

Australia's worsening mental health – what's next?

Joanne Enticott^{ab}, Shrinkhala Dawadi^{ab}, Frances Shawyer^a, Brett Inder^c, Ellie Fossey^d Helena Teede^b, Seb Rosenberg^{ef}, Ingrid Ozo^{ag}, Graham Meadows^{ah}

a Southern Synergy, Department of Psychiatry, Monash University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia.

b Monash Centre for Health Research and Implementation, Monash University, Clayton, VIC, Australia.

c Econometrics and Business Statistics, Monash Business School, Monash University, Clayton, VIC, Australia.

d Department of Occupational Therapy, Monash University-Peninsula Campus, Victoria, Australia

e Centre for Mental Health Research, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.

f Brain and Mind Centre, Sydney Medical School, University of Sydney, NSW, Australia.

g Mental Health at Work, VIC, Australia.

h Centre for Mental Health, School of Population and Global Health, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, VIC, Australia.

*Corresponding author during the review process: Joanne.enticott@monash.edu

*Corresponding author in published version: graham.meadows@monash.edu, Southern Synergy, Monash University, 126-128 Cleeland St, Dandenong, VIC 3175, Australia

Key words: Psychological distress, mental health services, prevalence, population measures

Abstract

Objectives: To examine trends in psychological distress in Australia between 2001 to 2017-18, including analysis by age, sex, and location.

Design, setting and participants: Secondary analysis of six successive national health surveys of representative samples of the working age population (18-64 years).

Main outcome measures: Prevalence of psychological distress at very-high symptom level (defined by a Kessler Psychological Distress Scale [K10] score of 30 or more) and combined high/very-high level (K10 score of 22 or more).

Results: The latest survey showed 5.1% of Australians reporting very-high level distress and 14.8% combined high/very-high level - both the largest rates recorded this century. The greatest increase from 2001 to 2017-18 was in women aged 55-64 with very-high distress significantly increasing from 3.5% (95% CI: 2.5-4.5%) to 7.2% (5.9-8.5%), and; high/very-high distress from 12.4% (10.5-14.2%) to 18.7% (16.7-20.7%). Men aged 25-34 had very-high distress increase from 2.1% (1.4-2.8) to 4.0% (2.9-5.1%); and combined high/very-high distress remained stable at 10.6% (9.1-12.1%) to 11.5% (9.7-13.3%). In 2017-18, greatest distress was in women aged 18-24 years (very-high 8.0% (5.9-10.2%); high/very-high 22.1% (18.8-25.3%)). Overall, distress was significantly more prevalent in inner regional Australia than elsewhere (very-high level 4.8% (4.4-5.1%); high/very-high 14.4% (13.8-15%)).

Conclusions: Australia's annual mental health expenditure over this period has doubled, yet population level psychological distress has increased. A whole of government approach and targeted strategies focusing on groups with the poorest mental health such as older working aged women, younger people, particularly women, and those outside of major cities are indicated.

Box with maximum 100 words (currently 100 words)

“The known” Previous examinations of national health surveys had suggested that population mental health was stable as measured by psychological distress.

“The new” Examining six consecutive national surveys we provide evidence that mental health has significantly deteriorated between 2001 and 2018. The latest survey showed 5.1% of Australians reporting very-high distress and 14.8% combined high/very-high distress, which are the largest rates reported this century.

“The implications” Whole of government approach and targeted strategies focusing on groups with the poorest mental health such as older working aged women, younger people particularly women, and those outside of major cities are indicated.

DECLARATIONS

Authors' contributions: JE and GM were responsible for the conception and design of the study. JE and SD were responsible for the acquisition of data, and analysis. All authors made contributions to all of the following: (1) the interpretation of data, (2) drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content, (3) approval of the version to be submitted.

Acknowledgement: This study was made possible by the high quality data collection conducted by the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

Funding: No funding to declare.

Disclosure of potential conflicts of interest: The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

1. Introduction

Health and mental health are influenced by many factors: social determinants link with gender, biological and environmental factors, health and other policies to influence mental health outcomes across the lifespan (1-3). When ill health occurs access to care varies in regional, rural and remote areas and across different communities (4-6). Even when it is accessible, variable educational attainment, income, social status and support, cultural and other factors influence personalised lifestyle and health behaviours, including care-seeking and engagement (3, 7). So mental illness prevalence, access and utilisation of mental health services can vary widely within subgroups.

