Social Science & Medicine 81 (2013) 110-114

ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at SciVerse ScienceDirect

Social Science & Medicine



Short report

Mental health of those directly exposed to the World Trade Center disaster: Unmet mental health care need, mental health treatment service use, and quality of life

Robert M. Brackbill^{a,*}, Steven D. Stellman^{a,b}, Sharon E. Perlman^a, Deborah J. Walker^a, Mark R. Farfel^a

^a New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, World Trade Center Health Registry, 2 Gotham Center, 42-09 28th Street, 7th Floor, Queens, NY 11101, USA ^b Department of Epidemiology, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University, NY, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Available online 3 January 2013

Keywords: WTC disaster Unmet mental health care need Health related quality of life Mental health service use Multinomial logistic regression

ABSTRACT

Mental health service utilization several years following a man-made or natural disaster can be lower than expected, despite a high prevalence of mental health disorders among those exposed. This study focused on factors associated with subjective unmet mental health care need (UMHCN) and its relationship to a combination of diagnostic history and current mental health symptoms, 5–6 years after the 9-11-01 World Trade Center (WTC) disaster in New York City, USA. Two survey waves of the WTC Health Registry, after exclusions, provided a sample of 36,625 enrollees for this analysis. Important differences were found among enrollees who were categorized according to the presence or absence of a self-reported mental health diagnosis and symptoms indicative of post-traumatic stress disorder or serious psychological distress. Persons with diagnoses and symptoms had the highest levels of UMHCN, poor mental health days, and mental health service use. Those with symptoms only were a vulnerable group much less likely to use mental health services include recognizing that many persons with undiagnosed but symptomatic mental health symptoms are not using mental health services, despite having perceived need for mental health care.

© 2012 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

SOCIAI

Introduction

Disasters such as the 1986 Chernobyl accident and 2001 attack on the World Trade Center (WTC) have documented long-term physical and mental health effects (Bromet, Havenaar, & Guey, 2011; Brackbill et al., 2009). In particular, the prevalence of stress disorders among Chernobyl clean-up workers remained high at 44% eight years after the event (Viel et al., 1997), as did post-traumatic stress symptom prevalence (23%) among directly exposed WTC disaster survivors up to six years after 9-11 (Brackbill et al., 2009). High prevalence of these illnesses years after a disaster translate into individual suffering and societal burden manifested by negative collateral effects on community and family intimacy as well as economic loss due to absence of income and treatment costs (Riggs, Byrne, Weathers, & Litz, 1998).

Although their effectiveness is unclear, early mental health interventions are usually implemented soon after disasters (Gray, Shira, & Litz, 2004). Following the 9-11 WTC disaster, public and

* Corresponding author. E-mail address: rbrackbi@health.nyc.gov (R.M. Brackbill). privately financed post-disaster mental health programs were implemented ranging from on-site crisis counseling to screening, referral and reimbursement systems (Felton, 2002). Despite this, large numbers of individuals did not avail themselves of these services (Stuber, Galea, Boscarino, & Schlesinger, 2006). In fact, immediate post 9-11 use of mental health services was surprisingly small as evidenced by a declining number of claims experienced between 9-11 and the first quarter of 2002 by one insurer of over 2 million New York City (NYC) residents (Green et al., 2006).

Given the high prevalence of persistent psychopathology five or more years after 9-11, it is important to understand the relationship between perceived need, quality of life, and healthcare utilization especially when it is frequently observed that people with mental health symptoms delay treatment (Wang et al., 2005) and that a majority of persons who have symptoms, do not seek help and have diminished functioning (Stuber et al., 2006). Perceived need or subjective unmet mental health care need (UMHCN) is a construct for measuring either choosing care but not receiving it because of financial or other barriers, or else not receiving expected care (Allin, Grignon, & Le Grand, 2010). Contrary to what might be expected, a cross-sectional Canadian population survey of perceived mental health care needs found that having a diagnosed

^{0277-9536/\$ –} see front matter @ 2012 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.12.016

mental health condition (e.g. depression, anxiety disorder, PTSD) and using mental health services were the strongest predictors of reporting an UMHCN (Nelson & Park, 2006). Prior studies have not evaluated how the presence of mental health disorder symptoms influence the perception of need, service use, and quality of life among those at risk for such disorders.

We use data from the World Trade Center Health Registry cohort to assess UMHCN post WTC disaster, in a population with a high prevalence of mental health symptoms 5–6 years after the event. We have two objectives. First, we describe the prevalence and predictors of UMHCN by demographics, social support level, WTC disaster exposure, quality of life, mental health status, and mental health service use. Second, to identify groups at risk of greater need and diminished quality of life, we evaluated the association between UMHCN and quality of life, mental health service use, social support, and 9-11 exposure with mental health status, defined by a combination of diagnosis status and presence or absence of current symptoms.

Methods

Study population

The Registry located in the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene is a cohort study of 71,434 enrollees that prospectively monitors the physical and mental health of populations with reported exposure to the September 11 WTC attack and its aftermath. The present analysis is restricted to 46,226 persons who completed both an intake interview on enrollment in 2003–04 (Wave 1) and a follow-up questionnaire in 2006–07 (Wave 2) as described in detail elsewhere (Brackbill et al., 2009; Farfel, Digrande, Brackbill, Prann, Cone, Friedman, et al., 2008). Wave 1 provided data on gender, race/ethnicity, household income, exposure, and eligibility group membership. Data on perceived unmet health care needs, and other covariates such as social support, marital status, and current symptoms of PTSD and serious psychological distress (SPD) were obtained at Wave 2.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the New York City (NYC) Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DOHMH) institutional review boards approved the study protocol.

Measures

A detailed description of study measures is available in the electronic Appendix A

Unmet mental health care need (UMHCN) is defined as a response of not receiving needed "mental health care or counseling" during the last 12 months.

Socio-demographic variables included gender, age at Wave 2 interview, race/ethnicity, household income at Wave 1, and marital status.

WTC disaster exposure was the sum of twelve experiences grouped as none/low (0-1 experiences), medium (2-3), high (4-5), and very high (6 or more) consistent with Adams's definition (Adams & Boscarino, 2006).

Social support had four categories: none, 1 to 2 sources, 3 sources, and 4 or more sources of support.

Probable Post-traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) was assessed with a 9-11 specific PTSD Checklist (PCL), a validated measure (McDonald & Calhoun). A cut-off score of 44 or greater indicated probable PTSD (McDonald & Calhoun, 2010).

Serious Psychological Distress (SPD) was based on the K6 scale, a psychometrically validated epidemiologic measure, using a cut-

off score of 13 (Kessler, Barker, Colpe, Epstein, Gfroerer, Hiripi, et al., 2003).

Mental health status was categorized based on having or not having a previously reported mental health diagnosis or symptoms indicative of PTSD or SPD. The categories were: diagnosed with current symptoms (D+S+); undiagnosed with current symptoms (D–S+); diagnosed but with no current symptoms (D+S–), and neither (D–S–). Diagnosed mental health conditions included generalized anxiety, probable PTSD, and depression with reported year of diagnosis between September 11, 2001 and December 31, 2005, so that diagnosis occurred before the assessed period of need and use of services (2006–2007).

Poor mental health days was defined as self-report of 14 or more days of poor mental health in the past 30 days, using the health related quality of life measure (Zahran, et al., 2005).

Any mental health service was considered to be an enrollee report of any mental health counseling, medication, or both in the preceding 12 months.

Data analysis

The final sample was 36,625 after excluding persons who reported a physician diagnosis of depression, anxiety, or PTSD prior to 9-11 (n = 3819), a diagnosis of depression, anxiety, or PTSD in 2006–2007 (n = 833), or were missing data for PTSD checklist or K6 (SPD screen) at Wave 1 or Wave 2 (n = 4949).

The first objective addressed UMHCN prevalence by demographic variables, social support, mental health status, 9-11 WTC disaster exposure, and mental health service using logistic regression to estimate adjusted odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals for the association of these characteristics with UMHCN.

The second objective involved multinomial logistic regression using mental health status categories (D+S+, D-S+, D+S-, D-S-[reference]) as multiple outcome levels. This technique is used when the dependent variable is categorical with more than two levels. It can simultaneously fit all levels of the dependent variable to provide estimated odds ratios. There are thus two implicit references in this type of analysis, one is a specified level of the categorical dependent variable (e.g. D-S-) and the other is the reference for the independent variable such as UMHCN relative to its reference (no UMNCN) (see Hosmer and Lemeshow, 2004).

All analyses were conducted using SAS version 9.2 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, North Carolina).

