

Published in final edited form as:

*Addiction*. 2015 September ; 110(9): 1505–1512. doi:10.1111/add.12939.

## What is wrong with non-respondents? Alcohol-, drug- and smoking related mortality and morbidity in a 12-year follow up study of respondents and non-respondents in the Danish Health and Morbidity Survey

Anne Illemann Christensen<sup>1</sup>, Ola Ekholm<sup>1</sup>, Lindsay Gray<sup>2</sup>, Charlotte Glümer<sup>3</sup>, and Knud Juel<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>National Institute of Public Health, University of Southern Denmark, Copenhagen, Denmark

<sup>2</sup>MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK

<sup>3</sup>Research Centre for Prevention and Health, The Capital Region of Denmark, Glostrup, Denmark

### Abstract

**Background and aim**—Response rates in health surveys have diminished over the last two decades, making it difficult to obtain reliable information on health and health-related risk factors in different population groups. This study compared cause-specific mortality and morbidity among survey respondents and different types of non-respondents to estimate alcohol-, drug- and smoking related mortality and morbidity among non-respondents.

**Design**—Prospective follow-up study of respondents and non-respondents in two cross-sectional health surveys.

**Setting**—Denmark.

**Participants**—A total sample of 39,540 Danish citizens aged 16 or older.

**Measurements**—Register-based information on cause-specific mortality and morbidity at the individual level was obtained for respondents (n=28,072) and different types of non-respondents (refusals n=8,954; illness/disabled n=731, uncontactable n=1,593). Cox proportional hazards models were used to examine differences in alcohol-, drug- and smoking-related mortality and morbidity, respectively, in a 12 year follow-up period.

**Findings**—Overall, non-response was associated with a significantly increased hazard ratio of 1.56 (95% CI: 1.36–1.78) for alcohol-related morbidity, 1.88 (95% CI: 1.38–2.57) for alcohol-related mortality, 1.55 (95% CI: 1.27–1.88) for drug-related morbidity, 3.04 (95% CI: 1.57–5.89) for drug-related mortality and 1.15 (95% CI: 1.03–1.29) for smoking-related morbidity. The hazard ratio for smoking-related mortality also tended to be higher among non-respondents compared with respondents although no significant association was evident (HR: 1.14; 95% CI:

---

Conflict of interest: None

#### Ethical considerations

The Danish Data Protection Agency has approved the linking of the registers and the survey data, and all local confidentiality and privacy requirements have been met.

0.95-1.36). Uncontactable and ill/disabled non-respondents generally had a higher hazard ratio of alcohol-, drug- and smoking related mortality and morbidity compared with refusal non-respondents.

**Conclusion**—Health survey non-respondents in Denmark have an increased hazard ratio of alcohol-, drug-, and smoking-related mortality and morbidity compared with respondents, which may indicate more unfavourable health behaviours among non-respondents.

## Introduction

Reliable information on health and health-related risk factors in different population groups is required to calculate the burden of morbidity and mortality attributable to these risk factors and to formulate and evaluate policies aimed at improving population health and reducing health inequalities. Health surveys of the general population are a commonly used method to obtain such information, but the validity depends on the representativeness of the population of interest. Over the last couple of decades, response rates in health surveys have been diminishing, which can be problematic as it means that inference is being made on a progressively limited sub-sample of the population (1-4). This will, however, only affect the estimates if respondents and non-respondents differ systematically from each other in a way that is relevant to the study results. There are known differences in sociodemographic characteristics between respondents and non-respondents; e.g. non-respondents are more likely to be men, young, unmarried and less educated (2, 5-7). Further, non-respondents tend to have more unfavourable health behaviours and excess mortality than respondents (5, 6, 8-12). This evidence suggests that survey-based estimates, for example, measures of smoking and alcohol consumption, are underestimated.

Often, non-response is assessed by comparing respondents to general population register-based datasets (13-15), and in some cases by comparing respondents and non-respondents on known characteristics from the sampling frame (1, 6, 10, 16). In the present study it was possible to assess mortality and morbidity among respondents and different types of non-respondents. Previous results indicate that individuals who took the time to decline the study invitation differed from those with whom the researchers had no contact (17). Knowledge about cause-specific mortality and morbidity among respondents and different types of non-respondents may provide additional insight into the extent of the associated bias. This has, to our knowledge, not previously been assessed. Hence, this study seeks to expand upon and improve the evidence surrounding the well-documented selection effects caused by non-response.

