Experience of clinical services shapes attitudes to mental health data sharing: Findings from a UK-

wide survey

Kirkham, E.J.*[1], Lawrie, S. M.[1], Crompton, C.J.[1], Iveson, M.H.[1], Jenkins, N. D.[2], Goerdten, J.[1,3], Beange,

I.[1], Chan, S.W.Y.[4], McIntosh, A.[1] & Fletcher-Watson, S.[1]

Author affiliations:

1: Division of Psychiatry, Centre for Clinical Brain Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Kennedy Tower,

Royal Edinburgh Hospital, Morningside Park, Edinburgh, EH10 5HF, UK

2: Edinburgh Dementia Prevention & Centre for Clinical Brain Sciences, University of Edinburgh,

Edinburgh, UK

3: Department of Epidemiological Methods and Etiological Research, Leibniz Institute for Prevention

Research and Epidemiology–BIPS, Bremen, Germany

4: Department of Clinical Psychology, School of Health in Social Science, University of Edinburgh, UK

Corresponding author details:

Division of Psychiatry, Centre for Clinical Brain Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Kennedy Tower,

Royal Edinburgh Hospital, Morningside Park, Edinburgh, EH10 5HF, UK

Email: elizabeth.kirkham@ed.ac.uk

22   **Abstract**

Background

Routinely-collected mental health data could deliver novel insights for mental health research.

However, patients' willingness to share their mental health data remains largely unknown. We

investigated factors influencing likelihood of sharing these data for research purposes amongst

people with experience of mental illness.

Methods

We collected responses from a diverse sample of UK National Health Service (NHS) users (n = 2187)

of which about half (n = 1087) had lifetime experience of mental illness. Ordinal logistic regression

was used to examine the influence of demographic factors, clinical service experience, and primary

mental illness on willingness to share mental health data, contrasted against physical health data.

Results

There was a high level of willingness to share mental (89.7%) and physical (92.8%) health data for

research purposes. Higher levels of satisfaction with the NHS were associated with greater

willingness to share mental health data. Furthermore, people with personal experience of mental

illness were more willing than those without to share mental health data, once the effect of NHS

satisfaction had been controlled for. Of the mental illnesses recorded, people with depression,

obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD), personality disorder or bipolar disorder were significantly

more likely to share their mental health data than people without mental illness.

Conclusions

These findings suggest that positive experiences of health services and personal experience of

mental illness are associated with greater willingness to share mental health data. NHS satisfaction is

a potentially modifiable factor that could foster public support for increased use of NHS mental

health data in research.

Keywords

mental health; data sharing; health data; patient satisfaction; patient perspectives

Background

Routinely-collected health data, such as those held by the UK's National Health Service (NHS) in

electronic health records, are highly valuable for mental health research. Not only do these data

represent millions of individuals, spanning entire life courses, they also capture information from

people who are simultaneously more in need of improved treatments and less likely to participate in

traditional research studies (1).

However, attempts to increase the sharing of such routinely collected data can suffer catastrophic

failure if they are not supported by the public who provide the data, as demonstrated by the scandal

surrounding NHS England's attempt to share health data on an opt-out basis in the early-2010s (2).

Whilst projects using routinely-collected health data do engage with special panels designed to

approximate public opinion (e.g. the Public Benefit and Privacy Panel in Scotland; (3)), and there is a

growing literature examining the general public's views on sharing routinely-collected health data

(4), there have been no large-scale quantitative investigations of the views of people with personal

experience of mental illness. Indeed, whilst there is evidence that the general public as a whole

views mental health data as more sensitive than other forms of health data (4-8), it remains unclear

whether this view is shared by people with lived experience of mental illness. Not only does this

result in stakeholders' priorities remaining potentially unmet, it also means that researchers'

particular difficulties in accessing mental health data (9) could be partly based on unsubstantiated

assumptions.

The limited data available tend to suggest that the organisation that will process the mental health

data and the perceived sensitivity of these data are important factors in people's decisions about

data sharing (10-13). However, without larger, more representative samples it remains impossible to

ascertain what characteristics and experiences affect willingness to share mental health data, and

how this contrasts with willingness to share physical health data. This contrast is important given

that most studies of this nature focus primarily on physical health data, and it remains unknown

whether their findings translate to mental health data, which may be more stigmatised (14).

To this end, we conducted a UK-wide online survey of adult NHS-users, to examine which factors

influence willingness to share routinely-collected mental health data, with a focus on the views of

people with experience of mental illness. We recruited a diverse sample to examine the influence of

demographic factors, and embedded the work within the context of the NHS, the primary source of

routinely-collected health data in the UK.

91   **Methods**

Study design and population

A first draft of the survey was designed by the research team. This draft was presented to a group of

people with lived experience of mental illness, and changes to wording and layout were made based

on their feedback. The survey was also sent to research clinicians and further suggested alterations

were incorporated. The survey covered participants' views about sharing mental and physical health

data, their personal experience of mental and physical health, and their demographic information.

The median response time was 11 minutes. The final survey was administered online through the

Qualtrics platform (15) and the full script is available at https://doi.org/10.7488/ds/3146 and in

Appendix 1. The research received ethical approval from the School of Health in Social Sciences

Research Ethics Committee at the University of Edinburgh.

Participants were recruited from December 2018 to August 2019 via social media, posters, and in-

person at a science festival. A number of research and clinical teams around the UK promoted the

survey through their networks, but there was no direct recruitment of patients via clinical settings.

This strategy formed the basis of our recruitment due to financial and time constraints. However, we

also sought to extend the reach of the survey where possible, by working with a company to

advertise the survey on Facebook. We ensured that a portion of this advertising was presented

specifically to men and to people without university degrees, as these demographic groups were

under-represented following our initial recruitment. In addition, we invited people from less

represented groups to take part using the study recruitment website Prolific Academic (16).

