

### **Dear Author**

Here are the proofs of your article.

- You can submit your corrections **online** or by **fax**.
- For **online** submission please insert your corrections in the online correction form. Always indicate the line number to which the correction refers.
- Please return your proof together with the permission to publish confirmation.
- For **fax** submission, please ensure that your corrections are clearly legible. Use a fine black pen and write the correction in the margin, not too close to the edge of the page.
- Remember to note the journal title, article number, and your name when sending your response via e-mail, fax or regular mail.
- **Check** the metadata sheet to make sure that the header information, especially author names and the corresponding affiliations are correctly shown.
- **Check** the questions that may have arisen during copy editing and insert your answers/corrections.
- **Check** that the text is complete and that all figures, tables and their legends are included. Also check the accuracy of special characters, equations, and electronic supplementary material if applicable. If necessary refer to the *Edited manuscript*.
- The publication of inaccurate data such as dosages and units can have serious consequences. Please take particular care that all such details are correct.
- Please **do not** make changes that involve only matters of style. We have generally introduced forms that follow the journal's style. Substantial changes in content, e.g., new results, corrected values, title and authorship are not allowed without the approval of the responsible editor. In such a case, please contact the Editorial Office and return his/her consent together with the proof.
- If we do not receive your corrections within 48 hours, we will send you a reminder.

#### **Please note**

Your article will be published **Online First** approximately one week after receipt of your corrected proofs. This is the **official first publication** citable with the DOI. **Further changes are, therefore, not possible.** 

After online publication, subscribers (personal/institutional) to this journal will have access to the complete article via the DOI using the URL:

http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10389-020-01242-x

If you would like to know when your article has been published online, take advantage of our free alert service. For registration and further information, go to: <u>http://www.springerlink.com</u>.

Due to the electronic nature of the procedure, the manuscript and the original figures will only be returned to you on special request. When you return your corrections, please inform us, if you would like to have these documents returned.

The **printed version** will follow in a forthcoming issue.

### Metadata of the article that will be visualized in OnlineFirst

1	Article Title	Mental health se epidemiological s	rvices and the city: a neighbourhood-level study
2	Article Sub- Title		
3	Article Copyright - Year	Springer-Verlag (This will be the	GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2020 copyright line in the final PDF)
4	Journal Name	Journal of Public	Health
5		Family Name	D'Agostino
6		Particle	
7		Given Name	Armando
8		Suffix	
9		Organization	Department of Mental Health, ASST Santi Paolo e Carlo
10	Corresponding	Division	
11	Author	Address	Milan, Italy
12		Organization	Università degli Studi di Milano
13		Division	Department of Health Sciences
14		Address	Ospedale San Paolo, via Antonio di Rudinì 8, Milan 20142, Italy
15		e-mail	armando.dagostino@unimi.it
16		Family Name	Ostinelli
17		Particle	
18		Given Name	Edoardo G.
19		Suffix	
20	Author	Organization	Università degli Studi di Milano
21		Division	Department of Health Sciences
22		Address	Ospedale San Paolo, via Antonio di Rudinì 8, Milan 20142, Italy
23		e-mail	
24		Family Name	Pesce
25		Particle	
26	A	Given Name	Luisa
27	Author	Suffix	
28		Organization	Mental Health Area, Provincial Agency for Health Services
29		Division	

30		Address	Trento, Italy
31		e-mail	
32		Family Name	Zangani
33		Particle	
34		Given Name	Caroline
35		Suffix	
36	Author	Organization	Università degli Studi di Milano
37		Division	Department of Health Sciences
38		Address	Ospedale San Paolo, via Antonio di Rudinì 8, Milan 20142, Italy
39		e-mail	
40		Family Name	Miragoli
41		Particle	
42		Given Name	Paolo
43		Suffix	
44	Author	Organization	Department of Mental Health, ASST Santi Paolo e Carlo
45		Division	
46		Address	Milan, Italy
47		e-mail	
48		Family Name	Durbano
49		Particle	
50		Given Name	Federico
51		Suffix	
52	Author	Organization	Department of Mental Health, ASST Melegnano e Martesana
53		Division	
54		Address	Melzo, Italy
55		e-mail	
56		Family Name	Biffi
57		Particle	
58		Given Name	Giuseppe
59	A	Suffix	
60	Autnor	Organization	Department of Mental Health, ASST Santi Paolo e Carlo
61		Division	
62		Address	Milan, Italy
63		e-mail	
64	A	Family Name	Mencacci
65	Author	Particle	

66		Given Name	Claudio
67		Suffix	
68		Organization	Department of Mental Health, ASST Fatebenefratelli Sacco
69		Division	
70		Address	Milan, Italy
71		e-mail	
72		Family Name	Scarone
73		Particle	
74		Given Name	Silvio
75		Suffix	
76		Organization	Università degli Studi di Milano
77	Author	Division	Department of Health Sciences
78		Address	Ospedale San Paolo, via Antonio di Rudinì 8, Milan 20142, Italy
79		Organization	Department of Mental Health, ASST Santi Paolo e Carlo
80		Division	
81		Address	Milan, Italy
82		e-mail	
83		Family Name	Gambini
84		Particle	
85		Given Name	Orsola
86		Suffix	
87		Organization	Università degli Studi di Milano
88		Division	Department of Health Sciences
89		Address	Ospedale San Paolo, via Antonio di Rudinì 8, Milan 20142, Italy
90	Author	Organization	Department of Mental Health, ASST Santi Paolo e Carlo
91		Division	
92		Address	Milan, Italy
93		Organization	University of Milan Medical School
94		Division	CRC "Aldo Ravelli" for Neurotechnology and Experimental Brain Therapeutics
95		Address	Ospedale San Paolo, via Antonio di Rudinì 8, Milan 20142, Italy
96		e-mail	
97		Received	12 August 2019
98	Schedule	Revised	
99		Accepted	21 February 2020

100	Abstract	<ul> <li>Introduction: Neighbourhood composition is considered a social determinant of mental health that can be addressed by policymakers to improve outcomes. Deprived neighbourhoods typically lack resources such as leisure and park facilities but also daycare centres. However, the study of specific needs and resource distribution tailored to the clinical-demographic features of mental health service users is still in its infancy.</li> <li>Aim: In this study, we aimed to identify discrepancies between neighbourhood resources and epidemiological composition of a representative sample of mental health service users in the large metropolitan area of Milan in Italy.</li> <li>Methods: In a cross-sectional study design, we described neighbourhood-specific density of community services and the socio-demographic and clinical features of residents who accessed local mental health services in the same geographical areas. Data were retrieved from municipal and mental health registries and analysed at a neighbourhood level and at a higher level of neighbourhood clustering based on territory coverage of three mental health departments.</li> <li>Results: At the neighbourhood level, no significant difference could be observed between resources of the three identified urban areas. However, a strong heterogeneity of resource localization was observed for public housing properties, social services, juvenile community homes, social aggregation spaces and day centres for disabled individuals after controlling for population density across the three areas. This heterogeneity disorders were most frequent in an area which incorporates relatively more affluent neighbourhoods. Further studies including a neighbourhood-level socio-economic index are needed to confirm the likelihood of these associations.</li> <li>Conclusion: Our preliminary findings suggest a heterogeneous distribution of diagnoses across city areas, which might reflect uneven neighbourhood resources to the specific mental health needs of vulnerable individuals.</li> &lt;</ul>
101	Keywords separated by ' - '	Neighbourhood resources - Mental health administration - Socio-economic condition - Severe mental disorders - Social deprivation
102	Foot note information	Edoardo G. Ostinelli and Armando D'Agostino contributed equally to this work.
		Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Journal of Public Health: From Theory to Practice https://doi.org/10.1007/s10389-020-01242-x

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

# Mental health services and the city: a neighbourhood-level epidemiological study

Edoardo G. Ostinelli<sup>1</sup> · Armando D'Agostino<sup>1,2</sup> · Luisa Pesce<sup>3</sup> · Caroline Zangani<sup>1</sup> · Paolo Miragoli<sup>2</sup> ·
 Federico Durbano<sup>4</sup> · Giuseppe Biffi<sup>2</sup> · Claudio Mencacci<sup>5</sup> · Silvio Scarone<sup>1,2</sup> · Orsola Gambini<sup>1,2,6</sup>

