Psychosocial Disability During the Long-term Course of Unipolar Major Depressive Disorder
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Background: The goal of this study was to investigate psychosocial disability in relation to depressive symptom severity during the long-term course of unipolar major depressive disorder (MDD).

Methods: Monthly ratings of impairment in major life functions and social relationships were obtained during an average of 10 years’ systematic follow-up of 371 patients with unipolar MDD in the National Institute of Mental Health Collaborative Depression Study. Random regression models were used to examine variations in psychosocial functioning associated with 3 levels of depressive symptom severity and the asymptomatic status.

Results: A progressive gradient of psychosocial impairment was associated with a parallel gradient in the level of depressive symptom severity, which ranges from asymptomatic to subthreshold depressive symptoms to symptoms at the minor depression/dysthymia level to symptoms at the MDD level. Significant increases in disability occurred with each stepwise increment in depressive symptom severity.

Conclusions: During the long-term course, disability is pervasive and chronic but disappears when patients become asymptomatic. Depressive symptoms at levels of subthreshold depressive symptoms, minor depression/dysthymia, and MDD represent a continuum of depressive symptom severity in unipolar MDD, each level of which is associated with a significant stepwise increment in psychosocial disability.
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Recent studies indicate that unipolar major depressive disorder (MDD) is associated with significant psychosocial disability, often exceeding that noted in common medical illnesses. A definitive monograph in 1996 by the World Health Organization identified unipolar MDD as the fourth-ranked cause of disability-adjusted life-years and premature death worldwide. Part of the reason unipolar MDD is responsible for so much global disability is that it is a very common disorder, with nearly 1 in 5 people in the general population suffering a lifetime major depressive episode (MDE). In addition, the clinical course typically is very chronic in that MDEs relapse and recur very frequently and depressive symptoms are present approximately 60% of the time during long-term follow-up. Thus, a large number of individuals in the general population are likely to experience significant chronic disability from unipolar MDD.

Most of what is established about psychosocial disability in unipolar MDD has been derived from cross-sectional epidemiological or short-term treatment studies. We know of no investigation to date that has characterized disability in the same patients with unipolar MDD during the long-term course of their illness. The National Institute of Mental Health Collaborative Depression Study (CDS) provides a unique resource for investigating impairment over time, since patients were studied prospectively, longitudinally, and naturalistically for many years after entering the study during an MDE.

See also page 381

The design of the CDS allows psychosocial disability to be investigated in the same patient while at different levels of depressive symptom severity and provides the basis to test important hypotheses about psychosocial impairment during the long-term course of unipolar MDD: (1) disability associated with unipolar MDD is pervasive, affecting most areas of everyday function; (2) disability associated with unipolar MDD varies directly as a function of depressive symptom severity; (3) disability associated with unipo-
SUBJECTS AND METHODS

SUBJECTS

The analysis sample consisted of 371 patients with unipolar MDD who entered the CDS\textsuperscript{12,22} during an MDE at 1 of 5 tertiary care centers from 1978 to 1981 and were followed up longitudinally for more than 2 years. Patients were diagnosed using Research Diagnostic Criteria (RDC)\textsuperscript{23} based on the Schedule for Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia (SADS)\textsuperscript{24} interviews. Only patients with no evidence of bipolar disorder (mania, hypomania, cyclothymic personality), schizoaffective disorder, or schizophrenia as of intake or at any time during follow-up were included in this investigation. Subjects were white, spoke English, had an IQ score of at least 70, and had no evidence of organic mental disorder or terminal medical illness. Informed consent was obtained. Intake demographic and clinical characteristics of the 371 patients with unipolar MDD are presented in Table 1.