The aim of the present study is to estimate the magnitude of non-response bias in health surveys by comparing register-based information on alcohol-, drug-, and smoking-related mortality and morbidity, respectively, for respondents and different types of non-respondents during a follow-up period of up to 12 years.

## Material and methods

The study is based on pooled data from the Danish Health and Morbidity surveys in 2000 and 2005. Both surveys are cross-sectional and designed to be nationally representative.

Information on cause-specific death and mortality at the individual level were subsequently obtained from administrative registers and linked to all individuals in the sampling frames, including non-respondents.

### Survey-based data

The survey from 2000 consisted of a county-stratified random sample of 22,484 individuals. The sample was drawn from the adult (16 years of age or older) Danish population by the Danish National Centre for Social Research (who carried out the data collection) using the Danish Civil Registration System (each citizen has a unique personal identification number) (18). A crucial aim was to have at least 1,000 completed interviews in each of the 15 Danish counties (except in the smallest county where 600 completed interviews were considered as sufficient). The main reason for this aim was that the survey should serve as a tool for the counties in their healthcare planning. In addition, the counties had the opportunity to increase the sample size in their county if they were willing to cover the costs that arise from such an expansion. Only one county (Frederiksborg County) decided to increase their sample size. Thus, the sample was supplemented with 612 individuals from Frederiksborg County and the total sample size was 23,096 Danish citizens. A total of 17,137 (74.2%) individuals participated in the survey. The reasons for non-response were refusal (n=5,188; 22.8%), uncontactable (address of residence was obtained but the interviewer failed to establish contact to the sampled individual) (n=379; 1.6%), illness/disabled (n=305; 1.3%) and other reasons (e.g. linguistic barriers) (n=87; 0.4%).

In 2004, a new local government reform was planned and it was implemented in 2007. The counties were dissolved and five regions were established. In order to give health-related information to the new regions, it was decided that the survey in 2005 should have at least 3,000 completed interviews in each region. Hence, the survey from 2005 consisted of a region-stratified random sample of 21,832 Danish citizens including a follow-up sample of 5,388 individuals from the 2000 survey. To avoid double counting it was decided to exclude the follow-up sample from the 2005 sample. Thus, the final sample size in 2005 consisted of 16,444 individuals of which 10,935 (66.5%) participated in the survey. The reasons for non-response were refusal (n=3,766; 22.9%), uncontactable (n=1,214; 7.4%), illness/disabled (n=426; 2.6%) and other reasons (n=103; 0.6%). The sample in 2005 was likewise drawn from the adult (16 years of age or older) Danish population using the Danish Civil Registration System and the Danish National Centre for Social Research was also responsible for the sampling and the data collection in 2005.

Institutionalised individuals were included in the sampling frame and respondents were interviewed at the institution. From the available data material it is not possible to know the breakdown of reasons for non-response for institutionalised non-respondents.

All selected individuals received a letter of introduction that briefly described the purpose and content of the survey and it was emphasized that participation was voluntary. Data were collected via face-to-face interview at the respondents' places of residence (a minimum of four contact attempts) and carried out by the professional interview staff at the Danish National Centre for Social Research. More details of the survey designs are described elsewhere (1).

## Register-based data

In Denmark, nationwide administrative registers are available for research purposes, and owing to the unique personal identification number it was possible to link information directly from several registers to each individual in the sample. The Danish Civil Registration System was used to retrieve information on sex, age, vital status and the date of any change of vital status. Information on the highest completed education at the time of data collection was extracted from Danish education registers, which are generated from the education institutions' administrative records (19). Information on cause-specific mortality was obtained from the Danish Register of Causes of Death (DRCD) (20) which covers all deaths among citizens dying in Denmark. Information on hospitalizations was obtained from the National Patient Register (DNPR), which holds administrative (e.g. hospital ward and date and time of activity) and clinical data (diagnoses and surgical procedures) on all patients in Danish hospitals (21). Classification of cause(s) of deaths and diagnoses is based on ICD-10 codes. Table 1 displays the ICD-10 codes used to define alcohol-, drug- and smoking-related mortality and morbidity. Inpatient admissions with one of the listed ICD-10 codes as either a primary or secondary diagnosis were defined as events, and deaths with one of the listed ICD-10 codes as either a primary or secondary cause were also defined as events. Only the first registered admission or death for the event under study was included in the analysis. Classifications are not mutually exclusive which means that individuals can be classified e.g. as having both an alcohol-related mortality event and a smoking-related morbidity event if the individual is hospitalized with a smoking-related event in 2008 and dies of an alcohol-related event in 2010. The list of conditions was mainly based on a former Danish study assessing the impact on various risk factors on public health (22). All-cause mortality was defined as any given event registered in DRCD including alcohol-, smoking- and drug-related deaths. The Danish Data Protection Agency has approved the linking of the registers and the survey data and all local confidentiality and privacy requirements have been met. No consent was needed at the individual level.

