

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/8533944>

Prevalence, Severity, and Unmet Need for Treatment of Mental Disorders in the World Health Organization World Mental Health Surveys The WHO World Mental Health Survey Consortium JA...

Article in JAMA The Journal of the American Medical Association · July 2004

DOI: 10.1001/jama.291.21.2581 · Source: PubMed

CITATIONS

1,374

READS

1,214

48 authors, including:



Koen Demyttenaere

KU Leuven

440 PUBLICATIONS 23,976 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Ronny Bruffaerts

KU Leuven

284 PUBLICATIONS 17,497 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Jose Posada-Villa

Universidad Colegio Mayor de Cundinamarca

190 PUBLICATIONS 21,888 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Isabelle Gasquet

Assistance Publique – Hôpitaux de Paris

124 PUBLICATIONS 10,288 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Prevalence, clinical characterisation and brain connectomics of mental disorder in Qatar: a nationwide study. [View project](#)



World Mental Health Survey [View project](#)

Prevalence, Severity, and Unmet Need for Treatment of Mental Disorders in the World Health Organization World Mental Health Surveys

The WHO World Mental Health Survey Consortium*

ALTHOUGH SURVEYS OF MENTAL disorders have been carried out since the end of World War II,¹⁻³ cross-national comparisons were hampered by inconsistencies in diagnostic methods. This situation changed in the 1980s with the development of the Diagnostic Interview Schedule (DIS), the first psychiatric diagnostic interview designed for use by lay interviewers.⁴ The DIS was initially used in the US Epidemiologic Catchment Area (ECA) Study and subsequently in similar surveys carried out in other countries in the 1980s.⁵⁻⁸ The results were brought together in the early 1990s in a series of important cross-national articles that showed mental disorders to be highly prevalent.⁹⁻¹² Indeed, prevalence of mental disorder was generally higher than that of any other class of chronic conditions.^{13,14} This was striking in light of research documenting that mental disorders have greater effects on role functioning than many serious chronic physical illnesses.^{13,15,16} A second generation of cross-national psychiatric surveys was carried out in the 1990s¹⁷⁻²⁴ using a more elaborate interview, the World Health Organization (WHO) Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI).²⁵ Although prevalence varied widely, more than one third of respondents typically met criteria for a lifetime CIDI disorder.²⁶ Survey-

Context Little is known about the extent or severity of untreated mental disorders, especially in less-developed countries.

Objective To estimate prevalence, severity, and treatment of *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition (DSM-IV)* mental disorders in 14 countries (6 less developed, 8 developed) in the World Health Organization (WHO) World Mental Health (WMH) Survey Initiative.

Design, Setting, and Participants Face-to-face household surveys of 60 463 community adults conducted from 2001-2003 in 14 countries in the Americas, Europe, the Middle East, Africa, and Asia.

Main Outcome Measures The *DSM-IV* disorders, severity, and treatment were assessed with the WMH version of the WHO Composite International Diagnostic Interview (WMH-CIDI), a fully structured, lay-administered psychiatric diagnostic interview.

Results The prevalence of having any WMH-CIDI/*DSM-IV* disorder in the prior year varied widely, from 4.3% in Shanghai to 26.4% in the United States, with an interquartile range (IQR) of 9.1%-16.9%. Between 33.1% (Colombia) and 80.9% (Nigeria) of 12-month cases were mild (IQR, 40.2%-53.3%). Serious disorders were associated with substantial role disability. Although disorder severity was correlated with probability of treatment in almost all countries, 35.5% to 50.3% of serious cases in developed countries and 76.3% to 85.4% in less-developed countries received no treatment in the 12 months before the interview. Due to the high prevalence of mild and subthreshold cases, the number of those who received treatment far exceeds the number of untreated serious cases in every country.

Conclusions Reallocation of treatment resources could substantially decrease the problem of unmet need for treatment of mental disorders among serious cases. Structural barriers exist to this reallocation. Careful consideration needs to be given to the value of treating some mild cases, especially those at risk for progressing to more serious disorders.

JAMA. 2004;291:2581-2590

www.jama.com

specific treatment questions showed uniformly that most mental disorders were untreated.^{27,28}

Before concluding that unmet need for treatment of mental disorders is a major problem, it is important to recognize that many mental disorders are mild and self-limiting. This was not a focus of the DIS or CIDI surveys, which were designed to estimate prevalence

rather than severity. However, the high prevalence estimates in these surveys raised concerns that even the richest of

***Author information** appears at the end of this article. **Corresponding Author:** Ronald C. Kessler, PhD, Department of Health Care Policy, Harvard Medical School, 180 Longwood Ave, Boston, MA 02115 (kessler@hcp.med.harvard) or T. Bedirhan Ustun, MD, Global Programme on Evidence for Health Policy, World Health Organization, Avenue Appia 20, 1211 Geneva 27, Switzerland (ustunb@who.int).

countries could not afford to treat all the people with a mental disorder.^{29,30} Motivated by this concern, investigators performed secondary analyses of 2 US surveys,^{8,20} which concluded that up to half of 12-month mental disorders were mild.³¹ Another secondary analysis of CIDI surveys in 5 developed countries found a similar proportion of mild cases²⁸ and showed that treatment was consistently correlated with severity. Between one third and two thirds of serious cases in these surveys nevertheless received no treatment.

The DIS and CIDI surveys had 3 limitations to analysis of severity and treatment. First, as they were designed to assess prevalence, not severity, the post hoc measures of severity used in secondary analyses of these surveys were weak. Second, the interviews did not include standardized treatment questions, thwarting valid cross-national comparisons of treatment. Third, the surveys were carried out mostly in developed countries, making it impossible to assess generalizability of results. WHO established the World Mental Health (WMH) Survey Consortium in 1998 to address such limitations.³² The CIDI was expanded to include detailed questions about disorder severity, impairment, and treatment.³³ Coordinated WMH-CIDI surveys were then implemented in 28 countries around the world, including less-developed countries in each region of the world. The WMH surveys have now been completed in 14 countries, 6 of them less developed. This article is the first joint publication from these surveys. The focus is on aggregate estimates of 12-month prevalence, severity, and treatment.

METHODS

Samples

Fifteen surveys were carried out in 14 countries in the Americas (Colombia, Mexico, United States), Europe (Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Spain, Ukraine), the Middle East and Africa (Lebanon, Nigeria), and Asia (Japan, separate surveys in Beijing and

Shanghai in the People's Republic of China). Six countries are classified by the World Bank³⁴ as less developed (China, Colombia, Lebanon, Mexico, Nigeria, and Ukraine) and the others as developed. An effort was made to recruit as many countries as possible in the initiative. The final set was determined by availability of collaborators in the country who were able to obtain funding for the survey. All surveys were based on multistage household probability samples (TABLE 1). All interviews were carried out face-to-face by trained lay interviewers. The 6 Western European surveys were carried out jointly.³⁵ Sample sizes range from 1663 (Japan) to 9282 (United States), with a total of 60 463 participating adults. Response rates range from 45.9% (France) to 87.7% (Colombia), with a weighted average of 69.9%.

Internal subsampling was used to reduce respondent burden by dividing the interview into 2 parts. Part 1 included core diagnostic assessment. Part 2 included information about correlates and disorders of secondary interest. All respondents completed part 1. All part-1 respondents who met criteria for any disorder and a subsample of approximately 25% of others were administered part 2. The part-2 sample included 25 828 respondents. Noncertainty part-2 respondents were weighted by the inverse of their probability of selection to adjust for differential sampling. Analyses in this article are based on this weighted part-2 sample. Additional weights were used to adjust for differential probabilities of selection within households and to match the samples to population sociodemographic distributions. The samples show substantial cross-national differences in age structure (younger in less-developed countries) and educational status (lower in less-developed countries). (Demographic distributions available on request.)

