

1 Economic determinants of county-level mental health – United States, 2019

2

3 Michele L.F. Bolduc<sup>1\*</sup>, Parya Saberi<sup>2</sup>, Torsten B. Neilands<sup>2</sup>, Carla I. Mercado<sup>1</sup>, Shanice Battle

4 Johnson<sup>1</sup>, Zoe. R.F. Freggens<sup>1</sup>, Desmond Banks<sup>1</sup>, Rashid Njai<sup>1</sup>, Kai McKeever Bullard<sup>3</sup>

5

6 <sup>1</sup>Office of Minority Health, Office of Health Equity, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

7 (CDC)

8 <sup>2</sup>Division of Prevention Science, Department of Medicine, University of California, San

9 Francisco

10 <sup>3</sup>Division of Diabetes Translation, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health

11 Promotion, CDC

12

13 \*Corresponding author

14 Email: [qdt5@cdc.gov](mailto:qdt5@cdc.gov) (MLFB)

## 1 **Abstract**

2 A better understanding of whether and how economic factors impact mental health can inform  
3 policy and program decisions to improve mental health. This study looked at the association  
4 between county-level economic factors and the prevalence of self-reported poor mental health  
5 among adults in US counties in 2019, overall and separately for urban and rural counties.  
6 General dominance analyses were completed to rank-order the relative importance of the  
7 selected variables in explaining county prevalence of adults reporting > 14 poor mental health  
8 days in the last 30 days (“poor mental health”). The highest weighted variables were assessed for  
9 the statistical significance of their relationships with county-level poor mental health through  
10 multiple linear regression. Across all models, the four highest-ranked economic factors were  
11 household income, receipt of Supplemental Security Income (SSI), population with a college  
12 degree, and receipt of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits. The overall,  
13 rural, and urban models explained over 69% of the variation in poor mental health prevalence  
14 between counties. Urban and rural models also showed notable differences in the relationship  
15 between poor mental health and median home value and population with public insurance. The  
16 findings from this study indicate a significant association between several economic factors and  
17 poor mental health, which may inform decision makers in addressing mental health in the US.

## 18 19 **Introduction**

20 Mental health is a key component of overall health and well-being, and mental health conditions  
21 are common in the United States.<sup>1</sup> The prevalence of any mental, behavioral, or emotional  
22 disorder among US adults has been increasing since 2008, reaching 20.6% by 2019.<sup>2</sup> An  
23 estimated 9.2% of adults have received mental health treatment in the last 12 months<sup>3</sup>, but almost

1 half (43.8%) of adults who needed treatment did not receive it.<sup>2</sup> Poor mental health, which  
2 includes stress, depression, and problems with emotions – is a risk factor for a range of chronic  
3 diseases and injuries, from stroke to diabetes.<sup>4-6</sup> Poor mental health is also costly for the  
4 economy.<sup>7</sup> Major Depressive Disorder alone cost the US an estimated \$326 billion in 2018, a  
5 37.9% increase over the costs in 2010, primarily due to increasing workplace costs.<sup>8</sup> However,  
6 many factors that affect mental health could be prevented or mitigated to improve overall public  
7 health.

8  
9 The biopsychosocial model of mental health acknowledges the role that social, economic, and  
10 political factors play in the development and worsening of poor mental health.<sup>9</sup> In the free  
11 market-oriented American economy, economic factors, including employment status and  
12 income, play a key role in our lives. One survey found that among people in the US, the top  
13 personal stressors were work (64% of respondents) and money (60%); 46% indicated the  
14 economy was a significant source of stress.<sup>1</sup> Exposure to adverse conditions, such as material  
15 hardship, “undoubtedly leads to stress and known psychological and physiological stress  
16 responses” that increase the risk of mental health conditions.<sup>9</sup> These issues may be exacerbated  
17 on a population level in difficult economic times, with higher rates of suicide, homicide,  
18 substance abuse, and psychiatric disorders noted during financial crises.<sup>10-13</sup> An exploration of  
19 the economic factors that impact mental health could inform possible public health interventions.

20  
21 Improving population mental health and reducing adverse mental health outcomes requires a  
22 shifting of focus from individual treatment – which is costly to patients and the healthcare  
23 system – to population-level or systems-based approaches. Specifically, there is a need to move

1 upstream from the more proximal social determinants of health to the structural drivers of those  
2 determinants.<sup>14-16</sup> Structural drivers relate to how policy and economics shape the distribution of  
3 resources; changes at the structural level have the potential for greater impacts on population  
4 health and health equity.<sup>14,17</sup> Upstream interventions in policy, programs, and practice place the  
5 responsibility of health on decision-makers to undertake broader systemic change rather than  
6 focus on individual choice and behavior<sup>9</sup>, which could have impacts across the life course and  
7 across generations.<sup>18</sup>

8  
9 Data demonstrating whether economic factors may be associated with mental health can inform  
10 policy and program decisions. This study, therefore, examines the association between county-  
11 level economic factors and the prevalence of self-reported poor mental health among adults in  
12 US counties in 2019.

13

## 14 **Methods**

15 This analysis is a cross-sectional study of the association between county-level economic  
16 determinants of health (SSDOH) variables (e.g., county Gross Domestic Product [GDP], income  
17 inequality, housing affordability) and self-reported poor mental health prevalence for US  
18 counties in 2019. Data for 2019 were used to get a baseline understanding of the economic  
19 factors associated with mental health prior to the start of the COVID-19 pandemic.

20

21 The dependent variable of self-reported poor mental health comes from Centers for Disease  
22 Control and Prevention (CDC) PLACES data ([www.cdc.gov/places](http://www.cdc.gov/places)), which produces small area  
23 estimates using data from the CDC's Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS). The

1 BRFSS ([www.cdc.gov/brfss](http://www.cdc.gov/brfss)) is a telephone survey through which states collect information on  
2 health-related risk behaviors and health conditions, with over 400,000 adult participants each  
3 year. The survey asks the question, “Now thinking about your mental health, which includes  
4 stress, depression, and problems with emotions, for how many days during the past 30 days was  
5 your mental health not good?”<sup>19</sup> BRFSS defines poor mental health as responses indicating >14  
6 poor mental health days over the last 30 days. PLACES uses the BRFSS data to generate  
7 county-level prevalence estimates of poor mental health for all US states and the District of  
8 Columbia, using a multilevel statistical model that considers individual-level demographic data  
9 from BRFSS, county-level percentage of adults below 150% of the federal poverty level from  
10 the American Community Survey (ACS), and state- and county-level random effects.<sup>20</sup> Estimates  
11 for poor mental health prevalence are available for 3,121 counties for 2019, with 23 missing  
12 counties in New Jersey (not available from BRFSS) and Alaska (missing the newer Chugach and  
13 Copper River Census Areas).