Results

Over four percent (4.2%) of the study population reported UMHCN in the past 12 months (Table 1). The prevalence of UMHCN was higher among younger persons (e.g. 19-29 year olds 7.0% vs. 45-64 years olds 3.9%; adjusted odds ratio (AOR) = 2.3), and those with low incomes vs. high income (e.g. \$10-25,000, 8.6% vs. \$150,000, 2.2%, AOR = 1.6). UMHCN was prominently mentioned by those with 14 or more poor mental health days (16%) vs. fewer than 14 days (2.1%), AOR = 2.6, no sources of social support (13.1%) vs. 4 or more (2.9%), AOR = 1.6 and very high level of 9-11 WTC exposure (10.5\%) vs. low/none (1.7%), AOR = 2.0.

Mental health status

In this analysis, we evaluated the relationship between subjective UMHCN and other factors and current mental health symptoms with and without a mental health diagnosis. Among those who had mental health symptoms at Wave 2 (28% of the total sample), 54% reported a mental health diagnosis in the period 9-11-01 to 12-31-05.Fig. 1 shows that a relatively high

Table 1

Prevalence and adjusted odds ratios (AOR) for unmet mental health care need (UMHCN) in the last 12 m: WTCHR, 2003–2007.^a

Interval MI ^b 36,625 100.0 4.2 W1 recruitment method 5617D 26,697 73.7 4.8 1.2 (1.0-1.4) List 9628 2.8 1.0 W2 W2 interview mode Paper 15,968 43.7 4.5 0.7 (0.6-1.9) CATI 4639 43.7 2.5 1.0 Gender Female 13,203 36.1 4.7 1.1 (0.98-1.3) Male 23,422 64.0 40 1.0 Age at W2 interview 19-29 1831 5.0 7.0 2.3 (1.8-2.9) 30-44 13,462 36.8 4.9 1.4 (1.3-1.6) Asian 1985 51.2 3.9 1.0 65+ 2577 7.0 1.4 0.5 (0.3-0.8) Race/ethnicity Non-Hispanic black 3689 10.1 3.9 0.8 (0.7-1.0) Hispanic 3996 10.9 6.1 1.0 0.23 (1.8-2.0) Otther 1147 3.1		Ν	%	% UMHCN	AOR ^c (95% confidence
All* 36,625 10.00 4.2 W1 recruitment method 26,697 73,7 4.8 1.2 (1.0-1.4) List 9628 26,3 2.8 1.0 W2 interview mode Paper 15,968 43,7 4,5 0.7 (0.6-1.9) CATT 4639 43,7 2,5 1.0 Gender - - - - Female 13,203 36,1 4,7 1.1 (0.98-1.3) Male 23,422 64,0 4.0 1.0 Aga tW2 interview - - - 2,3 (1.8-2.9) 19-29 1831 5.0 7.0 2,3 (1.8-2.9) 30-44 13,462 36.8 4.9 1.4 (1.3-1.6) 45-64 18,755 51.2 3.9 1.0 - Non-Hispanic black 3689 10.1 3.9 0.8 (0.7-1.0) Hispanic 3996 10.9 0.6.1 0.9 (0.8-1.1) Asian 125,50K 6156 16.8 <td>• 11b</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	• 11b				
W1 recruitment method Self-ID 26,697 73.7 4.8 1.2 (1.0-1.4) List 9628 26.3 2.8 1.0 W2 interview mode Paper 15,968 43.7 4.5 0.7 (0.6-1.9) CATI 4639 43.7 2.5 0.7 (0.6-1.9) CATI 4639 43.7 2.5 1.0 Gender	All ^b	36,625	100.0	4.2	
Seli-ID20,0977.74.81.2 (1.0–1.4)List962826.32.81.0W2 interview mode943.72.51.0 (0.9–1.1)Web16,00012.74.50.7 (0.6–1.9)CATI463943.72.51.0GenderFemale13,20336.14.71.1 (0.98–1.3)Male23,42264.04.01.0Age at W2 interview19–2918315.07.02.3 (1.8–2.9)30–4413,46236.84.91.4 (1.3–1.6)45–6418,7555.1.23.91.065+25777.01.40.5 (0.3–0.8)RacelethnicityNon-Hispanic black368910.13.90.8 (0.7–1.0)Hispanic399610.96.10.9 (0.8–1.1)Asian19855.44.41.1 (0.9–1.5)Other11473.16.31.3 (0.9–1.7)Non-Hispanic white25,8087.053.91.02002 income10–25K24376.78.61.6 (1.2–2.1)25–50K615616.86.01.5 (1.2–2.0)50–75K735820.14.31.2 (0.9–1.4)150K+432311.82.21.0Eligibility groupsResidents46451.2.74.20.9 (0.7–1.1)Area workers12,50034.23.30.6 (0.5–0.7)Pasersby17.054.76.71.1 (0.9–1.4)Divorced/sep	wirecruitment method	20.007	727	4.0	12(10 14)
List 9628 263 2.8 1.0 W2 interview mode Paper 15.968 43.7 4.5 1.0 (0.9–1.1) Web 16,000 12.7 4.5 0.7 (0.6–1.9) CATI 4639 43.7 2.5 1.0 Gender Female 13.203 36.1 4.7 1.1 (0.98–1.3) Male 23,422 64.0 4.0 1.0 Age at W2 interview 19–29 1831 5.0 7.0 2.3 (1.8–2.9) 30–44 13,462 36.8 4.9 1.4 (1.3–1.6) 45–64 18,755 51.2 3.9 1.0 65+ 2577 7.0 1.4 0.5 (0.3–0.8) Race/ethnicity Non-Hispanic black 3689 10.1 3.9 0.8 (0.7–1.0) Hispanic 3996 10.9 6.1 0.9 (0.8–1.1) Asian 1985 5.4 4.4 1.1 (0.9–1.5) Other 1147 3.1 6.3 1.3 (0.9–1.7) Non-Hispanic white 25,808 70.5 3.9 1.0 2002 income 10–25K 2437 6.7 8.6 1.6 (1.2–2.1) 25–50K 6156 16.8 6.0 1.5 (1.2–2.0) 50–75K 7358 20.1 4.3 1.2 (0.9–1.6) 75–150K 12.836 35.1 3.5 1.2 (0.9–1.4) 150K+ 4323 11.8 2.2 1.0 Eligibility groups Residents 4645 12.7 4.2 0.9 (0.7–1.1) Area workers 12,500 34.2 3.3 0.6 (0.5–0.7) Passersby 1705 4.7 6.7 1.1 (0.9–1.4) 150K+ 4323 11.8 2.2 1.0 Eligibility groups Residents 4645 12.7 4.2 0.9 (0.7–1.1) Area workers 12,500 34.2 3.3 0.6 (0.5–0.7) Passersby 1705 4.7 6.7 1.1 (1.0–1.4) Rescue/recovery workers 17,709 48.4 4.7 1.0 Marital status at W2 Nore 464 1.3 13.1 1.6 (1.2–2.3) 1 to 2 sources 5590 15.3 8.0 1.4 (1.2–1.7) Widowed 748 2.1 4.5 1.3 (0.9–2.0) Married 25,710 70.7 3.4 1.0 Por mental health days Social support at W2 None 464 1.3 13.1 1.6 (1.2–2.3) 1 to 2 sources 5590 15.3 8.0 1.4 (1.2–1.7) Widowed 748 2.1 1.5 None 464 1.3 13.1 1.6 (1.2–2.3) 1 to 2 sources 5590 15.3 8.0 1.4 (1.2–1.6) 3 sources 11.893 32.5 4.3 1.1 (0.99–1.3) 4 or more 18.678 51.0 2.9 1.0 Status of mental health condition D+5+ 3576 12.2 19.9 11.2 (9.2–13.7) D-5+ 3065 8.2 5.3 4.6 (3.8–5.8) D-5- 3658 8.2 5.3 4.6 (3.8–5.8) D-5- 4.3658 8.2 5.3 4.6 (3.8–5.8) D-5- 3658 8.2 5.3 4.6 (3.8–5.8) D-5- 4.3658 8.2 5.3 4.6 (3.8–5.8) D-5- 3659 3.3 1.0 Hental health service	Self-ID	26,697	/3./	4.8	1.2 (1.0-1.4)
We Interview mode Paper 15,968 43.7 4.5 1.0 (0.9-1.1) Web 16,000 12.7 4.5 0.7 (0.6-1.9) CATI 4639 43.7 2.5 1.0 Gender Image at W2 interview Image at W2 interview at W2 interview at W2 interview at W2 interview Image at W2 interview	LIST	9628	26.3	2.8	1.0