All participants took part voluntarily; 174 individuals who took part through Prolific Academic were

paid approximately £2. These participants were primarily from Black, Asian or Minority Ethnic

groups: we targeted these populations to improve the ethnic diversity of the sample. All participants

were over 16 and stated that they had used the NHS for either physical or mental health care.

Participants were classified as having experience of mental illness if they self-reported that they had

had a mental illness at some time in their life (diagnosis was not required). Participant demographics

are presented in Table 1. A total of 2187 participants contributed data to the study. However, the

number of participants responding to each question varied, due to participant drop-out and built-in

exclusion criteria (e.g. people were not asked specific questions about treatment for mental illness if

they reported no experience of mental illness). Consequently, the number of participants differs

between analyses.

Willingness to share both mental and physical health data for research was first captured using a

binary (yes/no) scale. Second, to analyse predictors of data sharing, the two primary outcome

measures were taken from the question "How likely would you be to share mental/physical health

data for research purposes?" Each response was measured on a Likert scale from 1 (extremely

unlikely) to 5 (extremely likely). The survey assessed satisfaction with the NHS using four items,

covering satisfaction with first contact for a mental/long-term physical health condition and

satisfaction with mental/physical health care during the previous 12 months. Each item was

measured on a 5-point Likert scale from "very dissatisfied" to "very satisfied" (Appendix 1). For

analysis, one NHS satisfaction variable was created from a mean of these four responses (17).

Cronbach's alpha for this new variable was 0.71 (18), indicating acceptable internal consistency.

Statistical analysis

All analyses were performed in IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 24. In cases where ordinal

logistic regression with proportional odds was used, the assumption of proportional odds was tested

using a full likelihood ratio test.

Likelihood of sharing health data

McNemar's and Wilcoxon signed-ranks tests were used to examine whether there were significant

differences in willingness to share mental and physical health data amongst the full sample and

amongst those with experience of mental illness. Following this, a Mann-Whitney U test was used to

examine whether likelihood of sharing mental or physical health data differed between people with

experience of mental illness only and people with experience of long-term physical illness only.

Factors influencing likelihood of sharing health data

Influence of demographic factors (Model 1, Table 2). Cumulative odds ordinal logistic

regression with proportional odds was used to determine the effect of demographic factors on

likelihood of sharing health data (Model 1). The factors included in Model 1 were based on

theoretical consideration of the topic, and were as follows: gender, age, ethnicity, location,

education, experience of mental illness (ever), experience of long-term physical illness or disability

(ever), self-rating of current mental health and self-rating of current physical health. The

aforementioned factors were used to predict two dependent variables: (a) likelihood of sharing

mental health data and (b) likelihood of sharing physical health data (Models 1a and 1b, Table 2).

Age was treated as a continuous variable, self-rating of current mental/physical health was treated

as ordinal (measured on a scale from 1 to 5), and the remaining variables were treated as categorical

(reference categories are included in the Notes section of Table 2). Response categories for these

variables are detailed in Table 1, and details of the questions can be found in Appendix 1. Being paid

for survey participation was included as a co-variate. Likelihood of sharing mental/physical health

data was measured on an ordinal scale from 1 to 5.

Influence of frequency of NHS use (Model 2, Table 2). Cumulative odds ordinal logistic

regression with proportional odds was next used to determine the effect of frequency of mental and

physical NHS health care on likelihood of sharing health data (Model 2). The factors included in

Model 2 were frequency of NHS mental health care, frequency of NHS physical health care, self-

rating of mental health and self-rating of physical health (the latter two factors were included as co-

variates because they reached significance in the previous analysis examining influence of

demographic factors (Model 1)). The aforementioned factors were used to predict two dependent

variables: (a) likelihood of sharing mental health data and (b) likelihood of sharing physical health

data (Models 2a and 2b, Table 2). Frequency of mental/physical NHS health care was treated as

binary and coded as either non-frequent: less than monthly, or frequent: monthly or more.

Participants who had received inpatient care were removed from this analysis, as this form of care

did not fit well into a "frequency" framework. Details of the frequency questions and original

response options can be found in Appendix 1.

Influence of satisfaction with the NHS (Models 3 and 4, Table 2). Spearman's rank-order

correlations were run to assess the relationship between satisfaction with the NHS and likelihood of

sharing mental and physical health data. In addition, Mann-Whitney U tests were used to examine

whether participants with and without experience of mental illness differed in their satisfaction with

the NHS.

Next, cumulative odds ordinal logistic regression with proportional odds was used to

examine whether the relationship between satisfaction with the NHS and likelihood of sharing

mental health data remained significant after controlling for variables which were significant in the

previous regression analyses (Model 3, Table 2). To this end, Model 3 contained the following

factors: mean NHS satisfaction, experience of mental illness, self-rating of mental health, and self-

rating of physical health (with the latter three variables acting as co-variates). The dependent

variable was likelihood of sharing mental health data.

Following this, Model 4 (Table 2) was generated to examine whether the effect of NHS

satisfaction at first contact was greater than the effect of NHS satisfaction at recent (12 month)

contact. Model 4 therefore contained the following factors: satisfaction with first contact with NHS

mental health services, satisfaction with 12 month contact with NHS mental health services, and

self-ratings of mental and physical health (as covariates). The dependent variable was likelihood of

sharing mental health data.