10 Received: 12 August 2019 / Accepted: 21 February 2020

11 © Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2020

#### 12 Abstract

 $\frac{3}{2}$ 

4

5

6

9

- 13 Introduction Neighbourhood composition is considered a social determinant of mental health that can be addressed by
- 14 policymakers to improve outcomes. Deprived neighbourhoods typically lack resources such as leisure and park facilities but
- 15 also daycare centres. However, the study of specific needs and resource distribution tailored to the clinical-demographic features 16 of mental health service users is still in its infancy.
- Aim In this study, we aimed to identify discrepancies between neighbourhood resources and epidemiological composition of a representative sample of mental health service users in the large metropolitan area of Milan in Italy.
- 19 **Methods** In a cross-sectional study design, we described neighbourhood-specific density of community services and the socio-20 demographic and clinical features of residents who accessed local mental health services in the same geographical areas. Data
- were retrieved from municipal and mental health registries and analysed at a neighbourhood level and at a higher level of neighbourhood clustering based on territory coverage of three mental health departments.
- Results At the neighbourhood level, no significant difference could be observed between resources of the three identified urban areas.
- However, a strong heterogeneity of resource localization was observed for public housing properties, social services, juvenile community homes, social aggregation spaces and day centres for disabled individuals after controlling for population density across the three areas. This heterogeneity did not match the distribution of service users or specific diagnosis–related needs across different urban districts. Non-affective psychoses were found to be more frequently diagnosed in deprived neighbourhoods, whereas anxiety disorders were most frequent in an area which incorporates relatively more affluent neighbourhoods. Further studies including a
- 29 neighbourhood-level socio-economic index are needed to confirm the likelihood of these associations.
- 30 Conclusion Our preliminary findings suggest a heterogeneous distribution of diagnoses across city areas, which might reflect 31 uneven neighbourhood resources. Overall, this study highlights the need to adequately tailor neighbourhood resources to the 32 specific mental health needs of vulnerable individuals.
- Keywords Neighbourhood resources · Mental health administration · Socio-economic condition · Severe mental disorders · Social
   deprivation

35

Edoardo G. Ostinelli and Armando D'Agostino contributed equally to this work.

Armando D'Agostino armando.dagostino@unimi.it

- <sup>1</sup> Department of Health Sciences, Università degli Studi di Milano, Ospedale San Paolo, via Antonio di Rudinì 8, 20142 Milan, Italy
- <sup>2</sup> Department of Mental Health, ASST Santi Paolo e Carlo, Milan, Italy
- <sup>3</sup> Mental Health Area, Provincial Agency for Health Services, Trento, Italy
- <sup>4</sup> Department of Mental Health, ASST Melegnano e Martesana, Melzo, Italy
- <sup>5</sup> Department of Mental Health, ASST Fatebenefratelli Sacco, Milan, Italy
- <sup>6</sup> CRC "Aldo Ravelli" for Neurotechnology and Experimental Brain Therapeutics, University of Milan Medical School, Ospedale San Paolo, via Antonio di Rudinì 8, 20142 Milan, Italy

#### 36 Introduction

Psychiatric disorders have received increasing attention 37 38 worldwide from policymakers, largely due to their impact on 39 socio-economic and overall health status of patients (Patel et al. 2007). The notion that mental health is a multilevel 40 41 phenomenon, influenced by multiple social contexts, and 42influencing itself multiple contexts, has existed for centuries. During the nineteenth century, physicians and social reformers 43 across Europe documented that some ways of living and 44 working conditions were related to high rates of disease, par-45ticularly among the poor (Engels 1958; Villerme 1988; 46 Virchow 1988). According to the Organisation for Economic 47 Co-operation and Development (OECD), one in two people 48 will develop a mental illness at some point in their lives, with 49 adverse effects on their productivity, wages and employment 50opportunities (Hewlett and Moran 2014). 51

Mental health is usually determined by a complex interac-5253tion of socio-cultural, psychological, environmental, urban and demographic factors (Jackson et al. 2010). The prevalence 54of psychiatric disorders is significantly associated with age, 55marital status, educational level, employment and health-5657related quality of life (HRQoL) (Alegria et al. 2002). Psychiatric disorders, such as depression and anxiety, are also 58influenced by educational level, income and occupation 5960 (Barry 2009; Lenze et al. 2001; Meyer et al. 2014).

At an individual level, the demographic and socio-economic 61 correlates of psychiatric disorders have been widely demonstrat-62 ed (Burvill 1995; Lorant et al. 2003). However, socio-economic 63conditions that influence mental health can also be studied at an 64 ecological level (Amaddeo et al. 2015). Contextual and urban 6566 effects are defined as measures that are associated with individual health (Diez Roux 2003; Duncan et al. 1995; Macintyre et al. 67 1993). The social environment includes groups to which indi-68 69 viduals belong, the neighbourhoods in which they live, the or-70ganization of workplaces and the policies created to regulate 71everyday life. Although the influence of the social environment 72has been demonstrated for a range of physical health outcomes (McKenzie et al. 2002; Pickett and Pearl 2001; Yen and Syme 731999), their association with outcomes in mental health has been 74studied more rarely and with mixed results (Pickett and Pearl 752001). The lack of homogeneity in study designs and measures 76of mental health and neighbourhoods has strongly limited the 7778possibility of generalizing findings on their relationship (Truong and Ma 2006). Nonetheless, neighbourhood composition is con-79sidered among the social determinants that can be addressed to 80 improve mental health outcomes in the framework of the United 81 82 Nations Sustainable Development Goals (Lund et al. 2018).

Subjects with mental disorders are among the vulnerable individuals who are most significantly influenced by
neighbourhood characteristics because of general limitations in
mobility and so-called "activity space" (Gale et al. 2011; Vallée
et al. 2011). Very few studies have examined demographic and

socio-economic variables and urban context across psychiatric 88 disorders in representative samples from large European metro-89 politan areas. Although available data are sparse, neighbourhood 90 deprivation has been associated with an increase in mental health 91service users, sustaining the need to direct resources towards 92 more deprived communities (Bhavsar and McGuire 2018). 93 Poorer neighbourhoods are usually characterized by a lack of 94 several resources, ranging from leisure and park facilities to 95daycare centres (Leventhal and Brooks-Gunn 2000). 96 Significantly fewer mental health problems have been reported 97 for male adolescents who were experimentally moved with their 98 families to relatively less poor neighbourhoods in New York 99 City (Leventhal and Brooks-Gunn 2003). However, the study 100 of different distribution patterns of resources in the territory in 101 relationship to specific clinical-demographic features of service 102users is still in its infancy. 103

From this perspective, Italian mental health services offer 104the advantage of a strict overlap with the urban territory. Since 1051978, mental health care has been based on a community-106 based model of care that is organized according to local health 107 districts which serve a well-defined geographic area. Each 108 district is served by a Department of Mental Health (DMH), 109which supplies a range of in- and outpatient services. Since the 110 first Regional Mental Health Plan, the Lombardy region 111 adopted an organizational model centred on multi-112disciplinary teams. These teams include psychiatrists, psy-113chologists, nurses, social workers, occupational therapists, re-114habilitation counsellors and auxiliary staff. According to the 115Plan and subsequent revisions, DMHs should provide a full 116 range of psychiatric care, from acute emergency treatment to 117long-term rehabilitation (Lora et al. 2012). The organization 118of related economic costs implies that individuals who seek 119public mental health interventions can only receive them from 120the DMH covering the district in which they reside. In this 121context, an association between service use and catchment 122area resources has been reported in small suburban territories 123(Donisi et al. 2013). 124

The aim of this study was to identify discrepancies between125the neighbourhood resources and epidemiological composi-126tion of a representative sample of mental health service users127from the large metropolitan area of Milan in Italy.128

129

130

#### Methods

#### Socio-environmental data

The Municipality of Milan is divided into 88 local identity131nuclei (Fig. 1). These nuclei are defined as neighbourhoods132characterized by differing historical and projectual identities.133Data on the social environment of the nuclei can be publicly134accessed from the Italian National Institute of Statistics135(ISTAT), the leading Italian producer of official statistics in136

Fig. 1 Urban districts covered by three Departments of Mental Health in Milan, Italy (area 1, Fatebenefratelli Hospital; area 2, San Carlo Hospital; area 3, San Paolo Hospital). Toponomastic data retrieved from http://dati. comune.milano.it/dataset/ds61\_ infogeo\_nil\_localizzazione\_on November 1, 2019



137the service of citizens and policy-makers (http://daticensimentopopolazione.istat.it/Index.aspx). The most recent 138population and housing census began in 2011 and the most 139complete data published on the municipality of Milan date 140141 back to 2012. All available data on the characteristics of the 142urban context on December 31, 2012, were obtained from the 143Statistics section of the municipality. The same data have become partially available through open platforms that can 144be accessed online (http://sisi.comune.milano.it/). 145

#### 146 **Clinical population**

The Regional register for mental health services PsicheWeb was 147148employed to collect data from all subjects who accessed three Departments of Mental Health in Milan, Italy. All interventions, 149ranging from interviews with social workers to medical visits to 150151rehabilitation are recorded on the register since 1999. Data are entered by one administrative professional in each Department. 152Demographic information, ICD-10 diagnoses and all interven-153154tions in any setting are recorded (Lora et al. 2012).