Paper13,9684.7.4.31.0 (0.9-1.1)Web16,00012.7.4.50.7 (0.6-1.9)CATI463943.72.51.0Gender	W2 Interview mode	15.000	42.7	4.5	10(00 11)
Web10,00012.74.30.7 (0.5–1.3)CATI463943.72.51.0Gender71.1 (0.98–1.3)Male23,22264.04.0Age at W2 interview19–2918315.07.02.3 (1.8–2.9)30–4413,46236.84.91.4 (1.3–1.6)45–6418,75551.23.91.065+25777.01.40.5 (0.3–0.8)Race/ethnicityNon-Hispanic black368910.13.90.8 (0.7–1.0)Hispanic399610.96.10.9 (0.8–1.1)Asian19855.44.41.1 (0.9–1.5)Other11473.16.31.3 (0.9–1.7)Non-Hispanic white25,80870.53.91.02002 income1025.50K615616.86.01.5 (1.2–2.0)50–75K735820.14.31.2 (0.9–1.4)150K+432311.82.21.0Eligibility groupsResidents464512.74.20.9 (0.7–1.1)Arae workers12.50034.23.30.6 (0.5–0.7)Passersby17.098.44.71.01.01.01.0Maried25.71070.73.41.01.0Marial status at W2107.51.5 (1.2–1.7)1.0Never married591416.35.41.2 (0.98–1.4)Divorced/separated397310.97.51.5 (1.2–1.7)Widow	Mab	15,908	43.7	4.5	1.0(0.9-1.1)
$\begin{array}{ccc} {\rm Cender} & {\rm Female} & {\rm 13,203} & {\rm 36,1} & {\rm 4.7} & {\rm 1.1} & {\rm (0.98-1.3)} \\ {\rm Male} & {\rm 23,422} & {\rm 64.0} & {\rm 4.0} & {\rm 1.0} \\ {\rm Age at W2 interview} & {\rm W2} & {\rm W2} \\ {\rm 19-29} & {\rm 1831} & {\rm 5.0} & {\rm 7.0} & {\rm 2.3} & {\rm (18-2.9)} \\ {\rm 30-44} & {\rm 13,462} & {\rm 36.8} & {\rm 4.9} & {\rm 1.4} & {\rm (1.3-1.6)} \\ {\rm 45-64} & {\rm 18,755} & {\rm 51.2} & {\rm 3.9} & {\rm 1.0} \\ {\rm 65+} & {\rm 2577} & {\rm 7.0} & {\rm 1.4} & {\rm 0.5} & {\rm (0.3-0.8)} \\ {\rm Race/ethnicity} & {\rm Won-Hispanic black} & {\rm 3689} & {\rm 10.9} & {\rm 6.1} & {\rm 0.9} & {\rm (0.8-1.1)} \\ {\rm Asian} & {\rm 1985} & {\rm 5.4} & {\rm 4.4} & {\rm 1.1} & {\rm (0.9-1.5)} \\ {\rm Other} & {\rm 1147} & {\rm 3.1} & {\rm 6.3} & {\rm 13.9} & {\rm 0.8} & {\rm (0.7-1.0)} \\ {\rm Hispanic} & {\rm 3996} & {\rm 10.9} & {\rm 6.1} & {\rm 0.9} & {\rm (0.8-1.1)} \\ {\rm Asian} & {\rm 1985} & {\rm 5.4} & {\rm 4.4} & {\rm 1.1} & {\rm (0.9-1.7)} \\ {\rm Non-Hispanic white} & {\rm 25,808} & {\rm 70.5} & {\rm 3.9} & {\rm 1.0} \\ 2002 income & {\rm U0-25K} & {\rm 2437} & {\rm 6.7} & {\rm 8.6} & {\rm 1.6} & {\rm (1.2-2.1)} \\ {\rm 25-50K} & {\rm 6156} & {\rm 16.8} & {\rm 6.0} & {\rm 1.5} & {\rm (1.2-2.0)} \\ {\rm 50-75K} & {\rm 7358} & {\rm 20.1} & {\rm 4.3} & {\rm 12} & {\rm (0.9-1.4)} \\ {\rm 150K+} & {\rm 4323} & {\rm 11.8} & {\rm 2.2} & {\rm 1.0} \\ \\ Eligibility groups & {\rm Residents} & {\rm 4645} & {\rm 12.7} & {\rm 4.2} & {\rm 0.9} & {\rm (0.7-1.1)} \\ {\rm Area workers} & {\rm 12,500} & {\rm 34.2} & {\rm 3.3} & {\rm 0.6} & {\rm (0.5-0.7)} \\ {\rm Passersby} & {\rm 1705} & {\rm 4.7} & {\rm 6.7} & {\rm 1.1} & {\rm (0.9-1.4)} \\ {\rm Divorced/separated} & {\rm 3973} & {\rm 10.9} & {\rm 7.5} & {\rm 1.5} & {\rm 12.1-7.7} \\ {\rm Widowed} & {\rm 748} & {\rm 2.1} & {\rm 4.5} & {\rm 1.3} & {\rm (0.9-2.0)} \\ {\rm Married} & {\rm 25,710} & {\rm 70.7} & {\rm 3.4} & {\rm 1.0} \\ {\rm Poor mental health days} & {\rm 30,539} & {\rm 844} & {\rm 2.1} & {\rm 1.0} \\ {\rm Social support at W2} & {\rm Nore} & {\rm 16.3} & {\rm 12.6} & {\rm 8.2} & {\rm (6.2-2.9)} \\ {\rm Less than 14 \ days} & {\rm 30,539} & {\rm 84.4} & {\rm 2.1} & {\rm 10.0} \\ {\rm Status of mental health condition} & {\rm 10-554} & {\rm 13.6} & {\rm 12.6} & {\rm 8.2} & {\rm (6.8-9.9)} \\ {\rm D+S} & {\rm 3658} & {\rm 8.2} & {\rm 5.3} & {\rm 1.0} & {\rm$	CATI	4620	12.7	4.5	1.0
General Female13,20336.14.71.1 (0.98–1.3)Male23,42264.04.01.0Age at W2 interview19–2918315.07.02.3 (1.8–2.9)30-4413,46236.84.91.4 (1.3–1.6)45–6418,75551.23.91.065+25777.01.40.5 (0.3–0.8)Race/ethnicityNon-Hispanic399610.96.1Asian19855.44.41.1 (0.9–1.5)Other11473.16.31.3 (0.9–1.7)Non-Hispanic white25,80870.53.91.02002 income </td <td>Cender</td> <td>4055</td> <td>4J./</td> <td>2.5</td> <td>1.0</td>	Cender	4055	4J./	2.5	1.0
Male12,2360.11.01.01.0Age at W2 interview11.019-2918315.07.02.3 (1.8-2.9)30-4413,46236.84.91.4 (1.3-1.6)45-6418,75551.23.91.065+25777.01.40.5 (0.3-0.8)Race/ethnicityNon-Hispanic black368910.13.90.8 (0.7-1.0)Hispanic399610.96.10.9 (0.8-1.1)Asian19855.44.41.1 (0.9-1.5)Other11473.16.31.3 (0.9-1.7)Non-Hispanic white25,80870.53.91.02002 income1025K24376.78.61.6 (1.2-2.1)25-50K615616.86.01.5 (1.2-2.0)50-75K735820.14.31.2 (0.9-1.4)150K+432311.82.21.0Eligibility groupsResidents464512.74.20.9 (0.7-1.1)Area workers12.50034.23.30.6 (0.5-0.7)Passersby17054.76.71.1 (0.9-1.4)Residents464512.74.20.9 (0.7-1.1)Area workers12.50034.23.30.6 (0.5-0.7)Passersby17054.76.71.1 (0.9-1.4)Residents464512.74.20.9 (0.7-1.1)Area workers12.50034.23.01.0Norredovery workers	Female	13 203	36.1	47	11(0.98-1.3)
Age at W2 interviewInterviewInterviewInterview19-2918315.07.02.3 (1.8-2.9)30-4413.46236.84.91.4 (1.3-1.6)45-6418,75551.23.91.065+25777.01.40.5 (0.3-0.8)Race/ethnicityNon-Hispanic black368910.13.90.8 (0.7-1.0)Hispanic399610.96.10.9 (0.8-1.1)Asian19855.44.41.1 (0.9-1.5)Other11473.16.31.3 (0.9-1.7)Non-Hispanic white25,80870.53.91.02002 income10-25K24376.78.61.6 (1.2-2.1)25-50K615616.86.01.5 (1.2-2.0)50-75K735820.14.31.2 (0.9-1.6)75-150K12,83635.13.51.2 (0.9-1.4)150K+432311.82.21.0Eligibility groupsResidents464512.74.20.9 (0.7-1.1)Ara workers17.70948.44.71.0Marital status at W2None7.51.5 (1.2-1.7)Widowed7482.14.51.3 (0.9-2.0)Marital status at W2None4.441.1None4641.31.3.11.6 (1.2-2.3)Ndrived7.482.11.05.2Nore14.9330.538.442.1Nore566115.616.02.6 (2	Male	23 422	64.0	40	10
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Age at W2 interview	23,122	0 110		110