WEEKLY DEPRESSIVE SYMPTOM RATINGS

Trained professional raters interviewed patients every 6 months for the first 5 years and yearly thereafter, using variations of the Longitudinal Interval Follow-up Evaluation (LIFE).\textsuperscript{25} Patient interviews were the primary information source of the LIFE, with chronological memory prompts used to obtain information on changes in weekly symptom severity for MDD and other psychiatric disorders. Level of depressive symptomatology was rated weekly using a 6-point Psychiatric Status Rating Scale (PSR-MDD) for MDEs and a 3-point scale (PSR-MinD) for episodes of minor depression or dysthymia, as described in detail elsewhere.\textsuperscript{19,25} The CDS raters undergo rigorous training, resulting in high interrater reliability for the weekly psychiatric status (intraclass correlation coefficients ≥0.90).\textsuperscript{25} Of the 5776 available LIFE forms, 2\% were omitted because interviewers judged the information obtained to be of “poor” or “very poor” accuracy. Remaining follow-up data for the analysis sample of 371 CDS patients with unipolar MDD covered an average of 518.5 weeks or 10 years per subject (SD = 156.2 weeks), with a median of 624.0 weeks or 12.0 years.

DEPRESSIVE SYMPTOM SEVERITY LEVELS

Weekly depressive symptom severity levels were derived by combining all depression-related Psychiatric Status Rating Scale scores as described in a previous publication.\textsuperscript{18} Each week was assigned to 1 of 4 mutually exclusive depressive symptom severity levels anchored to the diagnostic threshold for commonly observed levels of depression or the asymptomatic status. These constitute a continuum of severity: level 4 (most severe), at the threshold for MDD; level 3 (moderately severe), at the threshold for minor depressive or dysthymic disorders (MinD); level 2 (mildly severe), below the diagnostic threshold for MinD or MDD and thus representing subthreshold depressive symptoms; and level 1 (least severe), representing complete absence of depressive symptoms and return to the asymptomatic, usual self.

PSYCHOSOCIAL IMPAIRMENT RATINGS

Using the LIFE forms,\textsuperscript{25} the patient’s “worst level of psychosocial functioning per month,” reflecting impairment due only to the patient’s depressive symptomatology, was rated by trained interviewers in 9 specific functional domains. The key dependent measures examined in this article are global rating of overall psychosocial functioning and 2 individual domains of major life functions: work/employment and relationship with spouse/partner. These

RESULTS

The measures of psychosocial functioning investigated in this study showed increasing impairment as patients’ levels of depressive symptomatology increased during long-term follow-up (see means and SDs in Table 3 and the Figure, derived from mixed regression analyses adjusting for within-subject variation across multiple ratings). Progressive increments in depressive symptom severity (asymptomatic to subthreshold, subthreshold to MinD, and MinD to MDD), were associated with significant parallel increases (P < .001 level) in psychosocial disability.

Average ratings for work/employment functions showed “no impairment, satisfactory to high performance” during months when patients with unipolar MDD were asymptomatic. When the same patients experienced subthreshold symptoms, mean employment impairment ratings rose 1 full-scale value to a point midway between “satisfactory” and “mild impairment.” From the subthreshold to MinD level there was an 0.9 increment in work impairment (to a mean of 3.5), so that work ratings on average approached the “severe impairment” range (mean = 4.7) when the subjects were experiencing MDD-level symptoms.

Relationships with spouse/partner were also significantly associated with changes in depressive symptom severity. Mean ratings were “good” when patients were asymptomatic, then worsened to somewhat less than “good” when patients had subthreshold symptoms, “fair” during months when they were at the MinD level, and between “fair” and “poor” during months when the same patients had MDD-level symptoms.

Global ratings of overall psychosocial functioning showed a linear pattern of 0.7 or 0.8 increases in impairment with each increment in depressive symptom severity (Figure). Average global functioning ratings were “good” when these patients were asymptomatic, were close to “fair” at the subthreshold level, approached “poor” at the MinD level, and were between “poor” and “very poor” at the MDD level.

Another way to express the relationship between depressive symptom severity level and psychosocial functioning is to examine the distribution of global overall functioning at the 4 different symptom levels. During the 4887 person-months when these patients were asympt-
were selected because of their modest correlation with each other (0.34) and their strong correlation with the global functioning rating (0.69 and 0.52, respectively). These 2 measures represent everyday life functioning within the home (relationship with spouse/partner) and outside the home (work/employment) in domains of function that can be expected to be central to patients’ overall well-being.