Training and Field Procedures

The central WMH staff trained bilingual supervisors in each country. Consistent interviewer training docu-

ments and procedures were used across surveys. The WHO translation protocol was used to translate instruments and training materials. Two surveys were carried out in bilingual form (Dutch and French in Belgium; Russian and Ukrainian in Ukraine). Others were carried out exclusively in the country's official language (or, in Nigeria, in the Yoruba language that dominates in the region where the survey was carried out). Persons who could not speak these languages were excluded. Standardized descriptions of the goals and procedures of the study, data uses and protection, and the rights of respondents were provided in both written and verbal form to all predesignated respondents before obtaining verbal informed consent for participation in the survey. Quality control protocols described in more detail elsewhere³⁶ were standardized across countries to check on interviewer accuracy and to specify data cleaning and coding procedures. The institutional review board of the organization that coordinated the survey in each country approved and monitored compliance with procedures for obtaining informed consent and protecting human subjects.

Measures

All surveys used the WMH-CIDI, a fully structured diagnostic interview, to assess disorders and treatment. Disorders considered herein include anxiety disorders (agoraphobia, generalized anxiety disorder, obsessive-compulsive disorder, panic disorder, posttraumatic stress disorder, social phobia, specific phobia), mood disorders (bipolar I and II disorders, dysthymia, major depressive disorder), disorders that share a feature of problems with impulse control (bulimia, intermittent explosive disorder, and adult persistence of 3 childhood-adolescent disorders—attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, conduct disorder, and oppositional-defiant disorder—among respondents in the 18- to 44-year age range), and substance disorders (alcohol and drug abuse and dependence). Disorders were assessed

Table 1. Sample Characteristics

Country	Survey	Sample Characteristics*	Field Dates	Age Range, y	Sample Size		Response Rate, %†	
					Part 1	Part 2		
Belgium	ESEMeD	Stratified multistage clustered probability sample of individuals residing in households from the national register of Belgium residents, nationally representative	2001-2002	≥18	2419	1043	50.6	
Colombia	NSMH	Stratified multistage clustered area probability sample of household residents in all urban areas of the country (approximately 73% of the total national population)	2003	18-65	4544	2442	87.7	
France	ESEMeD	Stratified multistage clustered sample of working telephone numbers merged with a reverse directory (for listed numbers). Initial recruitment was by telephone, with supplemental in-person recruitment in households with listed numbers, nationally representative	2001-2002	≥18	2894	1436	45.9	
Germany	ESEMeD	Stratified multistage clustered probability sample of individuals from community resident registries, nationally representative	2002-2003	≥18	3555	1323	57.8	
Italy	ESEMeD	Stratified multistage clustered probability sample of individuals from municipality resident registries, nationally representative	2001-2002	≥18	4712	1779	71.3	
Japan	WMHJ2002-2003	Unclustered 2-stage probability sample of individuals residing in households in 4 metropolitan areas (Fukiage, Kushikino, Nagasaki, Oyayama)	2002-2003	≥20	1663	477	56.4	
Lebanon	LNMHs	Stratified multistage clustered area probability sample of household residents, nationally representative	2002-2003	≥18	2856	1029	70.0	
Mexico	M-NCS	Stratified multistage clustered area probability sample of household residents in all urban areas of the country (approximately 75% of the total national population)	2001-2002	18-65	5782	2362	76.6	
Netherlands	ESEMeD	Stratified multistage clustered probability sample of individuals residing in households that are listed in municipal postal registries, nationally representative	2002-2003	≥18	2372	1094	56.4	
Nigeria	NSMHW	Stratified multistage clustered area probability sample of household residents in the Yoruba-speaking Southwestern and North Central parts of the country (approximately 22% of the total national population)	2002	≥18	4985	1682	79.9	
People's Republic of China	Beijing	B-WMH	Stratified multistage clustered area probability sample of household residents in the Beijing metropolitan area	2002-2003	≥18	2633	914	74.8
		Shanghai	S-WMH	Stratified multistage clustered area probability sample of household residents in the Shanghai metropolitan area	2002-2003	≥18	2568	714
Spain	ESEMeD	Stratified multistage clustered area probability sample of household residents, nationally representative	2001-2002	≥18	5473	2121	78.6	
Ukraine	CMDPSD	Stratified multistage clustered area probability sample of household residents, nationally representative	2002	≥18	4725	1720	78.3	
United States	NCS-R	Stratified multistage clustered area probability sample of household residents, nationally representative	2002-2003	≥18	9282	5692	70.9	

Abbreviations: B-WMH, the Beijing World Mental Health survey; CMDPSD, Comorbid Mental Disorders During Periods of Social Disruption; ESEMeD, the European Study of the Epidemiology of Mental Disorders; LNMHS, the Lebanese National Mental Health Survey; M-NCS, the Mexico National Comorbidity Survey; NCS-R, the US National Comorbidity Survey Replication; NSMH, the Colombian National Study of Mental Health; NSMHW, the Nigerian Survey of Mental Health and Wellbeing; S-WMH, the Shanghai World Mental Health Survey; WMHJ2002-2003, World Mental Health Japan Survey.

*Most World Mental Health (WMH) surveys are based on stratified multistage clustered area probability household samples in which samples of areas equivalent to counties or municipalities in the United States were selected in the first stage followed by 1 or more subsequent stages of geographic sampling (eg, towns within counties, blocks within towns, households within blocks) to arrive at a sample of households, in each of which a listing of household members was created and 1 or 2 people were selected from this listing to be interviewed. No substitution was allowed when the originally sampled household resident could not be interviewed. These household samples were selected from census area data in all countries other than France (for which telephone directories were used to select households) and the Netherlands (where postal registries were used to select households). Several WMH surveys (Belgium, Germany, Italy) used municipal resident registries to select respondents without listing households. The Japanese sample is the only totally unclustered sample, with households randomly selected in each of the 4 sample areas and 1 random respondent selected in each sample household. Nine of the 15 surveys are based on nationally representative household samples, while 2 others are based on nationally representative household samples in urbanized areas (Colombia, Mexico).

†The response rate is calculated as the ratio of the number of households in which an interview was completed to the number of households originally sampled, excluding from the denominator households known not to be eligible either because of being vacant at the time of initial contact or because the residents were unable to speak the designated languages of the survey.

using the definitions and criteria of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition (DSM-IV)*.³⁷ CIDI organic exclusion rules were imposed in making all diagnoses. Methodological evidence collected in the WHO-CIDI Field Trials and later clinical calibration studies showed that all the disorders considered herein were assessed with acceptable reliability and validity both in the original CIDI³⁸ and in the original version of the WMH-CIDI.³⁹ Studies of cross-national comparability in the validity of the WMH-CIDI are currently underway.

WMH-CIDI/DSM-IV disorders were classified as serious, moderate, or mild. Serious disorders were defined as one of the following: meeting criteria for bipolar I disorder or substance dependence with a physiological depen-

dence syndrome; making a suicide attempt in conjunction with any other WMH-CIDI/DSM-IV disorder; reporting at least 2 areas of role functioning with severe role impairment due to a mental disorder in the disorder-specific Sheehan Disability Scales⁴⁰; or reporting overall functional impairment at a level consistent with a Global Assessment of Functioning⁴¹ of 50 or less in conjunction with any other WMH-CIDI/DSM-IV disorder. Respondents not classified as having a serious disorder were classified as moderate if interference was rated as at least moderate in any Sheehan Disability Scales domain or if the respondent had substance dependence without a physiological dependence syndrome. All other disorders were classified as mild. In an effort to validate severity rat-

ings, respondents were asked how many days out of 365 in the past 12 months they were totally unable to carry out their normal daily activities because of each disorder. These reports were combined by assigning respondents who had more than 1 disorder to the highest number of days out of role reported for any single disorder.