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	19–29	1831	5.0	7.0	2.3(1.8-2.9)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	30-44	13,462	36.8	4.9	1.4(1.3-1.6)
65+ 2577 7.0 1.4 $0.5 (0.3-0.8)$ Race/ethnicity 101 3.9 $0.8 (0.7-1.0)$ Non-Hispanic black 3699 10.1 3.9 $0.8 (0.7-1.0)$ Hispanic 3996 10.9 6.1 $0.9 (0.8-1.1)$ Asian 1985 5.4 4.4 $1.1 (0.9-1.5)$ Other 1147 3.1 6.3 $1.3 (0.9-1.7)$ Non-Hispanic white 25.808 70.5 3.9 1.0 2002 income $10-25K$ 2437 6.7 8.6 $1.6 (1.2-2.1)$ $25-50K$ 6156 16.8 6.0 $1.5 (1.2-2.0)$ $50-75K$ 7358 20.1 4.3 $1.2 (0.9-1.4)$ $550-75K$ 7358 20.1 4.3 $1.2 (0.9-1.4)$ $150K+$ 4323 11.8 2.2 1.0 Eligibility groups $Residents$ 4645 12.7 4.2 $0.9 (0.7-1.1)$ Area workers 12.500 34.2 3.3 $0.6 (0.5-0.7)$ Passersby 1705 4.7 6.7 $1.1 (0.9-1.4)$ Residents 4645 12.7 4.2 $0.9 (0.7-1.1)$ Area workers 12.500 34.2 3.3 $0.6 (0.5-0.7)$ Passersby 1705 4.7 6.7 $1.1 (0.9-1.4)$ Residents 4645 12.7 4.2 $0.9 (0.7-1.1)$ Marital status at W2 $Were married$ 5914 16.3 5.4 $1.2 (0.98-1.4)$ Divorced/separated 3973 10.9 7.5 <th< td=""><td>45-64</td><td>18,755</td><td>51.2</td><td>3.9</td><td>1.0</td></th<>	45-64	18,755	51.2	3.9	1.0
Race/ethnicityNon-Hispanic black368910.13.90.8 (0.7-1.0)Hispanic399610.96.10.9 (0.8-1.1)Asian19855.44.41.1 (0.9-1.5)Other11473.16.31.3 (0.9-1.7)Non-Hispanic white25,80870.53.91.02002 income10-25K24376.78.61.6 (1.2-2.1)25-50K615616.86.01.5 (1.2-2.0)50-75K735820.14.31.2 (0.9-1.6)75-150K12,83635.13.51.2 (0.9-1.4)150K+432311.82.21.0Eligibility groupsResidents464512.74.20.9 (0.7-1.1)Area workers12,50034.23.30.6 (0.5-0.7)Passersby17054.76.71.1 (0.9-1.4)Rescue/recovery workers17,70948.44.71.0Marital status at W2Never married591416.35.41.2 (0.98-1.4)Norced/separated397310.97.51.5 (1.2-1.7)Widowed7482.14.51.3 (0.9-2.0)Married25,71070.73.41.0Poor mental health days30,53984.42.11.0Social support at W2None4641.313.11.6 (1.2-2.3)None4641.313.11.6 (1.2-2.3)1.0 (0.9-1.3)4 or more18,67851.02.9	65+	2577	7.0	1.4	0.5 (0.3-0.8)
Non-Hispanic black368910.13.90.8 (0.7-1.0)Hispanic399610.96.10.9 (0.8-1.1)Asian19855.44.41.1 (0.9-1.5)Other11473.16.31.3 (0.9-1.7)Non-Hispanic white25.80870.53.91.02002 income1025.50K615616.86.01.5 (1.2-2.0)50-75K735820.14.31.2 (0.9-1.6)75-150K12.83635.13.51.2 (0.9-1.4)150K+432311.82.21.0Eligibility groups17054.76.71.1 (0.9-1.4)Area workers12.50034.23.30.6 (0.5-0.7)Passersby17054.76.71.1 (0.9-1.4)Area workers12.50034.23.30.6 (0.5-0.7)Passersby17054.76.71.1 (0.9-1.4)Marital status at W2Never married591416.35.41.2 (0.98-1.4)Divorced/separated397310.97.51.5 (1.2-1.7)Widowed7482.14.51.3 (0.9-2.0)Married25.71070.73.41.0Poor mental health days30.53984.42.11.0Social support at W2None4641.31.3.11.6 (1.2-2.3)1 to 2 sources519015.38.01.4 (1.2-1.6)3 sources11.89332.54.31.1 (0.99-1.3)4 or more18.6	Race/ethnicity				. ,
Hispanic399610.96.10.9 (0.8–1.1)Asian19855.44.41.1 (0.9–1.5)Other11473.16.31.3 (0.9–1.7)Non-Hispanic white25,80870.53.91.02002 income10–25K24376.78.61.6 (1.2–2.1)25–50K615616.86.01.5 (1.2–2.0)50–75K735820.14.31.2 (0.9–1.6)75–150K12,83635.13.51.2 (0.9–1.4)150K+432311.82.21.0Eligibility groupsResidents464512.74.20.9 (0.7–1.1)Area workers12,50034.23.30.6 (0.5–0.7)Passersby17054.76.71.1 (0.9–1.4)Rescue/recovery workers17,70948.44.71.0Marital status at W2Never married591416.35.41.2 (0.98–1.4)Divorced/separated397310.97.51.5 (1.2–1.7)Widowed7482.14.51.3 (0.9–2.0)Married25,71070.73.41.0Poor mental health days30,53984.42.11.0Social support at W2None4641.313.11.6 (1.2–2.3)1to 2 sources559015.38.01.4 (1.2–1.6)3 sources11.89332.54.31.1 (0.99–1.3)4 or more18.67851.02.91.0Status of mental health co	Non-Hispanic black	3689	10.1	3.9	0.8 (0.7-1.0)
Asian19855.44.41.1 $(0.9-1.5)$ Other11473.16.31.3 $(0.9-1.7)$ Non-Hispanic white25.80870.53.91.02002 income10-25K24376.78.61.6 $(1.2-2.1)$ 25-50K615616.86.01.5 $(1.2-2.0)$ 50-75K735820.14.31.2 $(0.9-1.6)$ 75-150K12.83635.13.51.2 $(0.9-1.4)$ 150K+432311.82.21.0Eligibility groupsResidents464512.74.2Area workers12.50034.23.30.6 $(0.5-0.7)$ Passersby17054.76.71.1 $(0.9-1.4)$ Rescue/recovery workers17.70948.44.71.0Marital status at W2Wever married591416.35.41.2 $(0.98-1.4)$ Divorced/separated397310.97.51.5 $(1.2-1.7)$ Widowed7482.14.51.3 $(0.9-2.0)$ Married25,71070.73.41.0Poor mental health days30,53984.42.11.0Social support at W2None4641.313.11.6 $(1.2-2.3)$ None4641.313.11.6 $(1.2-1.3)$ $0 + S +$ 35761.219.91.12 $(9.2-13.7)$ $0 - S +$ 303616.312.68.2 $(6.8-9.9)$ $0 + S -$ 26588.25.34.6 $(3.8-5.8)$ $0 - S +$ 3056	Hispanic	3996	10.9	6.1	0.9 (0.8-1.1)
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Asian	1985	5.4	4.4	1.1 (0.9-1.5)
Non-Hispanic white25,80870.53.91.02002 income	Other	1147	3.1	6.3	1.3 (0.9–1.7)
2002 income $10-25K$ 24376.78.61.6 (1.2-2.1) $25-50K$ 615616.86.01.5 (1.2-2.0) $50-75K$ 735820.14.31.2 (0.9-1.6) $75-150K$ 12,83635.13.51.2 (0.9-1.4) $150K+$ 432311.82.21.0Eligibility groups	Non-Hispanic white	25,808	70.5	3.9	1.0
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	2002 income				
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	10–25K	2437	6.7	8.6	1.6 (1.2–2.1)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	25–50K	6156	16.8	6.0	1.5 (1.2–2.0)
75-150K $12,836$ 35.1 3.5 $1.2 (0.9-1.4)$ $150K+$ 4323 11.8 2.2 1.0 Eligibility groups	50-75K	7358	20.1	4.3	1.2 (0.9–1.6)