14  
15 Economic SSDOH variables originate from the US Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) and  
16 from American Community Survey (ACS) five-year estimates for 2019 (S1 Table). Variables  
17 were chosen to measure economic factors (relating to the production, distribution, and  
18 consumption of goods and services) meaningful at the county level. Business variables from  
19 BEA were selected to measure current and changing county-level economic activity, including  
20 real GDP, 10-year change in GDP, and 10-year change in county GDP. Business variables from  
21 BEA are not available for 51 jurisdictions in Virginia due to combined independent city/county  
22 estimates, nor for two counties in Hawaii (Maui and Kalawao) due to combined county  
23 estimates. Employment variables covered a range of work-related issues, including

1 unemployment rate, employed but under the Federal Poverty Level (known throughout this paper  
2 as ‘working poverty rate’), mean usual hours worked over the last 12 months, employees  
3 working from home, and mean travel time to work. Income and wealth variables include median  
4 individual earnings, median household income, population with a college degree, two measures  
5 of inequity (Gini Index and the gender pay gap), percent of the population with public assistance  
6 income (Social Security, Supplemental Security Income [SSI], and cash public assistance), as  
7 well as homeownership rate as a significant component of wealth building. Several variables  
8 were included to cover key expenses – two housing affordability variables (for homeowners,  
9 population with Selected Monthly Owner Costs as a Percentage of Household Income  
10 [SMOC-API] costs of at least 30%, and, for renters, population with Gross Rent as a Percent of  
11 Household Income [GR-API] costs of at least 30%), a food security variable (percent receiving  
12 Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program or SNAP benefits), and two health insurance  
13 coverage variables (percent uninsured and percent with public health insurance coverage). Two  
14 more variables were added to capture county-level economics, including median home value and  
15 10-year population change.

16  
17 Our first step was to use PLACES data to map the prevalence of poor mental health at the county  
18 level for 2019 in RStudio version 4.2.1 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna,  
19 Austria). Stata version 17.0 (StataCorp LP, College Station, TX, USA) was used to complete the  
20 following analyses for all counties and for counties classified as either urban or rural based on  
21 the 2013 USDA Rural-Urban Continuum Codes. The median and Interquartile Range (IQR) for  
22 each variable were described across all counties in the datasets. Next, variable clustering was  
23 used to remove two highly collinear ( $>0.5$  Spearman coefficient) and redundant (based on our

1 understanding of the literature) variables from our analysis: median earnings (keeping median  
2 household income) and change in real GDP (keeping change in GDP). General dominance  
3 analyses were then completed using the Stata package *domin* with all the remaining economic  
4 variables to rank-order the relative importance of the variables in explaining county-level poor  
5 mental health.<sup>21</sup> This method finds the proportion of the total R<sup>2</sup> accounted for by each variable  
6 based on the average R<sup>2</sup> across all possible subsets of regression models. Using a scree plot (S1  
7 Fig), the most important (highest weighted) variables were identified from the dominance  
8 analyses based on dominance weights above the “elbow” of the graph, retaining eleven important  
9 variables. The eleven variables were then assessed for the statistical significance of their  
10 relationships with county-level poor mental health through multiple linear regression.

11

## 12 **Results**

13 Fig 1 shows the prevalence of poor mental health across all counties in 2019, with a mean of  
14 16.0% and a median of 15.8% (IQR: 14.1 – 17.8%). County prevalence ranged from 9.7% (Falls  
15 Church, VA) to 26.3% (East Carroll Parish, LA). Across the US, prevalence was higher in  
16 Appalachia and the Deep South and parts of Alaska, Montana, South Dakota, and the Southwest.  
17 Lower prevalence was found in the Upper Midwest.

18

19 **Fig 1. Estimated Prevalence of Poor Mental Health by County, United States, 2019.** Data  
20 come from CDC PLACES, which is modeled from the CDC Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance  
21 System (BRFSS). BRFSS asks the question, “Now thinking about your mental health, which  
22 includes stress, depression, and problems with emotions, for how many days during the past

1 30 days was your mental health not good?” Self-reported poor mental health is defined as  
 2 responses of >14 poor mental health days over the last 30 days.  
 3  
 4 Median and IQR values for each economic variable in 2019 are listed in Table 1. Table 2 shows  
 5 the most important economic variables for county-level poor mental health identified using the  
 6 dominance analysis based on standardized dominance weights. The top variables were median  
 7 household income, percent of households with SSI, percent of the population 25 years or older  
 8 with a college degree, percent of households receiving SNAP benefits in the last 12 months, and  
 9 percent of the population with public health insurance. The top results were similar for urban  
 10 counties, although unemployment had lower standardized dominance weights. For rural counties,  
 11 the results were similar, but travel time from work ranked higher.

12  
 13 **Table 1. Summary Statistics for Economic Determinants of Health Variables Used to**  
 14 **Analyze County-Level Association Between Economic Factors and Estimated Prevalence of**  
 15 **Poor Mental Health, United States, Overall and by Urban/Rural Classification, 2019.**

Factor	Variable	2019 Median [IQR]		
		Overall N=3,121	Urban n=1,145	Rural n=1,976
Business	10-year percent change in Gross Domestic Product (GDP), 2010 – 2019 (%)	28.2% [15.3 – 42.8%]	35.6% [22.6 – 49.2%]	24.6% [10.9 – 39.1%]
	Real GDP, in thousands of chained dollars (\$)	\$946,103 [\$361,013 – \$2,691,786]	\$4,018,925 [\$1,023,404 – \$10,900,000]	\$595,270 [\$263,664 – \$1,295,594]
	Change in Real GDP, 2010 – 2019 (%)	9.7% [-1.8 – 22.3%]	14.1% [3.6 – 26.3%]	6.4% [-4.38 – 19.5%]



Employment	Unemployment rate, $\geq 16$ years old (%)	4.9% [3.6 – 6.5%]	4.9% [3.9 – 6.1%]	5.0% [3.4 – 6.8%]
	Employed but under the Federal Poverty Limit (FPL) (%)	6.8% [5.1 – 8.9%]	6.0% [4.4 – 7.9%]	7.3% [5.5 – 9.3%]
	Mean usual hours per week worked in the past 12 months for workers 16-64 years old	39.3 hours [38.5 – 40.2 hours]	39.0 hours [38.3 – 39.7 hours]	39.6 hours [38.6 – 40.7 hours]
	Employees $\geq 16$ years old working from home (%)	4.5% [3.2 – 6.3%]	4.5% [3.4 – 5.8%]	4.4% [3.0 – 6.7%]
	Mean travel time to work (minutes)	23.7 minutes [19.8 – 27.5 minutes]	25.7 minutes [22.4 – 29.5 minutes]	22.4 minutes [18.4 – 26.0 minutes]
	Income and Wealth	Median earnings (\$)	\$32,607 [\$30,660 – \$36,916]	\$35,963 [\$32,175 – \$40,070]
Median household income (\$10,000 increments)		\$5.2 [\$4.4 – \$6.0]	\$5.8 [\$5.1 – \$6.8]	\$4.9 [\$4.2 – \$5.5]
Population $\geq 25$ years old with a college degree (%)		19.5% [15.3 – 25.8%]	24.8% [18.6 – 33.1%]	17.8% [14.3 – 22.1%]
Gini Index of income inequality (index 0-1)		0.44 [0.42 – 0.47]	0.44 [0.42 – 0.47]	0.44 [0.42 – 0.47]
Female pay as a percentage of male pay (gender pay gap) (%)		76.5% [71.4 – 81.8%]	78.0% [73.4 – 82.3%]	75.8% [70.2 – 81.3%]
Households with Social Security income (%)		37.4% [32.8 – 41.8%]	33.8% [29.4 – 37.9%]	39.2% [35.3 – 43.3%]
Households with Supplemental Security Income (SSI) (%)		5.5% [4.1 – 7.3%]	5.1% [4.0 – 6.6%]	5.8% [4.2 – 8.0%]
Households with public cash assistance (%)		1.9% [1.3 – 2.8%]	1.9% [1.4 – 2.6%]	1.9% [1.3 – 2.9%]
Homeownership (%)	72.9% [67.6 – 77.2%]	71.7% [64.6 – 77.0%]	73.4% [68.9 – 77.2%]	