Twelve-month treatment was assessed by asking respondents if they ever saw any of a long list of professionals either as an outpatient or inpatient for problems with emotions, nerves, mental health, or use of alcohol or drugs. Included were mental health professionals (eg, psychiatrist, psychologist), general medical professionals (eg, general practitioner, occupational therapist), religious counselors (eg, minister, sheikh), and

Table 2. Twelve-Month Prevalence of World Mental Health Composite International Diagnostic Interview/*Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition**

Country	% (95% Confidence Interval)				
	Anxiety	Mood	Impulse-Control	Substance	Any
Americas					
Colombia	10.0 (8.4-11.7)	6.8 (6.0-7.7)	3.9 (3.2-4.7)	2.8 (2.0-3.7)	17.8 (16.1-19.5)
Mexico	6.8 (5.6-7.9)†	4.8 (4.0-5.6)	1.3 (0.9-1.8)	2.5 (1.8-3.3)	12.2 (10.5-13.8)
United States	18.2 (16.9-19.5)	9.6 (8.8-10.4)	6.8 (5.9-7.8)	3.8 (3.2-4.5)	26.4 (24.7-28.0)
Europe					
Belgium	6.9 (4.5-9.4)	6.2 (4.8-7.6)§	1.0 (0.3-1.8)	1.2 (0.6-1.9)‡‡	12.0 (9.6-14.3)
France	12.0 (9.8-14.2)	8.5 (6.4-10.6)§	1.4 (0.7-2.0)	0.7 (0.3-1.2)‡‡	18.4 (15.3-21.5)
Germany	6.2 (4.7-7.6)	3.6 (2.8-4.3)§	0.3 (0.1-0.6)	1.1 (0.4-1.7)‡‡	9.1 (7.3-10.8)
Italy	5.8 (4.5-7.1)	3.8 (3.1-4.5)§	0.3 (0.1-0.5)	0.1 (0.0-0.2)‡‡	8.2 (6.7-9.7)
Netherlands	8.8 (6.6-11.0)	6.9 (4.1-9.7)§	1.3 (0.4-2.2)	3.0 (0.7-5.2)‡‡	14.9 (12.2-17.6)
Spain	5.9 (4.5-7.3)	4.9 (4.0-5.8)§	0.5 (0.2-0.8)	0.3 (0.0-0.5)‡‡	9.2 (7.8-10.6)
Ukraine	7.1 (5.6-8.6)†‡	9.1 (7.3-10.9)§	3.2 (2.4-4.0)¶##**	6.4 (4.8-8.1)‡‡	20.5 (17.7-23.2)
Middle East and Africa					
Lebanon	11.2 (8.9-13.5)	6.6 (4.9-8.2)	1.7 (0.8-2.6)¶##**	1.3 (0.0-2.8)	16.9 (13.6-20.2)
Nigeria	3.3 (2.4-4.2)	0.8 (0.5-1.0)	0.0 (0.0-0.1)¶##**	0.8 (0.3-1.2)	4.7 (3.6-5.8)
Asia					
Japan	5.3 (3.5-7.0)†	3.1 (2.2-4.1)	1.0 (0.4-1.5)¶##**††	1.7 (0.3-3.0)	8.8 (6.4-11.2)
People's Republic of China					
Beijing	3.2 (1.8-4.6)†	2.5 (1.5-3.4)	2.6 (1.3-3.9)¶##**	2.6 (1.2-3.9)	9.1 (6.0-12.1)
Shanghai	2.4 (0.9-3.9)†	1.7 (0.6-2.9)	0.7 (0.4-1.1)¶##**	0.5 (0.3-0.6)	4.3 (2.7-5.9)

*Anxiety disorders include agoraphobia, generalized anxiety disorder, obsessive-compulsive disorder, panic disorder, posttraumatic stress disorder, social phobia, and specific phobia. Mood disorders include bipolar I and II disorders, dysthymia, and major depressive disorder. Impulse-control disorders include bulimia, intermittent explosive disorder, and reported persistence in the past 12 months of symptoms of 3 child-adolescent disorders (attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder, conduct disorder, and oppositional-defiant disorder). Substance disorders include alcohol or drug abuse or dependence. In the case of substance dependence, respondents who met full criteria at some time in their life and who continue to have any symptoms are considered to have 12-month dependence even if they currently do not meet full criteria for the disorder. Organic exclusions were made as specified in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Health Disorders, Fourth Edition*, but diagnostic hierarchy rules were not used.

†Obsessive-compulsive disorder was not assessed.

‡Specific phobia was not assessed.

§Bipolar disorders were not assessed.

||Intermittent explosive disorder was not assessed.

¶Bulimia was not assessed.

#Attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder was not assessed.

**Oppositional-defiant disorder was not assessed.

††Conduct disorder was not assessed.

‡‡Only alcohol abuse and dependence were assessed. No assessment was made of other drug abuse or dependence.

traditional healers (eg, herbalist, spiritualist). The list varied across countries depending on local circumstances. We focus herein on 12-month treatment by either a mental health professional or general medical professional.

Analysis Methods

Data are reported on prevalence, severity, and associations of severity with days out of role and with treatment. Simple cross-tabulations were used to calculate prevalence and severity. Associations of severity with days out of role and treatment were examined using analysis of variance. Confidence intervals were estimated using the Taylor Series method⁴² with SUDAAN software⁴³ to adjust for clustering and weighting. Multivariate tests were made using Wald χ^2 and F tests computed from design-adjusted coefficient variance-covariance matrices. Statistical significance was based on 2-sided tests evaluated at the .05 level of significance.

RESULTS

Prevalence

Overall prevalence varies widely (TABLE 2), from 4.3% in Shanghai to 26.4% in the United States, with a 9.1% to 16.9% inter-quartile range (IQR, the range after excluding the highest and lowest 4 surveys). Anxiety disorders are the most common disorders in all but 1 country (higher prevalence of mood disorders in Ukraine), with prevalence in the range 2.4% to 18.2% (IQR, 5.8%-8.8%). Mood disorders are next most common in all but 2 countries (equal or higher prevalence of substance disorders in Nigeria and Beijing), with prevalence in the range 0.8% to 9.6% (IQR, 3.6%-6.8%). Substance disorders (12-month prevalence, 0.1%-6.4%; IQR, 0.8%-2.6%) and impulse-control disorders (12-month prevalence, 0.0%-6.8%; IQR, 0.7%-1.7%) are consistently less prevalent across the surveys. If we use the terms *high* and *low* to refer to the 5 highest and 5 lowest prevalence estimates in each column of the table, the United States and Colombia have consis-

tently high prevalence estimates across all classes of disorder, the Netherlands and Ukraine are high on 3 of 4, Nigeria and Shanghai are consistently low, and Italy is low on 3 of 4.

Severity

The proportions of the samples (TABLE 3) with either a serious disorder (0.4%-7.7%; IQR, 1.1%-3.7%) or a moderate disorder (0.5%-9.4%; IQR, 2.9%-6.1%) are generally smaller than the proportions with a mild disorder (1.8%-9.7%; IQR, 4.5%-6.4%). The proportion of disorders classified as mild is substantial: from 33.1% in Colombia to 80.9% in Nigeria (IQR, 40.2%-53.3%). The severity distribution among cases varies significantly across countries ($\chi^2_{28}=193.9, P<.001$), with severity not strongly related either to region or to development status. There are substantial positive associations, however, between overall prevalence of any disorder and both the proportion of cases classified as serious (Pearson $r=0.56; P=.03$) and the proportion of cases classified as either serious or moderate (Pearson $r=0.51; P=.05$).