150k+432311.82.21.0Eligibility groupsResidents464512.74.20.9 (0.7-1.1)Area workers12,50034.23.30.6 (0.5-0.7)Passersby17054.76.71.1 (0.9-1.4)Rescue/recovery workers17,70948.44.71.0Marital status at W2Never married591416.35.41.2 (0.98-1.4)Divorced/separated397310.97.51.5 (1.2-1.7)Widowed7482.14.51.3 (0.9-2.0)Married25,71070.73.41.0Poor mental health days30,53984.42.11.0Social support at W2None4641.313.11.6 (1.2-2.3)1 to 2 sources559015.38.01.4 (1.2-1.6)3 sources11,89332.54.31.1 (0.99-1.3)4 or more18,67851.02.91.0Status of mental health conditionU1.01.0D-S+303616.312.68.2 (6.8-9.9)D+S+357612.219.911.2 (9.2-13.7)D-S+36588.25.34.6 (3.8-5.8)D-S-26,35563.31.01.0Mental health service useMay666919.09.7Any666919.09.70.9 (0.9-1.0)Not reported29,74979.63.01.09-11 WTC exposureVery high3345 <td< td=""><td>75–150K</td><td>12,836</td><td>35.1</td><td>3.5</td><td>1.2 (0.9–1.4)</td></td<>	75–150K	12,836	35.1	3.5	1.2 (0.9–1.4)
Eligibility groupsResidents464512.74.20.9 (0.7-1.1)Area workers12,50034.23.30.6 (0.5-0.7)Passersby17054.76.71.1 (0.9-1.4)Rescue/recovery workers17,70948.44.71.0Marital status at W2 </td <td>150K+</td> <td>4323</td> <td>11.8</td> <td>2.2</td> <td>1.0</td>	150K+	4323	11.8	2.2	1.0
Residents464512.74.20.9 (0.7-1.1)Area workers12,50034.23.30.6 (0.5-0.7)Passersby17054.76.71.1 (0.9-1.4)Rescue/recovery workers17,70948.44.71.0Marital status at W2Never married591416.35.41.2 (0.98-1.4)Divorced/separated397310.97.51.5 (1.2-1.7)Widowed7482.14.51.3 (0.9-2.0)Married25,71070.73.41.0Poor mental health days30,53984.42.11.0Social support at W2None4641.313.11.6 (1.2-2.3)1 to 2 sources5550015.38.01.4 (1.2-1.6)3 sources11,89332.54.31.1 (0.99-1.3)4 or more18,67851.02.91.0Status of mental health conditionU1.2 (9.2-13.7)D-S+303616.312.68.2 (6.8-9.9)D -S+36588.25.34.6 (3.8-5.8)D-S-26,35563.31.01.0Mental health service useMay666919.09.70.9 (0.9-1.0)Not reported29,74979.63.01.09-11 WTC exposureVery high33457.510.52.0 (1.6-2.5)High855421.15.91.7 (1.4-2.1)Medium15,42144.23.51.4 (1.2-1.7)Low/none9303 <t< td=""><td>Eligibility groups</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Eligibility groups				
Area workers12,50034.23.30.6 (0.5-0.7)Passersby17054.76.71.1 (0.9-1.4)Rescue/recovery workers17,70948.44.71.0Marital status at W2 </td <td>Residents</td> <td>4645</td> <td>12.7</td> <td>4.2</td> <td>0.9 (0.7–1.1)</td>	Residents	4645	12.7	4.2	0.9 (0.7–1.1)
Passersby17054.76.71.1 ($0.9-1.4$)Rescue/recovery workers17,70948.44.71.0Marital status at W2	Area workers	12,500	34.2	3.3	0.6(0.5-0.7)
Rescue/recovery workers17,70948.44.71.0Marital status at W2	Passersby	1705	4.7	6.7	1.1 (0.9–1.4)
Martial Status at W2Never married591416.35.4 $1.2 (0.98-1.4)$ Divorced/separated397310.97.5 $1.5 (1.2-1.7)$ Widowed7482.14.5 $1.3 (0.9-2.0)$ Married25,71070.73.4 1.0 Poor mental health days' ≥ 14 days'5661 15.6 16.0 $2.6 (2.3-2.9)$ Less than 14 days30,539 84.4 2.1 1.0 Social support at W2None464 1.3 13.1 $1.6 (1.2-2.3)$ 1 to 2 sources5590 15.3 8.0 $1.4 (1.2-1.6)$ 3 sources11,89332.5 4.3 $1.1 (0.99-1.3)$ 4 or more18,678 51.0 2.9 1.0 Status of mental health condition D D S D-S+3036 16.3 12.6 $8.2 (6.8-9.9)$ D + S-3658 8.2 5.3 $4.6 (3.8-5.8)$ D-S-26,355 63.3 1.0 1.0 Mental health service use Any 6669 19.0 9.7 $0.9 (0.9-1.0)$ Not reported $29,749$ 7.6 3.0 1.0 9-11 WTC exposure V $1.44.2$ 3.5 $1.4 (1.2-1.7)$ Medium $15,421$ 44.2 3.5 $1.4 (1.2-1.7)$ Low/none 9303 27.2 1.7 1.0	Rescue/recovery workers	17,709	48.4	4.7	1.0
Never married391410.33.41.2 ($0.30-1.4$)Divorced/separated397310.97.51.5 ($1.2-1.7$)Widowed7482.14.51.3 ($0.9-2.0$)Married25,71070.73.41.0Poor mental health days**1.0'>14 days'566115.616.02.6 ($2.3-2.9$)Less than 14 days30,53984.42.11.0Social support at W2	Novor married	5014	16.2	5 4	12(0.09 14)
Divorced/separated35/31.57.31.2(1.2-1.7)Widowed7482.14.51.3 (0.9-2.0)Married25,71070.73.41.0Poor mental health days*1.5616.02.6 (2.3-2.9)Less than 14 days30,53984.42.11.0Social support at W2None4641.313.11.6 (1.2-2.3)1 to 2 sources559015.38.01.4 (1.2-1.6)3 sources11,89332.54.31.1 (0.99-1.3)4 or more18,67851.02.91.0Status of mental health conditionD+S+357612.219.911.2 (9.2-13.7)D-S+303616.312.68.2 (6.8-9.9)D+S-36588.25.34.6 (3.8-5.8)D-S-26,35563.31.01.0Mental health service useAny666919.09.70.9 (0.9-1.0)Not reported29,74979.63.01.09-11 WTC exposureVery high33457.510.52.0 (1.6-2.5)High855421.15.91.7 (1.4-2.1)Medium15,42144.23.51.4 (1.2-1.7)Low/none930327.21.71.0	Divorced/separated	2072	10.5	5.4 7.5	1.2(0.96-1.4) 1.5(1.2, 1.7)
Wildwick 740 2.71 4.3 1.0 Married $25,710$ 70.7 3.4 1.0 Poor mental health days $^{+}\geq 14$ days' 5661 15.6 16.0 2.6 $(2.3-2.9)$ Less than 14 days $30,539$ 84.4 2.1 1.0 Social support at W2 $W2$ $W2$ $W2$ None 464 1.3 13.1 1.6 $(1.2-2.3)$ 1 to 2 sources 5590 15.3 8.0 1.4 $(1.2-1.6)$ 3 sources $11,893$ 32.5 4.3 1.1 $(0.99-1.3)$ 4 or more $18,678$ 51.0 2.9 1.0 Status of mental health condition $U2$ 19.9 11.2 $(9.2-13.7)$ D-S+ 3036 16.3 12.6 8.2 $(6.8-9.9)$ D + S- 3658 8.2 5.3 4.6 $(3.8-5.8)$ D-S- $26,355$ 63.3 1.0 1.0 Mental health service use Any 6669 19.0 9.7 0.9 $(0.9-1.0)$ Not reported $29,749$ 79.6 3.0 1.0 9-11 WTC exposure W 17.2 $11.5.9$ 1.7 $(1.4-2.1)$ Medium $15,421$ 44.2 3.5 1.4 $(1.2-1.7)$ Low/none 9303 27.2 1.7 1.0	Widowed	7/8	2.1	1.5	1.3(1.2-1.7) 1.3(0.9-2.0)
Marice22,7103.41.0Poor mental health days566115.616.02.6 (2.3–2.9)Less than 14 days30,53984.42.11.0Social support at W2None4641.313.11.6 (1.2–2.3)1 to 2 sources559015.38.01.4 (1.2–1.6)3 sources11,89332.54.31.1 (0.99–1.3)4 or more18,67851.02.91.0Status of mental health conditionD+S+357612.219.911.2 (9.2–13.7)D-S+303616.312.68.2 (6.8–9.9)D+S-26,35563.31.01.0Mental health service useAny666919.09.70.9 (0.9–1.0)Not reported29,74979.63.01.09-11 WTC exposure </td <td>Married</td> <td>25 710</td> <td>2.1</td> <td>3.4</td> <td>1.0</td>	Married	25 710	2.1	3.4	1.0