Ratings of psychosocial function were made on 1 of 2 ordinal Likert scales. Scoring on scale A ranges from 1 (no impairment, high-level function) to 6 (did not do this activity at all owing to depressive psychopathology). On scale B scores range from 1 (very good) to 5 (very poor). Psychosocial ratings during the first 2 years were based on entire 6-month evaluation periods; because it was seldom possible to associate these with one and only one depressive symptom level, these data were not analyzed. Monthly ratings of psychosocial impairment used for these analyses were obtained for each month during follow-up years 3 to 5 and the last month only of follow-up years 6 to 12.

For simplicity and accuracy in examining the relationship to depressive symptom severity levels, psychosocial ratings were included in the analyses only for those months when a patient was at 1 of the 3 depressive symptom levels or the asymptomatic status during all weeks of the month in question. Table 2 shows the distribution of subjects with each combination of symptom severity levels. These contribute varying numbers of subjects and person-months to the random regression statistics for the 3 psychosocial function measures, as indicated in Table 3 and the Figure.

STATISTICAL ANALYSES

The SAS software26 was used to create monthly levels of severity and functioning and to describe the overall patient sample. Random (mixed) regression analysis was then used to model the relationship between each impairment rating (dependent variable) and the 4 levels of depressive symptom severity (independent variable) using the MIXREG software of Hedeker and Gibbons.27 Mean impairment ratings were obtained per depressive symptom level, adjusting for within-subject variation. Because multiple ratings of impairment for each subject are assumed to be correlated, an intraclass correlation coefficient was used in calculating SDs. The random regression models included a random intercept term to account for correlated observations within subjects over time, and dummy variables to represent levels of symptom severity.26,27

Because impairment ratings are not normally distributed, the significance of contrasts between levels (2 tailed) was tested by means of random-effects ordinal regression analyses using the MIXOR program,28 parameterized to test the significance of the contrast between subthreshold depression and each of the other symptom severity levels.

From more than 3000 relatives and controls interviewed within the CDS, 1817 were selected who had no current diagnosis of any RDC psychiatric or substance abuse disorder as of their 6-year follow-up, at which time they were evaluated for psychosocial functioning in the prior month. These ratings provide an opportunity to see whether patients with unipolar MDD return to “normal” levels of functioning when they are asymptomatic. The Wilcoxon rank sum test was used to compare the single-month impairment rating for each subject in the “currently well” (control) group with the patients with unipolar MDD when asymptomatic, using 1 randomly selected month for patients with multiple evaluations at the asymptomatic level, or the single asymptomatic rating for patients with only 1 month at that level.

An α level of .05 (2 tailed) was used to assess the significance of all statistical tests.

To our knowledge, this is the first study to examine the degree of psychosocial disability in the same patients while they were experiencing 3 different levels of depressive symptom severity (subthreshold, MinD, and MDD) and the asymptomatic status during the long-term course of unipolar MDD. Using structured interview data, we have examined functional disability related to work/employment, relationship with spouse/partner, and global overall psychosocial function during an average of 10 years of systematic follow-up. The results confirmed the following hypotheses: (1) psychosocial disability associated with unipolar MDD is pervasive and chronic, affecting most areas of everyday function; (2) disability varies directly with the level of depressive symptom severity during the course of illness; and (3) disability is state dependent—when depressive symptoms are present, disability is present; when the same patients are asymptomatic, disability decreases significantly and psychosocial function is good or very good. We also confirmed findings we reported previously6,8,10 that even a few depressive symptoms (subthreshold), below the diagnostic threshold for MinD, dysthymia, or MDD, are associated with a small but significant increase in psychosocial disability compared with months when the same patients are asymptomatic.

Major domains of life functioning show differences in their overall association with levels of depressive symptom severity and in the depressive symptom severity level...
at which significant increases in impairment appear. For example, depressive symptoms at even the lowest level (subthreshold) seem to have an effect on work/employment function, whereas the subthreshold effect on relationship with spouse/partner, although significant, is much smaller. While specific domains of function differ in their patterns of associations with depressive symptom severity, the global rating of overall psychosocial functioning shows a remarkable linear relationship to changes in depressive symptomatology. A stepwise increase in depressive symptom severity is associated with a significant increase in functional impairment. Each of 3 stepwise increments in depressive symptom severity is associated with a significant increase in functional impairment. Impairment ratings show level of functioning during the month prior to 6-year follow-up, based on Life Base Psychosocial Domain ratings.