## Statistical analyses

Initial descriptive analyses provided incidence rates for alcohol-, drug-, and smoking-related mortality and morbidity during follow-up and simple frequency distributions of potential confounding variables by response status. Observation intervals were calculated from the sampling date for non-respondents (i.e. 1. of January 2000 and 2005, respectively) and the interview date for respondents until the first relevant event, death, emigration, or end of follow-up (December 31, 2011, whichever came first). Hence, individuals' survival times were censored upon experiencing a competing risk. December 31, 2011 was chosen as end of follow since the longest possible follow-up time was preferred, and 2011 was the latest year DRCD and DNPR was fully updated at the time of data analysis. Incidence rates were calculated as the number of events during the study period divided by the sum of the person-time of the individuals at risk. Individuals were considered at risk until the first registered admission in DNPR or death in DRCD for the event under study.

The association between response status and the incidence of alcohol-, drug-, and smoking-related mortality and morbidity, respectively, was analysed using the Cox proportional hazards model adjusting for potential confounding factors (survey year, sex, education). Age

was applied as the underlying time in the statistical model. Evaluation of the validity of the proportional hazards assumption was done by visual inspections of log-log plots (data not shown). The number of participants (N) in the models with and without the inclusion of education differs due to missing information on educational attainment. This information is missing for individuals educated abroad and the older generation. In the present data material information on educational level is missing for 5.5% among individuals age 16 or older and for 45.1% among individuals age 75 years or older. In all tests, P values were 2-sided and statistical significance was defined as  $p < 0.05$ . All analysis was carried out using SAS version 9.3.

## Results

The relative distribution of basic characteristics among respondents and different types of non-respondents is summarized in table 2. In general, respondents were younger than non-respondents and individuals with basic school education were underrepresented among the respondents. No difference was seen in the sex distribution between respondents and non-respondents. Incidence rates of alcohol-, smoking- and drug-related mortality and morbidity, were lower among respondents compared to non-respondents; this also applied for all-cause mortality. The associations between response status and cause-specific mortality and morbidity, respectively, are shown in table 3. Non-respondents had an increased hazard ratio for alcohol-related mortality and morbidity, respectively, compared to respondents when adjusting for survey year, sex and education. The same pattern was evident for drug-related mortality and morbidity, smoking-related morbidity and all-cause mortality. Smoking-related mortality tended to be higher among non-respondents compared to respondents but not significantly different. Table 4 shows the association between cause-specific mortality and morbidity according to the different types of non-response. Uncontactable non-respondents had a significantly increased hazard ratio for alcohol-related morbidity (HR: 3.17, 95% CI: 2.44-4.11) and mortality (HR: 6.31, 95% CI: 3.78-10.53) compared to respondents when adjusting for survey-year, sex and education. The same pattern was seen for refusal and ill/disabled non-respondents, although the HRs were somewhat lower than for uncontactable non-respondents. Further, uncontactable non-respondents had a significantly increased hazard ratio for smoking-related morbidity (HR: 2.25, 95% CI: 1.69-3.01) and mortality (HR: 2.79, 95% CI: 1.82-4.29) compared to respondents when adjusting for survey-year, sex and education. The same pattern was seen for ill/disabled non-respondents, however, the HR was somewhat lower than for uncontactable non-respondents. No significant difference was observed between refusing non-respondents and respondents in relation to smoking-related morbidity or mortality. Non-respondents who were ill/disabled had the highest hazard ratio for drug-related morbidity (HR: 2.59, 95% CI: 1.44-4.66) and mortality (HR: 6.46, 95% CI: 1.45-28.79). Likewise, refusal and uncontactable non-respondents had an increased hazard ratio for drug-related morbidity and mortality, respectively. All types of non-respondents had an increased hazard ratio for all-cause mortality compared to respondents.