Expenses	Prevalence of units with a mortgage with Selected Monthly Owner Costs as a Percentage of Household Income (SMOCAPI) of 30% or more (%)	24.6% [20.9 – 29.4%]	24.2% [21.2 – 28.5%]	24.8% [20.6 – 29.8%]
	Prevalence of rent-paying units with Gross Rent as a Percentage of Household Income (GRAPI) of 30% or more (%)	44.3% [38.1 – 49.5%]	46.6% [42.3 – 50.8%]	42.4% [35.8 – 48.4%]
	Households with Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits in the past 12 months (%)	11.9% [8.3 – 16.2%]	11.1% [8.0 – 14.6%]	12.6% [8.5 – 17.1%]
	Population 19-64 years old without health coverage (%)	8.7% [5.8 – 12.1%]	8.0% [5.3 – 10.8%]	9.1% [6.1 – 13.2%]
	Population with public health insurance coverage alone (Medicaid, Medicare, Veterans Administration [VA]) (%)	39.4% [33.2 – 45.3%]	35.6% [30.3 – 41.3%]	41.7% [35.7 – 47.3%]
	Neighborhood	Median home value, in \$10,000 increments (\$)	\$12.7 [\$9.8 – \$17.4]	\$16.7 [\$13.0 – \$22.6]
	10-year population change (%)	-0.07% [-3.6 – 5.2%]	4.3% [-0.35 – 10.5%]	-1.8% [-4.9 – 2.0%]
Dependent Variable	Prevalence of > 14 poor mental health days of the last 30 days, age-adjusted (%)	15.8% [14.1 – 17.8%]	15.3% [13.7 – 16.9%]	16.1% [14.4 – 18.4%]

1 NB: The three Business variables are missing 2 counties in Hawaii and 51 counties in Virginia (Overall Analytic  
2 N=3,068; Urban n=1,109; Rural n=1,959).

3 \* ACS = American Community Survey, BRFSS = Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System

4

5 **Table 2. Most-to-Least Important County-Level Economic Variables Contributing to**

6 **County Prevalence of Poor Mental Health Based on Dominance Analysis Ranked by**

1 **Standardized Dominance Weights, Overall and by Urban/Rural Classification, United**  
 2 **States, 2019.**

2019 Dominance Analysis Rankings and Weights					
Overall N=3,068	Weights	Urban n=1,109	Weights	Rural n=1,959	Weights
1. Household income	0.1155	1. Household income	0.1203	1. Household income	0.1180
2. Receipt of SSI	0.1111	2. Receipt of SSI	0.1131	2. College degree	0.1091
3. College degree	0.0989	3. College degree	0.0918	3. Receipt of SSI	0.1032
4. Receipt of SNAP	0.0943	4. Receipt of SNAP	0.0827	4. Receipt of SNAP	0.0897
5. Public insurance	0.0834	5. Public insurance	0.0789	5. Work travel time	0.0822
6. Unemployment	0.0701	6. Social Security	0.0757	6. Public insurance	0.0789
7. Work from home	0.0670	7. Home values	0.0746	7. Unemployment	0.0762
8. Work travel time	0.0579	8. Work from home	0.0488	8. Work from home	0.0744
9. Home values	0.0576	9. Working poverty	0.0485	9. Working poverty	0.0496
10. Social Security	0.0549	10. Unemployment	0.0431	10. Home values	0.0388
11. Working poverty	0.0527	11. Work travel time	0.0315	11. Social Security	0.0385
12. Gini Index	0.0283	12. Population change	0.0298	12. Gini Index	0.0345
13. Uninsured	0.0192	13. SMOCAP $\geq$ 30%	0.0235	13. GRAP $\geq$ 30%	0.0230
14. Population Change	0.0160	14. Real GDP	0.0233	14. Hours worked	0.0198
15. Real GDP	0.0139	15. Uninsured	0.0213	15. Uninsured	0.0157
16. GRAP $\geq$ 30%	0.0123	16. Homeownership	0.0186	16. Cash assistance	0.0108
17. Homeownership	0.0111	17. Gini Index	0.0185	17. Homeownership	0.0104
18. Hours worked	0.0102	18. Change GDP	0.0172	18. SMOCAP $\geq$ 30%	0.0102
19. Cash assistance	0.0090	19. Gender pay gap	0.0171	19. Real GDP	0.0065
20. SMOCAP $\geq$ 30%	0.0086	20. Cash assistance	0.0089	20. Population change	0.0052
21. Change GDP	0.0054	21. Hours worked	0.0070	21. Change GDP	0.0029
22. Gender pay gap	0.0027	22. GRAP $\geq$ 30%	0.0056	22. Gender pay gap	0.0025

3 \* SSI = Supplemental Security Income, SNAP = Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, GDP = Gross  
 4 Domestic Product, GRAP = Gross Rent as a Percent of Household Income, SMOCAP = Selected Monthly Owner  
 5 Costs as a Percentage of Household Income

6  
 7 In the overall model using our top eleven variables identified in the scree plot, county-level  
 8 measures significantly positively associated with the prevalence of poor mental health included:  
 9 unemployment, working poverty rate, mean travel time to work, households with Social  
 10 Security, households with SSI, and households with SNAP benefits (Table 3). County-level  
 11 measures significantly inversely associated with poor mental health prevalence were employees

1 working from home, median household income, and percent of the population with a college  
 2 degree. The largest coefficients were in median household income, percent of the population  
 3 working from home, and population receiving SSI. The variables in the overall model explained  
 4 70% (Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> = 0.7001) of the variation in poor mental health prevalence between  
 5 counties.