Influence of specific mental health conditions. A cumulative odds ordinal logistic regression

with proportional odds was run to determine the effect of primary reported mental health condition

on likelihood of sharing mental health data (Table 3). Participants were asked to choose their

primary mental health condition from a list provided (Appendix 1; depression, anxiety, phobia,

eating disorder, schizophrenia or psychosis, OCD, personality disorder, bipolar disorder, addiction,

body dysmorphic disorder, self-harm or "other"). Binary coding was used to indicate whether a given

condition was the participant's primary mental health condition or not. In light of previous findings

(Table 2), NHS satisfaction and self-rating of mental/physical health were included as co-variates.

This analysis was considered to be exploratory given the low number of participants whose primary

mental health condition was not depression or anxiety (n = 217).

199   [Table 1 about here]

201   **Results**

Likelihood of sharing health data

Across the whole sample there was a high level of willingness to share both mental (89.68%) and

physical (92.75%) health data when measured on a binary (yes/no) scale. A McNemar's test

demonstrated that this difference was significant ($\chi^2(1) = 47.67$, p < .001). A similar pattern was seen

when dividing the sample by individuals who had experienced a mental health condition and

individuals who had never experienced a mental health condition (Figure 1); both participants with

experience of mental illness ($\chi^2(1) = 20.02$, p < .001), and participants without experience of mental

illness (exact McNemar's test p = .001) were significantly more likely to share physical health data

than mental health data.

212   [*Figure 1 about here*]

Figure 1: *Participants who would share their mental and physical health data, split by mental health*

status

Note. n(ever had mental illness) = 1085, n(never had mental illness) = 528. Participants who

responded that they would "prefer not to say" if they have ever had a mental or physical health

condition are not shown.

We next examined the reported likelihood (measured on a Likert scale) of sharing mental/physical

health data (Figure 2). A Wilcoxon signed-ranks test indicated that participants were significantly

more likely to share their physical health data than their mental health data, $z = -8.621$, $p < .001$. This

effect was also present amongst those with experience of mental illness, $z = -6.412$, $p < .001$.

225   [*Figure 2 about here*]

Figure 2: *Likelihood of sharing mental and physical health data across all participants*

Note. n = 1991

Two Mann-Whitney U tests were run to determine if likelihood of sharing mental or physical health

data differed between the group of people with experience of only mental illness (n = 468) and the

group of people with experience of only long-term physical illness (n = 244). Distributions of the

responses for the two groups were similar, as assessed by visual inspection. There was no

statistically significantly difference between people with only mental illness and people with only

physical illness, for either likelihood of sharing mental health data $U = 55776.50$, $z = -0.105$, $p = .917$

or likelihood of sharing physical health data $U = 55474.00$, $z = -0.327$, $p = .744$.

Factors influencing likelihood of sharing health data

Influence of demographic factors (Model 1)

The full ordinal logistic regression model examining the effect of demographic factors on likelihood

of sharing mental health data (Model 1a, Table 2) significantly predicted the outcome over and

above the intercept-only model $\chi^2(24) = 68.80$, $p < .001$. The assumption of proportional odds was

met $\chi^2(72) = 74.97$, $p = .38$. There was no significant difference between people who had and had

not experienced a mental illness in the likelihood of sharing mental health data. Those who said they

would "prefer not to say" if they had ever experienced a mental illness were much less willing to

share their mental health data than people who said they had never had a mental illness (OR 0.23).

An increase in self-rated physical health was associated with an increase in the odds of sharing

mental health data (OR 1.15). An increase in self-rated mental health was marginally associated with

an increase in the odds of sharing mental health data (OR 1.11).

The full ordinal logistic regression model examining the effect of demographic factors on likelihood

of sharing physical health data (Model 1b, Table 2) significantly predicted the outcome over and

above the intercept-only model $\chi^2(24) = 87.17$, $p < .001$. The assumption of proportional odds was

not met $\chi^2(72) = 105.24$, $p = .006$. As such, an additional adapted analysis which met the assumption

was run, giving a similar outcome (Appendix 2). Although there was no overall effect of highest

completed level of education on likelihood of sharing physical health data, Wald $\chi2(5) = 10.22$, $p =$

.069, the contrast between the subcategories of postgraduate degree and vocational qualification

was significant, such that people with a postgraduate degree were more likely to share their physical

health data than people with vocational or college-level qualifications (OR 1.61). The odds of people

who said they would "prefer not to say" if they had ever experienced a *mental* illness being willing to

share their *physical* health data were four times lower than that of people who said they had never

had a mental illness, (OR 0.25). There was no significant difference between people who had and

262   had not experienced a mental illness in likelihood of sharing physical health data. An increase in self-

263   rated physical health was associated with an increase in the odds of sharing physical health data (OR

264   1.13). An increase in self-rated mental health was also associated with an increase in the odds of

265   sharing physical health data (OR 1.18).

267   [Table 2 about here]

Influence of frequency of NHS use (Model 2)

Two cumulative odds ordinal logistic regression analyses with proportional odds were run to

determine the effect of frequency of mental and physical NHS health care on willingness to share (a)

mental and (b) physical health data (Models 2a and 2b, Table 2). The full model (Model 2a, Table 2)

significantly predicted the likelihood of sharing mental health data over and above the intercept-

only model $\chi^2(4) = 10.55$, p = .03. The assumption of proportional odds was met $\chi^2(12) = 19.98$, p =

.07. An increase in self-rated physical health was associated with an increase in the odds of sharing

mental health data (OR 1.18). Likelihood of sharing mental health data was not predicted by

frequency of NHS mental or physical health care, or self-rated mental health.

The full model (Model 2b, Table 2) also significantly predicted likelihood of sharing physical health

data over and above the intercept-only model $\chi^2(4) = 22.48$, p < .001. The assumption of

proportional odds was met $\chi^2(12) = 12.00$, p = .45. People who received NHS physical health care

more than monthly were more likely to share their physical health data than people who received

less frequent care (OR 1.42). An increase in self-rated physical health was associated with an

increase in the odds of sharing physical health data (OR 1.27). There was no association between

frequency of mental health care or self-rated mental health and the likelihood of sharing physical

health data.