Nome46415.616.02.6 (2.3-2.9)Less than 14 days30,53984.42.11.0Social support at W2	Poor mental health days	23,710	70.7	5.4	1.0
Less than 14 days30,53984.42.11.0Social support at W2None4641.313.11.6 $(1.2-2.3)$ 1 to 2 sources559015.38.01.4 $(1.2-1.6)$ 3 sources11,89332.54.31.1 $(0.99-1.3)$ 4 or more18,67851.02.91.0Status of mental health condition $D+S+$ 357612.219.9D-S+303616.312.68.2 $(6.8-9.9)$ D+S-26,35563.31.01.0Mental health service use Any 666919.09.7Any666919.09.70.9 $(0.9-1.0)$ Not reported29,74979.63.01.09-11 WTC exposure $Very$ high33457.510.52.0 $(1.6-2.5)$ High855421.15.91.7 $(1.4-2.1)$ Medium15,42144.23.51.4 $(1.2-1.7)$ Low/none930327.21.71.0	'>14 days'	5661	156	16.0	26(23-29)
Social support at W2 None 464 1.3 13.1 1.6 (1.2–2.3) 1 to 2 sources 5590 15.3 8.0 1.4 (1.2–1.6) 3 sources 11,893 32.5 4.3 1.1 (0.99–1.3) 4 or more 18,678 51.0 2.9 1.0 Status of mental health condition D+S+ 3576 12.2 19.9 11.2 (9.2–13.7) D-S+ 3036 16.3 12.6 8.2 (6.8–9.9) D+S- D-S+ 3658 8.2 5.3 4.6 (3.8–5.8) D-S- 26,355 63.3 1.0 Mental health service use Many 6669 19.0 9.7 0.9 (0.9–1.0) Not reported 29,749 79.6 3.0 1.0 9-11 WTC exposure Very high 3345 7.5 10.5 2.0 (1.6–2.5) High 8554 21.1 5.9 1.7 (1.4–2.1) Medium 15,421 44.2 3.5 1.4 (1.2–1.7) 1.0	Less than 14 days	30.539	84.4	2.1	1.0
None4641.313.11.6 (1.2–2.3)1 to 2 sources559015.38.01.4 (1.2–1.6)3 sources11.89332.54.31.1 (0.99–1.3)4 or more18,67851.02.91.0Status of mental health condition U U U D-S+303616.312.68.2 (6.8–9.9)D+S-36588.25.34.6 (3.8–5.8)D-S-26,35563.31.01.0Mental health service use H U U Any666919.09.70.9 (0.9–1.0)Not reported29,74979.63.01.09-11 WTC exposure U U U U Very high33457.510.52.0 (1.6–2.5)High855421.15.91.7 (1.4–2.1)Medium15,42144.23.51.4 (1.2–1.7)Low/none930327.21.71.0	Social support at W2	,			
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	None	464	1.3	13.1	1.6 (1.2-2.3)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1 to 2 sources	5590	15.3	8.0	1.4 (1.2–1.6)
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	3 sources	11,893	32.5	4.3	1.1 (0.99-1.3)
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c } Status of mental health condition \\ \hline D+S+ & 3576 & 12.2 & 19.9 & 11.2 (9.2-13.7) \\ D-S+ & 3036 & 16.3 & 12.6 & 8.2 (6.8-9.9) \\ D+S- & 3658 & 8.2 & 5.3 & 4.6 (3.8-5.8) \\ D-S- & 26,355 & 6.3 & 1.0 & 1.0 \\ \hline Mental health service use & & & & \\ Any & 6669 & 19.0 & 9.7 & 0.9 (0.9-1.0) \\ Not reported & 29,749 & 79.6 & 3.0 & 1.0 \\ \hline 9-11 WTC exposure & & & & \\ Very high & 3345 & 7.5 & 10.5 & 2.0 (1.6-2.5) \\ High & 8554 & 21.1 & 5.9 & 1.7 (1.4-2.1) \\ Medium & 15,421 & 44.2 & 3.5 & 1.4 (1.2-1.7) \\ Low/none & 9303 & 27.2 & 1.7 & 1.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$	4 or more	18,678	51.0	2.9	1.0
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Status of mental health conc	lition			
$\begin{array}{cccccccc} D-S+ & 3036 & 16.3 & 12.6 & 8.2 (6.8-9.9) \\ D+S- & 3658 & 8.2 & 5.3 & 4.6 (3.8-5.8) \\ D-S- & 26,355 & 63.3 & 1.0 & 1.0 \\ \\ Mental health service use & & & \\ Any & 669 & 19.0 & 9.7 & 0.9 (0.9-1.0) \\ Not reported & 29,749 & 79.6 & 3.0 & 1.0 \\ \\ 9-11 WTC exposure & & & & \\ Very high & 3345 & 7.5 & 10.5 & 2.0 (1.6-2.5) \\ High & 8554 & 21.1 & 5.9 & 1.7 (1.4-2.1) \\ Medium & 15,421 & 44.2 & 3.5 & 1.4 (1.2-1.7) \\ Low/none & 9303 & 27.2 & 1.7 & 1.0 \\ \end{array}$	D+S+	3576	12.2	19.9	11.2 (9.2–13.7)
$\begin{array}{ccccccc} D+S-&&3658&8.2&5.3&4.6&(3.8-5.8)\\ D-S-&&26,355&63.3&1.0&1.0\\ \\ \mbox{Mental health service use}&&&&\\ \mbox{Any}&&6669&19.0&9.7&0.9&(0.9-1.0)\\ \mbox{Not reported}&29,749&79.6&3.0&1.0\\ \\ \mbox{9-11 WTC exposure}&&&&\\ \mbox{Very high}&&3345&7.5&10.5&2.0&(1.6-2.5)\\ \mbox{High}&&8554&21.1&5.9&1.7&(1.4-2.1)\\ \mbox{Medium}&&15,421&44.2&3.5&1.4&(1.2-1.7)\\ \mbox{Low/none}&&9303&27.2&1.7&1.0\\ \end{array}$	D-S+	3036	16.3	12.6	8.2 (6.8-9.9)
D-S- 26,355 63.3 1.0 1.0 Mental health service use <	D + S -	3658	8.2	5.3	4.6 (3.8-5.8)
Mental health service use 6669 19.0 9.7 0.9 (0.9-1.0) Not reported 29,749 79.6 3.0 1.0 9-11 WTC exposure Very high 3345 7.5 10.5 2.0 (1.6-2.5) High 8554 21.1 5.9 1.7 (1.4-2.1) Medium 15,421 44.2 3.5 1.4 (1.2-1.7) Low/none 9303 27.2 1.7 1.0	D-S-	26,355	63.3	1.0	1.0
Any 6669 19.0 9.7 0.9 (0.9–1.0) Not reported 29,749 79.6 3.0 1.0 9-11 WTC exposure 7.5 10.5 2.0 (1.6–2.5) Very high 3345 7.5 10.5 2.0 (1.6–2.5) High 8554 21.1 5.9 1.7 (1.4–2.1) Medium 15,421 44.2 3.5 1.4 (1.2–1.7) Low/none 9303 27.2 1.7 1.0	Mental health service use				
Not reported 29,749 79.6 3.0 1.0 9-11 WTC exposure	Any	6669	19.0	9.7	0.9 (0.9–1.0)
9-11 WTC exposure 3345 7.5 10.5 2.0 (1.6–2.5) High 8554 21.1 5.9 1.7 (1.4–2.1) Medium 15,421 44.2 3.5 1.4 (1.2–1.7) Low/none 9303 27.2 1.7 1.0	Not reported	29,749	79.6	3.0	1.0
Very high 3345 7.5 10.5 2.0 (1.6-2.5) High 8554 21.1 5.9 1.7 (1.4-2.1) Medium 15,421 44.2 3.5 1.4 (1.2-1.7) Low/none 9303 27.2 1.7 1.0	9-11 WTC exposure	a- ·-			
Hign 8554 21.1 5.9 1.7 (1.4–2.1) Medium 15,421 44.2 3.5 1.4 (1.2–1.7) Low/none 9303 27.2 1.7 1.0	Very high	3345	7.5	10.5	2.0 (1.6–2.5)
Meaium 15,421 44.2 3.5 1.4 (1.2–1.7) Low/none 9303 27.2 1.7 1.0	High	8554	21.1	5.9	1.7(1.4-2.1)
Low/none 9303 27.2 1.7 1.0	Medium	15,421	44.2	3.5	1.4 (1.2–1.7)
	Low/none	9303	27.2	1./	1.0