Severity and Impairment

The severity classification was validated by documenting a statistically significant monotonic association between severity and days out of role in all but 2 surveys (TABLE 4). Respondents with serious disorders in most surveys reported at least 30 days in the past year when they were totally unable to carry out usual activities because of these disorders (IQR, 32.1-81.4 days). The mean days out of role for mild disorders, in comparison, is low in all surveys (0.1-3.6 days) while the mean for moderate disorders is intermediate between these extremes (4.1-33.7 days; IQR, 9.2-18.8 days). Even the means for moderate disorders are larger than those found in previous research to be associated with most serious chronic physical disorders.^{13,44}

Severity and Treatment

The proportion of respondents who received health care treatment for emotional or substance-use problems during the 12 months before the WMH interview varies widely across surveys (TABLE 5), from a low of 0.8% in Ni-

Table 3. Prevalence of 12-Month World Mental Health-Composite International Diagnostic Interview/Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition Disorders by Severity Across Countries*

Country	% (95% Confidence Interval)			
	Serious	Moderate	Mild	Any
Americas				
Colombia	5.2 (4.2-6.3)	6.6 (5.7-7.6)	5.9 (5.1-6.8)	17.8 (16.1-19.5)
Mexico	3.7 (2.8-4.6)	3.6 (2.9-4.2)	4.9 (4.0-5.8)	12.2 (10.5-13.8)
United States	7.7 (7.0-8.4)	9.4 (8.5-10.3)	9.2 (8.1-10.3)	26.3 (24.6-27.9)
Europe				
Belgium	2.4 (1.2-3.5)	3.3 (2.2-4.4)	6.4 (5.0-7.7)	12.0 (9.6-14.3)
France	2.7 (1.1-4.3)	6.1 (4.8-7.4)	9.7 (7.3-12.1)	18.4 (15.2-21.6)
Germany	1.2 (0.6-1.7)	3.3 (2.3-4.3)	4.5 (3.2-5.9)	9.1 (7.2-10.9)
Italy	1.0 (0.4-1.7)	2.9 (2.0-3.8)	4.3 (3.1-5.5)	8.2 (6.7-9.7)
Netherlands	2.3 (1.1-3.5)	3.7 (2.5-4.9)	8.8 (6.1-11.5)	14.8 (12.0-17.7)
Spain	1.0 (0.7-1.3)	2.9 (2.0-3.7)	5.3 (4.0-6.7)	9.2 (7.8-10.7)
Ukraine	4.8 (4.0-5.6)	7.4 (5.8-8.9)	8.2 (6.4-10.1)	20.4 (17.9-22.9)
Middle East and Africa				
Lebanon	4.6 (3.2-6.1)	6.2 (4.2-8.1)	6.1 (3.6-8.7)	16.9 (13.5-20.3)
Nigeria	0.4 (0.1-0.6)	0.5 (0.2-0.7)	3.8 (2.8-4.8)	4.7 (3.6-5.8)
Asia				
Japan	1.5 (0.7-2.2)	4.1 (2.7-5.5)	3.2 (1.7-4.7)	8.8 (6.2-11.4)
People's Republic of China				
Beijing	0.9 (0.5-1.2)	2.9 (1.3-4.5)	5.3 (3.2-7.3)	9.1 (5.9-12.2)
Shanghai	1.1 (0.0-2.2)	1.4 (0.4-2.5)	1.8 (0.6-3.0)	4.3 (2.6-6.0)

*See the "Methods" section text for a description of the coding rules used to define the severity levels.

geria to a high of 15.3% in the United States. Predictably, the proportion in treatment is much larger in developed than in less-developed countries. However, despite this wide variation, a meaningful association exists be-

tween disorder severity and probability of treatment in every survey. The proportion in treatment is much higher among serious cases (49.7%-64.5% in developed vs 14.6%-23.7% in less developed countries) than moderate cases (16.7%-50.0% in developed vs 9.7%-18.6% in less developed countries), and lower still among mild cases (11.2%-35.2% in developed vs 0.5%-10.2% in less developed countries). A small proportion of noncases also received treatment (2.4%-8.1% in developed countries and 0.3%-3.0% in less developed countries), presumably reflecting the joint effects of the WMH-CIDI not assessing all mental disorders, some true cases of the disorders being incorrectly classified as noncases, and some people in treatment not meeting criteria for a DSM-IV disorder.

Even though the proportion of noncases in treatment is small, the fact that noncases make up the vast majority of the population means that noncases constitute a meaningful fraction of all people in treatment. In fact, calculations based on Table 3 and Table 5 show that either the majority or a near ma-

Table 4. Association Between Severity of 12-Month World Mental Health–Composite International Diagnostic Interview/*Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition* Disorders and Days Out of Role

Country	Mean (95% Confidence Interval)			F _{2,n-3} Wald F
	Serious	Moderate	Mild	
Americas				
Colombia	28.0 (13.8-42.3)	6.0 (2.9-9.1)	0.2 (0.1-0.3)	17.5*
Mexico	26.6 (17.0-36.1)	7.4 (3.9-10.8)	1.8 (0.0-4.5)	13.4*
United States	66.9 (56.0-77.8)	10.6 (7.7-13.5)	0.7 (0.1-1.3)	74.9*
Europe				
Belgium	32.9 (7.8-58.0)	26.4 (5.3-47.5)	2.8 (0.0-8.1)	3.1
France	94.7 (46.5-142.9)	9.2 (4.6-13.7)	1.0 (0.0-3.0)	15.7*
Germany	84.6 (35.7-133.5)	13.4 (4.3-22.4)	0.3 (0.0-0.7)	10.1*
Italy	206.4 (114.9-297.9)	33.7 (13.0-54.4)	3.6 (1.8-5.5)	15.0*
Netherlands	123.2 (73.7-172.7)	13.4 (0.0-27.5)	1.3 (0.0-3.2)	13.9*
Spain	81.4 (33.5-129.2)	10.5 (4.8-16.1)	0.1 (0.0-0.3)	17.1*
Ukraine	38.1 (23.1-53.0)	18.8 (14.3-23.4)	0.7 (0.0-1.9)	42.0*
Middle East and Africa				
Lebanon	37.1 (19.7-54.6)	17.9 (7.5-28.3)	0.8 (0.0-1.9)	13.9*
Nigeria	15.2 (0.8-29.6)	18.8 (0.0-40.3)	0.6 (0.0-1.6)	3.0
Asia				
Japan	32.1 (0.0-65.6)	6.3 (1.6-11.0)	0.1 (0.0-0.2)	6.8*
People's Republic of China				
Beijing	25.9 (7.4-44.3)	23.1 (4.7-41.6)	0.4 (0.0-0.8)	7.2*
Shanghai	47.1 (13.6-80.7)	4.1 (0.0-10.3)	1.0 (0.0-2.5)	4.5*

*Significant association between severity and days out of role at the .05 level.

