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## Life Expectancy at birth in Japan



## Life Expectancy at 65 in Japan



## Background

- 20.8\% of Japanese population aged 65 and over*
- Longer lives = healthy lives?
- Improvements in health or worsening health over time?
- Compression or expansion of morbidity? Or dynamic equilibrium?
* Source: Ministry of Health, Welfare and Labor, Japan, 2007


## Self-rated health

- Various indicators used to measure health
- Self-rated health
- Fundamental and single indicator of overall health
- Takes into account a variety of social, physical and emotional factors
- Usually measured in large population health surveys
- Strong predictor of subsequent illness and all-cause and specific mortality (Ider and Benyami, 1997; Benjamin, 2004; Lyyra et al., 2006; Miller 2007)


## Objective

- To examine the number of years and proportion of life lived in good versus poor self-rated health and how they have changed over time from 1986 to 2004


## Data sources to compute HLE

- Sex-specific period life tables
- Obtained from the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Labor, Japan
- Prevalence rates for self-rated health
- National Survey on Everyday Life (Kokumin Seikatsu Kiso Chosa)
- Cross-sectional study conducted in large scale every three years beginning 1986
- Nationally representative, stratified sampling of census areas
- 280,000 households surveyed; data on over 750,000 individuals collected
- 7 time points available over 16-year period (1986, 1989, 1992, 1995, 1998, 2001, 2004)


## Data (continued)

## Interview Question:

"In general, how would you describe your state of health?"

1. Very good
2. Good
3. Average
4. Not so good
5. Poor

## Prevalence rates (in percentages)

$\begin{array}{lllllll}1986 & 1989 & 1992 & 1995 & 1998 & 2001 & 2004\end{array}$
Very good
Good
Average
Not too good
Poor
3.9
2.7
2.2
2.9
4.6
4.8

Total
$\begin{array}{lllllll}100.0 & 100.0 & 100.0 & 100.0 & 100.0 & 100.0 & 100.0\end{array}$

## Data (continued)

"In general, how would you describe your state of health?"

1. Good
2. Above average

3. Average

Average
4. Not so good
5. Poor


## Method

- Sullivan Method
- Combines mortality data from life tables and morbidity data from national surveys
- Partitions total life expectancy into healthy and unhealthy states


## RESULTS

## HLE of Japanese men at age 65

| Year | $e^{65}$ | Health status: |  |  | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Good | Average | Poor | Gd./Avg. |
| 1986 | 15.9 | 4.9 ■ | 7.2 | 3.8 | 75.9 |
| 1989 | 16.2 | 5.1 - | 7.2 | 3.9 | 75.7 |
| 1992 | 16.3 | 5.8 - | 7.1 | 3.4 | 79.3 |
| 1995 | 16.5 | 6.2) | 7.2 | 3.1 | 81.2 |
| 1998 | 17.1 | 5.5 | 7.8 | 3.8 - | 77.8 |
| 2001 | 17.8 | 5.3 | 8.1 | 4.4 - | 75.1 |
| 2004 | 18.2 | 5.5 | 8.0 | (4.7) | 74.1 |

## Trend in HLE of men at age 65



Trend in proportion of HLE: Japanese men at age 65


## Statistical Test of Difference

Between

Healthy Life
Expectancy

Unhealthy Life
Expectancy

## 1986 \＆ 1995

1995 \＆ 2004
1986 \＆ 2004

夫夫

夫夫

夫夫
＊＊

夫夫

夫夫
${ }^{* *}$ Significant at 0.01 level
＊Significant at 0.05 level

## HLE of Japanese women at age 65

| Year | $\mathrm{e}^{65}$ | Health status: |  |  | $\%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Good | Average | Poor | Gd./Avg. |
| 1986 | 19.3 | $4.7 ■$ | 9.4 | 5.2 | 72.9 |
| 1989 | 20.0 | $5.0-$ | 9.5 | 5.4 | 72.9 |
| 1992 | 20.3 | $5.9-$ | 9.5 | 4.9 | 76.1 |
| 1995 | 20.9 | 6.5 | 9.9 | 4.6 | 78.2 |
| 1998 | 22.0 | 5.8 | 10.6 | $5.6 \sim$ | 74.3 |
| 2001 | 22.7 | 5.5 | 10.5 | $6.6 \sim$ | 70.8 |
| 2004 | 23.3 | 5.8 | 10.6 | 6.8 | 70.6 |

## Men at age 65

Health status:
$\begin{array}{llllll}\mathrm{Yr} & \mathrm{e}^{65} & \mathrm{Gd} & \text { Avg Poor } & \text { Gd./ } \\ \text { Avg. }\end{array}$

|  | 156 | 15.9 | 4.9 | 7.2 | 3.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

$\begin{array}{llllll}\prime & 169 & 16.2 & 5.1= & 7.2 & 3.9 \\ 75.7\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}\prime 92 & 16.3 & 5.8- & 7.1 & 3.4 & 79.3\end{array}$

|  | 95 | 16.5 | 6.2 | 7.2 | 3.1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

$\begin{array}{llllll}\prime 98 & 17.1 & 5.5 & 7.8 & 3.8 & 77.8\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll} & 17.8 & 5.3 & 8.1 & 4.4 & 75.1\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll} & 04 & 18.2 & 5.5 & 8.0 & 4.7\end{array} 74.1$

Women at age 65

Health status:
\%
Yr $e^{65}$ Gd Avg Poor Gd./ Avg.