^a Excluded persons with physician diagnosed mental health conditions before year 2001 and between 2006 and 2007 or missing PTSD or SPD scores.

^b Missing: Income = 3515, eligibility group = 66, marital status = 280, WTC exposure = 2, mental health service use = 207.

^c Adjusted for all factors in the table.

percentage of persons with symptoms reported UMHCN (20% for D+S+ and 13% for D-S+) and poor mental health days (63% for D+S+ and 41% for D-S+) with big differences between mental health service use between those diagnosed and not diagnosed (e.g. 65% for D+S+ and 14% for D-S+).



Measures of UMHCN, poor mental health days, and service use

Fig. 1. Prevalence of unmet mental health care need (UMHCN), poor mental health days, and mental health service use by categories of mental health status.

In Table 2 we present the distributions of five critical variables (UMHCN, poor mental health days, social support, mental health service use, and 9/11 exposure) separately within each of the four mental health status categories: D+S+, D-S+, D+S-, and D-S-. Table 2 also shows adjusted odds ratios (AOR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) for association of mental health status with each of these five variables, using the 26,355 asymptomatic persons with no reported mental illness diagnostic history (D-S-) as the comparison population.

UMHCN was strongly associated with being in the D+S+ group with an AOR = 10.0 (8.2-12.2) compared to D-S-. The associations between UMHCN with being in the D-S+ or the D+S- group were also statistically significant but not as strong with an AOR = 7.0 (5.8-8.5) for D-S+ and an AOR = 3.9 (3.1-4.8) for D+S-. Self-reported poor mental health days and lack of social support showed similar association patterns, with very strong associations also evident in the group that had both a diagnostic history and current symptoms (D+S+). For poor mental health days (≥ 14 days), there was an AOR = 13.4(12.0-15.0) and for those persons without social support, there was an AOR = 7.4 (5.1-10.8) for association with D+S+ group compared to D-S- (Table 2). For both variables the AORs were lower but still statistically significant in the symptom-only group D-S+: 7.7 (7.0-8.5) and 5.2 (3.7-7.2) respectively, and lower still in the group (D+S-) with a prior diagnostic history that was symptom-free at Wave 2: 2.3 (2.0-2.6) and 1.5 (0.9-2.4), respectively.

Recent (past-year) utilization of mental health services or medication was also strongly associated with mental health status, with an AOR of 16.9 (15.2–18.4) in the D+S+ group relative to D–S–. However, the pattern for the D+S– and D–S+ groups was the reverse of that for unmet need and poor mental health days, being strongest for D+S– (AOR = 10.8, 9.9–11.8) and much weaker for D–S+ (AOR = 1.6, 1.4–1.8).

Finally, Table 2 shows dose-related associations of mental health status with both exposure to 9/11 experiences and lack of social support that have previously been reported to be strong predictors of PTSD. Among the D+S+ group the AOR for "very high" exposure was 22.7 (18.6–27.6), while it fell to 6.8 (5.7–8.1) among D–S+ and 4.6 (4.0–5.4) among D+S–.

Discussion

For survivors of the 9-11 disaster, the lasting impact of the trauma was still very apparent 5–6 years later, especially among

Table 2		
Multinomial adjusted odds ratios for association between selected factors and mental health status, V	WTCHR, 200	3–2007.ª

Characteristic ^c	Total N	Status of mental health condition: Self-reported diagnosis of anxiety, depression or PTSD (D) or screened by PCL and/or K6 (S)								
	36625	D+, S+		D-, S+			D+, S-			
		n 3576	% 100.0	AOR (95% CI) ^b	n 3036	% 100.0	AOR (95% CI)	n 3658	% 100.0	AOR (95% CI)
Unmet mental health care need in last 12 m										
Yes	1551	713	19.9	10.0 (8.2-12.2)	382	12.6	7.0 (5.8-8.5)	195	5.3	3.9 (3.1-4.8)
No	34,927	2845	79.6	1.0	2630	86.6	1.0	3451	94.3	1.0
Poor mental health days										
$\geq \! 14 \text{ days}$	5661	2262	63.3	13.4 (12.0–15.0)	1229	40.5	7.7 (7.0-8.5)	633	17.3	2.3 (2.0-2.6)
<14 days	30,964	1314	36.7	1.0	1807	59.5	1.0	3025	82.7	1.0
Mental health service use										
Any	6669	2327	65.1	16.9 (15.2–18.4)	416	13.7	1.6 (1.4–1.8)	1869	51.1	10.8 (9.9–11.8)
Not reported	29,749	1231	34.4	1.0	2600	85.6	1.0	1770	48.4	1.0
Social support										
None	464	156	4.4	7.4 (5.1–10.8)	95	3.1	5.2 (3.7–7.2)	23	0.6	1.5 (0.9–2.4)
1-2	5590	1015	28.4	2.8 (2.4–3.2)	892	29.4	2.7 (2.4–3.1)	421	11.5	1.1 (0.96–1.3)
3	11,893	1116	31.2	1.4 (1.3–1.6)	969	31.9	1.3 (1.2–1.4)	1243	34.0	1.0 (0.94–1.1)
4+	18,678	1289	36.0	1.0	1080	35.6	1.0	1971	53.9	1.0
9-11 exposure categories										
Low/none	9303	261	7.3	1.0	382	12.6	1.0	654	17.9	1.0
Medium	15,421	1069	29.9	2.5 (2.1-3.0)	1196	39.4	2.0 (1.8-2.3)	1497	40.9	1.6 (1.4–1.8)
High	8554	1245	34.8	7.4 (6.2–8.8)	1007	33.2	4.1 (3.6-4.8)	1048	28.6	2.6 (2.3–2.9)
Very high	3345	1001	28.0	22.7 (18.6–27.6)	451	14.9	6.8 (5.7-8.1)	459	12.5	4.6 (4.0-5.4)

^a Excluded pre-911 physician diagnosed mental health conditions, conditions diagnosed 2006–07, and those with missing PTSD and SPD scores.

^b Adjusted for Wave 1 recruitment method, Wave 2 survey mode, sex, age at Wave 2 interview, race/ethnicity, 2002 income, and marital status.

^c Missing: UMHCN = 147; mental health service use = 207; 9-11 exposure = 2.

those most intensely exposed. Survivors who lacked sources of social support and reported poor quality of life were also more prone to report an unmet mental health care need. On the other hand, perceived need of mental health services was not associated with actual service utilization. In addition, enrollees' subjective evaluation of their need for mental health care and quality of life were both associated in varying degrees with history of diagnosis of mental health conditions and current mental health symptoms. Specifically, those with symptoms indicative of PTSD or SPD reported higher levels of self-perceived poor mental health and lower social support, while having a prior mental health diagnosis was associated with both subjective unmet mental health care need and greater use of mental health services. Those with symptoms but no prior diagnosis are a particularly vulnerable population with both a diminished quality of life and perceived need for care that is much less likely to be receiving mental health care.

The continued reporting of perceived need for mental health care by those who also report a lack of social support and poor mental health quality of life suggests that these factors may mediate the long-term mental health effects observed in our studies (e.g. Brackbill et al., 2009) and others even on a national scale (Holman & Silver, 2011). WTC exposure was strongly associated with the severity of mental health issues (e.g. D+S+) similar to that reported two years after 9-11 using the same exposure metric (Boscarino, Adams, Stuber, & Galea, 2005).

These findings have implications for the long-term treatment and quality of life experience of disaster survivors who continue to have mental health sequelae. For diagnosed persons with ongoing symptoms, we can assume that diagnosis is the entry point for treatment, with sixty percent reporting some kind of mental health treatment in the last year. However, it is not clear whether persons with continued symptoms are more ill and in greater need of care, are non-compliant with care, or whether they are compliant but not receiving adequate care; any of these situations could result in a perceived lack of mental health care. Our subjective measure of UMHCN is likely composed of a combination of constructs including unmet need due to financial or other barriers or perceived inadequate care (Allin et al., 2010), so one or more of these reasons could apply to this D+S+ group.