Table 5. Association of 12-Month World Mental Health–Composite International Diagnostic Interview/*Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition* Disorder Severity With Health Care Treatment*

Country	% (95% Confidence Interval)					χ ² Test
	Serious	Moderate	Mild	None	Total	
Americas						
Colombia	23.7 (15.2-32.3)	11.5 (6.6-16.5)	8.4 (4.5-12.4)	3.0 (1.9-4.0)	5.0 (3.8-6.1)	41.1†
Mexico	20.2 (12.7-27.8)	18.6 (12.5-24.8)	10.2 (5.5-14.9)	2.6 (1.9-3.4)	4.2 (3.3-5.1)	73.4†
United States	52.3 (48.5-56.1)	34.1 (30.9-37.4)	22.5 (19.0-26.1)	8.1 (7.1-9.2)	15.3 (14.1-16.5)	278.4†
Europe						
Belgium	53.9 (25.2-82.5)	50.0 (35.8-64.2)	28.2 (14.9-41.4)	7.2 (4.2-10.1)	11.0 (7.6-14.4)	68.0†
France	63.3 (38.6-88.1)	35.7 (21.4-49.9)	22.3 (15.8-28.9)	7.8 (5.7-10.0)	12.4 (10.2-14.6)	29.7†
Germany	49.7 (26.6-72.8)	30.5 (18.5-42.5)	27.9 (14.5-41.3)	5.4 (3.5-7.2)	7.8 (6.0-9.5)	37.9†
Italy	...	30.5 (19.3-41.7)	18.9 (11.3-26.6)	2.4 (1.6-3.2)	4.5 (3.6-5.5)	64.2†
Netherlands	50.2 (29.5-70.8)	35.0 (15.7-54.2)	26.5 (15.6-37.4)	6.9 (4.4-9.4)	10.7 (8.1-13.2)	46.6†
Spain	64.5 (49.2-79.7)	37.9 (26.8-49.0)	35.2 (23.8-46.6)	4.0 (3.1-5.0)	7.3 (6.2-8.4)	152.1†
Ukraine	19.7 (13.9-25.6)	17.1 (9.7-24.4)	7.1 (1.2-13.0)	2.6 (1.5-3.8)	4.9 (3.5-6.3)	42.8†
Middle East and Africa						
Lebanon	14.6 (5.8-23.4)	9.7 (2.6-16.7)	4.5 (0.6-8.5)	2.6 (1.3-3.9)	3.7 (2.4-5.0)	14.6†
Nigeria	10.3 (3.7-17.0)	0.3 (0.0-0.5)	0.8 (0.4-1.1)	11.3†
Asia						
Japan	...	16.7 (4.5-28.9)	11.2 (0.1-22.3)	4.7 (2.6-6.9)	5.7 (3.7-7.7)	21.3†
People's Republic of China						
Beijing	...	11.9 (0.0-26.2)	2.0 (0.0-4.8)	2.4 (1.0-3.8)	2.7 (1.3-4.2)	3.1
Shanghai	0.5 (0.0-1.7)	2.3 (0.6-4.1)	3.1 (1.1-5.0)	6.2

*Ellipses indicate that the results were not reported because of sparse data (<30 respondents at the severity level in the survey).

†Significant association between severity and probability of treatment at the .05 level.

majority of people in treatment in each country are either noncases or mild cases. (Results available on request.) These will be referred to for the remainder of this article as subthreshold cases. We also examined the associations of severity with 2 indicators of treatment intensity among people in health care treatment: being seen in the specialty mental health sector rather than exclusively in the general medical sector and number of visits in the 12 months before the interview. Statistical power was low in these analyses because of the small numbers of treated cases with serious conditions in most countries. Nevertheless, there was a clear trend in the vast majority of countries for severity to be positively related both to proportional treatment in the specialty sector and to number of visits, with the highest scores on each consistently found among serious cases. (Results available on request.)

Even though a dose-response relationship exists between severity and probability of treatment in virtually all countries, substantial proportions of serious cases receive no treatment. This is true even in developed countries, where 35.5% to 50.3% of serious cases were untreated in the health care sector in the year before the interview. The situation is even worse in less-developed countries, where 76.3% to 85.4% of serious cases received no treatment. This is especially striking in light of the fact that such a high proportion of treatment in all countries is devoted to subthreshold cases. It is interesting to note that the 3 surveys with the highest overall 12-month prevalence estimates (United States, Ukraine, and Colombia) also had 3 of the 4 lowest proportions of treatment devoted to subthreshold cases (52%-59%). In comparison, the 3 Asian surveys, all of which had quite low overall 12-month prevalence estimates, had the 3 highest proportions of treatment devoted to subthreshold cases (71%-85%).

COMMENT

An important limitation of the WMH surveys is their wide variation in response

rate. In addition, some of the surveys had response rates below normally accepted standards. We attempted to adjust for differential response to the extent possible by poststratification, but this only deals with a limited type of bias. If response is related to mental illness, severity, or treatment in ways that cannot be corrected by simple sociodemographic adjustment, cross-national comparisons will be distorted.

A related limitation is that the Western European surveys, which were fielded before any of the other WMH surveys, experienced a number of difficulties in survey implementation, largely skip logic errors, that subsequent surveys avoided because they were resolved while carrying out the Western European surveys. As a result, these early surveys had much more item-missing data than later surveys, which led to underestimation of severity of some disorders because the Sheehan Disability Scales were sometimes mistakenly skipped.

An added complication was that various of the WMH surveys deleted disorders that were thought to have low relevance in their countries, leading to inconsistency in completeness of coverage. We investigated the implications of this variation by replicating analyses using only the disorders that were assessed in all surveys. Although basic patterns of association remained stable in these revised analyses (results available on request), it is still possible that some findings were sensitive to differential exclusion of some disorders in particular countries.

Another limitation is that schizophrenia and other nonaffective psychoses, although important mental disorders, were not included in the core WMH assessment because previous validation studies showed they are dramatically overestimated in lay-administered interviews like the WMH-CIDI.⁴⁴⁻⁴⁹ These same studies also showed, however, that the vast majority of respondents with clinician-diagnosed nonaffective psychoses meet criteria for CIDI anxiety, mood, or substance disorders and are consequently

captured as cases even if nonaffective psychoses are not assessed.

A final noteworthy limitation is that the WMH-CIDI might vary in accuracy across countries. Although the previous methodological studies that were cited in the measurement section documented that earlier versions of the CIDI had acceptable concordance with blind clinical reinterviews, these studies were carried out largely in developed Western countries. Performance of the WMH-CIDI could be worse in other parts of the world either because the concepts and phrases used to describe mental syndromes are less consonant with cultural concepts than in developed Western countries or because absence of a tradition of free speech and anonymous public opinion surveying causes greater reluctance to admit emotional or substance-abuse problems than in developed Western countries.

Clinical reappraisal studies are currently underway in both developed and less developed WMH countries in all major regions of the world to evaluate the issue of cross-national differences in WMH-CIDI diagnostic validity. Even before completing these studies, though, some patterns in the data (eg, the much lower estimated rate of alcoholism in Ukraine than expected from administrative data documenting an important role of alcoholism in mortality in that country⁵⁰) raise concerns about differential validity. The most striking such pattern is that countries with the lowest disorder prevalence estimates have the highest proportion of respondents in treatment who are subthreshold cases. This pattern could very well reflect greater underestimation of disorders in countries with the lowest prevalence estimates.

Within the context of these limitations, the WMH results are consistent with those of earlier surveys in showing that mental disorders are highly prevalent,⁹⁻¹² often are associated with serious role impairment,^{15,16,51} and often go untreated.^{27,28,52} We also found substantial cross-national variation in these results. Two broad patterns consistent with previous research are that

prevalence is low in Asian countries^{9-12,53} and that treatment is low in less developed countries.²⁶ There are so many idiosyncratic substantive and methodological factors that might contribute to these and other cross-national differences that it is more profitable to focus on consistency rather than on differences, at least in this initial report of broad WMH findings. It is noteworthy in this regard that prevalence and severity estimates are likely to be conservative, for previous methodological studies have shown that survey nonrespondents tend to have significantly higher rates and severity of mental illness than respondents.^{20,36,54,55} The estimates of proportional treatment, in comparison, are likely to be downwardly biased because hospitalized patients were excluded from the surveys.

We found that disorder severity is strongly related to treatment in all countries. This finding is consistent with 2 previous large-scale survey investigations of the relationship between severity and treatment.^{28,52} Correction for response bias would likely strengthen this relationship. The most reasonable interpretation is that demand for treatment is related to severity, presumably mediated by distress and impairment. A question could be raised whether this is merely a matter of demand or whether the treatment system is also more receptive to more severe cases. Some indirect indication of system responsiveness can be gleaned from the findings (available on request) that treatment intensity, as indicated by proportional treatment in the specialty sector and number of visits, is greater for serious than for other treated cases in most WMH countries.

