Variations in healthy aging: the role of different risk factors
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SES variations in unhealthy ageing

• Persons with a lower education:
  – loose several years of life expectancy
  – loose even more years in good health
  – spend more years with health problems as compared to peers with a high education

• Differences are persistent

• Healthy ageing of high SES as an achievable target for society and a benchmark for research
This presentation

1. How large are educational disparities in life expectancy (LE) and disability-free life expectancy (DFLE) in Europe in the 21st century?

2. What is the contribution of specific risk factors on LE and DFLE and on educational disparities in LE and DFLE?
   - 1 risk factor: low fruit & vegetable intake (F&V)
   - focus on how to assess contribution of risk factors
## Lifepath project: new data for DFLE by education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Mortality Period</th>
<th>Mortality Source</th>
<th>Disability Period</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
<td>Census follow up</td>
<td>2010-2014</td>
<td>EU-SILC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2006-2011</td>
<td>Census follow up</td>
<td>2008-2011</td>
<td>EU-SILC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
<td>Census follow up</td>
<td>2010-2014</td>
<td>EU-SILC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
<td>Survey follow up</td>
<td>2010-2014</td>
<td>EU-SILC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
<td>Census follow up</td>
<td>2010-2014</td>
<td>EU-SILC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2007-2011</td>
<td>Census follow up</td>
<td>2008-2011</td>
<td>EU-SILC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*EU-SILC harmonized questionnaire since 2008*

More countries to follow
Standard methods for DFLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Census/survey follow up</td>
<td>Deaths /PY</td>
<td>Mortality rates by age, sex and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Disabled/N</td>
<td>% with disability by age, sex and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortality rates % with disability</td>
<td>Sullivan life table method</td>
<td>Partial DFLE and LE with disability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Partial life expectancies: between ages 35 and 79 years
- GALI limitations: for the past 6 months or more, limited or strongly limited in activities people usually do because of a health problem
- 3 education groups:
  - Low = ISCED 0-2;
  - Medium = ISCED 3-4;
  - High = ISCED 5-6
Disability-Free Partial Life Expectancy (35-79 yrs) by Educational Attainment

Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Austria</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
<th>Finland</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Lithuania</th>
<th>Spain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2013</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2011</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2014</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2012</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2014</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2012</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contribution of risk factors

What is the contribution of life style factors to educational disparities in DFLE?

Focus on Fruit and Vegetable intake (F&V)

Two counterfactual scenarios:
1. complete elimination of low F&V intake
2. less than high educated has same F&V intake as high educated: high SES as benchmark

-> both scenarios no inequalities in F&V intake
## Data: disability and F&V intake

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Fruit &amp; Vegetable intake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>ESS 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>EHIS 2008/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>ESS 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>ESS data End of May, not yet included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>EHIS 2008/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Low in F&V: less than once a day fruit and vegetable intake
# PAF approach

$$PAF = \frac{\text{prevalence} \times (RR - 1)}{(\text{prevalence} \times (RR - 1)) + 1}$$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey (ESS, EHIS)</th>
<th>% low in F&amp;V by age, gender and education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meta-analyses Wang et al, 2014</td>
<td>RR F&amp;V -&gt; mortality: 1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort study Artaud et al, 2013</td>
<td>HR F&amp;V -&gt; disability: 1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR mortality % low in F&amp;V</td>
<td>PAF mortality (% low F&amp;V =0) PIF mortality (% low F&amp;V = high SES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR disability % low in F&amp;V</td>
<td>PAF disability (% low F&amp;V =0) PIF disability (% low F&amp;V = high SES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sullivan) life table + PAFs</td>
<td>LE, DFLE elimination of low F&amp;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sullivan) life table + PIFS</td>
<td>LE, DFLE with all SES groups F&amp;V exposure of highly educated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prevalence of low F&V intake
Males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Austria</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
<th>Finland</th>
<th>Spain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prevalence of low F&V intake Females

Percentage
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Low  Medium  High
Effect of changes in F&V intake on partial DFLE

Males - Low Educated

Input:
- RF Prevalence
- RR mortality: 1.17
- HR disability: 1.20
Effects of changes in F&V intake on educational disparities in DFLE (High vs low)
Effect of changes in F&V intake on partial DFLE
Females - Low Educated

Input:
- RF Prevalence
- RR mortality: 1.17
- HR disability: 1.20
Effects of changes in F&V intake on educational disparities in DFLE
(High vs low)
Females
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Years

Observed
Same exposure as highest educated
No exposure to low F&V intake
Wrapping up

• Approach seems to work
• Preliminary analyses suggest that:
  – F&V intake varies by education and there is some contribution of inequalities in F&V intake to inequalities LE and DFLE
  – Educational disparities in LE, DFLE and F&V intake and the potential impact of changing F&V intake vary by gender and country
Challenges PAF