Undiagnosed persons who continue to report untreated symptoms may number in the tens of thousands, if we project the prevalence found in our cohort to the estimated 409.000 persons directly exposed to the WTC disaster in NYC (Brackbill et al., 2009). These individuals may not be known to caregivers. Some (D-S+)may have visited a provider for physical health concerns without receiving a mental health evaluation or referral. Others may have been unable to locate a mental health provider or feared stigma related to receiving mental health care (Welch, Caramanica, Debchoudhury, Pulizzi, Farfel, Stellman, et al., 2012). In a study of factors related to mental health service use after the WTC disaster, Stuber et al. (2006) found that 64% of persons with symptoms did not seek help despite the fact that a majority of them (70%) had diminished functioning. Retrospective analysis of the National Comorbidity Survey showed that people with a diagnosable mental health condition have a median delay of 7 years before seeing a provider and only about 40% have provider contact within six years (Wang et al., 2005). In addition, some symptomatic people without a prior diagnosis of a mental health condition are not likely to perceive a need for treatment (Mojtabai, Olfson, & Mechanic, 2002).

Those who reported a diagnosis but did not subscribe to symptoms of PTSD or SPD reported less UMHCN and better quality of life, in combination with using services nearly as much as those who had a diagnosis and symptoms. It may be the case that the mental health care they received was effective or that symptoms among this group were less severe or resolved on their own.

Our findings underscore the challenges of reaching and treating a population exposed to a major disaster with long-lasting psychopathology regardless of the availability of treatment (Felton, 2002). Many may feel unwell for a good portion of the time, interfering with their ability to make and keep appointments and adhere to treatment. They also may lack social supports for seeking and adhering to treatment, and may even actively avoid treatment. Social support has been identified as one of the most important factors of reducing the impact of a disaster on survivors and appears to continue to be major factor in seeking mental health care (Shih, Liao, Chan, Duh, & Gau, 2002).

Strengths and limitations

The longitudinal design of the Registry along with this sample size of over 36,000 exposed persons enabled us to make comparisons between groups with and without reported diagnosis and symptoms of PTSD or SPD, both of which were measured with widely used, validated instruments. One limitation may be the 68.1% response rate at Wave 2, which could result in over-reporting of symptoms by affected individuals. However, there was no difference in either self-reported exposure (e.g. being injured or witnessing events) or post 9-11 depression, anxiety, or emotional problems as reported at Wave 1 between Wave 2 participants and non-participants, suggesting that differential symptom reporting is not subject to serious bias.

The overall prevalence of UMHCN in this cohort was similar to estimates of UMHCN in New York City (3.5%) and Ontario, Canada (4.5%) New York City, Community Health Survey: (Nelson & Park, 2006) using similar questions.

Implications

The implications for mental health service providers and policy makers include: First, a significantly large group of persons who have PTSD, depression, or anxiety symptoms report unmet mental health care need whether or not they are availing mental health services. Second, a significant number of undiagnosed persons also have symptoms indicative of PTSD or non-specific psychological distress. This group may be also hard-to-reach because of diminished quality of life and lack of social support. The Registry has a treatment referral program that encourages symptomatic registrants to seek care from the federal WTC Health Program (Welch et al., 2012). Policy makers associated with disaster-related mental health service provision can consider designing and implementing customized outreach programs for encouraging symptomatic but undiagnosed persons to seek treatment.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful for comments from Carolyn Greene, Jim Hadler and five anonymous reviewers that greatly strengthened the paper.

This publication was supported by Cooperative Agreement Numbers 2U500H009739 and 1U500H009739 from CDC-NIOSH, and U50/ATU272750 from CDC-ATSDR which included support from CDC-NCEH, and the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (NYC DOHMH). Its contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of CDC.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data related to this article can be found at http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.12.016.

References

- Adams, R. E., & Boscarino, J. A. (2006). Predictors of PTSD and delayed PTSD after disaster: the impact of exposure and psychosocial resources. *Journal of Nervous* and Mental Disease, 194(7), 485–493.
- Allin, S., Grignon, M., & Le Grand, J. (2010). Subjective unmet need and utilization of health care services in Canada: what are the equity implications? *Social Science & Medicine*, 70(3), 465–472.
- Boscarino, J. A., Adams, R. E., Stuber, J., & Galea, S. (2005). Disparities in mental health treatment following the World Trade Center disaster: implications for mental health care and health services research. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 18(4), 287–297.
- Brackbill, R. M., Hadler, J. L., DiGrande, L., Ekenga, C. C., Farfel, M. R., Friedman, S., et al. (2009). Asthma and posttraumatic stress symptoms 5 to 6 years following exposure to the World Trade Center terrorist attack. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 302(5), 502–516.
- Bromet, E. J., Havenaar, J. M., & Guey, L. (2011). A 25 year retrospective review of the psychological consequences of the Chernobyl accident. *Clinical Oncology (Royal College of Radiologists)*, 23(4), 297–305.
- Farfel, M., Digrande, L., Brackbill, R., Prann, A., Cone, J., Friedman, S., et al. (2008). An overview of 9/11 experiences and respiratory and mental health conditions among World Trade Center health registry enrollees. *Journal of Urban Health*, 85(6), 880–909.
- Felton, C. J. (2002). Project liberty: a public health response to New Yorkers' mental health needs arising from the World Trade Center terrorist attacks. *Journal of Urban Health*, 79(3), 429–433.
- Gray, M. J., Shira, M., & Litz, B. T. (2004). Acute psychological impact of disaster and large-scale trauma: limitations of traditional interventions and future practice recommendations. *Prehospital and Disaster Medicine*, 19(1), 64–72.
- Green, D. C., Buehler, J. W., Silk, B. J., Thompson, N., Shild, L., & Klein, M. (2006). Trends in healthcare use in New York City region following the terrorist attacks of 2001. *Biosecurity and Bioterrorism*, 4(3), 263–275.
- Holman, E. A., & Silver, R. C. (2011). Health status and health care utilization following collective trauma: a 3-year national study of the 9/11 terrorist attacks in the United States. Social Science & Medicine, 73(4), 483–490.
- Hosmer, D. W., & Lemeshow, S. (2004). Applied logistic regression (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kessler, R. C., Barker, P. R., Colpe, L. J., Epstein, J. F., Gfroerer, J. C., Hiripi, E., et al. (2003). Screening for serious mental illness in the general population. Archives of General Psychiatry, 60(2), 184–189.
- McDonald, S. D., & Calhoun, P. S. (2010). The diagnostic accuracy of the PTSD checklist: a critical review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 30(8), 976–987.
- Mojtabai, R., Olfson, M., & Mechanic, D. (2002). Perceived need and help-seeking in adults with mood, anxiety, or substance use disorders. Archives of General Psychiatry, 59(1), 77–84.
- Nelson, C. H., & Park, J. (2006). The nature and correlates of unmet health care needs in Ontario, Canada. Social Science & Medicine, 62(9), 2291–2300.
- Riggs, D. S., Byrne, C. A., Weathers, F. W., & Litz, B. T. (1998). The quality of the intimate relationships of male Vietnam veterans: problems associated with posttraumatic stress disorder. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 11(1), 87–101.
- Shih, F.-J., Liao, Y.-C., Chan, S.-M., Duh, B.-R., & Gau, M.-L. (2002). The impact of the 9-21 earthquake experiences of Taiwanese nurses as rescuers. Social Science & Medicine, 55(4), 659–672.
- Stuber, J., Galea, S., Boscarino, J. A., & Schlesinger, M. (2006). Was there unmet mental health need after the september 11, 2001 terrorist attacks? Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology, 41(3), 230–240.
- Viel, J. F., Curbakova, E., Dzerve, B., Eglite, M., Zvagule, T., & Vincent, C. (1997). Risk factors for long-term mental and psychosomatic distress in Latvian Chernobyl liquidators. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 105(Suppl 6).
- Wang, P. S., Berglund, P., Olfson, M., Pincus, H. A., Wells, K. B., & Kessler, R. C. (2005). Failure and delay in initial treatment contact after first onset of mental disorders in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 62(6), 603–613.
- Welch, A. E., Caramanica, K., Debchoudhury, I., Pulizzi, A., Farfel, M. R., Stellman, S. D., et al. (2012). A qualitative examination of health and health care utilization after the september 11th terror attacks among World Trade Center Health registry enrollees. *BMC Public Health*, 12(1), 721.
- Zahran, H. S., Kobau, R., Moriarty, D. G., Zack, M. M., Holt, J., & Donehoo, R. (2005). Health-related quality of life surveillance–United States, 1993–2002. MMWR Surveillance Summaries, 54(4), 1–35.