The three Departments involved organize the activity of the 155district mental health services associated with Fatebenefratelli, 156157San Carlo and San Paolo Hospitals. For the purpose of this study, they were renamed as follows: Area 1 (Fatebenefratelli), Area 2 158(San Carlo) and Area 3 (San Paolo). These are large, public 159metropolitan multi-service hospitals covering 10 of the 20 public 160161 health districts of the city, grouped into a total of 6 areas. These 20 districts overlap with 88 local identity nuclei of the 162Municipality of Milan (Fig. 1). All users who had any form of 163

contact with these Departments from January 1 to December 31, 1642012, were screened for inclusion. Data from a total of 9456 165subjects were retrieved. The identification code available on 166 the system was converted into a new anonymous code to pre-167serve the patients' privacy. According to the variable of interest, 168cases were excluded on the basis of missing data; 1754 (18.5%) 169subjects were excluded because their district of residence did not 170overlap with the Area of the mental health department they 171contacted. 172

#### Study design

This retrospective, cross-sectional, register-based study was	174
designed according to the following two levels:	175

#### Environmental level

The urban context related to the neighbourhoods in which the 177patients reside was accurately characterized through a large set 178of variables, subdivided into groups: population demo-179graphics (density, gender, families, foreigners, migrants, elder-180ly, newborn, dead); schooling services; welfare services (out-181 patient mental health services, juvenile community homes, 182non-profit and voluntary associations, social aggregation 183spaces for all residents and those for youth and for the elderly, 184social guardians, socio-recreational spaces for the elderly, oc-185cupational therapy laboratories, day centres for disabled indi-186 viduals, family consulting rooms, public housing properties, 187 public transportation, bike trails, parishes); law enforcement; 188

173

### 

recreational facilities (sport facilities, libraries, bars, restaurants and shops). The neighbourhoods were regrouped according to the public health districts from which the mental health data had been derived. According to the nature of the variable, rates were either calculated in relationship to km<sup>2</sup> or expressed as a number for 10,000 inhabitants of the territory.

#### 195 Epidemiological level

196 A set of variables were chosen to describe the clinical popu-197lation that accessed the mental health services of interest. All 198 data were subdivided according to the DMH of afference. The following patient variables were considered: gender, age of 199 first contact with service, nationality, civil status, education 200and occupation. The number of patients with at least one con-201202 tact during the year with any DMH service was considered the 203 prevalence of service use. Crude rates were calculated as the 204number for 10,000 adult inhabitants of the inherent territory. 205Inhabitants with age < 18 years were excluded from this calculation because clinical data were derived from adult ser-206207 vices. We calculated the prevalence of individuals with a com-208mon mental disorder and the population density per local 209 identity nuclei in the South-west area of Milan.

#### 210 Statistical analyses

Descriptive statistics were employed to report information on 211epidemiological features of the study population and on 212213neighbourhood composition. Continuous variables were reported as means and standard deviation, whereas categorical 214variables were reported as percentages. Shapiro-Wilk tests 215216revealed non-normal distributions of environmental and population data. Therefore, Kruskal-Wallis and chi-square tests 217218 were performed to explore differences between groups, with 219Bonferroni-corrected Dunn's pairwise comparison as post hoc 220 analysis. A highly conservative  $\pm 3$  cut-off was used for ad-221 justed standardized residuals to identify the largest deviations 222from expected values in associated variables.

A Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between the density of population at a neighbourhood level and the prevalence of residents with a diagnosis of any mental disorders. The STATA 16 statistical software was employed to conduct all analyses (StataCorp. 2019).

#### 229 Results

## 230 Socio-environmental characteristics of the urban231 context

Table 1 shows the distribution of all urban variables of interest across the three mental health areas, in combination (termed South-west Milan) and over the whole city. The South-west234Milan territory covers 46.1% of the whole city, where 50.6%235of the city population lives. All available population demographics (range 44.9%–54.5%) and schooling (range 46.9–23748.9%) services were generally representative of the whole city.238

When median neighbourhood-level resources were com-239pared among the three areas, no significant difference could be 240observed. However, inspection of data controlled for population 241density at the area level of clustering revealed that Areas 1 and 2 242were generally consistent with the whole city, whereas Area 3 243had a higher number of families (6425/10,000 inhabitants vs. 2444862/10,000 of the whole city), foreigners (2182/10,000 vs. 2451871/10,000), migrants (538/10,000 vs. 411/10,000), newborns 246(111/10,000 vs. 91/10,000) and deaths (141/10,000 vs. 106/ 24710,000). Welfare services were also generally representative, 248with the relevant exception of public housing services, 67.1% 249of which are located in the South-west Milan territory. Sixteen of 25010,000 public housing properties were found to be located in 251this area compared with an average 12/10,000 inhabitants over 252the whole city. This increase was found to be clearly driven by 253Areas 2 (19/10,000) and 3 (21/10,000). Public transportation 254services were representative of those available over the whole 255urban territory in terms of surface stops but not underground 256stops, which were found to be lower in South-west Milan 257(0.41/km<sup>2</sup> vs. 0.51/km<sup>2</sup>). In terms of surface stops, Areas 1 258and 2 had remarkably variable heterogeneity with 29.5/km<sup>2</sup> 259and 15.4/km<sup>2</sup> respectively, compared with the 20.4/km<sup>2</sup> of the 260whole city. Territorial support for ecological transportation was 261also found to be underdeveloped in Area 2, where only 9.3% of 262the city bike trails could be found. Law enforcement services 263were representative (42.7%), whereas recreational facilities were 264found to be lower than the city average in South-west Milan for 265museums, expositive spaces (30.2%) and cinemas (41.5%). In 266particular, Area 2 has no museum or expositive space compared 267with the 6/100,000 inhabitants found throughout the whole city. 268

#### Epidemiology of mental health service users

Table 2 shows the available clinical and demographic data of 270service users. When all areas were considered together (South-271west Milan), mean age of first contact was found to be  $39.7 \pm$ 27215.8, with a male-to-female ratio of approximately 44%-56%. 273Almost exactly half of service users were unmarried and the 274vast majority declared a secondary education (8 years, 40.4%; 27513 years, 32.5%). Over a third (36.6%) of users resided within 276their own family, whereas most of the others lived in their 277family of origin (30.6%) or alone (25.5%). Approximately 278one quarter of users declared no employment at the time of 279contact, whereas 41.2% declared some form of employment. 280