Influence of satisfaction with the NHS (Models 3 and 4)

Spearman's rank-order correlations were run to assess the relationship between satisfaction with

the NHS and likelihood of sharing mental and physical health data. Higher levels of satisfaction with

the NHS were associated with greater willingness to share mental health data, $r_s(1544) = .13$, p <

.001 and physical health data $r_s(1544) = .13$, p < .001. Mann-Whitney U tests were used to examine

whether participants with and without experience of mental illness differed in their satisfaction with

the NHS. It was found that participants with experience of mental illness were less satisfied with

their overall (mean) experience with the NHS (U = 147117.50, z = -12.47, p < .001), as well as less

satisfied with their first contact for a physical health condition (U = 46305.00, -5.52, p < .001) and

less satisfied with the physical health care they had received in the previous 12 months (U =

160531.00, z = -5.88, p < .001).

To disentangle the relationships between these aforementioned variables, a cumulative odds ordinal

logistic regression with proportional odds (Model 3, Table 2) was run to determine the relative

effects of mean NHS satisfaction and experience of mental illness on likelihood of sharing mental

health data (with self-rated mental and physical health included as covariate factors). The full model

significantly predicted the likelihood of sharing mental health data over and above the intercept-

only model ($\chi^2(5) = 66.44$, p < .001). The assumption of proportional odds was met ($\chi^2(15) = 21.45$, p

= .12). In keeping with previous analyses, satisfaction with the NHS (Wald $\chi2(1) = 20.64$, p < .001),

and experience of mental illness were associated with likelihood of sharing mental health data (Wald

$\chi^2(2) = 29.92$, p < .001). Participants who would "prefer not to say" whether they had a mental illness

were much less willing than people who said they had never had a mental illness to share their

mental health data (OR 0.27). This means that although experience of mental illness had no effect on

willingness to share mental health data when examining demographic factors only (Model 1a),

parsing out the effect of NHS satisfaction (by including it as a factor in Model 3) revealed a significant

relationship between experience of mental illness and higher likelihood of sharing mental health

data (OR 1.30).

Following this, a cumulative odds ordinal logistic regression with proportional odds was run to

determine the association between two specific measures of NHS satisfaction (satisfaction with first

contact for mental health care, and satisfaction with mental health care in the previous 12 months)

on likelihood of sharing mental health data amongst people who have had a mental illness (Model 4,

Table 2; n = 480). Ratings of mental and physical health were included as co-variates, as they

significantly predicted willingness to share mental health data in a previous analyses (Model 1a). The

assumption of proportional odds was met, (χ2(12) = 7.604, p = .82). All variance inflation factors (VIF)

values were well below 10, with the largest being 1.33, indicating that there was no multi-

collinearity. The final model did not significantly predict likelihood of sharing mental health data

over and above the intercept-only model, $\chi^2(4)$ = 8.885, p = .064. However, an increase in

satisfaction with first contact for mental health care was associated with an increase in the odds of

sharing mental health data (OR 1.16). There was no association between satisfaction with previous

12 months' mental health care, rating of physical health or rating of mental health and willingness to

share mental health data.

Influence of specific mental health conditions

A cumulative odds ordinal logistic regression with proportional odds was run to determine the effect

of each primary reported mental health condition on likelihood of sharing mental health data (Table

3). The full model significantly predicted the outcome over and above the intercept-only model

($\chi^2(15)$ = 43.06, p < .001). The assumption of proportional odds was met ($\chi^2(45)$ = 52.76, p = .20). In

comparison to participants with no experience of mental illness, participants whose primary

experience of mental illness was with depression, OCD, personality disorder or bipolar disorder were

more willing to share their mental health data (Table 3). There were no cases where experience of a

mental illness significantly reduced willingness to share mental health data.

336   [Table 3 about here]

338   **Discussion**

This study is the first to examine factors that determine likelihood of sharing mental health data for

research purposes in a large UK sample. Willingness to share mental health data was high amongst

people with and without experience of mental illness, though it was nevertheless lower than

willingness to share physical health data. Higher satisfaction with the NHS was strongly associated

with increased likelihood of sharing mental health data. Initial analyses suggested no association

between mental illness experience and likelihood of sharing mental health data, but once the

contribution of NHS satisfaction was controlled for, participants with experience of mental illness

were more likely to share their mental health data than those without experience of mental illness.

Specifically, people whose primary mental health condition was depression, OCD, personality

disorder or bipolar disorder were each significantly more likely to share their mental health data

than people with no experience of mental illness.

There was a high level of willingness to share both mental (89.7% "yes") and physical (92.8% "yes")

health data, supporting previous work which showed support for sharing health data at 73%, 81%

and 90% (8, 19, 20). These findings are encouraging given the value of routinely-collected health

data in health and data science research (9). At the same time, if one in ten people are unwilling to

share mental health data, this could still present a significant obstacle that hinders progress towards

increased availability of routine mental health data for research. Therefore researchers should not

underestimate the importance of continued and sustained public engagement on the value of

routine data analysis for research (21), especially since participants were less willing to share mental

health data than physical health data. This reluctance signals that mental health data may be more

"sensitive" than other health data (4-8), especially as it comes from participants who had already

chosen to engage with mental health research. Having said this, the actual size of the difference

found here (3%) suggests that mental health stigma (14) is not having a dramatic effect in this case.

