychiatric disorders</b>								
—Panic disorder	2.8 (0.5)	0.9 (0.1)	3.3 (2.1-5.3) <sup>a</sup>	1.8 (0.9-3.5)	5.6 (0.9)	2.0 (0.2)	2.8 (2.0-4.0) <sup>a</sup>	1.3 (0.9-2.0)
—Agoraphobia	3.3 (0.4)	0.7 (0.1)	4.7 (3.1-7.1) <sup>a</sup>	1.9 (1.2-3.2) <sup>a</sup>	7.8 (1.2)	1.9 (0.2)	4.3 (2.9-6.3) <sup>a</sup>	1.1 (0.6-2.0)
—Social phobia	5.0 (0.6)	2.4 (0.2)	2.2 (1.7-2.8) <sup>a</sup>	1.4 (0.9-2.1)	11.6 (1.4)	3.6 (0.2)	3.5 (2.6-4.7) <sup>a</sup>	2.1 (1.1-3.9) <sup>a</sup>
—Generalised anxiety disorder	7.8 (0.8)	2.2 (0.2)	3.7 (3.1-4.5) <sup>a</sup>	1.6 (1.3-2.1) <sup>a</sup>	6.0 (0.7)	2.1 (0.3)	2.9 (2.0-4.2) <sup>a</sup>	0.8 (0.5-1.3)
—Obsessive-compulsive disorder	0.7 (0.2)	0.3 (0.1)	2.8 (1.4-5.6) <sup>a</sup>	0.6 (0.3-1.4)	3.5 (0.7)	1.6 (0.2)	2.1 (1.3-3.4) <sup>a</sup>	0.8 (0.4-1.6)
—Post-traumatic stress disorder	6.8 (0.7)	2.6 (0.2)	2.7 (2.1-3.5) <sup>a</sup>	1.3 (0.9-1.7)	11.1 (1.1)	5.6 (0.3)	2.1 (1.6-2.7) <sup>a</sup>	1.2 (0.8-1.7)
—Major depression	13.2 (0.9)	5.6 (0.3)	2.6 (2.1-3.1) <sup>a</sup>	1.2 (0.9-1.6)	7.5 (1.0)	1.9 (0.3)	4.2 (2.8-6.3) <sup>a</sup>	1.8 (1.1-3.1) <sup>a</sup>
—Dysthymia	4.1 (0.7)	0.8 (0.1)	5.1 (3.4-7.8) <sup>a</sup>	1.2 (0.7-2.0)	4.7 (0.7)	0.7 (0.1)	7.1 (4.5-11.1) <sup>a</sup>	2.4 (1.4-4.2) <sup>a</sup>
—Bipolar disorder	-	-	-	-	4.9 (0.7)	1.2 (0.2)	4.1 (2.7-6.2) <sup>a</sup>	2.5 (1.4-4.5) <sup>a</sup>
—Alcohol use disorder	7.0 (0.5)	6.3 (0.3)	1.1 (0.9-1.4)	0.8 (0.6-1.0)	5.8 (0.9)	4.1 (0.4)	1.4 (1.0-2.2) <sup>a</sup>	1.2 (0.7-2.1)
—Substance use disorder	3.5 (0.5)	1.9 (0.2)	2.0 (1.4-2.8) <sup>a</sup>	1.1 (0.7-1.9)	3.0 (0.6)	1.2 (0.1)	2.6 (1.5-4.4) <sup>a</sup>	1.5 (0.8-3.0)
—Neurasthenia	5.4 (0.6)	0.8 (0.1)	7.1 (4.8-10.6) <sup>a</sup>	3.4 (2.2-5.2) <sup>a</sup>	-	-	-	-
—Any 12-month ICD disorder	30.7 (1.5)	16.9 (0.6)	2.2 (1.9-2.6) <sup>a</sup>	1.7 (1.4-2.1) <sup>a</sup>	35.0 (1.7)	17.3 (0.6)	2.6 (2.2-3.0) <sup>a</sup>	2.1 (1.6-2.6) <sup>a</sup>
<b>Other measures</b>								
—Illness anxiety disorder	-	-	-	-	14.8 (1.4)	2.4 (0.2)	7.1 (5.3-9.6) <sup>a</sup>	4.1 (2.8-5.9) <sup>a</sup>