The Australian National Health Survey (NHS), a regular and invaluable source of data on health and social determinants (8), includes the Kessler-10 (K-10) questionnaire (9). The K10 is a measure of psychological distress that includes anxiety and affective symptoms. High (22-29), and very-high (30-50) K10 band scores are strongly associated with anxiety and affective disorders (9). So regular NHS collection of K10 data enables surveillance of mental disorder trends in the Australian population.

Federal and state governments in Australia have more than doubled constant-dollar per-capita mental health services expenditure since 1992 (4). Around 11% of Australian adults use some mental health service annually (10). If this care was effective, equitably reaching those at greater risk and need, and assuming other influences were stable, improvement would be anticipated. But up to 2014, noting that whole-of-population NHS-K10 trend comparisons may obscure subgroup changes, population NHS K10 scores remained relatively unchanged (4, 11, 12), increasing recently in youth (13). Many other social determinants of health (1) have not in fact been stable, including increasing inequities of income and wealth (14). Concern has been voiced regarding Australia's mental health service delivery system quality and effectiveness, (eg (12, 13)), service delivery inequity, and possibly forms of iatrogenesis (5).

Building from previous work (11-13), here we examine prevalence of psychological distress in Australia between 2001 and 2018, exploring subgroups by age, gender and location and consider the policy implications arising.

2. Methods

2.1. Design

This study was a large-scale secondary analysis (n=78, 204) of K10 data from six national data sources collected from working aged Australian adults across the National Health Surveys (NHS) (2001-02, 2004-05, 2007-08, 2011-12, 2014-15, 2017-18), collected by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. We analysed responses from adults aged 18-64 years in each survey, except for the 2004-05 NHS as data was only available for adults aged 20-64 years. We standardised all surveys to the 2001 Australian census population based on the strata of sex and age (15). Elevated psychological distress were calculated, and compared across sex as available in the NHS.

National health surveys

The NHS are cross-sectional household-based surveys undertaken at 3-year intervals to monitor health trends over time with detailed methods described elsewhere (8). Trained ABS interviewers conducted face-to-face interviews in each survey. Household and person weights are assigned by the ABS to adjust for the probability of sample selection, seasonality and non-response, and the data are then calibrated to the population benchmarks. This ensures that the estimates are representative of population distributions and compensates for any over- or under-representation of particular categories of persons or households.

Psychological distress measure

The K10, a self-administered 10-item Likert scale tool, measures current psychological distress, particularly symptoms of anxiety and depressive disorders (9). Used in ordinal form, band scores are closely associated with mental health disorders (9). K10 scores range between 10 and 50, and score bands are: low (10–15), moderate (16–21), high (22–29) and very-high (30–50). Here we also generated a combined high/very-high category, which consisted of scores 22 and higher.

Geographic location

A residential location variable for each survey participant is available and based on the Accessibility and Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA+) (8). It describes the residential location as Major cities of Australia, Inner Regional Australia or Other.

Data analysis

All statistical analyses were performed in Stata 16.0 (StataCorp). When not stratified by age, data were directly age-standardised against the estimated resident population of Australia at 30 June 2001 (15). Effect size estimates for dichotomous outcomes of combined high/very-high and very-high psychological distress are presented as odds ratios calculated using logistic regression on the K10 data from the Australian working age population. Independent variables examined first in a univariate regression with the outcome, then in a multivariable regression, were: year, sex, age-group and location. All independent variables were specified as categorical, including the ‘year’ variable because prevalence changes over time was not linear. For time trend examinations the reference year was 2001. Level of significance for the regressions was set at an alpha of 0.05.

Comparing 2001 and 2017-18 data: Pairwise comparisons using tests for two proportions and a Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons was applied. Given that twelve sub-group comparisons were planned (see Table 2), to minimise the occurrences of spurious positives, the alpha value was set at 0.0042 (i.e., approx. 0.05/12) for these set of pairwise comparisons.

Ethics approval

As is common practice for the ABS, data collection occurred under the auspices of the Census and Statistics Act 1905, and the analyses were approved by both the Australian Parliament and the Privacy Commissioner.