6  
 7 **Table 3. Beta Coefficients, 95% Confidence Interval, and Statistical Significance for**  
 8 **County-Level Economic Variables Using Linear Regression with Prevalence of Poor**  
 9 **Mental Health as the Dependent Variable, Overall and by Urban/Rural Classification,**  
 10 **United States, 2019.** Blue-filled cells indicate a positive association between the variable and  
 11 the dependent variable; red-filled cells indicate a negative association; greyed out cells indicate  
 12 the variable was not significant.

Factor	Variable	2019		
		Overall N=3,121	Urban n=1,145	Rural n=1,976
Employment	Unemployment rate, 16 years old + (%)	<b>0.093</b> (0.066, 0.12) p<0.001	0.043 (-0.011, 0.098) p=0.12	<b>0.093</b> (0.061, 0.12) p<0.001
	Employed but under the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) (%)	<b>0.055</b> (0.031, 0.078) p<0.001	<b>0.056</b> (0.014, 0.098) p=0.01	<b>0.050</b> (0.022, 0.078) p<0.001
	Employees aged 16 years + working from home (%)	<b>-0.12</b> (-0.14, -0.10) p<0.001	<b>-0.12</b> (-0.16, -0.078) p<0.001	<b>-0.11</b> (-0.13, -0.09) p<0.001
	Mean travel time to work (minutes)	<b>0.085</b> (0.075, 0.095) p<0.001	<b>0.079</b> (0.061, 0.096) p<0.001	<b>0.074</b> (0.061, 0.088) p<0.001
Income and Wealth	Median household income (\$10,000 increments)	<b>-0.58</b> (-0.67, -0.48) p<0.001	<b>-0.49</b> (-0.62, -0.36) p<0.001	<b>-0.82</b> (-0.95, -0.69) p<0.001
	Population 25 years old + with a college degree (%)	<b>-0.037</b> (-0.046, -0.028) p<0.001	-0.012 (-0.025, 0.0010) p=0.059	<b>-0.080</b> (-0.094, -0.065) p<0.001
	Households with Social Security income (%)	<b>0.024</b> (0.012, 0.035) p<0.001	<b>0.067</b> (0.048, 0.085) p<0.001	-0.0013 (-0.013, 0.016) p=0.86

	Households with Supplemental Security Income (SSI) (%)	<b>0.13</b> <b>(0.096, 0.16)</b> <b>p&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.25</b> <b>(0.19, 0.31)</b> <b>p&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.090</b> <b>(0.055, 0.13)</b> <b>p&lt;0.001</b>
Expenses	Households with Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits in the past 12 months (%)	<b>0.030</b> <b>(0.013, 0.047)</b> <b>p=0.0014</b>	0.020 (-0.012, 0.052) p=0.21	<b>0.020</b> <b>(0.0001, 0.041)</b> <b>p=0.049</b>
	Population with public health insurance coverage alone (Medicaid, Medicare, Veterans Administration [VA]) (%)	0.0083 (-0.0040, 0.021) p=0.18	-0.021 (-0.043, 0.0010) p=0.059	<b>0.021</b> <b>(0.0062, 0.035)</b> <b>p=0.005</b>
Neighborhood	Median home value (\$10,000 increments)	-0.0042 (-0.014, 0.0051) p=0.38	<b>-0.030</b> <b>(-0.042, -0.019)</b> <b>p&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.044</b> <b>(0.029, 0.059)</b> <b>p&lt;0.001</b>
<b>Adj R<sup>2</sup> Value</b>		<b>0.7001</b>	<b>0.7140</b>	<b>0.6988</b>

1  
2 For urban counties, the unemployment rate, population with a college degree, and households  
3 with SNAP benefits were not statistically significantly associated with poor mental health  
4 prevalence. However, median home values were significantly inversely associated with the  
5 prevalence of poor mental health. In the rural model, nine county-level economic measures used  
6 were statistically significantly associated with poor mental health prevalence; households with  
7 Social Security and households with SNAP benefits were not significant. In contrast to urban  
8 counties, median home values in rural counties were significantly positively associated with poor  
9 mental health. The adjusted R<sup>2</sup> values indicate that the urban and rural models explained 71.4%  
10 and 69.9% of the variation in poor mental health, respectively.

11

## 12 Discussion

13 We identified the top eleven important economic determinants of self-reported poor mental  
14 health at the US county level; these variables explained over 70% of the variation in poor mental  
15 health between counties in 2019. These eleven explanatory variables associated with poor mental  
16 health were consistent in urban and rural models with some variation in the ranking. Across all

1 models, the four highest-ranked economic factors were related to income and expenses:  
2 household income, receipt of SSI, population with a college degree, and receipt of SNAP  
3 benefits.

4  
5 Based on our findings, median household income was the most important factor associated with  
6 county-level poor mental health in both urban and rural areas. Our results show that higher  
7 median income in a county is associated with a lower prevalence of poor mental health. Income  
8 is a key determinant of health because it provides households with the resources necessary for  
9 health and wellbeing, including basic needs like nutritious food, safe housing, and health care  
10 services and other resources like higher education.<sup>22</sup> Low income puts children and adults at  
11 higher risk for stress, worse physical health, exposure to adverse conditions in early life, and  
12 exposure to violence and crime, any of which could trigger mood and anxiety disorders.<sup>23-25</sup> A  
13 reduction in or loss of income may be particularly harmful to mental health.<sup>23,26-27</sup> In addition,  
14 there is ample evidence that interventions aimed at reducing poverty, such as through cash  
15 support, have a positive effect on mental health, particularly when the support lifts someone out  
16 of poverty.<sup>23,26</sup>

17  
18 One type of income support, SSI benefits, was also significant in the model. The results showed  
19 that as the percentage of the population with SSI benefits increased, so too did the prevalence of  
20 poor mental health. SSI provides fixed, monthly supplemental financial assistance to people who  
21 are: under 65 years old who are blind or have a disability (including mental disorders) that makes  
22 it difficult to perform substantial gainful activity or over 65 years old without a disability who  
23 live on a low income. Among the 72% of SSI recipients who are under 65 years old, six out of 10

1 were receiving SSI due to a mental health disorder.<sup>28</sup> In addition, adults with disabilities or who  
2 have low incomes are more likely to report frequent mental distress than those without  
3 disabilities or with higher incomes.<sup>29</sup> The association between receipt of SSI and prevalence of  
4 poor mental health may be due to the higher rate of mental health disorders among SSI recipients  
5 than among the general public; however, it may also suggest that the program on its own may not  
6 be able to mediate the impact that structural and social inequities have on the number of poor  
7 mental health days experienced by people with disabilities and/or low incomes.

8  
9 Similarly, a higher number of SNAP recipients in a county was associated with higher  
10 prevalence of poor mental health, with a stronger relationship in the rural than in the urban  
11 model. To be eligible for SNAP benefits, households must meet certain gross and net income and  
12 resource limits, making SNAP a proxy for low-income households. Under special SNAP rules,  
13 recipients with disability income (e.g., SSI) only need to meet net income limits. The positive  
14 relationship between SNAP benefits and poor mental health may reflect higher prevalence of  
15 mental health conditions among recipients. An estimated 28% of non-elderly SNAP recipients  
16 have a disability (which could include mental health conditions); of those with a disability,  
17 almost 60% receive social security benefits.<sup>30</sup> Though SNAP benefits may have a positive impact  
18 on public health<sup>31</sup>, the results of this model suggest that SNAP benefits may not be able to make  
19 up for the financial gaps people with low incomes and/or disabilities may have and the impacts  
20 of these financial shortfalls on mental health.