## Men at age 65

## Women at age 65

|  |  |  | 25 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Trend in proportion of HLE: Japanese women at age 65


## Men at age 65

## Women at age 65

||||||

## Statistical Test of Difference

Between

Healthy Life
Expectancy

Unhealthy Life
Expectancy

## 1986 \＆ 1995

1995 \＆ 2004
1986 \＆ 2004

夫夫

夫夫

夫夫
＊＊

夫夫

夫夫
${ }^{* *}$ Significant at 0.01 level
＊Significant at 0.05 level

## Quick recap

- At age 65, compared with men, women:
- will live longer, but can expect more years in average or poor health; the number of years in good health is about the same.
- can expect to spend a smaller proportion of their lives in good health and a larger proportion in average or poor health
- Some evidence of compression of poor health until 1995 and expansion of poor health after 1995


## Possible explanations for trend

```
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5
    # Poor
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Implementation of the "Golden Plan" in Japan
- 10-year plan to
promote health \& welfare services for the aged - Included home helper \& short-stay services, daycare and senior centers, health care facilities

\section*{Comparison with NUJLSOA}
- Nihon University Japanese Longitudinal Study of Aging (NUJLSOA)
- 1999, 2001, 2003, 2006
- 4,997 respondents aged 65 and over in 1999
- refreshed samples in 2001 and 2003
- Nationally representative of Japanese 65+
- Face-to-face interviews using structured questionnaire
- To compare, data used cross-sectionally for 1999, 2001, 2003
- Similar question on self-rated health was used.

\section*{HLE for Japanese men at age 65}

NUJLSOA
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Health status:} & \% \\
\hline Year & \(e^{65}\) & Gd. & Avg & Poor & Avg. \\
\hline 1998 & 17.1 & 5.5 & 7.8 & 3.8 & 77.8 \\
\hline 2001 & 17.8 & 5.3 & 8.1 & 4.4 & 75.1 \\
\hline 2004 & 18.2 & 5.5 & 8.0 & 4.7 & 74.1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{} & \multicolumn{3}{c|}{ Health status: } & \begin{tabular}{c}
\(\%\) \\
Gd./ \\
Year
\end{tabular} \\
\(e^{65}\) & Gd. & Avg & Poor & Avg.
\end{tabular} \begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 1999 & 17.0 & 6.2 & 6.0 \\
\hline 2001 & 17.8 & 7.7 & 6.2 \\
\hline 3.9 & 78.1 \\
\hline 2003 & 18.0 & 6.8 & 6.8 \\
\hline & 4.5 & 75.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Trend in HLE of men at age 65} NUJLSOA



\section*{Trend in proportion of HLE: Men at age 65}

\section*{NUJLSOA}


\section*{HLE for Japanese women at age 65}

NUJLSOA
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Health status:} & \\
\hline Year & \(e^{65}\) & Gd. & Avg & Poor & Avg. \\
\hline 1998 & 22.0 & 5.8 & 10.6 & 5.6 & 74.3 \\
\hline 2001 & 22.7 & 5.5 & 10.5 & 6.6 & 70.8 \\
\hline 2004 & 23.3 & 5.8 & 10.6 & 6.8 & 70.6 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{} & \multicolumn{3}{c|}{ Health status: } & \begin{tabular}{c}
\(\%\) \\
Gd./ \\
Year
\end{tabular} \\
\(e^{65}\) & Gd. & Avg & Poor & Avg.
\end{tabular} \begin{tabular}{cccccc|}
\hline 1999 & 21.9 & 6.6 & 8.5 & 6.7 & 69.2 \\
\hline 2001 & 22.7 & 7.7 & 8.3 & 6.7 & 70.3 \\
\hline 2003 & 23.0 & 6.8 & 9.6 & 6.6 & 71.6 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Trend in HLE of women at age 65} NUJLSOA
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\section*{Trend in proportion of HLE:} Women at age 65

NUJLSOA


\section*{Limitations}
- Data on institutionalized population not available by age and sex
- LE in good health could be over-estimated
- Biases in self-reports
- Gender differences
- Data used are cross-sectional and do not allow for transition estimations```