3. Results

In the six national surveys between 2001 and 2017-18 there were n=78,204 surveys completed by working age adults producing K10 distress data, see Table 1. Figure 1 shows that the greatest distress occurred in the latest survey at 2017-18: for combined high/very-high level distress the 14.8% rate was significantly greater than all previous years ($p < 0.001$), and; for very-high level distress the 5.1% rate was significantly greater than 2001, 2004, 2007 & 2011 ($p < 0.01$).

For very-high distress, the lowest rate appeared to be 3.6% (95% Confidence Interval: 3.3-3.9) in 2007; however, confidence intervals (CI's) overlapped with all other years except 2017-18, where rates appeared significantly greater at 5.1% (95% CI: 4.7-5.5). Multivariable regression confirmed similar rates of very-high distress across 2001, 2004, 2007, 2011 and

2014; and a greater rate in 2017-18 [odds ratios (OR) 1.24, 95% CI: 1.11 to 1.39] compared to 2001, see Table 4.

For combined high/very-high distress the 2001 rate was 13.2% (95% CI: 12.6-13.9), with lower rates but overlapping CIs for all years, except 2017-2018 where rates were greater at 14.8% (95% CI: 14.2-15.5), see Table 1. Multivariable regression confirmed that compared to 2001, the 2007, 2011 and 2014 rates were significantly lower with ORs of 0.92 (95% CI: 0.86-0.98), 0.81 (95% CI: 0.76-0.88) and 0.91 (95% CI: 0.85-0.98) respectively, whilst in 2017-18 rates were greater (ORs 1.08, 95% CI: 1.01 to 1.15), see Table 5.

In analysis by gender, very-high distress was more prevalent in women at 5.2% (95% CI: 5.0-5.4) compared to men at 3.3% (95% CI: 3.1-3.5). Combined high/very-high distress was also more prevalent in women at 16.1% (95% CI: 15.7-16.4) compared to men at 10.9% (95% CI: 10.6-13.9). Multivariable regression confirmed that women had greater odds for very-high distress (OR 1.56, 95% CI: 1.45 to 1.67) and for combined high/very-high distress (OR 1.54, 95% CI: 1.47 to 1.60), compared to men, see Tables 1 and 5.

In analysis by age groups, very-high distress rates ranged between 3.6% (95% CI: 3.3-3.8) in those aged 25-34 years to 5.4% (95% CI: 5.1-5.7) in 45-54 years. Multivariable regression showed that only the 45-54 age group had significantly greater odds for very-high distress (OR 1.56, 95% CI: 1.45 to 1.67) compared to the youngest group at 4.1% (95% CI: 3.6-4.5). Prevalence of combined high/very-high distress was greatest in those aged 18-24 years at 15.8% (95% CI: 15.0-16.6). Multivariable regression confirmed that all other age-groups had significantly lower rates than those aged 18-24 years with an OR of 0.77 (95% CI: 0.72-0.83), 0.79 (95% CI: 0.73-0.85), 0.86 (95% CI: 0.80-0.93) and 0.79 (95% CI: 0.73-0.85) for 15-34, 35-44, 45-54 and 55-64 years respectively.

Subgroup breakdowns for each survey by gender and age are in Table 2. The most marked increase in psychological distress between 2001 and 2017 is seen in women aged 55-64 years old, with very-high distress in 2001 at 3.5% (95% CI: 2.5-4.56) up to 7.2% (95% CI: 5.9-8.5%) in 2017. This doubling of prevalence was highly significant with a difference of 3.7% ($z = 4.10$, $p < 0.0001$). Combined high/very-high distress also significantly increased from 12.4% (95% CI: 10.5-14.2%) in 2001 to 18.7 (95% CI: 16.7-20.7%) in 2017. This increase of prevalence was highly significant with a difference of 6.4 ($z = 4.51$, $p < 0.0001$). Another almost doubling of combined high/very-high distress between 2001 and 2017 is seen in men aged 25-34 years old, with very-high distress in 2001 at 2.1% (95% CI: 1.4-2.8) up to 4.0%

(95% CI: 2.9-5.1%) in 2017, which was also significant with a difference of 1.9% ($z = 2.87$, $p=0.002$).

In terms of geographical location, very-high distress was more prevalent in those residing in inner regional areas at 4.8% (95% CI: 4.4-5.1) compared to major cities at 4.1% (95% CI: 3.9-4.3). Combined high/very-high distress was also more prevalent in inner regional areas at 14.4% (95% CI: 13.8-15.0) compared to major cities at 13.1% (95% CI: 12.8-13.4).