269

With the exception of gender distribution, all other variables differed significantly across the three urban areas investigated. Education level was significantly associated with urban areas [ $\chi^2(12) = 278,0210, p < 0,0001$ ]. The strongest 284

t1.1	able 1 District population demographics and facilities in	the territory of three mental he	calth departments and in the w	hole Municipality of Milan		
t1.2 P.	opulation demographics	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	South-west Milan	Milan
t1.3 P(	opulation (n, %)	338,185 (25.20%)	158,787 (11.83%)	182,059 (13.57%)	679,031 (50.60%)	$1,341,830\ (100\%)$
t1.4 Sı	urface (km <sup>2</sup> , %)	35.41 (19.48%)	22.87 (12.58%)	25.54 (14.05%)	83.82 (46.11%)	181.77 (100%)
t1.5 D	The term $(\text{pop. per km}^2)$	9550.65	6942.71	7128.34	8100.98	7381.93
t1.6 G	iender (m-f %)	46.58-53.42%	46.84-53.16%	47.58–52.42%	46.91 - 53.09%	47.61–52.39%
t1.7 Fi	amilies (n. %)	157,644 (24.16%)	75,012 (11.50%)	116,969 (17.93%)	349,625 (53.59%)	(52,455 (100%))
t1.8 Fi	amilies (n per 10,000)	4661.47	4724.06	6424.79	5148.88	4862.43
t1.9 F	oreigners $(n, \%)$	48,782 (19.43%)	24,177 (9.63%)	39,718 (15.82%)	112,677 (44.87%)	251,091 (100%)
t1.10 F	oreigners (n per 10,000)	1441.47	1522.61	2181.60	1659.38	1871.26
t1.11 M	figrants (n, %)	12,026 ( $21.81%$ )	5337 (9.68%)	9802 (17.77%)	27,165 (49.26%)	55,146 (100%)
t1.12 M	figrants (n per 10,000)	355.60	336.11	538.40	400.06	410.98
t1.13 A	Jone elderly (n, %)	12,136 (25.43%)	5846 (12.25%)	7913 (16.58%)	25,895 (54.27%)	47,718 (100%)
t1.14 A	Jone elderly (n per 10,000)	358.86	368.17	434.64	381.35	355.62
t1.15 N	lewborns (n, %)	2831 (23.33%)	1267 (10.44%)	2025 (16.68%)	6123 $(50.45%)$	12,137 (100%)
t1.16 N	lewborns (n per 10,000)	83.71	79	111.23	90.17	90.45
t1.17 D	teaths $(n, \%)$	3360 (23.65%)	1822 (12.82%)	2566(18.06%)	7748 (54.52%)	$14,210\ (100\%)$
t1.18 D	teaths (n per 10,000)	99.35	114.75	140.94	114.10	105.9
t1.19 S	chooling services					
t1.20 K	indergartens (n, %)	131 (18.74%)	98 (14.02%)	113 (16.17%)	342 (48.93%)	(699 (100%))
K	indergartens (n per 10,000)	3.874	6.172	6.207	5.037	5.209
d o	rinnary schools (n, %)	28 (19.58%) 0 020	18 (12.59%)	21 (14.69%) 1 152	67 (46.85%)	143 (100%) 1 066
ι, μ	IIIIIAI SCHOUIS (II DEI 10,000) ower secondary schools (n %)	0.020 20 (22-27%)	12 (13 33%)	11 (12 22%)	43 (47 78%)	1.000 90 (100%)
ц Ц	ower secondary schools (n per 10,000)	0.591	0.756	0.604	0.633	0.671
D	Ipper secondary schools $(n, \%)$	21 (24.14%)	5 (5.75%)	15 (18.39%)	41 (47.13%)	87 (100%)
D	pper secondary schools (n per 10,000)	0.621	0.315	0.824	0.604	0.648
t1.21 W	Velfare services					
t1.22 O	but patients mental health services $(n, \%)$	4 (21.05%)	2 (10.53%)	2 (10.53%)	38 (42.11%)	19 (100%)
t1.23 O	htpatients mental health services (n per 10,000)	0.118	0.126	0.110	0.118	0.142
t1.24 Ju	uvenile community homes $(n, \%)$	17 (26.56%)	7 (10.94%)	5 (7.81%)	29 (45.31%)	64~(100%)
t1.25 Ju	uvenile community homes (n per 10,000)	0.503	0.441	0.275	0.427	0.477
t1.26 N	on-profit and voluntary associations $(n, \%)$	206 (23.52%)	64 (7.31%)	109 (12.44%)	379 (43.26%)	876~(100%)
t1.27 N	on-profit and voluntary associations (n per 10,000)	6.091	4.031	5.987	5.581	6.528
t1.28 St	ocial aggregation spaces $(n, \%)$	4 (6.56%)	14 (22.95%)	9 (14.75%)	27 (44.26%)	61 (100%)
t1.29 St	ocial aggregation spaces (n per 10,000)	0.118	0.882	0.494	0.398	0.455
1241.30 St	ocio-recreational spaces for the elderly (n, %)	9 (18.37%)	6 (12.24%)	6 (12.24%)	21 (42.86%)	49 (100%)
Sprii		0.266	0.378	0.330	0.309	3.65
 nger						

J Public Health (Berl.): From Theory to Practice

۲ 132 T	able 1 (continued)					
م oringe	opulation demographics	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	South-west Milan	Milan
t1.31 S	ocio-recreational spaces for the elderly (n per 10.000)					
t1.32 C	ccupational therapy laboratories $(n, \%)$	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	0%0) (0%)	3 (60%)	5 (100%)
t1.33 C	ecupational therapy laboratories (n per 10,000)	0.059	0.063	0.000	0.044	0.037
t1.34 D	ay centres for disabled individuals $(n, \%)$	1 (4.76%)	3 (14.29%)	6 (28.57%)	10 (47.62%)	21 (100%)
t1.35 D	ay centres for disabled individuals (n per 10,000)	0.030	0.189	0.330	0.147	0.157
t1.36 F	amily consulting rooms $(n, \%)$	4 (21.05%)	2 (10.53%)	4 (21.05%)	10(52.63%)	19 (100%)
Ч	amily consulting rooms (n per 10,000)	0.118	0.126	0.220	0.147	0.142
<u>а</u> с	ublic housing properties (n, %)	406 (25.22%)	293 (18.20%)	382 (23.73%)	1081 (67.14%)	1610(100%)
7.0	ublic nousing properties (it per 10,000) ocial comines (n 26)	1215 (20 070%)	16.422 310 (8 17%)	20.982 447 (11 38%)	15.920 1981 (50 42%)	3079 (100%)
Ω Ω	ocial services (n per 10,000)	35.927	20.090	24.552	29.174	29.281
Ρ	arishes $(n, \%)$	35 (20.96%)	15 (8.98%)	23 (13.77%)	73 (43.71%)	167 (100%)
Р	arishes (n per 10,000)	1.035	0.945	1.263	1.075	1.245
t1.37 P	ublic transportation					
t1.38 S	urface stops $(n/km^2)$	29.46	15.35	22.67	23.54	20.40
ΒN	ubway stops (n/km²) ike trails (m, %)	0.45 17,762 ( $16.34%$ )	0.39 10,090 ( $9.28\%$ )	0.35 30,079 (27.67%)	0.41 57,931 (53.29%)	0.52 108,706 (100%)
t1.39 L	aw enforcement services					
t1.40 L	aw enforcement services $(n, \%)$	26 (19.12%)	14 (10.29%)	18 (13.24%)	58 (42.65%)	136 (100%)
t1.41 L	aw enforcement services (n per 10,000)	0.769	0.882	0.989	0.854	1.014
t1.42 R	ecreational facilities					
t1.43 S	port facilities $(n, \%)$	8 (28.57%)	3 (10.71%)	3 (10.71%)	14 (50.00%)	28 (100%)
<b>N</b>	port facilities (n per 10,000)	0.237	0.189	0.165	0.206	0.209
ц,	ibraries (n. %)	5(20.83%)	2 (8.33%)	5(20.83%)	12(50.00%)	24 (100%)
	ibraries (n per 10,000)	0.148	0.126	0.275	0.177	0.179
д	ars, restaurants (n, %)	1930 (28.04%)	403 (5.84%)	920 (13.41%)	(0/67.14) (2700 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (100) (1000 (100) (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000) (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (1000 (	6904 (100%)
цN	ars, restaurants (n per 10,000) hons (n %)	57.247 1241 (31 16%)	25.380 375 (8 16%)	50.863 448 (11 25%)	48.U83 2014 (50 56%)	3983 (100%)
n vi	hops (n per 10,000)	36.696	20.468	24.607	29.660	29.683
Ā	fuseums, expositive spaces $(n, \%)$	16(18.60%)	0 (0 ) (0 ) (0 ) (0 ) (0 ) (0 ) (0 ) (0	10 (11.63%)	26 (30.23%)	86 (100%)
t1.44 N	fuseums, expositive spaces (n per 10,000)	0.473	0.000	0.549	0.383	0.641
t1.45 C C	inemas $(n, \%)$ inemas $(n \text{ per } 10,000)$	10 (24.39%) 0.296	4 (9.76%) 0.252	3 (7.32%) 0.165	17 (41.46%) 0.306	41 (100%) 0.306

