eFigure 1. The Taiwan Longitudinal Study of Aging, the Social Environment and Biomarkers of Aging Study, and Analysis Samples.



Abbreviations: CES-D: Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression scale; LFU: lost to followup; PRH: physician-rated health; SEBAS: Social Environment and Biomarkers of Aging Study; SRH: self-rated health; TLSA: Taiwan Longitudinal Study of Aging.

<sup>a</sup> A few respondents living in remote areas were excluded from the subsample because they lived too far from the hospitals contracted to do the physical examination portion of the study. <sup>b</sup> Some respondents were not asked to participate in the 2000 hospital examination due to their health condition. These exclusion criteria were: living in an institution (n=10), seriously ill (n=61), catheter or diaper (n=23), kidney dialysis (n=7), other health condition that precludes blood drawing (n=33). Respondents may have more than one health condition that makes them ineligible for the examination.

<sup>c</sup> Respondents refused to participate in the 2000 exam for the following reasons: will be out of town during scheduled exam period (n=23), has no time during exam period (n=57), had just received an exam (n=84), has regular or frequent exams (n=75), thinks s/he is healthy and does not need exam (n=102), respondent's family doesn't feel the need (n=36), too old or difficulty moving (n=26), no one to accompany him/her (n=10), afraid of having blood drawn (n=32), too much trouble (n=86), afraid of riding in a car/suffers from car sickness/doesn't want to go out (n=11), other reason (n=34), did not give a reason (n=2). Respondents who refused to participate may have provided multiple reasons for refusing to participate.

<sup>d</sup> Some respondents were not asked to participate in the 2006 hospital examination due to their health condition. These exclusion criteria were: living in an institution (n=1), seriously ill (n=24), catheter or diaper (n=4), kidney dialysis (n=5), other health condition that precludes blood drawing (n=3). Respondents may have more than one health condition that makes them ineligible for the examination.

<sup>e</sup> Respondents refused to participate in the 2006 exam for the following reasons: will be out of town during scheduled exam period (n=13), has no time during exam period (n=60), had just received an exam (n=41), has regular or frequent exams (n=43), thinks s/he is healthy and does not need exam (n=39), respondent's family doesn't feel the need (n=23), too old or difficulty moving (n=18), no one to accompany him/her (n=3), afraid of having blood drawn (n=13), too much trouble (n=56), afraid of riding in a car/suffers from car sickness/doesn't want to go out (n=4), other reason (n=5), did not give a reason (n=2). Respondents who refused to participate may have provided multiple reasons for refusing to participate.

eTable 1: Hazard Ratios on Continuous Ratings Variables from Proportional Hazard Models of Dying by June 2011, the Social Environment and Biomarkers of Aging Study, 2006.

	ſ	Vodel 1	I	Model 2	I	Model 3	Model 4		
Continuous ratings	HR	95% CI	HR	95% CI	HR	95% CI	HR	95% CI	
Self	0.69	(0.55, 0.86)					0.85	(0.65, 1.11)	
Interviewer			0.63	(0.52, 0.77)			0.69	(0.54, 0.88)	
Physician					0.89	(0.67, 1.18)	1.05	(0.79, 1.40)	
N <sup>a</sup>	919		919		919		919		

<sup>a</sup> N is the exam sample (see text for details).

eTable 2: Hazard Ratios from Proportional Hazard Models of Dying by June 2011, the Social Environment and Biomarkers of Aging Study, 2006.

	ſ	Model 1	Ν	Aodel 2	Model 4		
Ratings	HR	95% CI	HR	95% CI	HR	95% CI	
Self							
Poor (1)	8.83	(2.98, 26.17)			3.54	(1.03, 12.14)	
Not so good (2)	4.98	(1.79, 13.86)			2.68	(0.89, 8.10)	
Average (3)	2.61	(0.93, 7.27)			1.66	(0.56, 4.90)	
Good (4)	2.55	(0.86, 7.58)			1.89	(0.62, 5.80)	
Excellent (5)	-ref-				-ref-		
Interviewer							
Poor (1)			12.08	(4.95, 29.52)	5.98	(2.08, 17.21)	
Not so good (2)			4.02	(1.90, 8.49)	2.49	(1.08, 5.75)	
Average (3)			3.78	(1.89, 7.59)	2.84	(1.34, 6.02)	
Good (4)			1.96	(0.97 <i>,</i> 3.93)	1.67	(0.81, 3.46)	
Excellent (5)			-ref-		-ref-		
N <sup>a</sup>	1,197		1,197		1,197		
P-value, joint test of ratings <sup>b</sup>							
Self	<0.001				0.087		
Interviewer			< 0.001		0.005		

<sup>a</sup> N is the interview sample (see text for details). <sup>b</sup> The p-value is from a joint Wald test of the four coefficients for the indicated set of ratings.

eTable 3: Hazard Ratios on Continuous Ratings from Proportional Hazard Models of Dying by June 2011, the Social Environment and Biomarkers of Aging Study, 2006.