Multivariable regression confirmed that those in inner regional areas had greater odds for very-high distress (OR 1.16, 95% CI: 1.06 to 1.26) compared to capital cities; and greater odds for combined high/very-high distress (OR 1.11, 95% CI: 1.05 to 1.17) compared to capital cities, see Tables 2 and 5.

4. Discussion

Key trend findings

The latest NHS reveals the highest estimates for very-high distress rates in Australia this century, at 5.1%. Relatively, there has been an increase of 34% since 2001; a modest rate of decline in the late 2000s was unsustainable. Rates and changes vary between subgroups: very-high distress in women aged 55-64 has doubled this century so far, a highly significant and concerning finding. Very-high distress also increased in males, significantly in the age group 25-34. Overall, distress is greatest in women aged 18-24 years. Considering location, very-high distress is somewhat more common in inner regional Australia than elsewhere.

Given the decade 2008-2017 included major mental-health developments such as the Better Access initiative (12), we might have hoped for better population outcomes. Instead, these years – and the rest of this century to date before the COVID-19 pandemic - as measured using psychological distress in national surveys have seen the mental health of Australians get appreciably worse.

Why this happened bears investigation. A lack of data precludes analysis of service quality (10). Considering key influences on healthcare utilisation (16), candidate environmental causes which may have contributed to this include the concern that rising inequity may have driven up prevalence (5). Wealth inequity increased in Australia between 2003 and 2016, with the most affluent financial quintile experiencing a 53% increase in wealth, and the poorest, a 9% decline (14).

For women in the 55-64 age group, income stress may often be significant - among other stresses - due to structural and occupational factors such as impacts of divorce, gender pay gap, and insecure work (17). Women in this age group are more likely to be at risk of poverty and homelessness in Australia (18). Greater socioeconomic disadvantage of area (5, 19) and lower personal income (20) are associated with 2-3 fold increased prevalence of mental health issues, so these influences may be contributing to the findings here regarding increasing psychological distress in this demographic group (19). Income stress may further compromise access healthcare services which require co-payments. Services may be particularly deficient in response to key influences on mental health in this group including family violence (21).

For the first time we find significantly greater psychological distress among Australians residing in inner regional Australia compared to elsewhere. Many such areas have greater socioeconomic disadvantage and proportionally much lower mental health care use (6). In addition to understanding social determinants operating in these areas and responding to these, addressing disparities in mental healthcare outside major cities should be a priority. The recent Federal Budget provided welcome continuation for popular telehealth services, though only until December 2021

Limitations

These data sources pre-date the COVID-19 pandemic. The impacts of COVID-19 are significant and mental health impacts have been reported to be greater in women. We note that further subgroup examination may add to our understanding of operation of other social determinants but is beyond the scope of this paper. For the NHS done to date, remote areas are out of scope. Forthcoming detailed mental health surveys will apply more specifically valid diagnostic instruments (22).

Broad policy implications

Why have enhanced mental health services so far not achieved gains for the community when measured as a whole (5)? Why is psychological distress increasing in prevalence? Repeated inquiries have found that Australia's mental health system is hard to navigate (23). Poor articulation of responsibilities between different levels of government have permitted the evolution of a proliferation of service structures (10, 23). There is a lack of equity in access and poor continuity of care. Comprehensive, recovery-oriented and person-centred care is very rare (5). Even recent budget announcements only go part way to bridging the gap

between the level of funding and the burden of disease for which mental illness is responsible (24).

In this context, resources for mental health care are very precious and cannot be wasted. They should be carefully directed to where it they are needed most, and to whom, including with attention to equity in service provision, then to delivery of acceptable and effective kinds of help.

As we aspire to improve mental health services, and improve population mental health in an equitable way (24), we need to understand and address root causes. If inequity or other social or economic conditions are driving prevalence up, then we need models that quantify this. Perhaps such influences are so powerful that mental health services cannot reasonably be expected to influence prevalence. Effective actions must instead model broader cooperation across a mental health ‘ecosystem’, in economic, housing, educational, employment and other policy spheres across portfolios and governments. Modelling also may inform how mental health services may be adapted to achieve better outcomes for more people and influence prevalence even against such adverse conditions. We already have the expertise and tools in Australia to do the modelling that could inform such direction setting (5, 25).