The Global Rating of Overall Psychosocial Functioning

The global rating of overall psychosocial functioning shows a remarkable linear relationship to changes in depressive symptomatology. A stepwise increase in depressive symptom severity is associated with a significant increase in functional impairment. Impairment ratings show level of functioning during the month prior to 6-year follow-up, based on Life Base Psychosocial Domain ratings. Each of 3 stepwise increments in depressive symptom severity is associated with a significant increase in functional impairment.

Table 1. Demographic and Clinical Characteristics of 371 Patients With Unipolar Major Depressive Disorder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Asymptomatic</th>
<th>Subthreshold</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (SD) age at intake, y</td>
<td>39.8 (14.7)</td>
<td>39.1 (14.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (SD) lifetime depressive episode, y</td>
<td>28.9 (14.0)</td>
<td>28.9 (14.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impairment status</td>
<td>274 (73.9)</td>
<td>274 (73.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median (range) lifetime depressive episodes</td>
<td>2 (1-107)</td>
<td>2 (1-107)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (SD) global assessment of severity at intake</td>
<td>38.6 (10.7)</td>
<td>38.6 (10.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data are presented as number (percentage) unless otherwise indicated. †Two subjects had missing data.

Table 2. Monthly Psychosocial Impairment Ratings by Levels of Depressive Symptom Severity in 371 Patients With Unipolar Major Depressive Disorder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depressive Symptom Severity Levels</th>
<th>No. (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All 4 levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymptomatic, subthreshold, MinD</td>
<td>64 (17.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Levels</td>
<td>123 (33.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymptomatic, subthreshold, MinD</td>
<td>54 (14.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymptomatic, subthreshold, MDD</td>
<td>5 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymptomatic, MinD, MDD</td>
<td>29 (7.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subthreshold, MinD, MDD</td>
<td>35 (9.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymptomatic, subthreshold</td>
<td>22 (5.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymptomatic, MinD</td>
<td>25 (6.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymptomatic, MDD</td>
<td>9 (2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subthreshold, MinD</td>
<td>20 (5.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subthreshold, MDD</td>
<td>2 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MinD, MDD</td>
<td>29 (7.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymptomatic</td>
<td>77 (20.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subthreshold</td>
<td>65 (17.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subthreshold</td>
<td>4 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDD</td>
<td>4 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental levels†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymptomatic and subthreshold</td>
<td>145 (39.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subthreshold and MinD</td>
<td>173 (46.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MinD and MDD</td>
<td>157 (42.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MinD indicates the threshold for minor depressive or dysthymic disorders; MDD, major depressive disorder. Psychosocial ratings were obtained using the Longitudinal Interval Follow-up Evaluation II (LIFE-II) or Catch-Up Form (CUF) variants of that instrument for all months in years 3 to 5 follow-up, and using the Streamlined Longitudinal Interval Continuation Evaluation (SLICE) for the last month (only) of years 6 to 12. Ratings are analyzed only for months when patients with unipolar MDD were entirely at 1 of 4 depressive symptom severity levels, defined by weekly Psychiatric Status Rating. †These subjects may have ratings at 2, 3, or 4 symptom severity levels.