	ſ	Vodel 1	Ν	/lodel 2	ľ	Vodel 3	Ν	/lodel 4	Ν	/lodel 5	ľ	Aodel 6	Ν	Aodel 7	Ν	Aodel 8
Continuous ratings	HR	95% CI														
Self	0.76	(0.61, 0.95)	0.76	(0.61, 0.95)	0.76	(0.61, 0.96)	0.76	(0.61, 0.96)	0.79	(0.63, 1.01)	0.80	(0.63, 1.01)	0.80	(0.63, 1.02)	0.78	(0.61, 1.00)
Interviewer	0.70	(0.57, 0.87)	0.68	(0.55, 0.84)	0.70	(0.57, 0.87)	0.70	(0.57, 0.87)	0.73	(0.59, 0.91)	0.77	(0.61, 0.96)	0.83	(0.64, 1.06)	0.84	(0.65, 1.08)
Covariates																
Sex			Х		Х		Х		Х		Х		Х		Х	
Social environment <sup>a</sup>					Х		х		Х		Х		х		х	
Smoking							Х		Х		Х		Х		Х	
Self-reported chronic conditions <sup>b</sup>									х		х		х		х	
Psychological well-being <sup>c</sup>											Х		х		х	
Self-reported functioning <sup>d</sup>													х		х	
Performance-based functioning <sup>e</sup>															Х	
N <sup>f</sup>	1,197		1,197		1,197		1,197		1,197		1,197		1,197		1,197	

<sup>a</sup> Social environment variables: urban/rural residence, educational attainment, participation in social activities, and marital status.

<sup>b</sup> Self-reported chronic conditions: high blood pressure, takes medicine or has prescription for high blood pressure, diabetes, heart disease, cancer, respiratory disease, ulcer, liver disease, kidney disease, gout.

<sup>c</sup> Psychological well-being: Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression score, perceived stress, sleep quality.

<sup>d</sup> Self-reported functioning: number of activities of daily living difficulties, number of mobility difficulties.

<sup>e</sup> Performance-based functioning: grip strength, peak lung flow, walk speed, chair stand speed, and indicators for whether the respondent was unable to perform each of these four tasks. Grip strength (in kg) is measured with a dynamometer as the maximum value of three trials per hand; we consider the maximum of both hands. Walking speed (in m/sec) is measured as the faster of two trials for a walk of 3m at normal speed (with a walking aid if needed. Chair stand speed (chair stands/sec) is the completion time for five chair stands. <sup>f</sup>N is the interview sample (see text for details).

eTable 4: Hazard Ratios from Proportional Hazard Models of Dying by Period, the Social Environment and Biomarkers of Aging Study, 2006.

	ſ	Vodel 1	Ν	Aodel 2	Model 3			
Ratings	HR	95% CI	HR	95% CI	HR	95% CI		
Self								
Poor (1)	7.12	(1.50, 33.73)			2.10	(0.34, 12.96)		
Not so good (2)	4.25	(0.99, 18.21)			1.97	(0.39, 9.82)		
Average (3)	1.98	(0.46 <i>,</i> 8.59)			1.17	(0.24, 5.63)		
Good (4)	1.73	(0.35 <i>,</i> 8.58)			1.24	(0.24, 6.54)		
Excellent (5)	-ref-				-ref-			
Interviewer								
Poor (1)			15.02	(4.11, 54.83)	8.95	(1.86, 43.08)		
Not so good (2)			4.05	(1.25, 13.13)	2.79	(0.74, 10.51)		
Average (3)			4.28	(1.44, 12.66)	3.43	(1.04, 11.30)		
Good (4)			1.65	(0.53, 5.07)	1.51	(0.46, 4.92)		
Excellent (5)			-ref-		-ref-			
N <sup>a</sup>	1,197		1,197		1,197			
P-value, joint test of ratings <sup>b</sup>								
Self	<0.001				0.580			
Interviewer			< 0.001		0.020			

Panel 1: Proportional Hazard Models of Dying by December 31, 2008.

<sup>a</sup> N is the interview sample (see text for details). <sup>b</sup> The p-value is from a joint Wald test of the four coefficients for the indicated set of ratings.

	ſ	Vodel 1	Ν	Aodel 2	Model 3			
Ratings	HR	95% CI	HR	95% CI	HR	95% CI		
Self								
Poor (1)	10.66	(2.33, 48.86)			5.24	(0.97, 28.30)		
Not so good (2)	5.71	(1.35, 24.22)			3.39	(0.73, 15.69)		
Average (3)	3.26	(0.77, 13.77)			2.18	(0.48 <i>,</i> 9.76)		
Good (4)	3.39	(0.75, 15.31)			2.57	(0.55, 12.00)		
Excellent (5)	-ref-				-ref-			
Interviewer								
Poor (1)			9.80	(2.71, 35.47)	4.28	(0.98, 18.83)		
Not so good (2)			4.08	(1.54, 10.77)	2.34	(0.79 <i>,</i> 6.94)		
Average (3)			3.48	(1.40 <i>,</i> 8.65)	2.51	(0.95 <i>,</i> 6.63)		
Good (4)			2.18	(0.89 <i>,</i> 5.33)	1.79	(0.71, 4.51)		
Excellent (5)			-ref-		-ref-			
N <sup>a</sup>	1,143		1,143		1,143			
P-value, joint test of ratings <sup>b</sup>								
Self	<0.001				0.210			
Interviewer			< 0.001		0.290			

Panel 2: Proportional Hazard Models of Dying between January 1, 2009 and June 30, 2011.

<sup>a</sup> N is the subset of the interview sample still alive as of January 1, 2009. (See text for details of the interview sample.) <sup>b</sup> The p-value is from a joint Wald test of the four coefficients for the indicated set of ratings.