A core finding of this work was that satisfaction with the NHS had a particularly notable impact on

willingness to share both mental and physical health data for research purposes, echoing previous

findings of a positive relationship between perceived quality of care and greater confidence in the

privacy of health information (22). One speculative explanation for the present finding may be that

positive experiences of health care are associated with greater trust in institutional structures which

deal with health care (23), and that this trust is in turn associated with greater willingness to share

health data (24). Both situations involve power differences between the individual and the

institution(s), and both concern personal information. Whether participants are explicitly conflating

health care and health research, or whether the association is more implicit, is a matter for future

qualitative research. Either way, it is apparent that ensuring positive clinical contact and facilitating

awareness of research in clinical settings could contribute to increased willingness to share health

data.

Furthermore, in the present study, once the impact of NHS satisfaction was taken into account,

participants with experience of mental illness were more willing to share their mental health data

than those without experience of mental illness. This finding has important implications for

clinicians, as it suggests that experience of mental illness is not in itself a barrier to data sharing,

rather it is how those with mental illness experience the NHS that matters. In addition, individuals'

satisfaction with their first contact with the NHS for mental health care may be particularly

important in predicting their likelihood of sharing mental health data. The related finding that

people with experience of mental illness are less satisfied with NHS care echoes previous findings of

a relationship between higher depression scores and lower satisfaction with physical health care (25,

26). Reduced satisfaction could be related to diagnostic overshadowing, in which people with mental

illness are less likely to receive appropriate treatment for comorbid physical illness (27, 28). Future

work should examine the relationship between mental health and satisfaction with health care in

further detail.

To our knowledge, this study was the first to examine the effect of experience of different mental

health conditions on willingness to share health data. People whose primary mental health condition

was depression, OCD, personality disorder or bipolar disorder were significantly more likely to share

their mental health data than those without experience of mental illness, when confounders were

taken into account. People whose primary condition was anxiety, phobia, eating disorder, psychosis,

addiction, body dysmorphic disorder or self-harm did not differ from people without experience of

mental illness in their willingness to share mental health data. Notably, none of the mental health

conditions measured were associated with a significant reduction in likelihood of sharing mental

health data. These findings should be considered in light of the small sample sizes in most of the

groups; further research is needed to examine whether the present pattern of relationships

between participants' primary mental health conditions and their willingness to share mental health

data remains once larger numbers of people are included. Nevertheless, taken together, people with

experience of mental illness are more willing than those without experience of mental illness to

share mental health data, possibly because they are more motivated to contribute towards

improved treatments for mental illness (11). Interestingly, there was very little evidence of

relationships between demographic factors and willingness to share mental health data, despite our

recruitment of a demographically diverse UK sample with a wide age range.

The present findings should be interpreted in light of potential self-selection bias; it is perhaps

unsurprising that willingness to share mental health data was high amongst individuals who chose to

complete a survey about the topic. That said, the data collected in our survey captured a small

fraction of the information held in the health records about which we enquired. In addition, whilst

the research sheds light on the impact of lifetime experience of mental illness on willingness to share

mental health data, it does not identify those who were experiencing mental illness at the time of

the survey. Further research should examine whether previous and current experience of mental

illness have different impacts on data sharing. Similarly, future work would benefit from recruitment

of more individuals with experience of less common mental health conditions in order to validate

and extend the current findings. It would also be beneficial to assess whether public awareness

campaigns aimed at reducing mental health stigma can eliminate the difference in willingness to

share mental and physical health data in the UK.

Conclusions

This study has shown for the first time that higher satisfaction with the NHS is associated with

greater willingness to share mental health data. Furthermore, despite oft-cited concerns that mental

health data are especially sensitive (4-8), it was found that people with experience of mental illness

are actually more willing than people without mental illness to share their mental health data, once

NHS satisfaction is taken into account. Much of the literature on preparing the ground for increased

sharing of routinely-collected health data focuses on ways in which researchers can use public

engagement to support greater buy-in from the general public (4). The present findings suggest that

work to improve satisfaction with the NHS (29, 30) could also have a beneficial effect on willingness

to share health data, especially amongst those with mental illness. In this way, both researchers and

clinicians can play an important role in fostering greater public acceptability of research that uses

routinely-collected mental health data. This in turn is expected to benefit researchers, clinicians and

patients alike.

List of abbreviations

NHS: National Health Service

OCD: obsessive-compulsive disorder

OR: odds ratio

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The research received ethical approval from the Department of Clinical and Health Psychology

School of Health in Social Science Research Ethics Research Panel Committee at the University of

Edinburgh (ref: STAFF132). All participants were presented with an online information sheet and

provided informed consent using an online form at the beginning of the survey.

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Availability of data and materials

The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available at

https://doi.org/10.7488/ds/3146.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

This project has received funding from the Medical Research Council (grant number MC_PC_17209)

and the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and

innovation programme (grant agreement n° 847776). AM is supported by the Wellcome Trust

(104036/Z/14/Z, 216767/Z/19/Z, 220857/Z/20/Z), UKRI MRC (MR/W014386/1 (DATAMIND),

MC_PC_17209, MR/S035818/1) and NIH R01 (Reference R01MH124873) grants. The funding bodies

had no role in the design of the study, the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data or in

writing the manuscript.