Table 3. Worst Level of Psychosocial Functioning During Follow-up Months Spent at 3 Different Levels of Depressive Symptom Severity and the Asymptomatic Status by Patients With Unipolar Major Depressive Disorder and Currently Well Controls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Asymptomatic</th>
<th>Subthreshold</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work/employment (N = 322 patients, 1314 controls)</td>
<td>1.7 (1.0)†</td>
<td>2.6 (1.7)</td>
<td>3.5 (1.7)</td>
<td>4.7 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with spouse/partner (N = 241 patients, 1247 controls)</td>
<td>2.0 (0.9)§</td>
<td>2.2 (1.1)</td>
<td>2.9 (1.1)</td>
<td>3.3 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data are presented as mean (SD) number of person-months. Impairment ratings are derived from the LIFE-II, CUF, and SLICE variants of the Longitudinal Interval Follow-up Evaluation interviews, conducted in follow-up years 3 through 12. Ratings are analyzed only for months spent entirely at 1 symptom severity level based on weekly Psychiatric Symptom Ratings (person-months). Means in table are from random (mixed) regression analysis and control for within-subject variation across multiple ratings. Control subjects are relatives, spouses, and community controls with no current Research Diagnostic Criteria mental or substance abuse disorder. Impairment ratings show level of functioning during the month prior to 6-year follow-up interviews, based on Life Base Psychosocial instruments, yielding 1 person-month per control subject. Means and SDs are derived from random (mixed) regression analysis controlling for within-subject variations across multiple ratings. Each of 3 stepwise increments in depressive symptom severity is associated with a significant increase in functional impairment (P<.001, 2 tailed), as determined by random-effects ordinal regression analysis, using the MIXOR software of Hedeker and Gibbons.† Odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for stepwise increments in depressive symptom severity are as follows: Work/employment: subthreshold vs asymptomatic OR = 4.0 (95% CI = 3.7-4.4); MinD vs subthreshold OR = 5.9 (95% CI = 5.5-6.4); and MDD vs MinD OR = 2.8 (95% CI = 2.6-3.1). Relationship with spouse/partner: subthreshold vs asymptomatic OR = 1.4 (95% CI = 1.2-1.5); MinD vs subthreshold OR = 7.6 (95% CI = 6.8-8.3); MDD vs MinD OR = 2.4 (95% CI = 2.2-2.7). For explanations of symptom severity levels, see footnote to Table 2. Since only 1 month’s psychosocial rating is available for currently well controls, one rating was randomly selected for patients with unipolar MDD in the asymptomatic status; these were contrasted with a Wilcoxon rank sum test on ordinal impairment ratings. †Scale key: work/employment: 1 = no impairment, high level; 2 = no impairment, satisfactory level; 3 = mild impairment; 4 = moderate impairment; 5 = severe impairment; 6 = did not do this all the period because of depressive psychopathology; Relationship with spouse/partner: 1 = very good; 2 = good; 3 = fair; 4 = poor; and 5 = very poor. ‡P<.01. §P<.001.
interrater reliability. In the CDS it was not feasible views have been shown to yield psychiatric symptom validity of data used for these analyses. The LIFE inter-
nearly equal increments in overall impairment ratings.

severity (asymptomatic to subthreshold, subthreshold to sive symptom level, strongly supporting one of our hy-
that on average, each increment in depressive sever-
ty (asymptomatic to subthreshold, subthreshold to MinD, or MinD to MDD) is associated with large and nearly equal increments in overall impairment ratings.

at the MDD level represent a continuum of depres-
sive symptoms, which suggests these measures also con-
tain a substantial amount of unique information.

Psychosocial function ratings of patients with unipo-
lar MDD return to unimpaired or good levels during months when they are asymptomatic, but still show very subtle although significant levels of impairment compared with control subjects with no current RDC diag-

nosis. In this study we did not examine the ultimate level of functioning reached by patients with unipolar MDD during intermorbid periods, which may be better than the levels we identified. Mintz et al32 have described a “trajectory” of recovery of work functioning that parallels, but lags considerably behind, the curve of depres-
sive symptom recovery.32 The course and ultimate level of recovery of psychosocial function in relation to levels of depressive symptomatology will be examined in greater detail in a subsequent article.

Our data are consistent with the findings of Coryell et al33,34 that very small degrees of residual interepisode impairment in certain areas may persist in patients between episodes. This may be the case particularly when unipolar MDD has reached a certain threshold of number and/or length of episodes over the lifetime course of illness. This will also be examined in a separate article.

Prior research has focused primarily on disability as-
associated with MDEs. Our results converge with other re-
cent evidence that symptoms at levels below the thresh-
old for MDE also have clinical and psychosocial signifi-
cance in the lives of patients with unipolar MDD.3,35 Results 
from this study support the conclusion that subthreshold depressive symptoms, symptoms at the MinD level, and those at the MDD level represent a continuum of depressive symptom severity in unipolar MDD, each step of which is associated with significant and substantial increments in psychosocial disability through the course of illness. These results suggest that as long as any level of depressive symp-
toms and disability are present the unipolar disease remains active and continued treatment is highly recommended.
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