This is perhaps Australia’s greatest challenge in mental health reform now, beyond the usual calls for political will and more funding. It is that we must abandon the planning strategies of the past in favour of a new and more sophisticated approach. Informed by contemporary modelling and paying particular attention to equitable implementation of evidence-based care, treatment and recovery support, we should be seeking to set and implement a broad and bold agenda, one that could provide all Australians with enjoyment of the greatest attainable standard of mental health.

Figures

Figure 1: Age-standardised prevalence of psychological distress in the Australian working age population, 2001-2017. ^a Standardised to 2001 Australian Census. Derived from a total of n=78,204 survey participants aged 18-64 years.

**Rate at 2017 significantly greater than all previous years (p<0.001).

* Rate in 2017 significantly greater than 2001, 2004, 2007 & 2011 (p<0.01).





Figure 2. Effect size estimates of psychological distress in the Australian working age population, 2001-2017. Derived using logistic regression on K10 data from n=78,204 adults.



Tables

Table 3: Age-standardised prevalence of psychological distress in the Australian working age population, 2001-2017. ^a Standardised to 2001 Australian Census. Derived from a total of n=78,204 survey participants aged 18-64 years.

	K10 very-high				K10 combined high/very-high			
	n	Standardised Rate ^a	95%	CI	n	Standardised Rate ^a	95%	CI
Age Group								
18 - 24	7846	4.05%	3.62%	4.49%	7846	15.75%	14.95%	16.56%
25 - 34	17292	3.55%	3.27%	3.82%	17292	12.78%	12.28%	13.28%
35 - 44	19874	3.97%	3.69%	4.24%	19874	12.99%	12.52%	13.46%
45 - 54	17742	5.39%	5.05%	5.72%	17742	14.00%	13.49%	14.51%
55 - 64	15470	4.53%	4.20%	4.85%	15470	12.96%	12.43%	13.49%
Location^a								
Major cities	51289	4.09%	3.92%	4.27%	51289	13.13%	12.83%	13.43%
Inner regional	15073	4.75%	4.40%	5.10%	15073	14.42%	13.83%	15.00%
Other	11862	4.24%	3.87%	4.61%	11862	13.66%	13.01%	14.30%
Sex^a								
Male	36809	3.30%	3.12%	3.49%	36809	10.90%	10.57%	11.22%
Female	41415	5.18%	4.96%	5.41%	41415	16.05%	15.68%	16.42%
Male and Year^a								
2001	6797	3.01%	2.60%	3.41%	6797	10.86%	10.11%	11.61%
2004	7135	3.27%	2.86%	3.69%	7135	11.33%	10.57%	12.08%
2007	6095	2.87%	2.46%	3.28%	6095	10.29%	9.52%	11.06%
2011	5871	3.08%	2.63%	3.52%	5871	9.54%	8.77%	10.31%
2014	5197	3.43%	2.92%	3.93%	5197	10.35%	9.50%	11.19%
2017	5714	4.19%	3.66%	4.72%	5714	12.57%	11.68%	13.46%
Female and Year^a								
2001	7844	5.19%	4.69%	5.69%	7844	17.00%	16.15%	17.84%
2004	8033	5.02%	4.54%	5.50%	8033	16.73%	15.89%	17.58%
2007	6509	4.59%	4.08%	5.11%	6509	15.33%	14.44%	16.23%
2011	6461	4.61%	4.09%	5.13%	6461	13.72%	12.85%	14.58%
2014	6099	5.43%	4.85%	6.02%	6099	15.50%	14.55%	16.44%
2017	6469	5.90%	5.31%	6.50%	6469	16.97%	16.03%	17.92%

Table 4: Prevalence of psychological distress by sex and age-groups over time.

