



BJP PRE-PROOF
(article published as accepted)

Original Article

**Association between Depressive Symptoms and Social Support
in a Nationally Representative Sample Of Older Adults (ELSI-
Brazil)**

Beatriz Oliveira Carvalho, Érico Castro-Costa, Maria Fernanda
Lima-Costa, Antônio Ignácio de Loyola Filho

<http://doi.org/10.47626/1516-4446-2024-3543>

Submitted: 10-Jan-2024

Accepted: 10-Aug-2024

This is a preliminary, unedited version of a manuscript that has been accepted for publication in the Brazilian Journal of Psychiatry. As a service to our readers, we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will still undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in final form. The final version may present slight differences in relation to the present version.

Association between Depressive Symptoms and Social Support in a Nationally Representative Sample Of Older Adults (ELSI-Brazil)

Running title: Depressive Symptoms and Social Support

Beatriz Oliveira Carvalho¹, Érico Castro-Costa², Maria Fernanda Lima-Costa², Antônio Ignácio de Loyola Filho^{2,3}

¹ Programa de Pós-Graduação em Saúde Coletiva, Instituto René Rachou/Fundação Oswaldo Cruz, MG, Brazil.

² Núcleo de Estudos em Saúde Pública e Envelhecimento (NESPE), Instituto René Rachou, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, MG, Brazil.

³ Departamento de Gestão de Serviços de Saúde, Escola de Enfermagem/Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, MG, Brazil.

Corresponding Author

Antônio Ignácio de Loyola Filho

Av. Augusto de Lima, 1715 - Barro Preto - Belo Horizonte/M.G - CEP: 30.190-002 – Phone: (31) 3349-7730

E-mail: antonio.filho@fiocruz.br

ABSTRACT

Objective: To investigate the association between depressive symptoms and social support among a representative sample of the Brazilian population aged 50 years or older.

Methodology: Cross-sectional study, based on 8,074 participants of the second wave of the Brazilian Longitudinal Study on Aging – ELSI-Brasil. Depressive symptoms were screened based on the CES-D8 instrument, and social support was investigated in its structural and functional dimensions. Sociodemographic variables and health conditions were considered for adjustment in investigating the association between social support and depressive symptoms using the Poisson regression model.

Results: The prevalence of depressive symptoms was estimated at 19.1% (95% CI:16.7;21.7). In the analysis adjusted for possible confounding factors, depressive symptoms were independently associated with negative social support in the items “not married” (RP=1.24; 95% CI: 1.07–1.44), “not having someone to trust” (RP=1.31; 95% CI: 1.10–1.56) and “not having someone to borrow money or an object from, in case of need” (RP=1.46; 95% CI: 1.21–1.75).

Conclusion: The present results highlight the importance of social relations in determining the presence of depressive symptoms and reinforce the need to implement public policies aimed at strengthening social networks to minimize this public health problem.

Keywords: Depressive symptoms, social support, older adults, health of older adults.

INTRODUCTION

Depressive disorders are mental disorders characterized by the presence of feelings of sadness, emptiness, and irritable mood, accompanied by somatic and cognitive changes, whose diagnosis is based on symptoms that form a syndrome and result in functional impairment.¹ In 2019, about 280 million people in the world were living with depressive disorders, with a prevalence of 5% among adults (aged 20 or older), which makes it the most common mental disorder in this population segment.²

Demographic transformations (in this case, population aging) and epidemiological transition have resulted in chronic non-communicable diseases, including mental disorders, an increasingly important role in shaping the epidemiological profile of human populations. Among older adults, depressive disorders are also common—two recent meta-analyses estimated the overall prevalence of depression among older adults at between 13.3%³ and 31.74%.⁴ In Brazil, a systematic review with meta-analysis estimated that 21% of older Brazilian adults had depressive symptoms.⁵

In this population segment, depressive disorders are an important risk factor for disability,⁴ negatively impacting quality of life;⁶ they have been associated with increased risk of suicide⁷ and excess mortality.⁴ In addition, the presence of depressive disorders in older adults is related to significantly higher health costs.⁸