—Any personality disorder	12.4 (1.0)	5.4 (0.3)	2.5 (2.0-3.0) <sup>a</sup>	1.2 (0.9-1.6)	-	-	-	-
—Psychosis	1.2 (0.3)	0.3 (0.1)	4.0 (2.3-7.2) <sup>a</sup>	2.3 (0.9-5.9)	-	-	-	-
—Suicidality	7.3 (0.6)	2.1 (0.1)	3.6 (2.9-4.6) <sup>a</sup>	1.8 (1.1-2.9) <sup>a</sup>	7.2 (1.0)	1.5 (0.2)	4.9 (3.4-7.1) <sup>a</sup>	2.3 (1.4-3.7) <sup>a</sup>
—Cognitive impairment (≤23 on MMSE)	3.7 (0.6)	0.9 (0.1)	4.5 (2.9-7.0) <sup>a</sup>	1.5 (1.1-2.1) <sup>a</sup>	21.6 (1.1)	12.8 (0.2)	1.9 (1.6-2.2) <sup>a</sup>	2.4 (1.5-4.1) <sup>a</sup>
—Neuroticism (top 10 percentile of EPQ)	22.7 (1.3)	7.7 (0.4)	3.5 (3.0-4.2) <sup>a</sup>	2.3 (1.8-2.8) <sup>a</sup>	-	-	-	-
<b>Distress and impairment</b>								
—High psychological distress	61.6 (1.2)	27.3 (0.6)	4.3 (3.8-4.8) <sup>a</sup>	3.6 (3.1-4.1) <sup>d</sup>	55.1 (1.7)	24.4 (0.7)	3.8 (3.3-4.4) <sup>a</sup>	2.8 (2.4-3.4) <sup>d</sup>
—One or more days out of role	36.5 (1.6)	14.9 (0.5)	3.3 (2.8-3.8) <sup>a</sup>	3.0 (2.5-3.5) <sup>d</sup>	56.3 (2.1)	22.4 (0.7)	4.5 (3.6-5.5) <sup>a</sup>	3.1 (2.5-3.9) <sup>d</sup>
<b>Service use in past 12 months</b>								
—Mental health service	10.5 (0.9)	4.1 (0.3)	2.7 (2.1-3.6) <sup>a</sup>	2.1 (1.5-2.9) <sup>a</sup>	13.1 (1.5)	6.3 (0.4)	2.3 (1.7-3.0) <sup>a</sup>	1.2 (0.8-1.7)
—General health service	93.5 (0.5)	84.2 (0.5)	2.7 (2.3-3.2) <sup>a</sup>	1.9 (1.6-2.3) <sup>a</sup>	90.9 (1.4)	81.5 (0.9)	2.3 (1.6-3.2) <sup>a</sup>	1.5 (1.0-2.1) <sup>a</sup>
—Mental or general health service	93.8 (0.5)	84.5 (0.5)	2.8 (2.3-3.4) <sup>a</sup>	1.9 (1.6-2.3) <sup>a</sup>	91.3 (1.3)	82.0 (0.9)	2.3 (1.6-3.3) <sup>a</sup>	1.5 (1.0-2.1) <sup>a</sup>
—Hospitalisations	25.4 (1.1)	10.6 (0.3)	2.9 (2.5-3.3) <sup>a</sup>	2.2 (1.8-2.6) <sup>a</sup>	18.5 (1.4)	9.0 (0.5)	2.3 (1.9-2.8) <sup>a</sup>	1.5 (1.2-1.9) <sup>a</sup>
—Medications	38.5 (1.5)	13.5 (0.5)	4.0 (3.5-4.7) <sup>a</sup>	2.6 (2.2-3.1) <sup>a</sup>	24.1 (1.4)	9.5 (0.6)	3.0 (2.5-3.7) <sup>a</sup>	1.6 (1.2-2.0) <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$

