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Abstract

Among multiple determinants affecting sleep health, there is people socioeconomic status (SES), a multidimensional concept of an individual's social, economic and ecological position associated to public health inequalities at different levels. No systematic review on the relation between SES and sleep health has been previously conducted in India. Following Prisma protocol, seven articles were selected. Findings revealed that all studies were cross-sectional. The combined number of participants is N=12,746 participants, composed of 81.15% of adults (n=10,343), 10.56% of children (n=1346) and 8.29% of adolescents (n=1057). The smallest sample was N=268 and the larger was N=7017. The socioeconomic determinants the most reported by authors were perceived SES/composite indices, education, income and employment/occupation. The most reported sleep disturbances were obstructive sleep apnea (OSA), insomnia, restless legs syndrome (RLS) and sleep quality. Higher SES (specifically high education and high income) was associated on one hand in adults, with insomnia and a lower risk for OSA; and on the other hand, in adolescents, with poor quality of sleep and shorter sleep duration. Unemployment was significantly associated with insomnia and risk for pediatric OSA (specifically maternal employment). These findings are coherent with the conceptual socioeconomic model of sleep health published by Etindele Sosso et al. and one previous ecological model of sleep published by Grandner et al., both explaining the relationship between SES and sleep disparities. More studies on the subject and more longitudinal research are necessary to support public health programs related to sleep health disparities in India.
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1- INTRODUCTION

Health disparities are associated to socioeconomic gradient that can be measured through indicators like education, income, marital status or type of employment [1-7]. These indicators were previously employed in social epidemiology and biomedical research such as those related to cardiovascular system [8], breathing system [9] or sleep mechanisms [1, 2]. They helped established how environments can affect the pathway of an individual’s health status and it was documented extensively that, this relationship was behind a lot of public health issues [4, 6, 10]. Among others important public health issues potentially linked to the social and physical environment, there is sleep health, which is decreasing considerably worldwide since the last decade [10-14].

Sleep is a multifactorial mechanism very sensitive to external inputs with a complex construction at the corner of physiology, sociology, psychology and public health [4, 6, 15]. The concept of sleep health, which is relatively new, promote a multidimensional sleep research’s approach considering a wide range of clinical parameters such as sleep duration, sleep continuity, sleep efficiency or total sleep time [1, 2, 11]; and also no clinical parameters such as sleep quality or sleep insufficiency [12, 16, 17]. Sleep health inequalities represents a public health outcome similar to public health issues previously reported for cardiovascular, mental health and metabolic diseases [18] and among factors influencing variations of these inequalities; socioeconomic status (SES) is one of the most important but strangely also one of the less documented in developing countries [6, 10]. SES is an invisible multidimensional concept of an individual's social, economic and ecological position associated to public health inequalities at different levels; generated by subjective norms and social ladder defined or adopted by the individual’s community [4, 6, 10, 18-20]. Thus, sleep
health disparity is a complex assessment of a socio-ideological and theoretical construct measured in a variety of ways usually considering several determinants such as employment, income, education, occupation and social position [3, 15, 18, 21]. Trends in terms of sleep health disparities seems to be similar everywhere regardless the country [6, 15].

An extensive screening of empirical literature revealed that India was one of the biggest countries with a lack of literature about sleep health relationship with socioeconomic determinants of health disparities. This screening also revealed that, no systematic review on the relation between SES and sleep health has been previously conducted in India. Its pertinent to understand if public health inequalities in terms of sleep observed elsewhere, are the same in this important country with documented variety of national’s health burdens and economic disparities among their multiple ethnocultural populations [22, 23]. The goals of this systematic review is to 1) document socioeconomic determinants of sleep health inequalities in India and 2) recommend future actions and research directions based on evidence.

2- METHODS

2.1- Literature search

Relevant citations for this review were identified by searching the databases PubMed/Medline and Google scholar between January 2000 and July 2022. A combination of search terms “socioeconomic”, “socio-economic”, “social position”, “social class”, “socioeconomic position”, “determinant*”, “health disparities”, “sleep”, “sleep disorders”, “sleep disturbances”, “sleep complains”, “sleep outcome”, “sleep health” and “India*” was used. All included articles were identified on the basis of relevance to the association between SES determinants and sleep outcomes following the PRISMA guidelines (Fig. 1).
Figure 1. Prisma flowchart of study selection process.