The pathogenesis of depressive disorders is complex, and its occurrence has been associated with a wide range of factors, including demographic, socioeconomic, and biological ones. The female gender, older age, and low income and educational level are the sociodemographic characteristics most consistently associated with depressive symptoms among older adults in different populations.^{4,9} Regarding biological factors, there is evidence of an association between depressive disorders and chronic (NCDs), especially cardiovascular diseases and diabetes.¹⁰

Along with sociodemographic factors and health conditions, scientific literature has pointed out that mental health is influenced by the interactions between people in society and how they relate to the social environment around them. Social support is understood as the existence of social networks, which

enable the establishment of relationships and social interactions between their members (whether family, friends, or professionals), enabling support actions that favor the well-being of those who receive them.

Social support can be described as perceived (available) or received (effective) and has two dimensions, structural and functional. Perceived social support refers to a person's potential access to social support, while received (effective) is the exchange or use of social support resources reported by an individual¹¹. The structural dimension covers quantitative aspects of social relationships (individuals with whom one has an interpersonal relationship and the connections between these individuals). This structure can be characterized by aspects such as number and type of relationships, frequency, duration, diversity, density and reciprocity of contacts. The functional dimension covers qualitative aspects of social relationships and concerns the support offered and can be measured through the evaluation of aspects such as emotional support (involves affection and trust) and instrumental/material support (involves real support in activities and financial assistance) received¹².

The relationship between social support and depressive symptoms among older adults is well documented in the international literature,^{13,14} indicating a lower occurrence of the latter in the presence of the former. As it turns out, Brazilian literature is scarce in investigating the relationships between social support and depressive disorders on a population basis and among older adults. A longitudinal population-based study with regional coverage, conducted with 551 older adults (aged 60 or older) living in the community, observed a reduction in the number of depressive symptoms when there was social support, considering both dimensions. Being married, interacting more intensely with relatives, and being satisfied with family relationships decreased the number of depressive symptoms, while living alone had the opposite effect¹⁵. Another cross-sectional study, conducted with a representative sample of the Brazilian population aged 60 or older, showed a lower prevalence of depressive symptoms among those who received support from family and friends and engaged in religious and leisure activities.¹⁶

Considering the above, the present study aimed to investigate the association between depressive symptoms and social support among Brazilians aged 50 or older from a cross-sectional perspective.

METHODOLOGY

Design, scenario, and study population

This study used data from the second wave of the Brazilian Longitudinal Study on Aging (ELSI-Brasil). The ELSI-Brasil sample was designed to represent the Brazilian population aged 50 or older. The sampling was designed in selection stages, considering the municipality, census sector, and household. The research is conducted in 70 municipalities located in the five macro-regions of the country. The sample replacement is performed at each wave to ensure national representativeness.¹⁷

The sample weights used considered the different probabilities of selection and non-differentiated responses. All residents aged 50 or older from the selected households were eligible for individual interviews. The baseline survey was conducted in 2015–2016, and the second wave in 2019–2021. Additional details can be seen in previous publications.¹⁷ For the present analysis, the 8,954 participants in the second wave of the study who answered the questionnaire without the help of a close informant were eligible.

Data collection and study variables

Data were collected through interviews conducted at the participants' homes; they included individual and household information, physical measurements, and biomaterial collection, stored for future analysis. Participant data involved sociodemographic, work, and retirement characteristics, health behavior, physical and mental health, psychosocial measures, and use of medications and health services, among others. The database, dictionary of variables, and protocols are freely accessible to researchers, under registration at <https://elsi.cpqrr.fiocruz.br/en/register/>.¹⁷