## Discussion

It is evident from the current study that non-respondents were more likely than respondents to suffer from alcohol-, smoking- and drug-related morbidity and mortality. Further, the analyses showed that non-response is a heterogeneous matter, i.e. different types of non-response have varied effects on the non-response bias. Refusal was the most frequent reason for non-response, but significant differences between respondents and refusing non-respondents was only observed in relation to alcohol- and drug-related mortality and morbidity. Uncontactable non-respondents constituted the second largest category, and pronounced differences between uncontactable non-respondents and respondents were seen in relation to alcohol- and smoking-related mortality and morbidity and drug-related morbidity. The ill/disabled constituted a small group among non-respondents, but had a significant higher hazard ratio for smoking- and drug-related mortality and morbidity and alcohol-related morbidity. Overall, the observed hazard ratio was higher among uncontactable and ill/disabled non-respondents compared to refusal non-respondents. Hence, uncontactable and ill/disabled non-respondents were the most important contributor to non-response bias.

The assumption in the present study is that differences in alcohol-, smoking- and drug-related morbidity and mortality infer differences in alcohol consumption, smoking and drug use. However, this requires a strong association between the selected ICD-10 codes and the particular health behaviour. Smoking is a fairly specific cause for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and cancer in the larynx, tracheas, bronchus and lung, which were the diagnoses selected to represent smoking. Overall the aetiological fraction of smoking in the development of these diseases is about 80-90% (23). The aetiological fraction for each of the selected alcohol- and drug-related diagnoses is 100% per definition. The chosen alcohol-, and drug-related diseases are, however, mainly associated with extensive alcohol consumption and drug use, respectively, and diseases associated with more moderate use are not included. The results, therefore, indicate more heavy alcohol and drug use and not necessarily more moderate use among non-respondents than respondents. Thus the selected diagnoses provide guideline indications of the actual consumption in the general population and the results indicate that estimates of smoking and heavy alcohol and drug use are most likely underestimated by the bias produced by non-response. This is in accordance with previous studies (6, 9, 10, 16, 24, 25). Such resulting bias is an important component that should be taken into consideration in surveys based on general populations (15).

The reason why smoking-related events show less relationship with non-response compared to alcohol- and drug-related events may be partly explained as follows: as described the alcohol-, and drug-related diagnoses are associated with extensive alcohol consumption and drug use, and individuals with these diagnoses may represent a more marginalized group with more severe health problems than heavy smokers. Further, the selected alcohol- and drug-related diagnoses have shorter lag time than the selected smoking-related diagnoses. Hence, non-respondents may have died from other causes before developing a smoking-related diagnosis.



Some degree of health outcome-related self-selection into the study is to be expected; e.g. those who are already sick at baseline decline to respond resulting in a higher morbidity and mortality among non-respondents during the first years of follow-up. This is supported by a previous study showing that the excess mortality of non-respondents was higher after 4 years of follow-up in comparison to 28 years of follow-up (10). However, a stable excess mortality and morbidity several years after baseline would indicate that the respondents and non-respondents differ not only in health status at baseline. The analysis in the present study showed difference in mortality and morbidity between respondents and non-respondents even after a relative long follow-up period and differences in lifestyle are therefore likely. Differences in socio-demographic characteristics between respondents and non-respondents have been suggested as explanation for this difference in outcome, but this factor did not seem to be a sufficient explanation in the current study. In most cases the adjusted HR remained significantly increased for non-respondents, indicating that these socio-demographic characteristics did not capture all the differences in health between the groups. This is in accordance with findings in other studies (10, 24). One explanation could be that sex and education inadequately captured the factors related to participation, i.e. the categories were too broad or that other unmeasured characteristics were more important. Another explanation could be that those who chose to respond were healthier than those who chose not to respond, even within the same socio-demographic group.

As mentioned in the statistical section, information on educational level is missing for individuals educated abroad and the older generation. However, as this is a problem for both respondents and non-respondents there is no reason to suspect any differential misclassification of educational level.