	K10 very-high				K10 combined high/very-high			
	n	Rate	95%	CI	n	Rate	95%	CI
<i>Males aged 18-24 years</i>								
2001	759	2.64%	1.50%	3.77%	759	11.07%	8.84%	13.30%
2004	622	2.25%	1.09%	3.42%	622	11.25%	8.77%	13.74%
2007	684	1.02%	0.27%	1.78%	684	7.31%	5.36%	9.26%
2011	626	2.72%	1.44%	3.99%	626	10.86%	8.43%	13.30%
2014	560	3.93%	2.32%	5.54%	560	11.61%	8.95%	14.26%
2017	562	3.91%	2.31%	5.52%	562	15.30%	12.33%	18.28%
<i>Males aged 25-34 years</i>								
2001	1555	2.12%	1.41%	2.84%	1555	10.61%	9.08%	12.14%
2004	1569	2.55%	1.77%	3.33%	1569	9.82%	8.34%	11.29%
2007	1224	2.29%	1.45%	3.13%	1224	10.54%	8.82%	12.26%
2011	1231	2.11%	1.31%	2.92%	1231	9.10%	7.49%	10.70%
2014	1106	2.98%	1.98%	3.99%	1106	9.40%	7.68%	11.12%
2017	1205	3.98%	2.88%	5.09%	1205	11.45%	9.65%	13.25%
<i>Males aged 35-44 years</i>								
2001	1888	2.81%	2.06%	3.55%	1888	10.43%	9.06%	11.81%
2004	1865	3.65%	2.80%	4.50%	1865	12.06%	10.59%	13.54%
2007	1553	2.96%	2.12%	3.81%	1553	9.98%	8.49%	11.47%
2011	1427	3.15%	2.25%	4.06%	1427	9.46%	7.94%	10.98%
2014	1253	3.19%	2.22%	4.17%	1253	10.69%	8.98%	12.41%
2017	1307	3.21%	2.26%	4.17%	1307	10.64%	8.96%	12.31%
<i>Males aged 45-54 years</i>								
2001	1544	4.02%	3.04%	4.99%	1544	11.53%	9.94%	13.12%
2004	1670	3.95%	3.02%	4.89%	1670	12.16%	10.59%	13.72%
2007	1395	4.16%	3.11%	5.21%	1395	11.47%	9.80%	13.14%
2011	1353	3.55%	2.56%	4.53%	1353	9.16%	7.63%	10.70%
2014	1164	3.95%	2.83%	5.07%	1164	10.91%	9.12%	12.70%
2017	1330	5.11%	3.93%	6.30%	1330	13.08%	11.27%	14.90%
<i>Males aged 55-64 years</i>								
2001	1051	3.62%	2.49%	4.74%	1051	10.75%	8.88%	12.62%
2004	1409	3.83%	2.83%	4.83%	1409	11.36%	9.70%	13.01%
2007	1239	3.63%	2.59%	4.67%	1239	11.70%	9.91%	13.49%
2011	1234	4.13%	3.02%	5.24%	1234	9.56%	7.92%	11.20%
2014	1114	3.23%	2.19%	4.27%	1114	9.16%	7.46%	10.85%
2017	1310	5.04%	3.85%	6.22%	1310	13.89%	12.02%	15.77%
<i>Females aged 18-24 years</i>								
2001	869	5.64%	4.11%	7.17%	869	23.02%	20.22%	25.81%
2004	708	3.25%	1.94%	4.55%	708	19.63%	16.71%	22.56%
2007	679	4.71%	3.12%	6.31%	679	18.41%	15.49%	21.32%
2011	600	4.00%	2.43%	5.57%	600	15.50%	12.60%	18.40%
2014	565	6.90%	4.81%	8.99%	565	21.42%	18.03%	24.80%
2017	612	8.01%	5.86%	10.16%	612	22.06%	18.77%	25.34%
<i>Females aged 25-34 years</i>								
2001	1924	5.35%	4.35%	6.36%	1924	17.15%	15.47%	18.84%
2004	1802	4.50%	3.54%	5.45%	1802	16.04%	14.34%	17.73%
2007	1442	3.88%	2.89%	4.88%	1442	14.36%	12.55%	16.16%
2011	1483	3.51%	2.57%	4.44%	1483	13.01%	11.30%	14.73%
2014	1380	3.91%	2.89%	4.94%	1380	13.12%	11.33%	14.90%
2017	1371	4.30%	3.23%	5.38%	1371	15.17%	13.27%	17.07%
<i>Females aged 35-44 years</i>								
2001	2172	4.65%	3.76%	5.54%	2172	16.44%	14.88%	18.00%
2004	2148	5.49%	4.53%	6.46%	2148	17.32%	15.72%	18.92%