21  
22 Although the percentage of the population with public health insurance coverage was a top factor  
23 in the dominance analysis for all models, it was only statistically significant (positive) in the

1 rural counties analysis. This suggests that income-based health insurance coverage may play a  
2 bigger role in poor mental health prevalence in rural areas than urban ones. Like SSI and SNAP  
3 households discussed previously, the positive relationship between public health insurance  
4 coverage and poor mental health may indicate that access to public insurance may not mediate  
5 the impact of having a low income, and this appears to be particularly true for rural areas.

6  
7 The significance of having a college degree for lower prevalence of poor mental health may be  
8 related to higher wages associated with greater educational attainment<sup>32</sup> and the increased  
9 potential to build wealth. College education also increases opportunities for jobs with benefits  
10 like health coverage and increased access to health-promoting knowledge and resources,  
11 resulting in lower rates of death and longer lives.<sup>9</sup> Lower levels of educational attainment are  
12 associated with increased risk of some psychiatric diagnoses like Major Depressive Disorder and  
13 Generalized Anxiety Disorder<sup>33</sup> and higher rates of suicide.<sup>34</sup> Conversely, poor mental health is  
14 associated with higher risk of early termination of education, limiting educational attainment.<sup>35</sup>

15  
16 In addition to the income and expense variables, we found that as mean travel time to work  
17 increased, the prevalence of poor mental health increased, which could be explained as a  
18 function of the increased time spent making driving-related decisions, leading to higher stress  
19 levels.<sup>36</sup> The results showed that the percentage of employees working from home was inversely  
20 associated with poor mental health, which also may be related to commute time and other aspects  
21 of remote work that support mental well-being, such as fewer distractions, a more comfortable  
22 environment, and more time to spend with family or cook meals.<sup>37</sup>

23



1 An unexpected result was the null finding for median home values across all US counties, yet  
2 significant associations for both the urban and rural models – but in opposite directions. Median  
3 home value in urban counties had a significant inverse relationship with poor mental health. This  
4 is consistent with other studies like those on the Moving to Opportunity for Fair Housing  
5 Demonstration Program that have shown that higher income and higher opportunity  
6 neighborhoods may improve mental and physical health, especially for adults<sup>38-40</sup>, possibly  
7 relating to less exposure to neighborhood level stressors like crime<sup>40</sup> and greater access to health-  
8 promoting resources like high-quality medical providers<sup>41</sup> and recreation facilities and amenities  
9 in good condition<sup>42</sup> than are available in poorer neighborhoods. However, higher home values in  
10 rural areas are associated with higher prevalence of poor mental health – though the importance  
11 of median home values ranked lower in rural areas than in urban areas. Lower wages, fewer  
12 opportunities for high-paying jobs, and slower recovery of employment since the Great  
13 Recession<sup>43</sup> in rural places may indicate greater financial insecurity among rural counties,  
14 including among homeowners. The contrasting relationships to poor mental health in urban and  
15 rural counties support the need to examine associations with urban and rural economic factors  
16 separately.

17  
18 While individual- and clinical-level interventions to address these economic drivers exist, such  
19 as connecting patients receiving mental health care with economic resources to ease financial  
20 burdens, these types of interventions are not sufficient.<sup>9</sup> Population health improves as income  
21 increases, particularly for populations in the lowest income brackets.<sup>23,26</sup> Interventions that  
22 systematically address poverty and the financial burden of basic needs like health insurance and  
23 food may have a greater impact on health in the US than a narrow focus on individual

1 interventions.<sup>17</sup> Addressing the upstream economic drivers of poor mental health may also have  
2 cascading impacts on a range of other chronic health outcomes that share the same drivers, from  
3 mortality to substance abuse.<sup>44-47</sup>  
4  
5 Structural interventions relating to household income that may have a positive effect on county-  
6 level mental health include expanding programs for federal income subsidies<sup>48</sup>; ensuring income  
7 support for households during difficult financial times, such as unemployment<sup>49-50</sup>; establishment  
8 of a universal basic income<sup>51</sup>; increasing federal, state, or local minimum wages<sup>52-53</sup>; offering  
9 additional tax breaks or credits for low-income households<sup>54-55</sup>; and enacting policies which  
10 promote equitable access to higher-paying employment opportunities.<sup>56</sup> Programs like SSI that  
11 provide financial assistance to people with poor mental health who may have challenges  
12 maintaining stable work and health insurance for treatment could positively impact mental  
13 health. Similarly, policies and programs that support people with low incomes so they can afford  
14 necessary expenses like housing and food may have a beneficial impact on mental health,  
15 beyond the original intentions of the program.<sup>57-58</sup> Additional interventions that might benefit  
16 population mental health include increasing educational opportunities, such as high school  
17 completion initiatives, low-cost technical college programs, and college tuition assistance<sup>59-60</sup>;  
18 expanding access to healthcare through subsidized or universal health insurance coverage<sup>61-63</sup>;  
19 and thoughtful implementation of policies supporting work from home.<sup>64</sup>  
20  
21 Future analyses could evaluate which approaches are most likely to improve mental health.  
22 However, economic considerations may be necessary but insufficient to comprehensively  
23 address the persistence of poor mental health in the US. A systems approach would help

1 understand the most effective ways to improve mental health. Impactful changes in one place can  
2 have cascading effects and create systemic change.<sup>18</sup> Assessment of the mental health  
3 consequences of any new policy or policy change could be standard practice, in line with a  
4 Health in All Policies approach.<sup>65</sup> However, the full effects of large-scale, structural, and  
5 systemic changes may not be seen for many years.<sup>7</sup>

6  
7 Additional research could clarify the relationships between economic factors and mental health  
8 at the individual level; however, more SSDOH data (such as standardized data in electronic  
9 health systems<sup>66</sup>) are needed to capture how mental health may be influenced by SSDOH on an  
10 individual basis. Relatedly, the importance of each economic variable would be expected to vary  
11 depending on membership in various intersecting minority groups (e.g., age, sex, sexual  
12 orientation and gender identity, race, ethnicity, and nativity). Past and present discrimination  
13 against members of minority groups has had lasting economic consequences for group  
14 members<sup>67</sup>, and these inequities are not fully reflected in existing datasets. Future research could  
15 continue to explore the relationships between economic factors and health inequities, as well as  
16 the most effective change points for interventions to improve the association between economic  
17 factors and a range of health outcomes.