RRs linking exposure to disability

1. Different disability measure than in HE
2. Different exposure measure than for prevalence in the studied population
3. RRs for disability are scarce and based on a single study
4. RR for disability generally not published by age, gender and SES
5. RR for disability for some risk factors are absent
Alternative: fractions based on attribution method

• Attribution method to attribute disability to diseases using cross-sectional data (Nusselder & Looman, 2014)

• Disability due to a disease (cause) is determined by:
  (1) prevalence of the disease
  (2) disabling impact of the disease (cause) estimated with additive rate model

• Method takes into account that:
  – People specified diseases (causes) can be disabled (background risk)
  – More than 1 disease (cause) can be present

• hazard for disability = sum of background hazard + disease hazards
• probability = (1 - exp(- hazard for disability)).
Alternative: fractions based on attribution tool (2)

• Use risk factors instead of diseases as causes of disability in attribution method

• Use cross-sectional individual data on risk factors, disability, age, and sex

• % prevalence of disability due to specific risk factor

• Similar interpretation as PAF
Comparison of approaches

- EHIS wave 1, Belgium, ages 40-59 years

- Risk factor = Fruit and vegetable intake (F&V intake)

- PAF: RR from authors study Artaud, 2013 for ages 60+: 1.20
  - PAF: same RR for both genders and all ages

- Attribution method: F&V, smoking, physical activity, overweight
  - Background and disabling impact can vary by age

- PAF and attribution method: F&V prevalence based on same selection in EHIS
% disability due to lack of F&V intake based on PAF and attribution

PAF:
- RF Prevalence
- RR mortality: 1.17
- RR disability: 1.20

Attribution:
- Background 5 yr age group
- F&V, ever smoking, BMI, PA
- Background and RF effects same both gender

7.9 vs. 8.4%
Effect of assumption constant RR for all ages in PAF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>RR in PAF</th>
<th>RR to get same as attribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing PAF, Attribution, and PAF RR decline for different age groups (40-44, 45-49, 50-54, 55-59).]
% disability due to lack of F&V intake based on PAF and attribution

PAF:
- RF Prevalence
- RR mortality: 1.17
- RR disability: 1.20

Attribution:
- Background 5 yr age group
- F&V, ever smoking, BMI, PA
- Background and RF effects same both gender

6.5 vs. 7.6%
Effect of assumption constant RR for all ages in PAF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>RR in PAF</th>
<th>RR to get same as attribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Women

- PAF
- Attribution
- PAF RR decline
Attribution: more risk factors

Men

Women

- FVC
- PhysicalActivity
- Obese
- EverSmok
- backgrnd
## Differences and similarities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PAF</th>
<th>Attribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F&amp;V intake</strong></td>
<td>Daily vs. nondaily F&amp;V intake</td>
<td>Daily vs. nondaily F&amp;V intake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disability</strong></td>
<td>GALI based on health surveys</td>
<td>GALI based on health surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Link RF- disability</strong></td>
<td>Direct link (immediate effect)</td>
<td>Direct link (immediate effect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Causal effect</strong></td>
<td>Ideally: RR meta-analyses Here: RR 1 observational study, corr. for other risk factors &amp; excl. first years of FU</td>
<td>No causal effect from cross-sectional data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competing risks</strong></td>
<td>Not taken into account Sum &gt;100%</td>
<td>Yes, here: smoking, BMI, PA, and “background”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variations age, gender</strong></td>
<td>Possible, limiting factor is published RR Here: single RR all ages and both genders</td>
<td>Possible, limiting factor is sample size Here background by age, no significant differences by sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SES</strong></td>
<td>Possible, limiting factor is absence of RR by SES</td>
<td>Possible (limiting factor is sample size)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pros and cons PAF approach

Strong points:
- RR can be derived from best available (meta) meta-analyses
- Exposure can be obtained from best available data source
- More exposure categories possible
- Transparent approach

However:
- Limited evidence on RR linking risk factors to disability
- Definition of exposure in RR and population prevalence differs
- Definition of outcome in RR and in health expectancies differs
- RR by SES hardly available (same applies for age and gender)
- No competing risk factors taken into account: more risk factors, then attribution > 100%
Pros and cons attribution approach

Strong points:
• Consistent data on exposure and outcome in entire approach
• Data are available by country, sex and SES
• Takes into account competing risk factors

However:
• Cross sectional data cannot be used to infer causal effects
• High risk of reverse causation
• Assumptions proportionality of hazards violated if people jump between risk factor states
• Presence vs. absence of risk factor
No final conclusions

Only one risk factor, one age group, one country

Next steps:

• Extend to other age groups (small sample size)
• Extend to other risk factors
• Pooling multiple countries and/or multiple surveys

Conclusions on usefulness of each approach, general or for specific risk factors
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