The presence of depressive symptoms(dependent) was evaluated using the 8-item Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression scale (CES-D8), an abbreviated version of the CES-D20¹⁸ that has comparable psychometric properties across sex, age, and country¹⁹. It is often preferred over other versions because it is shorter and has similar internal consistency, reliability, and validity to the CES-D10 and CES-D20 versions¹⁹. All questions are scored as a "yes" or "no" option. The scale questions are: 1) Much of the time during

the past week, I felt depressed; 2) I felt everything I did was an effort; 3) My sleep was restless; 4) I was happy; 5) I felt lonely; 6) I enjoyed life; 7) I felt sad; 8) I could not "get going." For each respondent, the total number of "yes" responses to questions 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, and 8 and the "no" responses to questions 4 and 6 were summed to arrive at a total CES-D8 score ranging from 0-8. In the Brazilian validation of CES-D, the Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analysis showed excellent discriminatory power (AUC=0.977; 95% CI: 0.975-0.980) for distinguishing the "depressed" from the reference group. The optimal cut-off value of the CES-D8 for identifying clinically significant depressive symptoms was 3/4 while sensitivity, specificity and accuracy were 94.3%, 84.5%, 90.9%, respectively (Castro-Costa, 2024, submitted)

The exposure of interest was social support, investigated in its structural and functional dimensions, each measured by four questions. Four items were considered in the investigation of the structural dimension of social support, covering aspects of the social network and the frequency of social interaction: 1) marital status (married; not married); 2) cohabitation status (living alone; not living alone); 3) frequency of face-to-face interactions with children, relatives and friends (at least once a week; less than once a week); 4) frequency of interactions via telephone or skype/internet with children, relatives and friends (at least once a week; less than once a week). In this dimension, social support was classified as negative for each item separately when the participant was not married, lived alone, and interacted face-to-face or by phone/skype/internet less than once a week.

The functional dimension of social support refers to instrumental and emotional support. This dimension also encompassed four items: 1) instrumental support at home, 2) instrumental support outside the home, 3) financial instrumental support, and 4) emotional support. Instrumental support at and outside the home refers to having someone help with household chores and activities outside the home, such as shopping and payments, in the context of illness. On the other hand, financial instrumental support refers to having someone to borrow objects and money from, if necessary. Lastly, emotional support is having somebody one can trust or confide in. Not having someone to help with household chores and extra domiciliary activities and not having

somebody one can rely on or turn to in case of material needs implies the classification of functional social support as negative, separately for each item.

For adjustment, investigating the hypothesis of association between social support and the presence of depressive symptoms considered sociodemographic variables and descriptors of the health condition. Sociodemographic variables were gender (male; female), age (50–59, 60–69, 70–79, 80+), self-reported skin color (white, black, brown, indigenous/oriental), education (<4 years of study, 4–7 years of study, 8+ years of study) and individual income based on national minimum wage (in quartiles).

The health condition descriptor variables included self-rated health (very good/good; fair; poor/very poor) and self-reported medical diagnosis, at some point in life, for some objective health conditions (hypertension, diabetes, heart attack, angina, stroke, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, cancer, chronic renal failure, and Parkinson's disease). Based on dichotomous responses (0=no; 1=yes), the variable number of chronic diseases was constructed, corresponding to the sum of positive responses.

Data analysis

The characterization of the study population and the distribution of depression concerning the study variables occurred through absolute and relative frequencies. Participants with and without depressive symptoms were compared in relation to the study variables based on Pearson's chi-square test, using the Rao-Scott correction factor, as it is a complex sample.

Univariate and multivariate analyses were used to test the hypothesis of an association between social support and depressive symptoms. The association hypothesis test was based on the Poisson regression model, which provides the prevalence ratio as a measure of association with a 95% confidence interval. Statistical analyses were performed in the following sequence: (1) univariate analysis, (2) multivariate analysis corresponding to the mutual adjustment between the eight items of social support, and (3) multivariate analysis to define the final model, with the adjustment variables (sociodemographic and health). The final model (step 3) included only the social support items that, in the mutual adjustment (step 2), were associated with depressive symptoms at a significance level of $p < 0.05$; this same criterion was

considered to identify the social support items independently associated with depressive symptoms. The analyses were developed using the statistical software Stata®, version 14.