2007	1666	4.44%	3.45%	5.43%	1666	14.83%	13.12%	16.53%
2011	1548	4.07%	3.09%	5.05%	1548	12.73%	11.07%	14.39%
2014	1510	4.57%	3.52%	5.62%	1510	13.64%	11.91%	15.37%
2017	1537	4.49%	3.45%	5.52%	1537	14.12%	12.38%	15.86%
<i>Females aged 45-54 years</i>								
2001	1664	6.43%	5.25%	7.61%	1664	16.53%	14.74%	18.31%
2004	1839	6.58%	5.45%	7.71%	1839	16.53%	14.83%	18.23%
2007	1451	5.58%	4.40%	6.76%	1451	15.78%	13.91%	17.66%
2011	1507	7.03%	5.74%	8.32%	1507	14.86%	13.07%	16.66%
2014	1355	6.64%	5.32%	7.97%	1355	16.75%	14.76%	18.74%
2017	1470	6.94%	5.64%	8.24%	1470	17.48%	15.54%	19.42%
<i>Females aged 55-64 years</i>								
2001	1215	3.54%	2.50%	4.58%	1215	12.35%	10.50%	14.20%
2004	1536	4.56%	3.51%	5.60%	1536	14.26%	12.51%	16.01%
2007	1271	4.41%	3.28%	5.53%	1271	14.00%	12.10%	15.91%
2011	1323	4.31%	3.21%	5.40%	1323	13.00%	11.19%	14.81%
2014	1289	6.05%	4.75%	7.35%	1289	14.58%	12.66%	16.51%
2017	1479	7.17%	5.85%	8.48%	1479	18.73%	16.74%	20.72%

Table 5. Two-sample comparisons of psychological distress rates in 2001 and 2017/19. Positive differences indicate an increase in prevalence in 2017/18 compared to 2001. Given that twelve sub-group comparisons were planned (see Table 2), to minimise the occurrences of spurious positives, the alpha value was set at 0.0042.

	K10 very-high				K10 combined high/very-high			
	difference	p-value	95%	CI	difference	p-value	95%	CI
<i>Male</i>	1.09	0.001*	0.43	1.75	1.71	0.004*	0.55	2.87
<i>Female</i>	0.71	0.067	-0.05	1.47	0.03	0.963	-1.23	1.29
<i>Male</i>								
18 - 24	1.27	0.045	0.03	2.51	4.23	0.023	0.57	7.89
25 - 34	1.86	0.003*	0.62	3.10	0.84	0.925	-16.59	18.27
35 - 44	0.40	0.505	-0.77	1.58	0.21	0.957	-26.59	28.27
45 - 54	1.09	0.160	-0.43	2.61	1.15	0.179	-0.72	3.81
55 - 64	1.42	0.090	-0.22	3.06	3.14	0.022	0.449	5.83
<i>Female</i>								
18 - 24	2.37	0.252	-1.70	6.44	-0.96	0.655	-5.06	3.14
25 - 34	-1.05	0.149	-2.48	0.379	-1.98	0.133	-4.57	0.61
35 - 44	-0.16	0.826	-1.59	1.27	-2.32	0.047	-4.61	-0.03
45 - 54	0.51	0.995	-183.5	183.4	0.95	0.462	-1.59	3.49
55 - 64	3.63	<0.0001*	1.94	5.32	6.35	<0.0001*	3.45	9.33