Despite this evidence of rationality in treatment resource allocation, we found that 35.5% to 50.3% of serious cases in developed countries and 76.3% to 85.4% in less developed countries received no treatment in the 12 months before the survey. Yet a majority of people in treatment in most of the countries were subthreshold cases. Correction for response bias would likely show that we underestimated the proportion of seri-

ous cases in treatment more than the proportion of subthreshold cases in treatment, leading to this pattern becoming even stronger. The fact that many people with subthreshold disorders are treated while many with serious disorders are not shows that unmet need for treatment among serious cases is not merely a matter of limited treatment resources but that misallocation of treatment resources is also involved.

A major practical difficulty in rationalizing allocation of treatment resources is that system barriers constrain reallocation options. This is especially true in a decentralized system like in the United States. For example, there is no obvious mechanism by which constraining access to psychotherapy among middle-class persons with mild mental disorders in the United States would result in an increase in treatment of low-income people with serious mental illness. Another complexity is that misallocation of treatment resources is partly due to differences in perceived need for treatment that are unrelated to objective severity and to differences in access associated with insurance coverage and financial resources.^{28,52,56} A report comparing the mental health care delivery systems in the United States and Ontario showed that these 2 systems differ along exactly these lines.⁵⁶ A higher proportion of people with serious mental illness were treated in Ontario than were treated in the United States because of lower constraint on access among persons unable to pay in Ontario than were able to pay in the United States while a higher proportion of mild cases were treated in the United States than Ontario because of significantly higher perceived need for treatment among insured middle-class people with mild disorders in the United States than in Ontario. Although a number of structural possibilities exist to modify constraints on access, it is unclear how perceived need could be modified to align demand with true need for treatment.

A final complexity in reallocating treatment resources is that optimal allocation rules are not obvious. The sim-

plistic strategy of not treating any mild disorders is almost certainly suboptimal³¹ because we know that many people with mild disorders, especially young people, go on to develop serious mental disorders.⁵⁷ To the extent that early intervention can prevent progression, early treatment of mild cases might be cost effective.⁵⁸ It is difficult to act on this insight, however, because we lack good information either about the characteristics of mild cases that predict risk of progression to more serious disorders or about the effectiveness of interventions for mild cases in preventing this progression. A new focus on the development and evaluation of secondary prevention programs for the early treatment of mild cases is needed to guide rationalization of treatment resource allocation.

Authors: *Belgium:* Koen Demyttenaere, Ronny Bruffaerts; *Colombia:* Jose Posada-Villa; *France:* Isabelle Gasquet, Viviane Kovess, Jean Pierre Lepine; *Germany:* Matthias C. Angermeyer, Sebastian Bernert; *Italy:* Giovanni de Girolamo, Pierluigi Morosini, Gabriella Polidori; *Japan:* Takehiko Kikkawa, Norito Kawakami, Yutaka Ono, Tadashi Takeshima, Hidenori Uda; *Lebanon:* Elie G. Karam, John A. Fayyad, Aimee N. Karam, Zeina N. Mneimneh; *Mexico:* Maria Elena Medina-Mora, Guilherme Borges, Carmen Lara; the Netherlands: Ron de Graaf, Johan Ormel; *Nigeria:* Oye Gureje; *People's Republic of China Beijing:* Yucun Shen, Yueqin Huang; *People's Republic of China Shanghai:* Mingyuan Zhang; *Spain:* Jordi Alonso, Josep Maria Haro, Gemma Vilagut; *Ukraine:* Evelyn J. Bromet, Semyon Gluzman, Charles Webb; *United States:* Ronald C. Kessler, Kathleen R. Merikangas, James C. Anthony, Michael R. Von Korff, Philip S. Wang; *ESEMEd/MHEDEA 2000 Consortium in Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and Spain:* Jordi Alonso, Traolach S. Brugha; *PAHO WMH Consortium in Colombia and Mexico:* Sergio Aguilar-Gaxiola; *Asia-Pacific WMH Consortium in Japan and the People's Republic of China:* Sing Lee; *WMH Data Collection Coordinating Center:* Steven Heeringa, Beth-Ellen Pennell; *WMH Data Analysis Coordinating Center:* Alan M. Zaslavsky; *WHO:* T. Berhan Ustun, Somnath Chatterji. Drs Kessler and Ustun are coprincipal investigators of the overall WMH Survey Initiative.

Author Contributions: Dr Kessler, as principal investigator, had full access to all of the data in this study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data, and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Study concept and design: Kessler, Demyttenaere, Bruffaerts, Kovess, de Girolamo, Morosini, Polidori, Kikkawa, Kawakami, Takeshima, E. Karam, A. Karam, Mneimneh, Gureje, Alonso, Haro, Gluzman, Merikangas, Anthony, Wang, Heeringa, Pennell, Ustun, Chatterji.

Acquisition of data: Kessler, Demyttenaere, Bruffaerts, Posada-Villa, Isabelle Gasquet, Kovess, Lepine, Angermeyer, Bernert, de Girolamo, Morosini, Polidori, Kawakami, Ono, Uda, E. Karam, Fayyad, A. Karam, Mneimneh, Medina-Mora, Borges, Lara, de Graaf, Ormel, Gureje, Shen, Huang, Alonso, Haro, Vilagut, Bromet, Gluzman, Webb, Aguilar-Gaxiola, Lee, Heeringa, Pennell, Ustun, Chatterji.

Analysis and interpretation of data: Kessler, Kovess, de Girolamo, Morosini, Polidori, E. Karam, Fayyd, Mneimneh, Medina-Mora, Borges, Ormel, Gureje, Shen, Huang, Zhang, Haro, Gluzman, Webb, Merikangas, Von Korff, Wang, Brugha, Aguilar-Gaxiola, Zaslavsky, Ustun, Chatterji.

Drafting of the manuscript: Kessler, Ono, Gluzman, Merikangas, Wang, Ustun, Chatterji.

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: Kessler, Demyttenaere, Bruffaerts, Posada-Villa, Isabelle Gasquet, Kovess, Lepine, Angermeyer, Bernert, de Girolamo, Morosini, Polidori, Kikkawa, Kawakami, Takeshima, Uda, E. Karam, Fayyd, A. Karam, Mneimneh, Medina-Mora, Borges, Lara, de Graaf, Ormel, Gureje, Shen, Huang, Zhang, Alonso, Haro, Vilagut, Bromet, Gluzman, Webb, Anthony, Von Korff, Wang, Brugha, Aguilar-Gaxiola, Lee, Heeringa, Pennell, Zaslavsky, Ustun, Chatterji.

Statistical expertise: Kessler, Borges, Huang, Gluzman, Webb, Merikangas, Heeringa, Zaslavsky.

Obtained funding: Kessler, Posada-Villa, Kovess, Lepine, Angermeyer, Bernert, de Girolamo, Morosini, Polidori, Kikkawa, Kawakami, Ono, Takeshima, Uda, E. Karam, Fayyd, A. Karam, Mneimneh, Medina-Mora, de Graaf, Ormel, Gureje, Alonso, Haro, Bromet, Gluzman, Merikangas, Aguilar-Gaxiola, Lee, Ustun, Chatterji.

Administrative, technical, or material support: Kessler, Demyttenaere, Bruffaerts, Posada-Villa, de Girolamo, Morosini, Polidori, Kikkawa, Kawakami, Ono, Uda, E. Karam, Fayyd, A. Karam, Mneimneh, Medina-Mora, Gureje, Shen, Huang, Alonso, Vilagut, Bromet, Gluzman, Webb, Merikangas, Wang, Brugha, Aguilar-Gaxiola, Lee, Pennell, Chatterji.