18  
19 Our study had three main limitations. First, we conducted an ecological study to assess county-  
20 level associations, limiting our ability to infer causality. Second, this study carries forward the  
21 limitations of our original data sources. For example, the mental health prevalence estimates use  
22 data from BRFSS, which uses self-reported answers to a single question to assess mental health

1 status. Third, reduced sample sizes in the urban- and rural-specific models may have impacted  
2 our findings.

3  
4 Nevertheless, this study provides a unique list of county-level economic factors that may  
5 influence mental health status that could be used as a starting point for further analysis. It  
6 provides a baseline analysis to understand economic factors related to mental health prior to the  
7 major economic disruptions associated with the COVID-19 pandemic, which worsened mental  
8 health challenges.<sup>68-70</sup> Finally, it applies dominance analysis techniques to go beyond the  
9 identification of potential drivers to rank these drivers in order of importance, which can inform  
10 the prioritization of policies and programs to improve mental health status.

11

## 12 **Conclusions**

13 This study provides important data to researchers and policymakers on the association of  
14 economic factors and mental health. This study found that higher county-level access to  
15 resources, including income, education, and health insurance, is associated with a lower  
16 prevalence of poor mental health. In our market-based economy, economic factors shape the  
17 distribution of resources and opportunities needed to maintain mental well-being and these  
18 distributions are geographically uneven across the US. Additional research could explore  
19 additional economic variables as indicators and their relationship to specific mental health  
20 outcomes (e.g., depression); spatial trends in poor mental health over time; and possible mental  
21 health-specific population-level interventions and their effectiveness in improving mental health  
22 to improve public health and address health inequities.

23

## 1 **Acknowledgements**

2 The findings and conclusions in this manuscript are those of the authors and do not necessarily  
3 represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The authors  
4 would like to recognize the CDC Health Equity Science Manuscript Fellowship in partnership  
5 with the University of California, San Francisco, for the dedicated training and collaboration that  
6 have contributed to this publication. This manuscript also benefitted from statistical consultation  
7 with the UCSF Clinical and Translational Science Institute.

8

## 9 **References**

- 10 1. American Psychological Association. Stress in America: Stress and current events. 2019.  
11 Available from: [https://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/stress/2019/stress-america-](https://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/stress/2019/stress-america-2019.pdf)  
12 [2019.pdf](https://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/stress/2019/stress-america-2019.pdf).
- 13 2. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. Key substance use and  
14 mental health indicators in the United States: Results from the 2019 National Survey on  
15 Drug Use and Health. HHS Publication No PEP20-07-01-001, NSDUH Series H-55.  
16 2020. Rockville, MD: Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality. Available  
17 from: <https://www.samhsa.gov/data/report/2019-nsduh-annual-national-report>.
- 18 3. Terlizzi EP, Schiller JS. Mental health treatment among adults aged 18-44: United States,  
19 2019-2021. NCHS Data Brief, No 444. 2022. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for  
20 Health Statistics. Available from: <https://dx.doi.org/10.15620/cdc:120293>.

- 1       4. Liao B, Xu D, Tan Y, Chen X, Cai S. Association of mental distress with chronic  
2           diseases in 1.9 million individuals: A population-based cross-sectional study. *J*  
3           *Psychosom Res.* 2022;162:111040. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2022.111040>.
- 4       5. Rashid M, Islam MM, Li ASN, Shifa N. Frequent mental distress among adults in the  
5           United States and its association with socio-demographic characteristics, lifestyle, and  
6           chronic health condition. *J Public Hlth Dev*, 2022;20(1):146-162.  
7           <https://doi.org/10.55131/jphd/2022/200112>.
- 8       6. Scott KM, Lim C, Al-Hamzawi A, Alonso J, Bruffaerts R, Caldas-de-Almeida JM, et al.  
9           Association of mental disorders with subsequent chronic physical conditions: World  
10          mental health surveys from 17 countries. *JAMA Psychiatry.* 2016;73(2):150–8.  
11          <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2015.2688>.
- 12       7. Knapp M, Wong G. Economics and mental health: The current scenario. *World*  
13          *Psychiatry.* 2020;19(1):3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20692>.
- 14       8. Greenberg PE, Fournier AA, Sisitsky T, Simes M, Berman R, Koenigsberg SH, et al. The  
15          economic burden of adults with Major Depressive Disorder in the United States (2010  
16          and 2018). *Pharmacoecon.* 2021;39(6):653–665. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s40273-021-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40273-021-01019-4)  
17          01019-4.
- 18       9. Compton MT, Shim RS. The social determinants of mental health. *Focus.*  
19          2015;13(4):419–25. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.focus.20150017>.
- 20       10. Labonté R, Stuckler D. The rise of neoliberalism: How bad economics imperils health  
21          and what to do about it. *J Epidemiol Community Health.* 2015;70(3):312–8.  
22          <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech-2015-206295>.

- 1 11. Frasquilho D, Matos MG, Salonna F, Guerreiro D, Storti CC, Gaspar T, et al. Mental  
2 health outcomes in times of economic recession: A systematic literature review. BMC  
3 public health. 2015;16(1):1-40. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-016-2720-y>.
- 4 12. Suhrcke M, Stuckler D. Will the recession be bad for our health? It depends. Soc Sci  
5 Med. 2012;74(5):647–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.12.011>.
- 6 13. Catalano R, Goldman-Mellor S, Saxton K, Margerison-Zilko C, Subbaraman M, LeWinn  
7 K, et al. The health effects of economic decline. Annu Rev Public Health.  
8 2011;32(1):431–50. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031210-101146>.
- 9 14. Mercado C, Bullard KM, Bolduc M, Andrews C, Freggens Z, Liggett G, et al. A shift in  
10 approach to addressing public health inequities in considering societal structural and  
11 systemic drivers and their impact on social determinants of health. Social Science  
12 Research Network. 2023. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4599504>.
- 13 15. Alegría M, Alvarez K, Cheng M, Falgas-Bague I. Recent advances on social  
14 determinants of mental health: Looking fast forward. Am J Psychiatry. 2023;180(7):473–  
15 82. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.20230371>.
- 16 16. Brown AF, Ma GX, Miranda J, Eng E, Castille D, Brockie T, et al. Structural  
17 interventions to reduce and eliminate health disparities. Am J Public Health.  
18 2019;109(S1):S72–8. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2018.304844>.
- 19 17. Frieden TR. A framework for public health action: The health impact pyramid. Am J  
20 Public Health. 2010;100(4):590–5. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2009.185652>.
- 21 18. Carey G, Crammond B. Systems change for the social determinants of health. BMC  
22 Public Health. 2015;15(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-1979-8>.