- Records identified through database searching (n = 232)
  - Duplicate excluded (n = 2)
  - Full-text articles assessed for eligibility (n = 230)
    - Full text articles excluded (n = 223)
      - Non relevant (167)
        - Full text not available in English or French (n = 1)
        - Univariate associations (n = 14)
        - No SES/sleep measure (n = 9)
        - Specific populations (n = 14)
        - No comparison (n = 6)
        - Variables as covariates (n = 8)
        - Not original research (n = 4)
      - Articles included in the qualitative synthesis (n = 7)
    - Articles included in the quantitative synthesis / meta-analysis (n = 0)
2.2- Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Empirical studies were defined as peer-reviewed scientific articles of any design (cross-sectional, retrospective or longitudinal) that assess the relation SES and sleep, including a human sample of any sex, race/ethnicity, gender or age from the general population of India. The study had to include an objective such as education, income, assets, occupation, employment status, perceived SES or a qualitative measure of SES including self-reported items by participants. Aggregate measures of SES (neighbourhood SES or area deprivation indices) were included if participant’s data were not available or reported by authors. For studies with children or adolescents’ participants, perceived family SES measures such as parental education, parental profession or household income were used. Articles were not included excluded when they met one or many of the following criteria: 1) They were reviews or meta-analyses, case series, editorial, case reports, and/or did not present original research, 2) they were not written in English or French, 3) the full text was not available, 4) samples included participants with conditions potentially influence the relation SES and sleep base (for example sleeping pills, chronic sleep disturbances, diseases with sleep symptoms, etc.…), 5) they did not provide statistical significance in cases where the relation between SES indicators and sleep parameters were evaluated.

2.3- Quality assessment

The National Institute of Health’s Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-Sectional Studies was used to rate the quality of included studies [7]. It assesses 14 quality criteria, asking equal numbers of questions about study objectives, population, exposures, outcomes, follow-up rates, and statistical analysis. Overall quality ratings were calculated by taking the proportion of positive ratings over the sum of applicable criteria. Studies with <50% positive rating were judged as poor quality, 65% as good quality and the rest as fair quality. Complete evaluations criteria of all articles are available in Table 2.
### 3- RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% Women</th>
<th>Age (mean ± SD or range)</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>SES measures</th>
<th>Sleep measures</th>
<th>Main effects</th>
<th>Interactions/ Mediations</th>
<th>Odds ratio, p-value</th>
<th>Quality rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangarajan 2007</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Adults from the general population in Bangalore, India</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>38.1 ± 14.2</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>Education (below high school vs high school and above) Monthly per-capita income (2 cut-offs: US$2/day and US$1/day)</td>
<td>NIH/IRLSSG criteria for diagnosis of RLS (questionnaire)</td>
<td>RLS was associated with education less than high school level in the group with per-capita income less than US$2/day</td>
<td>Education less than high school was associated with the occurrence of RLS: Adjusted OR= 2.76 [1.17–6.55]</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reddy 2009</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Adults 30-65 y from the general population in South Delhi, India</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Kuppuswami socioeconomic status score</td>
<td>OSA (AHI ≥5 in PSG)</td>
<td>Prevalence of OSA was not significantly different across the socio-economic strata</td>
<td>95 % confidence interval of adjusted OR contain one</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bapat 2017</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>5th-9th grade adolescents from two public and four private schools in Pune, India</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>13.8 ± 1.3</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>4-item Family Affluence Scale (divided in 3 categories)</td>
<td>Self-reported sleep time</td>
<td>Children with a higher SES slept shorter than children with a lower SES</td>
<td>This relation was significantly mediated by screen time (low SES children reported more screen time and thus less sleep time) and academic work (high SES children reported more academic work)</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Characteristics of included studies investigating determinants of sleep health disparities in India.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Mean Age</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goyal 2018</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Children 5-10y from 3 schools in Bhopal, India</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>Maternal education (illiterate vs literate), Maternal employment status (yes vs no)</td>
<td>OSA risk (score &gt;0.33 in the Sleep-Related Breathing Disorder scale of the Pediatric Sleep Questionnaire), Maternal employment was associated with OSA risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaisoorya 2018</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Adults 18-60y attending 71 primary health centers in the State of Kerala, India</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>41.1± 11.0</td>
<td>7017</td>
<td>Education (≤10y vs &gt;10y), Income (below vs above poverty line), Employment status (unemployed vs employed)</td>
<td>Insomnia (ISI score 0, &lt;15, ≥15), Lower education was associated with both subclinical and clinical insomnia. Unemployment was associated only with subclinical insomnia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Mean Age</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan 2018</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Adults ≥20y from the general population of Dehradun district, India</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Education (none, high school, intermediate, graduate and above) Employment (not working, service, agriculture, self-employed) Socio-economic class (upper, middle, lower) Insomnia (ISI score &gt;7)</td>
<td>Higher education and unemployment increased the odds for having clinical insomnia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarveswaran 2019</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Adolescents 10-19y from the general population of two villages in rural Puducherry, India</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>14.1± 2.4</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>Income (Modified BG Prasad’s scale; lower and lower middle, middle, upper and upper middle) Sleep quality (PSQI global score ≥5)</td>
<td>Higher education and higher income was found to be significant determinant for poor quality of sleep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Upper and upper middle income were significantly associated with poor quality of sleep: aPR = 5.48 [1.61–49.40].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Q11</th>
<th>Q12</th>
<th>Q13</th>
<th>Q14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangarajan 2007</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reddy 2009</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bapat 2017</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goyal 2018</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaisoorya 2018</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan 2018</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarveswaran 2019</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Y = Yes; N = No; CD = cannot determine; NA = not applicable; NR = not reported.