Supervision: Kessler, Demyttenaere, Bruffaerts, Isabelle Gasquet, Morosini, Kikkawa, Kawakami, Uda, E. Karam, Fayyd, A. Karam, Mneimneh, Medina-Mora, Lara, Shen, Zhang, Gluzman, Merikangas, Wang, Aguilar-Gaxiola, Heeringa, Pennell, Ustun, Chatterji.

Funding/Support: Instrument development, training, and field quality control monitoring were carried out by the WHO WMH Data Collection Coordinating Center (DCCC) at the Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, with support from the US National Institute of Mental Health (R13 MH066849-02), the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, and the Pfizer Foundation. World Mental Health data were centrally processed by the WHO WMH Data Analysis Coordinating Center (DACC) at the Department of Health Care Policy, Harvard Medical School, as well as by satellite centers at the Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Michigan State University and at the Center for Health Studies, Group Health Cooperative with support from the US National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH; R01 MH069864-01), the US National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA; R01 DA016558), Eli Lilly and Company, GlaxoSmithKline, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO), and the Pfizer Foundation. Regional Data Analysis Centers exist for the PAHO surveys, at the Mexican National Institute of Psychiatry, with support from the Pan American Health Organization; the ESEMeD/MHEDEA surveys, at the Institut Municipal d'Investigació Mèdica (IMIM-IMAS), with support from the funders described below; and the Asian-Pacific WMH surveys, at the Department of Psychiatry at the Chinese University of Hong Kong, with support from the Pfizer foundation.

Support for survey data collection came from the following: Beijing (Pfizer Foundation); Shanghai (Pfizer Foundation); and Colombia (Ministry of Social Protection, Colombia; The ESEMeD/MHEDEA 2000 project was funded by the European Commission (Contract QLGS-1999-01042); Fondo de Investigación Sanitaria, Instituto de Salud Carlos III, Spain (FIS 00/0028), Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología, Spain (SAF

2000-1800-CE); the Piedmont Region (Italy), Generalitat de Catalunya, Spain; other local agencies; and by an unrestricted educational grant from GlaxoSmithKline. Japan (Grants of Research on Psychiatric and Neurological Diseases and Mental Health Special Research from the Japan Ministry of Health, Labour, and Welfare), Lebanon (Institute for Development, Research, and Applied Care -IDRAC/Lebanon, The Lebanese Ministry of Health, The World Health Organization/Lebanon), Mexico (The Mexican Institute of Psychiatry Ramon de la Fuente DIES 4280 and by the National Council on Science and Technology G30544-H, with supplemental support from PAHO and Pfizer Mexico), Nigeria (The World Health Organization Geneva), Ukraine (US National Institute of Mental Health R01-MH61905), United States (US National Institute of Mental Health U01-MH60220 with supplemental support from the US National Institute of Drug Abuse, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Grant 044708, and the John W. Alden Trust).

Role of the Sponsors: The US WMH survey is funded under a collaborative agreement between the National Institute of Mental Health and Harvard Medical School. Dr Merikangas is the NIMH collaborator in this survey. No other sponsor played any part in the design of the study, in data collection, in data analysis or interpretation, in manuscript preparation, or in authorization for publication.

Disclaimer: The views and opinions expressed in this report are those of the authors and should not be construed to represent the views of any of the sponsoring agencies or governments.

Acknowledgment: We thank the DCCC staff—Stephanie Chardoul, Karl Dinkelman, Nancy Gebler, Lisa Holland, Nicole Kirgis—for their work in programming, training, and supervising fieldwork and data cleaning. We thank the DACC biostatistical staff—Minnie Ames, Patricia Berglund, Wai Tat Chiu, Olga Demler, Eva Hiripi, Robert Jin, Michael Lane, Ellen E. Walters—for their work in file construction, data cleaning, and data analysis. The following additional WMH collaborators played vital roles in study design and supervision of data collection and cleaning in individual countries. We thank them for these valuable contributions: Kazeem Adebayo, Josué Almansa, Saena Arbazadeh-Bouchez, Jaume Autonell, Corina Benjet, Mariola Bernal, Martine A. Buist-Bouwman, Heather Bryson, Miquel Codony, Antonia Domingo-Salvany, Montserrat Ferrer, Clara Fleiz, Dmitry Goldgaber, Luis Carlos Gomez, Zinoviy Gutkovich, Valeriy Khmelko, Montserrat Martínez-Alonso, Fausto Mazzi, Yoshibumi Nakane, K. Daniel O'Leary, Yomi Olowosegun, Concepción Palacín, Volodymyr I. Paniotto, Berta Romera, Leo Russo, Joseph E. Schwartz, Nick Taub, Wilma A. M. Vollebergh, and Victoria Zakhosha.

REFERENCES

1. Leighton AH. *My Name Is Legion: Vol. 1 of the Stirling County Study*. New York, NY: Basic Books; 1959.
2. Langner TS, Michael ST. *Life Stress and Mental Health: The Midtown Manhattan Study*. Vol 2. London, England: Collier-MacMillan; 1963.
3. Hagnell O. *A Prospective Study of the Incidence of Mental Disorder: A Study Based on 24,000 Person Years of the Incidence of Mental Disorders in a Swedish Population Together With an Evaluation of the Aetiological Significance of Medical, Social, and Personality Factors*. Lund, Sweden: Svenska Bokförlaget; 1966.
4. Robins LN, Helzer JE, Croughan JL, Ratcliff KS. National Institute of Mental Health Diagnostic Interview Schedule: its history, characteristics and validity. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 1981;38:381-389.
5. Bland RC, Orn H, Newman SC. Lifetime prevalence of psychiatric disorders in Edmonton. *Acta Psychiatr Scand Suppl*. 1988;338:24-32.

6. Hwu HG, Yeh EK, Cheng LY. Prevalence of psychiatric disorders in Taiwan defined by the Chinese diagnostic interview schedule. *Acta Psychiatr Scand*. 1989;79:136-147.

7. Lépine JP, Lellouch J, Lovell A, et al. Anxiety and depressive disorders in a French population: methodology and preliminary results. *Psychiatry & Psychology*. 1989;4:267-274.

8. Robins LN, Regier DA, eds. *Psychiatric Disorders in America: The Epidemiologic Catchment Area Study*. New York, NY: The Free Press; 1991.

9. Weissman MM, Bland RC, Canino GJ, et al, for the Cross National Collaborative Group. The cross-national epidemiology of obsessive compulsive disorder. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 1994;55(suppl):5-10.

10. Weissman MM, Bland RC, Canino GJ, et al. The cross-national epidemiology of social phobia: a preliminary report. *Int Clin Psychopharmacol*. 1996;11(suppl 3):9-14.

11. Weissman MM, Bland RC, Canino GJ, et al. Cross-national epidemiology of major depression and bipolar disorder. *JAMA*. 1996;276:293-299.

12. Weissman MM, Bland RC, Canino GJ, et al. The cross-national epidemiology of panic disorder. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 1997;54:305-309.

13. Kessler RC, Greenberg PE, Mickelson KD, Meadeas LM, Wang PS. The effects of chronic medical conditions on work loss and work cutback. *J Occup Environ Med*. 2001;43(suppl 3):218-225.

14. Murray CJL, Lopez AD. *The Global Burden of Disease: A Comprehensive Assessment of Mortality and Disability From Diseases, Injuries and Risk Factors in 1990 and Projected to 2020*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press; 1996.

15. Ormel J, VonKorff M, Ustun TB, Pini S, Korten A, Oldehinkel T. Common mental disorders and disability across cultures: results from the WHO Collaborative Study on Psychological Problems in General Health Care. *JAMA*. 1994;272:1741-1748.

16. Wells KB, Stewart A, Hays RD, et al. The functioning and well-being of depressed patients: results from the Medical Outcomes Study. *JAMA*. 1989;262:914-919.