J Public Health (Berl.): From Theory to Practice

#### $t2.1 \quad \textbf{Table 2} \quad \text{Service user demographics across three mental health departments in South-west Milanp}$

t2.2		Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	p value*
t2.3	Age (years)				
t2.4	At first contact (mean $\pm$ SD)	$40.63 \pm 15.7$	$40.04 \pm 16.4$	38.3 ± 15.0 ↑	< 0.001
t2.5	At first contact (%)	<i>n</i> = 2577	<i>n</i> = 2272	<i>n</i> = 2172	< 0.001
	$\leq 17$ years old	3.1%	4.2%	3.9%	
	18-64 years old	88.5%	86.2%↓	90.1% ↑	
	65–79 years old	7.2%	8.1%	5.5%↓	
10.0	$\geq$ 80 years old	1.2%	1.5%	0.5%↓	- 0.001
t2.0	Age (mean $\pm$ SD)	51.38±15.2	$52.45 \pm 16.1 \downarrow$	48.97±14.9	< 0.001
t2.7	Age groups (%)	n = 2752	n = 2278	n = 2154	< 0.001
	$\leq 1$ / years old	0.0%	0.4% ↑ 75.0% ↓	0.1%	
	16-04 years old	80.0% 16.8%	75.9%↓ 20.1% ↑	83.9%	
	> 80 years old	3.2%	3.6%	1.9%	
t2.8	Gender	n = 2819	n = 2348	n = 2198	n.s.
	Male – female (n %)	44.1-55.9%	45.0-55.0%	42.9-57.1%	
t2.9	Marital status	<i>n</i> = 2738	n = 2335	<i>n</i> = 2169	< 0.05
	Unmarried	50.8%	49.2%	52.2%	
	Married	31.5%	30.8%	30.6%	
	Separated	5.8%	7.5%	6.6%	
	Divorced	7.0%	6.6%	6.8%	
+9.10	Widowed Education	4.9%	6.0%	3.8%	< 0.001
t2.10 t2.11	No school	n = 2033 0.7%	n = 2322	1 2%	< 0.001
+0.10	Primary education (5 years)	10.20%	10.5%	12 10	
12.12	Finally education ( $\geq$ 5 years)	10.5%	19.3%	13.1%	
t2.13	Lower secondary education (8 years)	34.9%↓	43.9% <sup>†</sup>	43.4% ĵ	
t2.14	Upper secondary education (13 years)	37.6%↑	28.3%↓	31.0%	
t2.15	Higher education ( $\geq 15$ years)	16.5% ↑	7.4%↓	11.3%	
t2.16	Residential status	n = 2707	n = 2336	n = 2159	< 0.001
	Alone	28.3% ↑	24.7%	22.8%↓	
	Family of origin	$21.1\% \downarrow$	33.0% ↑ 27.70	31.5%	
	Other relatives	5.5%	2.6%	50.0% 6.8%	
	Community home	1.1%	2.0 <i>%</i> ↓ 1.2%	2.0%	
	Retirement home	0.1%	0.3%	0%	
	Other non-psychiatric institution	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	
	Prison	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	
	Homeless	0.1%	0%	0%	
	Other	0.9%	0.3%	0.4%	
t2.17	Occupational status	n = 2687	n = 2333	n = 2162	< 0.001
	Unemployed	28.3% T	22.7% ↓	26.2%	
	Retired	4.0%	4.0 <i>%</i> 16.7% ↑	4.5%	
	Invalid	7.7%	20.7% ↑	14.0%	
	Other	2.7% ↑	0.8% 1	2.3%	
	Employed – worker	14.3%	13.5%	13.6%	
	Employed – manager	16.6%	13.9%↓	19.2% ↑	
	Self-employed	5.1% ↑	2.8%	2.7%	
	Military	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	
10.10	Home duties	4.9%	4.8%	6.1%	- 0.001
12.18	Primery sector	n = 2343	n = 1891	n = 101 / 1 + 107	< 0.001
	Secondary sector	6.1%	0.1%↓ 7.5%	1.1% 5.3%	
	Business	9.4% ↑	4.8%	9.1%	
	Public administration services	17.2% ↑	7.7%↓	11.4%	
	Other, non-professional	66.1%	80.1%↑	73.2%	
t2.19	Diagnosis	n = 2819	n = 2348	n = 2198	< 0.001
	Neurocognitive disorders	3.4% ↑	2.7%	1.5%	
	Substance-related and addictive disorders	1.6%	1.3%	2.4%	
	Schizophrenia spectrum disorders	24.4%	31.1% ↑	22.1%↓	
	Mood disorders	25.1%	24.6%	25.1%	

### AUTIPIes Rtb 34 PRt 0 130 P2 120

#### t2.20 Table 2 (continued)

Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	p value*
29.0% ↑	21.7%↓	28.3%	
0.5%↓	1.1%	4.1% ↑	
12.1%	11.8%	9.7%	
1.2% ↓	3.0%	3.2% ↑	
0.8%	1.2%	1.0%	
1.3%	1.5%	2.0%	
-	Area 1 29.0% ↑ 0.5% ↓ 12.1% 1.2% ↓ 0.8% 1.3%	Area 1         Area 2 $29.0\%$ ↑ $21.7\%$ ↓ $0.5\%$ ↓ $1.1\%$ $12.1\%$ $11.8\%$ $1.2\%$ ↓ $3.0\%$ $0.8\%$ $1.2\%$ $1.3\%$ $1.5\%$	Area 1Area 2Area 3 $29.0\%$ $\uparrow$ $21.7\%$ $\downarrow$ $28.3\%$ $0.5\%$ $\downarrow$ $1.1\%$ $4.1\%$ $\uparrow$ $12.1\%$ $11.8\%$ $9.7\%$ $1.2\%$ $\downarrow$ $3.0\%$ $3.2\%$ $\uparrow$ $0.8\%$ $1.2\%$ $1.0\%$ $1.3\%$ $1.5\%$ $2.0\%$

\*Kruskal-Wallis rank test was used for continuous variables; chi-square test was used for categorical variables. Arrows show significant deviations from expected values with the largest adjusted standardized residuals (±3)

285differences were observed between Areas 1 and 2, across 286 which service users with education  $\geq 13$  years were reciprocally distributed. Occupational status was also associated with 287urban areas, with a higher-than-expected proportion of unem-288289 ployed individuals in Area 1 and the opposite in Area 2  $[\chi^2(18) = 274,1001, p < 0,0001)]$ . The most significant dis-290crepancy could perhaps be observed in terms of invalidity 291292 status, which ranged from 7.7% in Area 1 to 20.7% in Area 293 2. The crude prevalence rate of service users across the investigated territories was 96/10,000 adult population for Area 1, 294295168/10,000 for Area 2 and 100/10,000 for Area 3. Taken together, the general rate for South-west Milan was 113/ 29629710,000). Age-adjusted prevalence rates confirm the distribu-298tion across all available ranges, including < 18 years. The largely predominant age grouping of service users at the time 299of data collection was 18-64 years across areas. Three major 300 301 diagnostic clusters with an overlapping distribution were iden-302 tified (schizophrenia spectrum, 25.8%; mood disorders, 25.3%; anxiety disorders, 26.5%). Diagnostic clusters were 303 304 also found to differ significantly across areas. Schizophrenia spectrum disorders were more frequently diagnosed in Area 2 305 and less frequently in Area 3, whereas anxiety disorders were 306 more frequently diagnosed in Area 1 and less in Area 2 307  $[\chi^2(18) = 234,0884, p < 0.0001)].$ 308