When using DNRP there are some aspects one needs to be aware of. Since 2000 the DNPR has formed the basis for payment to public hospitals and the registration from these hospitals is assumed to be complete since then. However, registration from private hospitals and clinics is known to be incomplete. In 2008, the National Board of Health estimated that 5% of all operations were missing from the DNPR. In addition, hospitals in Denmark are reimbursed according to the diagnosis related groups system (DRG), which is a classification system that identified the ‘products’ that the patient has received. Hence, the use of the DRG-system for payment of hospitals may cause a diagnostic drift in the coding towards diagnoses with higher costs, which influences the validity of disease classifications in hospital systems (28). However, any misclassification of outcome will most likely be non-differential as it will apply for both respondents and non-respondents, and will therefore tend to underestimate the true association. Last, DNPR and DRCD only cover morbidity and mortality events that occur in Denmark. Hence, individuals who emigrates have unknown health outcomes and are therefore censored from the analysis at the day of emigration.

Overall, the identified non-response bias is an important component that should be taken into consideration when using estimates based on surveys of the general population. Standard approaches aim to improve overall response rates, but even if the response rate is high, selective non-response may bias estimates and tailored methods aiming to improve response rate in different types of non-response groups – particularly hard-to-reach communities and those with morbidities – may be warranted. For example, the introduction

letter could stress the importance of response despite illness/disability and a shorter questionnaire could be offered as a second option to those indicating illness/disability. Additionally, the number of contacts attempts, could be increased for uncountable non-respondents and the contacts attempts could be varied by time of day and week and by contact mode i.e. telephone, letter and visit at the address.

Post hoc, non-response adjustment by inverse probability weighting is routinely applied to account for non-response bias by selective non-response. However, weights based on socio-demographics characteristics may not adequately capture differential health and health related behaviour within categories. The information obtained from the present study may be used to improve weighting as the success of weighting depends on how useful the proxy variables (reason for non-response) are for the survey variables (health behaviour). This will never fully substitute for missing data from non-respondents, but knowledge about socio-demographic characteristics and cause-specific mortality and morbidity among respondents and different types of non-respondents may provide additional insight into the magnitude and direction of the associated bias. However, this requires that information on reason for non-response be registered in a systematic way during data collection. A promising alternative to weighting is a health outcome-informed multiple imputation approach which is currently in development (29). This exploits the record-linked health outcome data to form the basis of imputation of missing survey data on non-respondents. The explicit incorporation of differential distributions for respondents and different kinds of non-respondents can be factored in by implementation of a pattern mixture-based approach which allows for data which are missing not at random (30).

From the present data material no further information is available about the illness or disability such as diagnosis. This information would have been valuable to further explore this reason for non-response. Unfortunately this information was not registered during data collection.

## Conclusion

The increased hazard ratios of alcohol-, drug-, and smoking-related mortality and morbidity among non-respondents compared to respondents indicate more unfavourable health behaviours among non-respondents compared to non-respondents. Further, different types of non-response seemed to have varied effects on non-response bias. To reduce the selection bias, data collection strategies that maximise the response rate among those non-respondents who are the most important contributors to non-response bias should be used and post hoc methodologies such as tailored multiple imputation using information on reason for non-response could be applied.

## Reference list

1. Ekholm O, Hesse U, Davidsen M, Kjoller M. The study design and characteristics of the Danish national health interview surveys. *Scand J Public Health*. 2009; 37:758–765. [PubMed: 19622549]
2. Linden-Bostrom M, Persson C. A selective follow-up study on a public health survey. *Eur J Public Health*. 2013; 23:152–157. [PubMed: 22253457]