17. Andrade L, de Lolio C, Gentil V, Laurenti R, Werebe D. Lifetime prevalence of mental disorders in a catchment area in Sao Paulo, Brazil. In: Program and abstracts of the 7th Congress of the International Federation of Psychiatric Epidemiology; August 1996; Santiago, Chile.

18. Bijl RV, van Zessen G, Ravelli A, de Rijk C, Langendoen Y. The Netherlands Mental Health Survey and Incidence Study (NEMESIS): objectives and design. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol*. 1998;33:581-586.

19. Caraveo J, Martinez J, Rivera B. A model for epidemiological studies on mental health and psychiatric morbidity. *Salud Mental*. 1998;21:48-57.

20. Kessler RC, McGonagle KA, Zhao S, et al. Lifetime and 12-month prevalence of DSM-III-R psychiatric disorders in the United States: results from the National Comorbidity Survey. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 1994;51:8-19.

21. Kylyc C. *Mental Health Profile of Turkey: Main Report*. Ankara, Turkey: Ministry of Health Publications; 1998.

22. Vega WA, Kolody B, Aguilar-Gaxiola S, Alderete E, Catalano R, Caraveo-Anduaga J. Lifetime prevalence of DSM-III-R psychiatric disorders among urban and rural Mexican Americans in California. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 1998;55:771-778.

23. Wittchen HU, Perkonig A, Lachner G, Nelson CB. Early developmental stages of psychopathology study (EDSP): objectives and design. *Eur Addict Res*. 1998;4:18-27.

24. Andrade L, Walters EE, Gentil V, Laurenti R. Prevalence of ICD-10 mental disorders in a catchment area

- in the city of Sao Paulo, Brazil. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol*. 2002;37:316-325.
25. Robins LN, Wing J, Wittchen H-U, et al. The Composite International Diagnostic Interview: an epidemiologic instrument suitable for use in conjunction with different diagnostic systems and in different cultures. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 1988;45:1069-1077.
 26. WHO International Consortium in Psychiatric Epidemiology. Cross-national comparisons of the prevalences and correlates of mental disorders. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2000;78:413-426.
 27. Alegria M, Bijl RV, Lin E, Walters EE, Kessler RC. Income differences in persons seeking outpatient treatment for mental disorders: a comparison of the US with Ontario and the Netherlands. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2000;57:383-391.
 28. Bijl RV, de Graaf R, Hiripi E, et al. The prevalence of treated and untreated mental disorders in five countries. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2003;22:122-133.
 29. Regier DA, Kaelber CT, Rae DS, et al. Limitations of diagnostic criteria and assessment instruments for mental disorders: implications for research and policy. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 1998;55:109-115.
 30. Regier DA, Narrow WE, Rupp A, Rae DS, Kaelber CT. The epidemiology of mental disorder treatment need: community estimates of medical necessity. In: Andrews G, Henderson S, eds. *Unmet Need in Psychiatry*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press; 2000.
 31. Narrow WE, Rae DS, Robins LN, Regier DA. Revised prevalence estimates of mental disorders in the United States: using a clinical significance criterion to reconcile 2 surveys' estimates. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2002;59:115-123.
 32. Kessler R. The World Health Organization International Consortium in Psychiatric Epidemiology (ICPE): initial work and future directions—the NAPE lecture 1998. *Acta Psychiatr Scand*. 1999;99:2-9.
 33. Kessler RC, Ustun TB. The World Mental Health (WMH) Survey Initiative Version of the World Health Organization Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI). *Int J Methods Psychiatr Res*. In press.
 34. World Bank. *World Development Indicators 2003*. Washington, DC: The World Bank; 2003.
 35. The ESEMeD/MHEDEA 2000 Investigators. The European Study of the Epidemiology of Mental Disorders (ESEMeD/MHEDEA 2000) Project: rationale and methods. *Int J Methods Psychiatr Res*. 2002;11:55-67.
 36. Kessler RC, Merikangas K. The National Comorbidity Survey Replication (NCSR). *Int J Methods Psychiatr Res*. In press.
 37. American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth ed*. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association; 1994.
 38. Wittchen HU. Reliability and validity studies of the WHO Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI): a critical review. *J Psychiatr Res*. 1994;28:57-84.
 39. Kessler RC, Berglund PA, Walters EE, et al. Population-based analyses: a methodology for estimating the 12-month prevalence of serious mental illness. In: Manderscheid RW, Henderson MJ, eds. *Mental Health*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office; 1998:99-109.
 40. Leon AC, Olsson M, Portera L, Farber L, Sheehan DV. Assessing psychiatric impairment in primary care with the Sheehan Disability Scale. *Int J Psychiatry Med*. 1997;27:93-105.
 41. Endicott J, Spitzer RL, Fleiss JL, Cohen J. The global assessment scale: a procedure for measuring overall severity of psychiatric disorders. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 1976;33:766-771.
 42. Wolter KM. *Introduction to Variance Estimation*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag; 1985.
 43. SUDAAN [computer program]. Version 8.0.1. Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute; 2002.
 44. Verbrugge LM, Patrick DL. Seven chronic conditions: their impact on US adults' activity levels and use of medical services. *Am J Public Health*. 1995;85:173-182.
 45. Bebbington PE, Nayani T. The Psychosis Screening Questionnaire. *Int J Meth Psychiatr Res*. 1995;5:11-20.
 46. Eaton WW, Romanoski A, Anthony JC, Nestadt G. Screening for psychosis in the general population with a self-report interview. *J Nerv Ment Dis*. 1991;179:689-693.
 47. Spengler PA, Wittchen HU. Procedural validity of standardized symptom questions for the assessment of psychotic symptoms—a comparison of the DIS with two clinical methods. *Compr Psychiatry*. 1988;29:309-322.
 48. Keith SJ, Regier DA, Rae DS. Schizophrenic disorders. *Psychiatric Disorders in America: The Epidemiologic Catchment Area Study*. New York, NY: Free Press; 1991:33-52.
 49. Kendler KS, Gallagher TJ, Abelson JM, Kessler RC. Lifetime prevalence, demographic risk factors, and diagnostic validity of nonaffective psychosis as assessed in a US community sample: the National Comorbidity Survey. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 1996;53:1022-1031.
 50. World Health Organization Liaison Office in Ukraine. *Ukraine Country Health Report*. Geneva: World Health Organization; 1999.
 51. Kessler RC, Frank RG. The impact of psychiatric disorders on work loss days. *Psychol Med*. 1997;27:861-873.
 52. Kessler RC, Frank RG, Edlund M, Katz SJ, Lin E, Leaf P. Differences in the use of psychiatric outpatient services between the United States and Ontario. *N Engl J Med*. 1997;336:551-557.
 53. Simon GE, Goldberg DP, Von Korff M, Ustun TB. Understanding cross-national differences in depression prevalence. *Psychol Med*. 2002;32:585-594.
 54. Eaton WW, Anthony JC, Tepper S, Dryman A. Psychopathology and attrition in the Epidemiologic Catchment Area Study. *Am J Epidemiol*. 1992;135:1051-1059.
 55. Allgulander C. Psychoactive drug use in a general population sample, Sweden: correlates with perceived health, psychiatric diagnoses, and mortality in an automated record-linkage study. *Am J Public Health*. 1989;79:1006-1010.
 56. Katz SJ, Kessler RC, Frank RG, Leaf PJ, Lin E. Mental health care use, morbidity, and socioeconomic status in the United States and Ontario. *Inquiry*. 1997;34:38-49.
 57. Kessler RC, Merikangas KR, Berglund P, Eaton WW, Koretz DS, Walters EE. Mild disorders should not be eliminated from the DSM-V. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2003;60:1117-1122.
 58. Kessler RC, Price RH. Primary prevention of secondary disorders: a proposal and agenda. *Am J Community Psychol*. 1993;21:607-633.