309 Table 3 shows the subdivision of the same variables 310 according to patients' diagnostic clusters. Compared with all other diagnostic subgroups, patients with an eating dis-311order were more likely to access adult services before 31218 years of age. A third (34.9%) of patients who had a first 313 contact with adult services < 18 years of age were diag-314 315nosed with a schizophrenia spectrum disorder; 11.4% of 316 patients with mood disorders and 10.5% of those with anx-317 iety disorders accessed services for the first time at > 65 years of age. Indeed, these two diagnostic clusters cover 318 31971.1% of all those patients in this age range who had a first 320 contact with a mental health service. The relative distribution of diagnoses for each age group at first contact and at 321322 the time of data collection is shown in Fig. 2. Figure 3 323 shows the direction of the difference between median values for age of first contact (a) and age at the time of 324 data collection (b), respectively. 325

Finally, we investigated the relationship between the den-326 sity of population at a neighbourhood level and the prevalence 327 of residents with a diagnosis of any mental disorders, purpose-328 ly excluding four local identity nuclei to prevent introducing a 329 bias in our estimates given their special characteristics (i.e. 330 regional parks not serving as residential areas). None of our 331 analyses showed a statistically significant correlation, consid-332 ering either the common mental disorders jointly together or 333 as specific subgroups Fig. 4. 334Q2

335

#### Discussion

This large epidemiological study yielded two main results: (1) 336 the number of several territory resources differed substantially 337 across three large urban areas, although the difference subsid-338 ed when median values were considered at a neighbourhood 339 level; (2) the distribution of mental health service users diag-340 nosed with schizophrenia and anxiety disorders appears to 341differ substantially across urban territories, the former being 342 associated with the most deprived area and the latter with the 343 most affluent one. Because available South-west Milan popu-344 lation demographics were in line with those from the whole 345city, it seems possible to generalize findings to the metropol-346 itan territory. 347

In the urban context of Milan, our data confirm the gener-348 ally low use of mental health services observed in Italy com-349pared with other European countries (Alonso et al., 2004). In 350Q3/Q4 general, the prevalence of service use in South-west Milan 351was slightly lower than available regional estimates (Lora 352et al. 2012). Schizophrenia spectrum and mood and anxiety 353 disorders covered most service users' diagnoses, representing 354over three quarters of the total across the three areas. This is in 355 line with available data on public service use in Italy 356 (Ferrannini et al. 2014) and-excluding substance use disor-357 der patients treated in tailored outpatient units-other 358 European countries (Wittchen et al., 2010). The highest rate 359**Q5** of schizophrenia spectrum diagnoses was observed in Area 2. 360 Whereas anxiety disorders were the most frequently diag-361 nosed in Area 1, they were least represented of the three major 362 diagnostic spectra in Area 2. In the latter area residents were 363

J Public Health (Berl.): From Theory to Practice

**Fig. 2** Cumulative percentage of diagnostic clusters grouped by age at first contact with mental health service (top) and age at the time of data collection (bottom)



	Not specified	Neurocognitive Disorders	Substance use disorders	Schizophrenia	Mood disorders	Anxiety disorders	Eating disorders	Personality disorders	Intellectual disability
Neurocognitive Disorders									
Substance use disorders		$\downarrow$							
Schizophrenia	$\downarrow$								
Mood disorders		↓							
Anxiety disorders		$\downarrow$			¢				
Eating disorders	$\downarrow$								
Personality disorders	Ļ		Ļ						
Intellectual disability	$\downarrow$						↓		
Neurodevelopmental disorders	$\downarrow$		$\downarrow$						

**Fig. 3** Age of first contact. Arrows indicate the direction of the difference between median values by rows. Dark blue: p < 0.0001; blue: p = 0.001-0.0001; light blue: p = 0.05-0.001

Q1

more elderly, invalid, had a lower mean education level and364less access to limited neighbourhood resources. This area dif-365fers substantially from Areas 1 and 3, which both include366more affluent and culturally attractive neighbourhoods of the367city centre and have more commercial and recreational facil-368ities but also non-profit and voluntary associations.369

Although neighbourhood deprivation has often been asso-370 ciated with higher rates of psychosis in urban populations 371(O'Donoghue et al. 2016), the nature of this association re-372 mains unclear and is perhaps bidirectional. On the one hand, 373 deprived neighbourhoods might increase vulnerability 374through exacerbation of life stressors and limited access to 375support. On the other, social drift phenomena might explain 376 higher concentrations of individuals with more severe mental 377 disorders in less affluent neighbourhoods (Lund et al. 2018). 378Other commentators have observed that the frequently report-379 ed association between psychosis and deprived 380 neighbourhoods might imply a causal relationship but also 381inequality of access opportunity or lack of specific protective 382 factors (Bhavsar 2019). Although progress in this field re-383 mains limited, defined geographic areas have recently been 384



**Fig. 4** Age. Arrows indicate the direction of the difference between median values by rows. Dark green: p < 0.0001; green: p = 0.001-0.0001; light green: p = 0.05-0.001

	Not specified	Neurocognitive Disorders	Substance use disorders	Schizophrenia	Mood disorders	Anxiety disorders	Eating disorders	Personality disorders	Intellectual disability
Neurocognitive Disorders	↑								
Substance use disorders		$\downarrow$							
Schizophrenia		$\downarrow$	↑						
Mood disorders	1		¢	↑					
Anxiety disorders		$\downarrow$		$\downarrow$	$\downarrow$				
Eating disorders	$\downarrow$	$\downarrow$	$\rightarrow$	$\downarrow$	$\downarrow$	$\downarrow$			
Personality disorders		$\downarrow$		$\downarrow$	$\downarrow$	$\downarrow$	Ŷ		
Intellectual disability		$\downarrow$		$\downarrow$	$\downarrow$	$\downarrow$			
Neurodevelopmental disorders		$\downarrow$		$\downarrow$	$\downarrow$				

proposed as targets for refined services and public health in-385 terventions in a study which confirmed a relationship between 386 incident psychosis and socio-economic neighbourhood depri-387 vation in another high-income country (Eaton et al. 2019). Of 388 note, our findings only partially reflect known environmental 389 390 risk factors of psychosis such as socio-economic deprivation, ethnic density or social cohesion. Indeed, the investigated area 391 392 with the higher density of foreigners and migrants had a rela-393 tively lower proportion of schizophrenia spectrum diagnoses 394when compared across areas.

This is the first study to clearly report a higher frequen-395 396 cy of diagnosed anxiety disorders in a portion of a large metropolitan city which incorporates relatively more afflu-397 ent neighbourhoods. Indeed, competitive community 398 399 norms, achievement pressure and emotional isolation have been hypothesized to increase the risk of anxiety in youth 400who grow up in affluent neighbourhoods (Luthar 2003). 401 402 However, the quality of urban neighbourhoods and neighbourhood deprivation in general have also been asso-403ciated with the presence and severity of anxiety disorders 404 405(Ventimiglia and Seedat 2019). As shown in Fig. 1, Area 1 includes neighbourhoods surrounding the city centre but 406 also peripheral ones that are likely to account for the 407 highest unemployment rate observed across areas. Our 408 409findings reflect the distribution of anxiety disorders over the whole area, so further studies are needed to clarify 410 the strength of this observation. 411

Population density was found to be slightly lower and 412somewhat variable across the three areas, ranging from 6761 413 (Area 3) to 9551 (Area 1) people/km<sup>2</sup>. This might justify a 414relative increase of most welfare, transportation and commer-415cial services in the latter. However, a lower consistency was 416observed for some specific services when normalized for pop-417ulation. Almost a third of all social services found in the city of 418 Milan were in Area 1 and juvenile community homes were 419more than double in Area 1 compared with Area 3. On the 420contrary, Area 1 had 4-7 times fewer social aggregation 421spaces and 6-10 times fewer day centres for disabled individ-422uals compared with the other two areas. This latter finding was 423striking given the similar prevalence of individuals diagnosed 424 with intellectual disabilities or neurodevelopmental disorders 425across the two areas. When normalized for population, public 426housing properties were also found to be consistently fewer in 427Area 1. However, the density in this area was equivalent to 428that of the whole city (12/10,000) whereas it was relatively 429 higher in both Areas 2 (18/10,000) and 3 (17/10,000). Our 430 analyses on population density at a neighbourhood level does 431not support a relationship between urbanization and the prev-432alence of common mental disorders. The substantial disagree-433 ment on this topic in the published literature highlights the 434need to investigate further and in greater detail the 435influence-if any-exerted by urbanization on mental health 436(Generaal et al. 2019; Judd et al. 2002; Krabbendam and van 437 Os 2005; Peen et al. 2010; Zijlema et al. 2015). 438