3. Tolonen H, Helakorpi S, Talala K, Helasoja V, Martelin T, Prattala R. 25-year trends and socio-demographic differences in response rates: Finnish adult health behaviour survey. *Eur J Epidemiol.* 2006; 21:409–415. [PubMed: 16804763]
4. Galea S, Tracy M. Participation rates in epidemiologic studies. *Ann Epidemiol.* 2007; 17:643–653. [PubMed: 17553702]
5. Christensen AI, Ekholm O, Glumer C, Andreasen AH, Hvidberg MF, Kristensen PL, et al. The Danish National Health Survey 2010. Study design and respondent characteristics. *Scand J Public Health.* 2012; 40:391–397. [PubMed: 22786925]
6. Harald K, Salomaa V, Jousilahti P, Koskinen S, Vartiainen E. Non-participation and mortality in different socioeconomic groups: the FINRISK population surveys in 1972–92. *J Epidemiol Community Health.* 2007; 61:449–454. [PubMed: 17435214]
7. Schneider KL, Clark MA, Rakowski W, Lapane KL. Evaluating the impact of non-response bias in the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS). *J Epidemiol Community Health.* 2012; 66:290–295. [PubMed: 20961872]
8. Gundgaard J, Ekholm O, Hansen EH, Rasmussen NK. The effect of non-response on estimates of health care utilisation: linking health surveys and registers. *Eur J Public Health.* 2008; 18:189–194. [PubMed: 17984128]
9. Hansen ABG, Hvidtfeldt UA, Gronbaek M, Becker U, Nielsen AS, Tolstrup JS. The number of persons with alcohol problems in the Danish population. *Scand J Public Health.* 2011; 39:128–136. [PubMed: 21382854]
10. Tolonen H, Laatikainen T, Helakorpi S, Talala K, Martelin T, Prattala R. Marital status, educational level and household income explain part of the excess mortality of survey non-respondents. *Eur J Epidemiol.* 2010; 25:69–76. [PubMed: 19779838]
11. Suominen S, Koskenvuo K, Sillanmaki L, Vahtera J, Korkeila K, Kivimaki M, et al. Non-response in a nationwide follow-up postal survey in Finland: a register-based mortality analysis of respondents and non-respondents of the Health and Social Support (HeSSup) Study. *BMJ open.* 2012;2. [PubMed: 22422917]
12. Struijk EA, May AM, Beulens JW, van Gils CH, Monninkhof EM, van der Schouw YT, et al. Mortality and cancer incidence in the EPIC-NL cohort: impact of the healthy volunteer effect. *Eur J Public Health.* 2015; 25:144–149. [PubMed: 24736167]
13. Gorman E, Leyland AH, McCartney G, White IR, Katikireddi SV, Rutherford L, et al. Assessing the Representativeness of Population-Sampled Health Surveys Through Linkage to Administrative Data on Alcohol-Related Outcomes. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2014; 180:941–948. [PubMed: 25227767]
14. Schneider KL, Clark MA, Rakowski W, Lapane KL. Evaluating the impact of non-response bias in the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS). *J Epidemiol Community Health.* 2012; 66:290–295. [PubMed: 20961872]
15. Gray L, McCartney G, White IR, Katikireddi SV, Rutherford L, Gorman E, et al. Use of record-linkage to handle non-response and improve alcohol consumption estimates in health survey data: a study protocol. *BMJ open.* 2013;3. [PubMed: 23457333]
16. Jousilahti P, Salomaa V, Kuulasmaa K, Niemela M, Vartiainen E. Total and cause specific mortality among participants and non-participants of population based health surveys: a comprehensive follow up of 54,372 Finnish men and women. *J Epidemiol Community Health.* 2005; 59:310–315. [PubMed: 15767385]
17. Meiklejohn J, Connor J, Kypri K. The Effect of Low Survey Response Rates on Estimates of Alcohol Consumption in a General Population Survey. *Plos One.* 2012;7. [PubMed: 22532858]
18. Pedersen CB. The Danish Civil Registration System. *Scand J Public Health.* 2011; 39:22–25. [PubMed: 21775345]
19. Jensen VM, Rasmussen AW. Danish Education Registers. *Scand J Public Health.* 2011; 39:91–94. [PubMed: 21775362]
20. Helweg-Larsen K. The Danish Register of Causes of Death. *Scand J Public Health.* 2011; 39:26–29. [PubMed: 21775346]
21. Lyng E, Sandegaard JL, Rebolj M. The Danish National Patient Register. *Scand J Public Health.* 2011; 39:30–33. [PubMed: 21775347]