Q1. Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?
Q2. Was the study population clearly specified and applied uniformly to all participants?
Q3. Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?
Q4. Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study or not specified and applied uniformly to all participants?
Q5. Was the sample size justification, power, description, or variance and effect estimates provided?
Q6. For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?
Q7. Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?
Q8. For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)?

Q9. Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?

Q10. Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?

Q11. Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?

Q12. Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?

Q13. Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?

Q14. Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?

3.1- Characteristics of studies selected

Seven articles [24-30] were included in the final sample. All these articles were cross-sectional studies (Table 1) and evaluated as of good quality (Table 2). The combined number of participants is N= 12,746 participants, composed of 81.15% of adults (n = 10,343), 10.56% of children (n = 1346) and 8.29% of adolescents (n= 1057). The smallest sample was N= 268, and the largest was N= 7017. The socioeconomic indicators used were perceived SES/composite indices in three studies [24-26], education in five studies [26-29], income in three studies [27, 29, 30] and employment/occupation in three studies [26, 28, 29].

The measurement instruments and the sleeps disturbances reported were: self-reported sleep time [25], apnea-hypopnea index (AHI) [24] and sleep-related breathing disorder scale (SRBD) [28] for obstructive sleep apnea (OSA), the Insomnia Severity Index (ISI) for insomnia [26, 29], sleep quality using the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI) [30] and sleep disturbance via National Institutes of Health/International Restless Legs Syndrome Study Group (NIH/IRLSSG) for diagnosis of restless legs syndrome (RLS) [27].

3.2- Determinants of sleep health disparities in India
**Disparities in sleep apnea**

In the study by Goyal et al. [28], a significant higher risk for pediatric OSA was observed in association with maternal employment (adjusted odds ratio 1.8; 95% CI: [1.2-2.7]) in school children aged 5-10y. Prevalence of OSA was not significantly different across the updated Kuppuswami socioeconomic status score in the study by Reddy et al. [24] among adults aged 30-65y ($p > 0.05$).

**Disparities in insomnia**

Two studies reported that employment status and education are associated with insomnia (clinical and subclinical) in adults [26, 29]. In the study by Jaisoorya et al. [29], *Subclinical insomnia* was considerably lower in employed (adjusted odds ratio 0.74; 95% CI: [0.62-0.87]) and higher educated >10y (adjusted odds ratio 0.79; 95% CI: [0.64-0.98]). Also, *Clinical insomnia* was considerably higher in unemployed [26, 29]. But for education, prevalence of clinical insomnia decreased with higher educated >10y in the study by Jaisoorya et al. [29] (adjusted odds ratio 0.64; 95% CI: [0.42-0.98]); while it decreased in the lower educated: none (adjusted odds ratio 0.10; 95% CI: [0.04-0.20]) and high school (adjusted odds ratio 0.38; 95% CI: [0.20-0.72]) in the study by Khan et al. [26].

**Disparities in restless legs syndrome**

One study [27] indicated positive association between education and RLS. Occurrence of RLS was significantly associated with education less than high school in the group with higher income cut-off ($2/day) (adjusted odds ratio 2.76; 95% CI: [1.17-6.55]).

**Disparities in sleep quality**
One study [30] showed that education and income was associated with poor quality of sleep among the adolescents. Adolescents with a high educational level ≥ 11y (adjusted prevalence ratio 3.43; 95% CI: [1.66 – 12.35]) or a high socio-economic class (adjusted prevalence ratio 5.48; 95% CI: [1.61-49.40]) were more likely to suffer from poor sleep quality.