J Public Health (Berl.): From Theory to Practice

#### 439 Limitations

The major limitation of our work is the lack of individual-440 441 level information of neighbourhood composition beyond ba-442 sic population demographics. Information such as employment status, income or household wealth is necessary to 443 444 develop a reliable socio-economic status (SES) index that can be used to test specific hypotheses of association with 445clinical outcomes in the local population (Tello et al. 2005; 446 447 Lasalvia et al. 2014). Reported territory characteristics such 448 as welfare services or recreational facilities can be included 449 in an index but cannot directly be correlated with clinical variables in a meaningful way, so future studies will need to 450include a broader set of economic neighbourhood variables 451of Milan's local identity nuclei. This will also allow over-452coming another limitation, i.e., that the three large identified 453areas overlapping with mental health service user data are 454455intrinsically not homogeneous. Access to geographically re-456stricted socio-economic variables will lead to higher order association analyses among comparable neighbourhoods. 457 Another limitation is the lack of information on patients 458treated in private services who reside in the urban context 459460 examined. In particular, mood and anxiety disorders treated in public mental health services are known to reflect approx-461imately half of all patients with such diagnoses on the whole 462463territory (Wang et al. 2007).

Finally, the method employed to collect patients' clinical information limited the possibility of retrieving neuropsychiatric or general medical comorbidities. However, the aim of our study was to analyse the characteristics of the principal diagnoses that require mental health service use rather than individual psychopathological or psychophysical features.

#### 471 Conclusion

483

The reported data suggest a relationship between nonaffective psychoses and socially deprived neighbourhoods in a large metropolitan context. Future studies including socioeconomic variables of neighbourhood inhabitants and service users could be a guide to the development of a socioeconomic index to confirm the likelihood of an association.

478 Acknowledgments We thank Arcadio Erlicher, former head of the
479 Department of Mental Health at Niguarda Ca' Granda Hospital and men480 tal health consultant for the Municipality of Milan at the time of data
481 collection, and Anna Minuti and Valerio Marinai (Municipality of
482 Milan) for their contributions.

#### 484 **Compliance with ethical standards**

485 **Conflict of interest** All authors declare that they have no conflicts of 486 interest.

49306

 $528 \\ 529$ 

Ethical approvalThis article does not contain any studies with animals487performed by any of the authors. All procedures performed in studies488involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical stan-489dards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the4901964 Helsinki Declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical491standards.492

#### References

- Alegria M, Canino G, Ríos R, Vera M, Calderón J, Rusch D, Ortega AN (2002) Mental health care for Latinos: inequalities in use of specialty mental health services among Latinos, African Americans, and non-Latino whites. Psychiatr Serv 53:1547–1555. https://doi.org/10. 497 1176/appi.ps.53.12.1547
- Alonso J, Angermeyer MC, Bernert S, Bruffaerts R, Brugha TS, Bryson 499H, de Girolamo G, Graaf R, Demyttenaere K, Gasquet I, Haro JM, 500Katz SJ, Kessler RC, Kovess V, Lépine JP, Ormel J, Polidori G. 501Russo LJ, Vilagut G, Almansa J, Arbabzadeh-Bouchez S, 502Autonell J, Bernal M, Buist-Bouwman MA, Codony M, 503Domingo-Salvany A, Ferrer M, Joo SS, Martínez-Alonso M, 504505Matschinger H, Mazzi F, Morgan Z, Morosini P, Palacín C, Romera B, Taub N, Vollebergh WA, ESEMeD/MHEDEA (2000) 506Investigators, European study of the epidemiology of mental disor-507ders (ESEMeD) project (2004) use of mental health services in 508509Europe: results from the European study of the epidemiology of mental disorders (ESEMeD) project. Acta Psychiatr Scand 510109(s420):47-54. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0047.2004.00327. 511512
- Amaddeo F, Salazzari D, Salinas-Perez JA (2015) Is a geographical approach worthwhile for epidemiological research in mental health?513Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci 24:38–41. https://doi.org/10.1017/515S2045796014000705516
- Barry MM (2009) Addressing the determinants of positive mental health:
   517

   concepts, evidence and practice. Int J Ment Health Promot 11:4–17.
   518

   https://doi.org/10.1080/14623730.2009.9721788
   519
- Bhavsar V, McGuire PK (2018) Neighbourhood deprivation is positively520associated with detection of the ultra-high risk (UHR) state for psy-<br/>chosis in South East London. Schizophr Res 192:371–376. https://<br/>doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2017.06.006523
- Bhavsar V (2019) Is neighbourhood effects research in psychosis fit for purpose? Commentary on Eaton et al Schizophr Res DOI. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2019.10.010
   525

   Burvill PW (1995) Recent progress in the epidemiology of major depres-527
   527
- Burvill PW (1995) Recent progress in the epidemiology of major depression. Epidemiol Rev 17:21–31. https://doi.org/10.1093/ oxfordjournals.epirev.a036178
- Censimento Popolazione Abitazioni (2019). http://daticensimentopopolazione.istat.it/Index.aspx. Accessed 01 November 2019 532
- Diez Roux AV (2003) The examination of neighbourhood effects on<br/>health: conceptual and methodological issues related to the presence<br/>of multiple levels of organization. In: Kawachi I, Berkman LF (eds)533Neighbourhoods and health. Oxford University Press, New York, p<br/>45.64536
- Donisi V, Tedeschi F, Percudani M, Fiorillo A, Confalonieri L, De Rosa C, Salazzari D, Tansella M, Thornicroft G, Amaddeo F (2013) Prediction of community mental health service utilization by individual and ecological level socio-economic factors. Psychiatry Res 209:691–698. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2013.02.031 542
- Duncan C, Jones K, Moon G (1995) Psychiatric morbidity: a multi-level<br/>approach to regional variations in the UK. J Epidemiol Community<br/>Health 49:290–295. https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.49.3.290543<br/>545
- Eaton S, Harrap B, Downey L, Thien K, Bowtell M, Bardell-Williams M, Ratheesh A, McGorry P, O'Donoghue B (2019) Incidence of treated first episode psychosis from an Australian early intervention service 548