22. Juel K, Sorensen J, Bronnum-Hansen H. Supplement: Risk factors and public health in Denmark. *Scand J Public Health*. 2008; 36:11–227. [PubMed: 19033299]
23. WHO. WHO global report: mortality attributable to tobacco. WHO; Geneva: 2012.
24. Larsen SB, Dalton SO, Schuz J, Christensen J, Overvad K, Tjonneland A, et al. Mortality among participants and non-participants in a prospective cohort study. *Eur J Epidemiol*. 2012; 27:837–845. [PubMed: 23070658]
25. Tolonen H, Dobson A, Kulathinal S, Project WM. Effect on trend estimates of the difference between survey respondents and non-respondents: Results from 27 populations in the WHO MONICA project. *Eur J Epidemiol*. 2005; 20:887–898. [PubMed: 16284866]
26. Ronzani TM, Higgins-Biddle J, Furtado EF. Stigmatization of alcohol and other drug users by primary care providers in Southeast Brazil. *Soc Sci Med*. 2009; 69:1080–1084. [PubMed: 19692163]
27. Keyes KM, Hatzenbuehler ML, McLaughlin KA, Link B, Olfson M, Grant BF, et al. Stigma and treatment for alcohol disorders in the United States. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2010; 172:1364–1372. [PubMed: 21044992]
28. Thygesen LC, Ersboll AK. When the entire population is the sample: strengths and limitations in register-based epidemiology. *Eur J Epidemiol*. 2014; 29:551–558. [PubMed: 24407880]
29. Gray, LG,E.; White, IR.; McCartney, G.; Katikireddi, SV.; Rutherford, L.; Graham, L.; Robinson, M.; Leyland, AH. Estimation of alcohol intake corrected for non-response bias using record-linked survey data in Scotland; 7th Joint European Public Health Conference; Glasgow, UK. 2014;
30. Little RJA. Pattern-Mixture Models for Multivariate Incomplete Data. *J Am Stat Assoc*. 1993; 88:125–134.
31. Christensen AI, Ekholm O, Kristensen PL, Larsen FB, Vinding AL, Glumer C, et al. The effect of multiple reminders on response patterns in a Danish health survey. *Eur J Public Health*. 2015; 25:156–161. [PubMed: 24855288]

**Table 1**  
**Definitions of alcohol-, drug- and smoking-related diagnoses**

Alcohol-related diagnoses	Alcoholic liver disease (K70, K74)
	Acute pancreatitis (K85, K86)
	Mental and behavioural disorders due to use of alcohol (F10)
	Accidental poisoning by and exposure to alcohol (X45)
	Intentional self-poisoning by and exposure to alcohol (X65)
Drug-related diagnoses	Poisoning by and exposure to alcohol, undetermined intent (Y15)
	Mental and behavioural disorders due to use of drugs (F11-F19)
	Accidental poisoning by and exposure to drugs (X40-X44)
	Intentional self-poisoning by and exposure to drugs (X60-X64)
	Poisoning by and exposure to drugs (Y10-Y14)
Smoking-related diagnoses	Poisoning by narcotics and psychodysleptics (T40)
	Poisoning by psychotropic drugs, not elsewhere classified (T43)
	Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (J44)
	Malignant neoplasm of larynx, tracheas, bronchus and lung (C32-C34)

**Table 2**  
**Characteristics of the study population. Percentages and incidence rates (per 100,000 person years)**

	Respondents (n=28,072)	Refusals (n=8,954)	Illness/disabled (n=731)	Uncontactable (n=1,593)	P-value
Age [%]					
16-24 years	12.5	11.1	4.1	20.8	p<0.01
25-44 years	33.6	31.7	11.9	36.8	
45-64 years	34.8	36.7	19.7	26.5	
65 years or older	19.1	20.4	64.3	15.9	
Sex [%]					
<i>Men</i>	48.9	49.1	40.2	57.1	p<0.01
<i>Women</i>	51.1	50.9	59.8	42.9	
Educational level [%]					
<i>Basic school</i>	34.2	42.2	47.9	42.3	p<0.01
<i>Upper secondary or vocational school</i>	39.5	38.2	15.7	36.9	
<i>Higher education</i>	21.6	13.9	7.1	12.6	
<i>No information</i>	4.7	5.7	29.3	8.2	
All-cause mortality [Incidence rate, (n)]	1,196 (3,158)	1,454 (1,196)	9,652 (410)	2,507 (276)	p<0.01
Alcohol-related mortality [Incidence rate, (n)]	38 (101)	61 (50)	95 (4)	203 (22)	p<0.01
Alcohol related morbidity [Incidence rate, (n)]	218 (573)	312 (255)	547 (23)	663 (72)	p<0.01
Smoking related mortality [Incidence rate, (n)]	159 (418)	177 (145)	701 (29)	272 (30)	p<0.01
Smoking related morbidity [Incidence rate, (n)]	385 (1,009)	434 (355)	1,693 (70)	570 (63)	p<0.01
Drug related mortality [Incidence rate, (n)]	6 (17)	22 (18)	71 (3)	18 (2)	p<0.01
Drug related morbidity [Incidence rate, (n)]	104 (274)	158 (130)	353 (15)	291 (32)	p<0.01