Authors' contributions

EJK made contributed to the design of the work, conducted acquisition, analysis and interpretation

of the data, and drafted the manuscript. SFW contributed to the conception and design of the work,

the acquisition, analysis and interpretation of the data, and substantively revised the draft. AM

contributed to the conception and design of the work, and the interpretation of the data. SML, CJC,

SWYC and MHI contributed to the conception of the work. NDJ and JG contributed to the analysis

and interpretation of the data. IB contributed to the acquisition of the data. All authors read and

approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the following individuals and organisations for their support with this work:

Dr Mark Adams, Mahmud Al-Gailani, Dr Natalie Banner, Katie Breeze, Prof Rudolf Cardinal, Philippa

Carr, Alison Churchill, Mark Coles, Judith Cramb, Clare Curtis, Dr Emma Davidson, Prof Ian Deary, Dr

Josie Dickerson, the Edinburgh Pathfinder Stakeholder Advisory Group, Prof John Geddes, Dr Jane

Haley, Prof Jeremy Hall, Emma Hawkins, Dr Sumeet Jain, Anders Jespersen, Prof Ann John, Prof Mark

Johnson, Linda Jones, Prof Ian Jones, Catriona Keerie, Prof Simon Lovestone, Jonathan MacBride, Dr

Donald MacIntyre, Prof John Macleod, Liz MacWhinney, Kate McAllister, Lanarkshire Links,

Niamh McDade, Maria McMahon, Isabella Melking, Lynn Molloy, Denise Munro, National Survivor

User Network, Jenny Nelder, Anne O'Donnell, Prof David Osborn, Prof Martyn Pickersgill, Prof David

Porteous, Dr Carys Pugh, Emma Robinson, Dr Dan Robotham, Prof Ilina Singh, Prof Daniel Smith, Prof

Robert Stewart, Suzy Syrett, Judith Syson, Adele Taylor, Leela Thomas, Liesbeth Tip, Shobna Vasishta,

Hope Virgo, VOX Scotland, Prof James Walters, Katherine Woods.

References

1.   McIntosh AM, Stewart R, John A, Smith DJ, Davis K, Sudlow C, et al. Data science for mental
health: a UK perspective on a global challenge. Lancet Psychiatry. 2016;3(10):993-8.
2.   Carter P, Laurie GT, Dixon-Woods M. The social licence for research: why care.data ran into
trouble. Journal of Medical Ethics. 2015;41(5):404-9.
3.   Iveson M, Deary I. Navigating the landscape of non-health administrative data in Scotland: A
researcher?s narrative [version 2; peer review: 2 approved]. Wellcome Open Research. 2019;4(97).
4.   Aitken M, Jorre JD, Pagliari C, Jepson R, Cunningham-Burley S. Public responses to the
sharing and linkage of health data for research purposes: a systematic review and thematic synthesis
of qualitative studies. Bmc Medical Ethics. 2016;17.
5.   Grant A, Ure J, Nicolson DJ, Hanley J, Sheikh A, McKinstry B, et al. Acceptability and
perceived barriers and facilitators to creating a national research register to enable 'direct to patient'
enrolment into research: the Scottish Health Research Register (SHARE). Bmc Health Services
Research. 2013;13.
6.   Robling MR, Hood K, Houston H, Pill R, Fay J, Evans HM. Public attitudes towards the use of
primary care patient record data in medical research without consent: a qualitative study. Journal of
Medical Ethics. 2004;30(1):104-9.
7.   Trinidad SB, Fullerton SM, Bares JM, Jarvik GP, Larson EB, Burke W. Genomic research and
wide data sharing: Views of prospective participants. Genetics in Medicine. 2010;12(8):486-95.
8.   King T, Brankovic L, Gillard P. Perspectives of Australian adults about protecting the privacy
of their health information in statistical databases. International Journal of Medical Informatics.
2012;81(4):279-89.
9.   Ford T, Mansfield KL, Markham S, McManus S, John A, O'Reilly D, et al. The challenges and
opportunities of mental health data sharing in the UK. Lancet Digit Health. 2021;3(6):e333-e6.
10.   Shen N, Sequeira L, Silver MP, Carter-Langford A, Strauss J, Wiljer D. Patient Privacy
Perspectives on Health Information Exchange in a Mental Health Context: Qualitative Study. Jmir
Mental Health. 2019;6(11).
11.   Soni H, Grando A, Murcko A, Diaz S, Mukundan M, Idouraine N, et al. State of the art and a
mixed-method personalized approach to assess patient perceptions on medical record sharing and
sensitivity. Journal of Biomedical Informatics. 2020;101.
12.   Grando MA, Murcko A, Mahankali S, Saks M, Zent M, Chern D, et al. A Study to Elicit
Behavioral Health Patients' and Providers' Opinions on Health Records Consent. Journal of Law
Medicine & Ethics. 2017;45(2):238-59.
13.   Caine K, Hanania R. Patients want granular privacy control over health information in
electronic medical records. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association. 2013;20(1):7-
15.
14.   Clement S, Schauman O, Graham T, Maggioni F, Evans-Lacko S, Bezborodovs N, et al. What is
the impact of mental health-related stigma on help-seeking? A systematic review of quantitative and
qualitative studies. Psychological Medicine. 2015;45(1):11-27.
15.   Qualtrics [Available from: https://www.qualtrics.com/uk/.
16.   Prolific [Available from: https://www.prolific.co/.
17.   Sullivan GM, Artino AR, Jr. Analyzing and interpreting data from likert-type scales. J Grad
Med Educ. 2013;5(4):541-2.
18.   Peterson RA. A Meta-Analysis of Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha. Journal of Consumer
Research. 1994;21(2):381-91.
19.   Luchenski SA, Reed JE, Marston C, Papoutsi C, Majeed A, Bell D. Patient and Public Views on
Electronic Health Records and Their Uses in the United Kingdom: Cross-Sectional Survey. Journal of
Medical Internet Research. 2013;15(8).