References

1. Burke S, Enticott J, Isaacs A, Meadows G, Rosenberg S. Critical environmental and social determinants of mental health problems and their care. In: Meadows G, Rosenstein S, McDermott F, Fossey E, Farhall J, editors. *Mental Health and Collaborative Community Practice: An Australian Perspective*. 4th ed. Melbourne: Oxford University Press; 2020. p. 30-50.
2. Marmot M, Allen J, Bell R, Bloomer E, Goldblatt P, Consortium for the European Review of Social Determinants of H, et al. WHO European review of social determinants of health and the health divide. *Lancet*. 2012;380(9846):1011-29.
3. Sex, Gender Sensitive Research Call to Action G, Wainer Z, Carcel C. Sex and gender in health research: updating policy to reflect evidence. *Med J Aust*. 2020;212(2):57-62 e1.
4. Meadows G, Enticott J, Rosenberg S. Three charts on: why rates of mental illness aren't going down despite higher spending. *The Conversation* 2018.
5. Meadows GN, Prodan A, Patten S, Shawyer F, Francis S, Enticott J, et al. Resolving the paradox of increased mental health expenditure and stable prevalence. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*. 2019;53(9):844-50.
6. Meadows G, Enticott J, Inder B, Russell G, Gurr R. Better access to mental health care and the failure of the Medicare principle of universality. *Medical Journal of Australia*. 2015;202(4):190-5.
7. World Health Organization. Determinants of health 2017 [cited 2021 13 May, 2021]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/news-room/q-a-detail/determinants-of-health>.
8. Australian Bureau of Statistics. About the National Health Survey: Australian Government; 2018 [cited 2021 13 May]. Available from: <https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/health/health-conditions-and-risks/national-health-survey-first-results/latest-release#about-the-national-health-survey>.
9. Andrews G, Slade T. Interpreting scores on the Kessler Psychological Distress Scale (K10). *Aust N Z J Public Health*. 2001;25(6):494-7.
10. Productivity Commission 2020. *Mental Health*, Report no. 95, Canberra. 2020.
11. Harvey SB, Deady M, Wang MJ, Mykletun A, Butterworth P, Christensen H, et al. Is the prevalence of mental illness increasing in Australia? Evidence from national health surveys and administrative data, 2001–2014. *Med J Aust*. 2017;206(11):490-3.
12. Jorm AF. Australia's 'Better Access' scheme: Has it had an impact on population mental health? *Aust N Z J Psychiatry*. 2018;52(11):1057-62.
13. Jorm AF, Kitchener BA. Increases in youth mental health services in Australia: Have they had an impact on youth population mental health? *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*. 2021;5(5):476-84.

14. Davidson P, Bradbury B, Wong M, Hill T. Inequality in Australia, Part 1: Overview. Sydney: Australian Council of Social Service and UNSW (Sydney). 2020.
15. FEATURE ARTICLE: WHICH POPULATION TO USE FOR AGE STANDARDISATION? CANBERRA: Australian Bureau of Statistics; 2013 [Available from: <https://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Previousproducts/3101.0Feature%20Article1Mar%202013?open=document&tabname=Summary&prodno=3101.0&issue=Mar%202013&num=&view=>].
16. Andersen RM. Revisiting the Behavioral Model and Access to Medical Care: Does it Matter? *J Health Soc Behav.* 1995;36(1):1-10.
17. Boyle J, Garad R, Teede H. There's a fundamental need to reverse the 'pink recession' Melbourne: Monash University; 2020 [cited 2021 13 May]. Available from: <https://lens.monash.edu/@rhonda-garad/2020/12/14/1381848/theres-a-fundamental-need-to-reverse-the-pink-recession>.
18. Older Women's Risk of Homelessness: Background Paper 2019. Sydney; 2019. Report No.: ISBN: 978-1-925917-01-7.
19. Enticott JC, Meadows GN, Shawyer F, Inder B, Pattern S. Mental disorders and distress: Associations with demographics, remoteness and socioeconomic deprivation of area of residence across Australia. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry.* 2016;50(12):1169-79.
20. Isaacs AN, Enticott J, Meadows G, Inder B. Lower Income Levels in Australia Are Strongly Associated With Elevated Psychological Distress: Implications for Healthcare and Other Policy Areas. *Frontiers in Psychiatry.* 2018;9(356).
21. Soh HJ, Grigg J, Gurvich C, Gavrilidis E, Kulkarni J. Family Violence: An Insight Into Perspectives and Practices of Australian Health Practitioners. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence.* 2021;36(5-6):NP2391-NP409.
22. Australian Government. Intergenerational Health and Mental Health Study Canberra, Australia 2020 [Available from: <https://www.health.gov.au/initiatives-and-programs/intergenerational-health-and-mental-health-study>].
23. State of Victoria. Royal Commission into Victoria's Mental Health System, Final Report, Summary and recommendations, Parl Paper No. 202 Session 2018-21. Melbourne Victoria, Services DoHaH; 2021.
24. United Nations. Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Right of Everyone to the Enjoyment of the Highest Attainable Standard of Physical and Mental Health. United Nations Digital Library; 2017.
25. Whiteford H, Diminic S, Gossip K, Rutherford Z. National Mental Health Systems Modelling Network 2021 [Available from: <https://qcmhr.org/research/research-streams/policy-and-epidemiology-research-stream/mental-health-services-research/national-mental-health-systems-modelling-network/>].