- 1        19. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance  
2            System survey questionnaire. 2019. Available from:  
3            <https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/questionnaires/index.htm>.
- 4        20. Greenlund KJ, Lu H, Wang Y, Matthews KA, LeClercq JM, Lee B, et al. PLACES:  
5            Local data for better health. *Prev Chronic Dis*. 2022;19:210459.  
6            <http://dx.doi.org/10.5888/pcd19.210459>.
- 7        21. Luchman JN. Determining relative importance in Stata using dominance analysis: domin  
8            and domme. *The Stata Journal*. 2021 Jun;21(2):510-38.
- 9        22. Galobardes B, Shaw M, Lawlor DA, Lynch JW, Smith GD. Indicators of socioeconomic  
10           position (part 1). *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2006;60(1):7–12.  
11           <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.2004.023531>.
- 12       23. Ridley M, Rao G, Schilbach F, Patel V. Poverty, depression, and anxiety: Causal  
13           evidence and mechanisms. *Science*. 2020;370(6522):eaay0214.  
14           <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aay0214>.
- 15       24. Santiago CD, Wadsworth ME, Stump J. Socioeconomic status, neighborhood  
16           disadvantage, and poverty-related stress: Prospective effects on psychological syndromes  
17           among diverse low-income families. *J Econ Psychol*. 2011;32(2):218–30.  
18           <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2009.10.008>.
- 19       25. Sareen J, Afifi TO, McMillan KA, Asmundson GJG. Relationship between household  
20           income and mental disorders. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2011;68(4):419–427.  
21           <https://doi.org/10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2011.15>.
- 22       26. Thomson RM, Igelström E, Purba AK, Shimonovich M, Thomson H, McCartney G, et al.  
23           How do income changes impact on mental health and wellbeing for working-age adults?



- 1           A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Public Health*. 2022;7(6):e515–e528.  
2           [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(22\)00058-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(22)00058-5).
- 3           27. Reiss F. Socioeconomic inequalities and mental health problems in children and  
4           adolescents: A systematic review. *Soc Sci Med*. 2013;90(1):24–31.  
5           <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.04.026>.
- 6           28. Social Security Administration (SSA). SSI annual statistical report, 2019. SSA  
7           publication no 13-11827. 2020. Washington, DC: Office of Research, Evaluation, and  
8           Statistics. Available from:  
9           [https://www.ssa.gov/policy/docs/statcomps/ssi\\_asr/2019/ssi\\_asr19.pdf](https://www.ssa.gov/policy/docs/statcomps/ssi_asr/2019/ssi_asr19.pdf).
- 10          29. Cree RA, Okoro CA, Zack MM, Carbone E. Frequent mental distress among adults, by  
11          disability status, disability type, and selected characteristics — United States, 2018.  
12          *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(36):1238–43.  
13          <http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6936a2>.
- 14          30. Carlson S, Keith-Jennings B, Chaudhry R. SNAP Provides Needed Food Assistance to  
15          Millions of People with Disabilities. 2017. Available from  
16          [https://www.cbpp.org/research/snap-provides-needed-food-assistance-to-millions-of-](https://www.cbpp.org/research/snap-provides-needed-food-assistance-to-millions-of-people-with-disabilities)  
17          [people-with-disabilities](https://www.cbpp.org/research/snap-provides-needed-food-assistance-to-millions-of-people-with-disabilities).
- 18          31. Gregory CA, Deb P. Does SNAP improve your health? *Food Policy*. 2015;50:11–19.  
19          <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2014.09.010>.
- 20          32. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). Current population survey. 2020. Available from:  
21          <https://www.bls.gov/cps/tables.htm>.

- 1 33. Demange P, Boomsma DI, Elsje van Bergen, Nivard MG. Evaluating the causal  
2 relationship between educational attainment and mental health. medRxiv. 2023.  
3 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.26.23285029>.
- 4 34. Phillips JA, Hempstead K. Differences in U.S. suicide rates by educational attainment,  
5 2000-2014. Am J Prev Med. 2017;53(4):e123–30.  
6 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2017.04.010>.
- 7 35. Breslau J, Lane M, Sampson N, Kessler RC. Mental disorders and subsequent  
8 educational attainment in a US national sample. J Psychiatr Res. 2008;42(9):708–16.  
9 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2008.01.016>.
- 10 36. Ferenchak NN, Katirai M. Commute mode and mental health in major metropolitan  
11 areas. Transportation Letters. 2014;7(2):92–103.  
12 <https://doi.org/10.1179/1942787514Y.00000000040>.
- 13 37. Kitagawa R, Kuroda S, Okudaira H, Owan H. Working from home and productivity  
14 under the COVID-19 pandemic: Using survey data of four manufacturing firms. PLoS  
15 One. 2021;16(12):e0261761. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0261761>.
- 16 38. Graif C, Arcaya MC, Diez Roux AV. Moving to opportunity and mental health:  
17 Exploring the spatial context of neighborhood effects. Soc Sci Med. 2016;162:50–8.  
18 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.05.036>.
- 19 39. Ludwig J, Duncan GJ, Gennetian LA, Katz LF, Kessler RC, Kling JR, et al. Long-term  
20 neighborhood effects on low-income families: Evidence from Moving to Opportunity.  
21 Am Econ Rev. 2013;103(3):226–31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/aer.103.3.226>.

- 1        40. Turney K, Kissane R, Edin K. After Moving to Opportunity. *Soc Ment Health*.  
2            2012;3(1):1-21.  
3            <https://doi.org/10.1177/2156869312464789>.
- 4        41. Thomas L. Hospitals, doctors moving out of cities to more affluent areas. *Pittsburgh Post*  
5            *Gazette*. 2014. Available from: [https://archive.jsonline.com/news/health/hospitals-](https://archive.jsonline.com/news/health/hospitals-doctors-moving-out-of-poor-city-neighborhoods-to-more-affluent-areas-b99284882z1-262899701.html)  
6            [doctors-moving-out-of-poor-city-neighborhoods-to-more-affluent-areas-b99284882z1-](https://archive.jsonline.com/news/health/hospitals-doctors-moving-out-of-poor-city-neighborhoods-to-more-affluent-areas-b99284882z1-262899701.html)  
7            [262899701.html](https://archive.jsonline.com/news/health/hospitals-doctors-moving-out-of-poor-city-neighborhoods-to-more-affluent-areas-b99284882z1-262899701.html).
- 8        42. McKenzie TL, Moody JS, Carlson JA, Lopez NV, Elder JP. Neighborhood income  
9            matters: Disparities in community recreation facilities, amenities, and programs.  
10           *J Park Recreat Admi*, 2013;31(4):12.
- 11       43. United States Department of Agriculture. Rural America at a glance. Economic  
12           Information Bulletin No 112. 2019. Economic Research Service, Department of  
13           Agriculture. Available from: [https://www.ers.usda.gov/pub-](https://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/pub-details/?pubid=95340)  
14           [details/?pubid=95340](https://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/pub-details/?pubid=95340).
- 15       44. Venkataramani AS, O'Brien R, Whitehorn GL, Tsai AC. Economic influences on  
16           population health in the United States: Toward policymaking driven by data and  
17           evidence. *PLoS Med*. 2020;17(9):e1003319.  
18           <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003319>.
- 19       45. Montez JK, Beckfield J, Cooney JK, Grumbach JM, Hayward MD, Koytak HZ, et al. US  
20           state policies, politics, and life expectancy. *Milbank Q*. 2020;98(3):668–699.  
21           <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0009.12469>.
- 22       46. Lakerveld J, Mackenbach J. The upstream determinants of adult obesity. *Obes Facts*.  
23           2017;10(3):216–22. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000471489>.