**Disparities in sleep duration**

Bapat et al. [25] observed a positive association between socioeconomic status and sleep time mediated by academic work mainly and screen time (point estimate = 8.44, 95% CI [5.14 -12.96]), but not by physical activity among adolescents. In the sense that children from a higher SES sleep less as a result of school demands, than children from a lower SES that reporting more screen time which is negatively related to time spent sleeping ($p=0.001$).

4- **DISCUSSION**

A. **Summary of findings**

The main findings of the qualitative analyses were as follows: (1) higher SES (specifically education and income) was significantly associated with insomnia and a lower risk of OSA in adults populations, (2) higher SES (specifically education and income) was associated with poor sleep quality and shorter sleep duration in adolescents populations, (3) Unemployment was significantly associated with insomnia, and (4) maternal employment was significantly associated with risk for pediatric OSA.
B. Relation with current knowledge

The findings of this systematic review are coherent with previous literature including a recent socioeconomic model of sleep health [2, 10, 18] and different socioecological model of sleep [19, 31], stating the strong association existing between the individual socioeconomic status and sleep health. Biological needs for sleep are met by engaging in behaviors that are largely influenced by the environment, social norms and demands, and societal influences and pressures [19]. Understanding the etiology of socioeconomic disparities in sleep could assist public health authorities in preventing the morbidity of socially disadvantaged individuals, in western countries as well in developing countries [32]. Findings of this research supports theories stating that low SES induced sleep disturbances or in other terms, an individual SES is mediating his sleep health following a social gradient measured through markers like education and income [4, 6, 10, 19, 32]. A narrative synthesis of three decades of empirical literature demonstrated that, unhealthy behaviors, increased stress levels and limited access to healthcare in low SES individuals may explain this SES-sleep health gradient [10], because low SES people often reported more sleep disturbances than high SES people. Similarly, it was established that environmental stressors related to climate changes like noise, heat stress and respirable dust are related to an increase of sleep disturbance [33]. In addition, it was showed recently that these disparities are present in several rich countries where social inequities are reduced. For example, a recent systematic review found that in canadian populations, sleep health disparities among children and adolescent are strongly correlated to parental socioeconomic indicators [18]. Findings revealed also that poor parental income, poor family SES and poor parental education are associated with higher sleep disturbances among children and adolescents; same thing with lower education which acts as a predictor of increased sleep disturbances for adults [18]. The same trends were observed with adults and old populations, with low SES associated with high sleep disturbances and low income which was significantly associated with short sleep duration [10, 18]. These results clearly highlight the importance of considering multiple psychosocial and environment risk factors for implementing occupational health and ergonomics interventional programs to prevent sleep disturbances for the entire population,
including adolescents and the country’s workforce [33], if governments and employers wish to prevent major expenditures related to inevitable consequences due to an unhealthy sleep [4, 12, 34]. However, the cross-sectional design of most studies related to this relationship and the high heterogeneity in employed measures of SES, reduce the larger promotion of better sleep hygiene and a global standardization of evidence-based policies to improve sleep health of populations across the world [4]. Further research in India is warranted due to important implications for health issues and policy changes.

C. Recommendations for future research

SES has an unrecognized influence on behavioral risk factors as well as public health strategies related to sleep health disparities. In several countries with a wide range of public health policies and economic challenges, sleep appears to be the main visible consequence of stress induced by difficult living conditions regardless population [13, 35-38]. Obviously, at a more macro level, country’s economic policy influences population’s SES as well as the funding of public health programs. The national and regional public health programs can target directly sleep health, while the same sleep health is affected by stress generated by the individual SES. Thus, SES, economic policy, public health and sleep are linked together. The socioeconomic model of sleep health (Figure 2, Figure 3) developed in previous research [2, 4, 18, 31] may explains all these interconnexions and can be a good start for a more national thinking about the management of Indian’s sleep health. The comparison of sleep health determinants can be made with other diseases determinants (cardiovascular diseases, mental disorders, etc…) to assess the magnitude of their influence, knowing that influence of SES on sleep can be measured objectively and quantitatively [1, 2, 11].
Figure 2. Socioeconomic Model of Sleep Health (adapted with permission from Etindele Sosso FA et al. Eur. J. Investig. Health Psychol. Educ 2022)
Figure 3. Socioeconomic Model of Sleep (adapted with permission from Etinelle Sosso FA et al. Sleep Health 2021)
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