<sup>b</sup> Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ . Multivariate analysis adjusting for demographics, psychiatric illness, suicidality, cognitive impairment and, in the 1997 survey only, neuroticism.

<sup>c</sup> Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ . Multivariate analysis adjusting for demographics, any physical condition, all other psychiatric disorders, suicidality, cognitive impairment and neuroticism (1997 survey only).

<sup>d</sup> Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ . Multivariate analysis adjusting for demographics, any physical condition, psychiatric illness, suicidality, cognitive impairment and neuroticism (1997 survey only).

<sup>e</sup> Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ . Multivariate analysis adjusting for demographics, any physical condition, psychiatric illness, suicidality, cognitive impairment, neuroticism (1997 survey only), psychological distress and days out of role.

	1997 NATIONAL SURVEY OF MENTAL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING			2007 NATIONAL SURVEY OF MENTAL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING		
	Negative self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Positive self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) <i>OR (95% CI)</i>	Negative self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Positive self-rated health <i>Weighted Prevalence % (SE)</i>	Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) <i>OR (95% CI)</i>
<b>Physical disorders</b>						
Any physical disorder	72.0 (1.2)	32.7 (0.6)	5.3 (4.6-6.0) <sup>a</sup>	87.9 (1.4)	65.6 (0.8)	3.8 (2.9-5.0) <sup>a</sup>
<b>12 month ICD-10 psychiatric disorders</b>						
Panic disorder	2.8 (0.5)	0.9 (0.1)	3.3 (2.1-5.3) <sup>a</sup>	5.6 (0.9)	2.0 (0.2)	2.8 (2.0-4.0) <sup>a</sup>
Agoraphobia	3.3 (0.4)	0.7 (0.1)	4.7 (3.1-7.1) <sup>a</sup>	7.8 (1.2)	1.9 (0.2)	4.3 (2.9-6.3) <sup>a</sup>
Social phobia	5.0 (0.6)	2.4 (0.2)	2.2 (1.7-2.8) <sup>a</sup>	11.6 (1.4)	3.6 (0.2)	3.5 (2.6-4.7) <sup>a</sup>
Generalised anxiety disorder	7.8 (0.8)	2.2 (0.2)	3.7 (3.1-4.5) <sup>a</sup>	6.0 (0.7)	2.1 (0.3)	2.9 (2.0-4.2) <sup>a</sup>
Obsessive compulsive disorder	0.7 (0.2)	0.3 (0.1)	2.8 (1.4-5.6) <sup>a</sup>	3.5 (0.7)	1.6 (0.2)	2.1 (1.3-3.4) <sup>a</sup>
Post-traumatic stress disorder	6.8 (0.7)	2.6 (0.2)	2.7 (2.1-3.5) <sup>a</sup>	11.1 (1.1)	5.6 (0.3)	2.1 (1.6-2.7) <sup>a</sup>
Major depression	13.2 (0.9)	5.6 (0.3)	2.6 (2.1-3.1) <sup>a</sup>	7.5 (1.0)	1.9 (0.3)	4.2 (2.8-6.3) <sup>a</sup>
Dysthymia	4.1 (0.7)	0.8 (0.1)	5.1 (3.4-7.8) <sup>a</sup>	4.7 (0.7)	0.7 (0.1)	7.1 (4.5-11.1) <sup>a</sup>
Bipolar disorder	=	=	=	4.9 (0.7)	1.2 (0.2)	4.1 (2.7-6.2) <sup>a</sup>
Alcohol use disorder	7.0 (0.5)	6.3 (0.3)	1.1 (0.9-1.4)	5.8 (0.9)	4.1 (0.4)	1.4 (1.0-2.2) <sup>a</sup>
Substance use disorder	3.5 (0.5)	1.9 (0.2)	2.0 (1.4-2.8) <sup>a</sup>	3.0 (0.6)	1.2 (0.1)	2.6 (1.5-4.4) <sup>a</sup>
Any personality disorder	12.4 (1.0)	5.4 (0.3)	2.5 (2.0-3.0) <sup>a</sup>	=	=	=

<sup>a</sup> Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$

Table 3. Univariate and multivariate relationships between somatisation and service use and self-rated health in the 1997 (n = 10641) and 2007 (n = 8841) Australian National Surveys of Mental Health and Well-Being