- 1 47. Williams DR, Costa MV, Odunlami AO, Mohammed SA. Moving upstream: How  
2 interventions that address the social determinants of health can improve health and reduce  
3 disparities. *J Public Health Manag Pract.* 2008;14(Supplement):S8–17.  
4 <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.PHH.0000338382.36695.42>.
- 5 48. Dore EC, Livingston III MD, Shafer PR. Easing cash assistance rules during COVID-19  
6 was associated with reduced days of poor physical and mental health. *Health Aff.*  
7 2022;41(11):1590–7. <https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2022.00740>.
- 8 49. Berkowitz SA, Basu S. Unemployment insurance, health-related social needs, health care  
9 access, and mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic. *JAMA Intern Med.*  
10 2020;181(5): 699–702. <https://doi.org/10.1001%2Fjamainternmed.2020.7048>.
- 11 50. O’Campo P, Molnar A, Ng E, Renahy E, Mitchell C, Shankardass K, et al. Social welfare  
12 matters: A realist review of when, how, and why unemployment insurance impacts  
13 poverty and health. *Soc Sci Med.* 2015;132:88–94.  
14 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.03.025>.
- 15 51. Wilson N, McDaid S. The mental health effects of a Universal Basic Income: A synthesis  
16 of the evidence from previous pilots. *Soc Sci Med.* 2021;287:114374.  
17 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114374>.
- 18 52. Kuroki M. State minimum wage and mental health in the United States: 2011–2019. *SSM*  
19 *Ment Health.* 2021;1:100040. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmmh.2021.100040>.
- 20 53. Leigh JP, Leigh WA, Du J. Minimum wages and public health: A literature review. *Prev*  
21 *Med.* 2019;118:122–134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2018.10.005>.
- 22 54. Shields-Zeeman L, Collin DF, Batra A, Hamad R. How does income affect mental health  
23 and health behaviours? A quasi-experimental study of the earned income tax credit. *J*

- 1           Epidemiol Community Health. 2021;75(10):929–935. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jech->  
2           2020-214841.
- 3           55. Boyd-Swan C, Herbst CM, Ifcher J, Zarghamee H. The earned income tax credit, mental  
4           health, and happiness. *J Econ Behav Organ.* 2016;126:18–38.  
5           <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2015.11.004>.
- 6           56. Yearby R. When equal pay is not enough: The influence of employment discrimination  
7           on health disparities. *Public Health Rep.* 2019;134(4):447–50.  
8           <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033354919847743>.
- 9           57. Bovell-Ammon A, Yentel D, Koprowski M, Wilkinson C, Sandel M. Housing Is health:  
10           A renewed call for federal housing investments in affordable housing for families with  
11           children. *Acad Pediatr.* 2020;21(1):19-23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acap.2020.06.141>.
- 12           58. Keith-Jennings B, Llobrera J, Dean S. Links of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance  
13           Program with food insecurity, poverty, and health: Evidence and potential. *Am J Public*  
14           *Health.* 2019;109(12):1636–40. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2019.305325>.
- 15           59. Courtin E, Kim S, Song S, Yu W, Muennig P. Can social policies improve health? A  
16           systematic review and meta-analysis of 38 randomized trials. *Milbank Q.*  
17           2020;98(2):297-371. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0009.12451>.
- 18           60. Hahn RA, Truman BI. Education improves public health and promotes health equity. *Int*  
19           *J Health Serv.* 2015;45(4):657–78. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020731415585986>.
- 20           61. Wray CM, Khare M, Keyhani S. Access to care, cost of care, and satisfaction with care  
21           among adults with private and public health insurance in the US. *JAMA Netw Open.*  
22           2021;4(6):e2110275. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.10275>.

- 1       62. Robertson-Preidler J, Trachsel M, Johnson T, Biller-Andorno N. The Affordable Care  
2           Act and recent reforms: Policy implications for equitable mental health care delivery.  
3           Health Care Anal. 2020;28(3): 229-248. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10728-020-00391-0>.
- 4       63. Fox A, Poirier R. How single-payer stacks up: Evaluating different models of universal  
5           health coverage on cost, access, and quality. *Int J Health Serv.* 2018;48(3):568–85.  
6           <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020731418779377>.
- 7       64. Oakman J, Kinsman N, Stuckey R, Graham M, Weale V. A rapid review of mental and  
8           physical health effects of working at home: How do we optimise health? *BMC Public*  
9           Health. 2020;20(1825):1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-09875-z>.
- 10      65. World Health Organization (WHO). Health in All Policies (HiAP): Helsinki Statement -  
11          Framework for country action. 2014. Available from:  
12          [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/112636/9789241506908\\_eng.pdf](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/112636/9789241506908_eng.pdf).
- 13      66. Alegria M, NeMoyer A, Falgàs Bagué I, Wang Y, Alvarez K. Social determinants of  
14          mental health: Where we are and where we need to go. *Curr Psychiatry Rep.*  
15          2018;20(11):95. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6181118/>.
- 16      67. Phelan JC, Link BG. Is racism a fundamental cause of inequalities in health? *Annu Rev*  
17          Sociol. 2015;41(1):311–330. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112305>.
- 18      68. Kämpfen F, Kohler IV, Ciancio A, Bruine de Bruin W, Maurer J, Kohler HP. Predictors  
19          of mental health during the Covid-19 pandemic in the US: Role of economic concerns,  
20          health worries and social distancing. *PLoS One.* 2020;15(11):e0241895.  
21          <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0241895>.

- 1        69. Kim D. Financial hardship and social assistance as determinants of mental health and  
2            food and housing insecurity during the COVID-19 pandemic in the United States. *SSM*  
3            *Popul Health*. 2021;16:100862. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2021.100862>.
- 4        70. Lu X, Lin Z. COVID-19, economic impact, mental health, and coping behaviors: A  
5            conceptual framework and future research directions. *Frontiers in Psychology*.  
6            2021;12:5285. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.759974>.

## 8        **Supporting information**

- 9        **S1 Fig. Scree Plot of Dominance Weights Identified by the Dominance Analysis of**  
10        **Economic Variables in Relation to Poor Mental Health.** The “elbow” on the plot at variable  
11        12 (indicated in red) shows where the dominance weights drop off most steeply in value; values  
12        to the left of the elbow (11 total) were retained as significant for our multiple linear regression  
13        models.
- 14
- 15        **S1 Table. Economic Determinants of Health Variables Used to Analyze County-Level**  
16        **Association Between Economic Factors and Estimated Prevalence of Poor Mental Health**  
17        **and their Sources, United States, 2019.**




Fig 1