20. Buckley BS, Murphy AW, MacFarlane AE. Public attitudes to the use in research of personal
health information from general practitioners' records: a survey of the Irish general public. J Med
Ethics. 2011;37(1):50-5.
21. Beange I, Kirkham EJ, Fletcher-Watson S, Iveson MH, Lawrie SM, Batty GD, et al. Using a
knowledge exchange event to assess study participants? attitudes to research in a rapidly evolving
research context [version 1; peer review: 3 approved]. Wellcome Open Research. 2020;5(24).
22. Patel V, Beckjord E, Moser RP, Hughes P, Hesse BW. The Role of Health Care Experience and
Consumer Information Efficacy in Shaping Privacy and Security Perceptions of Medical Records:
National Consumer Survey Results. Jmir Medical Informatics. 2015;3(1).
23. Platt J, Kardia S. Public trust in health information sharing: implications for biobanking and
electronic health record systems. J Pers Med. 2015;5(1):3-21.
24. Howe N, Giles E, Newbury-Birch D, McColl E. Systematic review of participants' attitudes
towards data sharing: a thematic synthesis. J Health Serv Res Policy. 2018;23(2):123-33.
25. Adogwa O, Parker SL, Shau DN, Mendenhall SK, Bydon A, Cheng JS, et al. Preoperative Zung
depression scale predicts patient satisfaction independent of the extent of improvement after
revision lumbar surgery. Spine Journal. 2013;13(5):501-6.
26. Bui QUT, Ostir GV, Kuo YF, Freeman J, Goodwin JS. Relationship of depression to patient
satisfaction: findings from the barriers to breast cancer study. Breast Cancer Research and
Treatment. 2005;89(1):23-8.
27. Molloy R, Munro I, Pope N. Understanding the experience of diagnostic overshadowing
associated with severe mental illness from the consumer and health professional perspective: a
qualitative systematic review protocol. JBI Evid Synth. 2020;19(6):1362-8.
28. Noblett J, Caffrey A, Deb T, Khan A, Lagunes-Cordoba E, Gale-Grant O, et al. Liaison
psychiatry professionals' views of general hospital care for patients with mental illness: The care of
patients with mental illness in the general hospital setting. Journal of Psychosomatic Research.
2017;95:26-32.
29. Wykes T, Csipke E, Williams P, Koeser L, Nash S, Rose D, et al. Improving patient experiences
of mental health inpatient care: a randomised controlled trial. Psychological Medicine.
2018;48(3):488-97.
30. Fortin M, Bamvita JM, Fleury MJ. Patient satisfaction with mental health services based on
Andersen's Behavioral Model. Canadian Journal of Psychiatry-Revue Canadienne De Psychiatrie.
2018;63(2):103-14.

Table 1

Participant demographics

	All participants	Experience of mental illness (ever)		
		Yes	**No**	**Prefer not to say**
Total, n	2187	1087 (65.09%)	529 (31.68%)	54 (3.23%)
Gender, n (%)				
Male	514 (31.28%)	314 (29.51%)	187 (35.82%)	12 (22.64%)
Female	1094 (66.59%)	721 (67.76%)	334 (63.98%)	36 (67.92%)
Non-binary or prefer to self-describe	19 (1.16%)	18 (1.69%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (1.89%)
Prefer not to say	16 (0.97%)	11 (1.03%)	1 (0.19%)	4 (7.55%)
Location, n (%)				
England	1050 (63.99%)	695 (65.38%)	316 (60.77%)	36 (67.92%)
Scotland	490 (29.86%)	300 (28.22%)	174 (33.46%)	14 (26.42%)
Wales	65 (3.96%)	49 (4.61%)	15 (2.88%)	1 (1.89%)
Northern Ireland	19 (1.16%)	10 (0.94%)	9 (1.73%)	0 (0.00%)
Outside UK	17 (1.04%)	9 (0.85%)	6 (1.15%)	2 (3.77%)
Ethnicity, n (%)				
White	1438 (88.38%)	961 (91.26%)	431 (83.37%)	41 (80.39%)
Asian/Asian British	92 (5.65%)	38 (3.61%)	51 (9.86%)	3 (5.88%)
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British	53 (3.26%)	24 (2.28%)	26 (5.03%)	2 (3.92%)
Mixed/multiple ethnic groups	32 (1.97%)	21 (1.99%)	7 (1.35%)	4 (7.84%)
Other	12 (0.74%)	9 (0.85%)	2 (0.39%)	1 (1.96%)
Highest education, n (%)				
Postgraduate degree or professional qualification	587 (36.01%)	383 (36.23%)	181 (34.94%)	21 (42.00%)
Undergraduate degree	390 (23.93%)	260 (24.60%)	122 (23.55%)	8 (16.00%)
Vocational or college qualification	246 (15.09%)	147 (13.91%)	91 (17.57%)	6 (12.00%)
A-levels or equivalent	189 (11.60%)	121 (11.45%)	62 (11.97%)	5 (10.00%)
GCSEs or equivalent	200 (12.27%)	135 (12.77%)	55 (10.62%)	10 (20.00%)
Primary school	18 (1.10%)	11 (1.04%)	7 (1.35%)	0 (0.00%)
Experience of physical disability or long-term physical illness (ever), n (%)				
Yes	871 (52.56%)	598 (55.84%)	244 (46.21%)	27 (50.94%)
No	774 (46.71%)	468 (43.70%)	283 (53.60%)	20 (37.74%)
Prefer not to say	12 (0.72%)	5 (0.47%)	1 (0.19%)	6 (11.32%)
Age (years), mean (SD)	45.58 (17.38)	44.44 (17.03)	48.26 (17.74)	42.14 (18.18)

568 **Table 2**

569 *Ordinal logistic regression models examining factors affecting likelihood of sharing (a) mental and (b)*