**Table 3**  
**Numbers of events, hazard ratios (HR) (non-respondents vs respondents) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) of all-cause mortality and cause-specific mortality and morbidity**

	Adjusted for survey year			Adjusted for survey year, sex and education		
	Number of events (N=39,540)	HR	95% CI	Number of events (N=37,358)	HR	95% CI
All-cause mortality	5,065	1.35	(1.28-1.43)	3,582	1.40	(1.31-1.50)
Alcohol-related mortality	177	2.02	(1.50-2.72)	166	1.88	(1.38-2.57)
Alcohol-related morbidity	926	1.64	(1.43-1.87)	883	1.56	(1.36-1.78)
Smoking-related mortality	624	1.21	(1.02-1.43)	550	1.14	(0.95-1.36)
Smoking-related morbidity	1,503	1.21	(1.08-1.34)	1,360	1.15	(1.03-1.29)
Drug-related mortality	40	3.55	(1.89-6.66)	36	3.04	(1.57-5.89)
Drug-related morbidity	453	1.69	(1.40-2.05)	431	1.55	(1.27-1.88)

**Table 4**  
**Hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) of all-cause mortality and cause-specific mortality and morbidity by response status**

	Adjusted for survey-year and sex		Adjusted for survey-year, sex and education	
	HR	95% CI	HR	95% CI
<b>All-cause mortality</b>				
<i>Respondents</i>	1	(ref)	1	(ref)
<i>Refusals</i>	1.1	(1.03-1.18)	1.11	(1.03-1.20)
<i>Illness/disabled</i>	2.36	(2.12-2.63)	2.89	(2.51-3.34)
<i>Uncontactable</i>	3.46	(3.05-3.93)	3.92	(3.37-4.56)
<b>Alcohol-related morbidity</b>				
<i>Respondents</i>	1	(ref)	1	(ref)
<i>Refusals</i>	1.40	(1.21-1.62)	1.34	(1.15-1.56)
<i>Illness/disabled</i>	2.52	(1.65-3.84)	2.52	(1.64-3.88)
<i>Uncontactable</i>	3.40	(2.65-4.38)	3.17	(2.44-4.11)
<b>Alcohol-related mortality</b>				
<i>Respondents</i>	1	(ref)	1	(ref)
<i>Refusals</i>	1.54	(1.10-2.16)	1.52	(1.07-2.14)
<i>Illness/disabled</i>	2.44	(0.89-6.69)	1.94	(0.61-6.17)
<i>Uncontactable</i>	7.70	(4.77-12.43)	6.31	(3.78-10.53)
<b>Smoking-related morbidity</b>				
<i>Respondents</i>	1	(ref)	1	(ref)
<i>Refusals</i>	1.04	(0.92-1.18)	1.01	(0.89-1.14)
<i>Illness/disabled</i>	2.06	(1.61-2.65)	2.06	(1.56-2.70)
<i>Uncontactable</i>	2.61	(2.02-3.39)	2.25	(1.69-3.01)
<b>Smoking-related mortality</b>				
<i>Respondents</i>	1	(ref)	1	(ref)
<i>Refusals</i>	1.03	(0.85-1.25)	0.98	(0.80-1.20)
<i>Illness/disabled</i>	2.00	(1.36-2.94)	1.91	(1.22-2.98)
<i>Uncontactable</i>	3.21	(2.20-4.68)	2.79	(1.82-4.29)
<b>Drug-related morbidity</b>				
<i>Respondents</i>	1	(ref)	1	(ref)
<i>Refusals</i>	1.51	(1.23-1.86)	1.41	(1.13-1.74)
<i>Illness/disabled</i>	3.13	(1.83-5.33)	2.59	(1.44-4.66)
<i>Uncontactable</i>	2.51	(1.72-3.65)	2.22	(1.52-3.26)
<b>Drug-related mortality</b>				
<i>Respondents</i>	1	(ref)	1	(ref)
<i>Refusals</i>	3.31	(1.70-6.43)	2.86	(1.42-5.74)
<i>Illness/disabled</i>	8.00	(2.21-29.00)	6.46	(1.45-28.79)



	Adjusted for survey-year and sex		Adjusted for survey-year, sex and education	
	HR	95% CI	HR	95% CI
<i>Uncontactable</i>	3.91	(0.88-17.44)	3.58	(0.80-16.12)