	1997 NATIONAL SURVEY OF MENTAL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING				2007 NATIONAL SURVEY OF MENTAL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING			
			Univariate	Multivariate			Univariate	Multivariate
	Negative self-rated health Weighted Prevalence % (SE)	Positive self-rated health Weighted Prevalence % (SE)	Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) OR (95% CI)	Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) Adjusted OR (95% CI)	Negative self-rated health Weighted Prevalence % (SE)	Positive self-rated health Weighted Prevalence % (SE)	Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) OR (95% CI)	Poor self-rated health vs. Good self-rated health (ref) Adjusted OR (95% CI)
<b>Somatisation</b>								
Neurasthenia	5.4 (0.6)	0.8 (0.1)	7.1 (4.8-10.6) <sup>a</sup>	3.4 (2.2-5.2) <sup>b</sup>	14.8 (1.4)	2.4 (0.2)	7.1 (5.3-9.6) <sup>a</sup>	4.1 (2.9-5.9) <sup>b</sup>
Health anxiety	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=
<b>Service use in past 12 months</b>								
Mental health service	10.5 (0.9)	4.1 (0.3)	2.7 (2.1-3.6) <sup>a</sup>	2.5 (1.8-3.4) <sup>b</sup>	13.1 (1.5)	6.3 (0.4)	2.3 (1.7-3.0) <sup>a</sup>	1.3 (0.9-1.8)
General health service	93.5 (0.5)	84.2 (0.5)	2.7 (2.3-3.2) <sup>a</sup>	1.9 (1.6-2.4) <sup>b</sup>	90.9 (1.4)	81.5 (0.9)	2.3 (1.6-3.2) <sup>a</sup>	1.5 (1.0-2.2)
Mental or general health service	93.8 (0.5)	84.5 (0.5)	2.8 (2.3-3.4) <sup>a</sup>	2.0 (1.6-2.4) <sup>b</sup>	91.3 (1.3)	82.0 (0.9)	2.3 (1.6-3.3) <sup>a</sup>	1.5 (1.0-2.2)
Hospitalisations	25.4 (1.1)	10.6 (0.3)	2.9 (2.5-3.3) <sup>a</sup>	2.2 (1.9-2.7) <sup>b</sup>	18.5 (1.4)	9.0 (0.5)	2.3 (1.9-2.8) <sup>a</sup>	1.5 (1.2-1.9) <sup>b</sup>
Medications	38.5 (1.5)	13.5 (0.5)	4.0 (3.5-4.7) <sup>a</sup>	2.7 (2.3-3.2) <sup>b</sup>	24.1 (1.4)	9.5 (0.6)	3.0 (2.5-3.7) <sup>a</sup>	1.7 (1.3-2.1) <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Statistically significant at p<0.05.

<sup>b</sup> Statistically significant at p<0.01. Multivariate analysis adjusting for demographics, any physical condition and ICD-10 psychiatric disorders.

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

	Item No	Recommendation
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (pg. 1) (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found (pg. 2-3)
<b>Introduction</b>		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported (pg. 4-5)
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses (pg. 5-6)
<b>Methods</b>		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper (pg. 6)
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection (pg.6)
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants (pg.6)
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable (pg.7-11)
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 (pg.7-11)
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias (pg.6)
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at (pg.6)
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why (pg.7-12)
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding (pg.11-12) (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (pg.11-12) (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (n/a) (d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy (pg.11-12) (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses (n/a)
<b>Results</b>		
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (pg.6) (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (pg.6) (c) Consider use of a flow diagram (n/a)
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (Tables 1-2) (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures (Tables 1-2)
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (Tables 1-2) (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (pg. 7-



**11 & Tables 1-2)**

		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period <b>(n/a)</b>
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses <b>(Tables 1-2)</b>
<b>Discussion</b>		
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives <b>(pg. 14-15)</b>
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias <b>(pg.15)</b>
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence <b>(pg. 16-18)</b>
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results <b>(pg. 6)</b>
<b>Other information</b>		
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 <b>(pg. 18, Acknowledgments)</b>

\*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

**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](http://www.strobe-statement.org).