570 *physical health data*

	a. Likelihood of sharing mental health data			b. Likelihood of sharing physical health data		
	OR	95% CI	P value	OR	95% CI	P value
Model 1 (Effect of demographic factors; n = 1465)						
Gender						
Female	0.93	0.75 to 1.14	0.47	0.91	0.74 to 1.13	0.40
Other	0.85	0.35 to 2.05	0.72	0.92	0.38 to 2.25	0.86
Prefer not to say	0.62	0.18 to 2.09	0.44	0.48	0.14 to 1.63	0.24
Location						
Scotland	1.03	0.83 to 1.29	0.77	1.02	0.82 to 1.28	0.86
Wales	0.83	0.51 to 1.33	0.43	0.77	0.48 to 1.24	0.29
Northern Ireland	0.44	0.19 to 1.03	0.06	0.47	0.20 to 1.12	0.09
Outside UK	1.83	0.67 to 5.00	0.24	1.71	0.61 to 4.77	0.31
Ethnicity						
Black	0.74	0.36 to 1.49	0.39	0.75	0.37 to 1.53	0.43
Asian	0.99	0.56 to 1.75	0.97	1.1	0.62 to 1.96	0.75
Mixed/multiple	0.83	0.43 to 1.61	0.58	0.71	0.37 to 1.39	0.32
Other	1.11	0.37 to 3.32	0.86	0.73	0.24 to 2.19	0.57
Education						
Primary	0.8	0.32 to 1.99	0.64	0.67	0.27 to 1.64	0.38
GCSE	1.27	0.92 to 1.74	0.15	0.87	0.63 to 1.20	0.39
A-level	1.13	0.82 to 1.57	0.46	0.79	0.57 to 1.10	0.16
Vocational/college	0.84	0.62 to 1.13	0.25	0.62	0.46 to 0.84	0.002*
Undergraduate	0.96	0.74 to 1.24	0.75	0.85	0.66 to 1.10	0.22
Mental illness ever						
Yes	1.18	0.93 to 1.50	0.16	1.17	0.92 to 1.49	0.20
Prefer not to say	0.23	0.13 to 0.43	< .001*	0.25	0.14 to 0.47	< .001*
Physical illness ever						
Yes	1	0.81 to 1.25	0.99	0.96	0.77 to 1.20	0.73
Prefer not to say	0.99	0.22 to 4.42	0.99	1.26	0.28 to 5. 72	0.77
Paid						
Yes	0.73	0.45 to 1.21	0.22	0.7	0.42 to 1.15	0.16
Age	1	1.00 to 1.00	0.66	1	1.00 to 1.00	0.65
Rate mental health	1.11	1.00 to 1.24	0.05*	1.18	1.05 to 1.31	0.004*
Rate physical health	1.15	1.03 to 1.29	0.01*	1.13	1.01 to 1.27	0.03*
Model 2 (Effect of frequency of NHS use; n = 975)						
Frequent mental health care	1.17	0.85 to 1.62	0.33	1.04	0.75 to 1.44	0.81
Frequent physical health care	1.2	0.89 to 1.61	0.23	1.42	1.05 to 1.91	0.02*
Rate mental health	1.05	0.93 to 1.89	0.43	1.1	0.97 to 1.24	0.14
Rate physical health	1.18	1.04 to 1.34	0.01*	1.27	1.12 to 1.45	< .001*
Model 3 (Effect of mean NHS satisfaction; n = 1530)						
Mental illness ever						

Yes	1.30	1.02 to 1.62	0.03*
Prefer not to say	0.27	0.15 to 0.49	<.001*
Rate mental health	1.06	0.96 – 1.17	0.24
Rate physical health	1.10	1.00 – 1.21	0.06
Mean NHS satisfaction	1.26	1.14 to 1.39	<.001*
Model 4 (Effect of recency of NHS satisfaction; n = 480)			
NHS satisfaction – first contact MH	1.16	1.00 to 1.34	0.045*
NHS satisfaction – previous 12m MH	1.08	0.92 to 1.26	0.35
Rate mental health	0.99	0.83 to 1.19	0.93
Rate physical health	1.05	0.89 to 1.24	0.58

572 *Note:* Reference categories for categorical variables: gender – male, location – England, ethnicity –

573 White, highest education – postgraduate, mental illness ever – no, physical illness ever – no, paid –

574 no. OR = odds ratio, CI = confidence interval, * = p < .05.

587   **Table 3**

588   *Effect of mental health condition on likelihood of sharing mental health data*

	n	Likelihood of sharing mental health data		
		OR	95% CI	p value
Primary reported mental illness				
Depression	450	1.34	1.03 to 1.75	0.03*
Anxiety	352	1.21	0.91 to 1.59	0.18
Phobia	10	1.04	0.33 to 3.26	0.95
Eating disorder	29	1.23	0.61 to 2.47	0.57
Schizophrenia or psychosis	9	0.74	0.22 to 2.47	0.63
Obsessive-compulsive disorder	25	2.20	1.02 to 4.73	0.04*
Personality disorder	23	2.80	1.24 to 6.29	0.01*
Bipolar disorder	23	2.55	1.15 to 5.68	0.02*
Addiction or substance use disorder	26	1.19	0.57 to 2.45	0.64
Body dysmorphic disorder	3	1.04	0.13 to 8.11	0.97
Self-harm	9	0.94	0.28 to 3.14	0.93
Other	60	1.01	0.61 to 1.66	0.98
Mean NHS satisfaction		1.25	1.13 to 1.39	< .001*
Rate mental health		1.08	0.97 to 1.19	0.17
Rate physical health		1.09	0.98 to 1.20	0.10

590   *Note.* Reference category for primary reported mental illness was no mental illness (n = 456). OR =

591   odds ratio, CI = confidence interval, * = p < .05.

Percentage responding "yes"

	Mental health data	Physical health data
Ever had mental illness	90.9%	93.8%
Never had mental illness	92.4%	95.2%

■ Ever had mental illness ☒ Never had mental illness