### 

614

615

616

631

632

633

642

643

644

- 549and its association with neighbourhood characteristics. Schizophr550Res 209:206–211. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2019.04.017551Engels F (1958) The condition of the working class in England. (1958).
- Engels F (1958) The condition of the working class in England. (1958).
   Stanford University Press, Stanford
- Ferrannini L, Ghio L, Gibertoni D, Lora A, Tibaldi G, Neri G, Piazza A,
  Italian Mental Health Data Group (2014) Thirty-five years of community psychiatry in Italy. J Nerv Ment Dis 202:432–439. https://
  doi.org/10.1097/NMD.0000000000141
- 557 Gale CR, Dennison EM, Cooper C, Sayer AA (2011) Neighbourhood
  558 environment and positive mental health in older people: the
  559 Hertfordshire cohort study. Health Place 17:867–874. https://doi.
  560 org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2011.05.003
- 561 Generaal E, Timmermans EJ, Dekkers JEC, Smit JH, Pennix BWJH
   562 (2019) Not urbanization level but socioeconomic, physical and so 563 cial neighbourhood characteristics are associated with presence and
   564 severity of depressive and anxiety disorders. Psychol Med 49:149–
   565 161. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291718000612
- Hewlett E, Moran V (2014) Making mental health count: the social and
  economic costs of neglecting mental health care. OECD Health
  Policy Studies, OECD Publishing, Paris. https://doi.org/10.1787/
  9789264208445-en
- Jackson JS, Knight KM, Rafferty JA (2010) Race and unhealthy behaviors: chronic stress, the HPA axis, and physical and mental health
  disparities over the life course. Am J Public Health 100:933–939.
  https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2008.143446
- Judd FK, Jackson HJ, Komiti A, Murray G, Hodgins G, Fraser C (2002)
  High prevalence disorders in urban and rural communities. Aust N Z
  J Psychiatry 36:104–113. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1440-1614.2002.
  00986.x
- 578 Krabbendam L, van Os J (2005) Schizophrenia and urbanicity: a major
   579 environmental influence—conditional on genetic risk. Schizophr
   580 Bull 31:795–799. https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbi060
- Lasalvia A, Bonetto C, Tosato S, Zanatta G, Cristofalo D, Salazzari D,
  Lazzarotto L, Bertani M, Bissoli S, De Santi K, Cremonese C, De
  Rossi M, Gardellin F, Ramon L, Zucchetto M, Ameddeo F, Tansella
  M, Ruggeri M, the PICOS\_Veneto Group (2014) First-contact incidence of psychosis in North-eastern Italy: influence of age, gender,
  immigration and socioeconomic deprivation. Br J Psychiatry
  205(2):127–134. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.113.134445
- Lenze EJ, Rogers JC, Martire LM, Mulsant BH, Rollman BL, Dew MA,
   Schulz R, Reynolds CF 3rd (2001) The association of late-life de pression and anxiety with physical disability: a review of the litera ture and prospectus for future research. Am J Geriatr Psychiatry 9:
   113–115
- Leventhal T, Brooks-Gunn J (2000) The neighbourhoods they live in: the
   effects of neighbourhood residence on child and adolescent out comes. Psychol Bull 126:309–337. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033 2909.126.2.309
- Leventhal T, Brooks-Gunn J (2003) Moving to opportunity: an experimental study of Neighbourhood effects on mental health. Am J Public Health 93:1576–1582. https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.93.9.
  1576
- Lora A, Barbato A, Cerati G, Erlicher A, Percudani M (2012) The mental health system in Lombardy, Italy: access to services and patterns of care. Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol 47:447–454. https://doi. org/10.1007/s00127-011-0352-1
- Lorant V, Deliege D, Eaton W, Robert A, Philippot P, Ansseau M (2003)
   Socioeconomic inequalities in depression: a meta-analysis. Am J
   Epidemiol 157:98–112. https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwf182
- Lund C, Brooke-Sumner C, Baingana F, Baron EC, Breuer E, Chandra P,
   Haushofer J, Herrman H, Jordans M, Kieling C, Medina-Mora ME,
   Morgan E, Omigbodun O, Tol W, Patel V, Saxena S (2018) Social
   determinants of mental disorders and the sustainable development
   goals: a systematic review of reviews. Lancet Psychiatry 5:357–369.
- 613 https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(18)30060-9

- Luthar SS (2003) The culture of affluence: psychological costs of material wealth. Child Dev 74:1581–1593. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1467-8624.2003.00625.x
- Macintyre S, Maciver S, Sooman A (1993) Area, class and health: should617we be focusing on places or people? J Soc Policy 22:213–234.618https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047279400019310619
- McKenzie K, Whitley R, Weich S (2002) Social capital and mental health. Br J Psychiatry 181:280–283. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp. 181.4.28 622
- Meyer OL, Castro-Schilo L, Aguilar-Gaxiola S (2014) Determinants of mental health and self-rated health: a model of socioeconomic status, neighbourhood safety, and physical activity. Am J Public Health 104:1734–1741. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2014.302003
- O'Donoghue B, Roche E, Lane A (2016) Neighbourhood level social deprivation and the risk of psychotic disorders: a systematic review. Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol 51:941–950. https://doi.org/10. 1007/s00127-016-1233-4 630
- Patel V, Flisher AJ, Hetrick S, McGorry P (2007) Mental health of young people: a global public-health challenge. Lancet 369:1302–1313. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(07)60368-7
- Peen J, Schoevers RA, Beekman AT, Dekker J (2010) The current status634of urban-rural differences in psychiatric disorders. Acta Psychiatr635Scand 121:84–93. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0447.2009.63601438.x637
- Pickett KE, Pearl M (2001) Multilevel analyses of neighbourhood socio-<br/>economic context and health outcomes: a critical review. J638<br/>639Epidemiol Community Health 55:111–122. https://doi.org/10.6401136/jech.55.2.111641
- Sistema Statistico Integrato Comune di Milano (2019) http://sisi. comune.milano.it/. Accessed 01 November 2019
- StataCorp (2019) Stata Statistical Software: Release 16. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC
- Tello JE, Jones J, Bonizzato P, Mazzi M, Amaddeo F, Tansella M (2005)
   646

   A census-based socio-economic status (SES) index as a tool to examine the relationship between mental health services use and deprivation. Soc Sci Med 61:2096–2105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.
   649

   socscimed.2005.04.018
   650
- Truong KD, Ma S (2006) A systematic review of relations between651neighbourhoods and mental health. J Ment Health Policy Econ 9:652137–154653
- Vallée J, Cadot E, Roustit C, Parizot I, Chauvin P (2011) The role of daily
  mobility in mental health inequalities: the interactive influence of
  activity space and neighbourhood of residence on depression. Soc
  Sci Med 73:1133–1144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.
  657
  08.009
- Ventimiglia I, Seedat S (2019) Current evidence on urbanicity and the659impact of neighbourhoods on anxiety and stress-related disorders.660Curr Opin Psychiatry 32(3):248–253. https://doi.org/10.1097/YCO.66100000000000496662
- Villerme LR (1988) A description of the physical and moral state of workers employed in cotton, wool, and silk mills. In: Buck C, Llopis A, Nàjera E, Terris M (eds) The challenge of epidemiology: issues and selected readings. PAHO/WHO, Washington, pp 33–36
- Virchow L (1988) Report on the typhus epidemic in upper silesia. In: Rather LJ (ed) Rudolf Virchow: collected essays on public health and epidemiology. Science History Publications, Canton, pp 205– 319 670
- Wang PS, Aguilar-Gaxiola S, Alonso J, Angermeyer MC, Borges G, 671 Bromet EJ, Bruffaerts R, de Girolamo G, de Graaf R, Gureje O, 672 Haro JM, Karam EG, Kessler RC, Kovess V, Lane MC, Lee S, 673 Levinson D, Ono Y, Petukhova M, Posada-Villa J, Seedat S, Wells 674JE (2007) Use of mental health services for anxiety, mood, and 675 substance disorders in 17 countries in the WHO world mental health 676 677surveys. Lancet 370(9590):841-850. https://doi.org/10.1016/ S0140-6736(07)61414-7 678

689 Zijlema WL, Klijs B, Stolk RP, Rosmalen JG (2015) (un)healthy in the City: respiratory, Cardiometabolic and mental health associated with 690 urbanity. PLoS One 10:e0143910. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal. 691 pone.0143910 692

693 Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations. 694

- Wittchen HU, Jacobi F, Rehm J, Gustavsson A, Svensson M, Jönsson B, Olesen J, Allgulander C, Alonso J, Faravelli C, Fratiglioni L, Jennum P, Lieb R, Maercker A, van Os J, Preisig M, Salvador-Carulla L, Simon R, Steinhausen HC (2011) The size and burden of mental disorders and other disorders of the brain in Europe 2010. Eur Neuropsychopharmacol 21:655–679. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. euroneuro.2011.07.018
- 685 686 Yen IH, Syme SL (1999) The social environment and health: a discussion 687 of the epidemiologic literature. Annu Rev Public Health 20:287-688 308. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.publhealth.20.1.287 unconnection
- 695

679

680

681

682

683

### AUTHOR QUERIES

#### AUTHOR PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUERIES.

- Q1. Figure 3a and 3ab were renumbered to Figures 3 and 4. Please check if appropriate.
- Q2. Missing citation for Figure 4 was inserted here. Please check if appropriate. Otherwise, please provide citation for Figure 4. Note that the order of main citations of figures/tables in the text must be sequential.
- Q3. Ref. "Alonso et al., 2004" is cited in the body but its bibliographic information is missing. Kindly provide its bibliographic information in the list.
- Q4. Ref. "Alonso et al., 2004" is cited in the body but its bibliographic information is missing. Kindly provide its bibliographic information in the list.
- Q5. Ref. "Wittchen et al., 2010" is cited in the body but its bibliographic information is missing. Kindly provide its bibliographic information in the list.
- Q6. References [Alonso et al, 2000, Censimento Popolazione Abitazioni, 2019, Sistema Statistico Integrato Comune di Milano, 2019, Wittchen et al, 2011] were provided in the reference list; however, this was not mentioned or cited in the manuscript. As a rule, all references given in the list of references should be cited in the main body. Please provide its citation in the body text.

UNCORPECTED