Ethical considerations

ELSI-Brasil was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the René Rachou Institute of the Oswaldo Cruz Foundation (CAAE:34649814.3.0000.5091), and all participants interviewed signed the Informed Consent Form (ICF).

RESULTS

The present study included 8,074 participants with complete information for all variables analyzed. Table 1 presents the characteristics of the study population and the proportional distribution of depressive symptoms. Most of the study population was female (55.4%), aged 59–69 (78.7%), with up to eight years of schooling (70.2%); nine out of 10 participants were white or brown. As for health-related variables, approximately half assessed their health positively (50.1% said they perceived their health as good/very good), and 58.5% reported medical diagnoses for at least one of the chronic diseases analyzed.

Table 1. Proportional distribution (%)[#] of depressive symptoms among older Brazilian adults, according to sociodemographic characteristics and health conditions, Brazilian Longitudinal Study on Aging (ELSI-Brasil), 2022.

Characteristics	Total (n=8,074)	Depressive symptoms (CES-D8≥4)		P-value *
		Yes (n=1,501) % (95% CI) ^Ψ	No (n=6,573) % (95% CI) ^Ψ	
Gender				
Male	44.6	13.7 (11.5-16.3)	86.3 (83.7-88.5)	<0.001
Female	55.4	23.4 (20.5-26.6)	76.6 (73.4-79.5)	
Age (years)				
50–59	48.8	20.9 (17.9-24.2)	79.1 (75.8-82.1)	0.007
60–69	29.9	17.0 (14.7-19.7)	83.0 (80.3-85.4)	
70–79	15.4	17.0 (14.3-20.7)	83.0 (79.8-85.7)	
80 or more	5.9	19.7 (15.2-25.2)	80.3 (78.3-83.3)	
Schooling (in years)				
None	10.8	22.0 (17.7 - 26.9)	78.0 (73.1-82.3)	0.004
1–4	38.0	20.7 (17.9 - 23.8)	79.3 (76.2-82.1)	
5–8	21.5	19.7 (16.7 - 22.9)	80.3 (77.1-83.3)	
9 or more	29.8	15.6 (12.6 - 19.1)	84.4 (78.3-83.3)	
Skin color				
White	45.9	17.0 (14.6–19.7)	83.0 (80.3-85.4)	0,018
Brown	43.1	20.6 (17.8–23.8)	79.4 (76.2-82.2)	
Black	10.6	22.3 (17.0–28.6)	77.7 (72.4-82.3)	
Indigenous/Oriental	5.0	12.1 (4.5–28.6)	87.9 (71.5-95.5)	
Individual income in quartiles (in R\$)				
1 st Quartile	27.2	23.0 (19.5-26.9)	77.0 (73.1-80.5)	<0.001
2 nd Quartile	24,5	22.0 (18.4-26.1)	78.0 (73.9-81.6)	
3 rd Quartile	22.3	17.6 (14.8-20.8)	82.4 (79.2-85.2)	
4 th Quartile	26.1	13.5 (10.9-16.6)	86.5 (83.4-89.2)	
1. Self-assessment of health				
Very good/good	50.1	0.9 (7.7-10.5)	91.9 (89.5-92.4)	<0.001
Fair	36.8	23.5 (20.2-27.1)	76.5 (72.9-79.8)	
Poor/Very poor	13.1	45.5 (39.6-51.6)	54.5 (39.6-51.6)	
Number of chronic diseases [¥]				
0	41.5	14.3 (12.1 - 16.8)	85.7 (83.2-87.9)	< 0.001
1	37.0	18.2 (15.4 - 21.3)	81.8 (78.7-84.6)	
2 or more	21.5	30.0 (26.0 - 34.3)	70.0 (65.6-74.0)	

weighted values

Ψ 95% Confidence Interval

* Obtained by Pearson's chi-square, with Rao-Scott correction factor; significant when <0.05.

¥ Hypertension, diabetes, heart attack, angina, stroke, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, cancer, chronic kidney failure, and Parkinson's disease.

The prevalence of depressive symptoms estimated in this study was 19.1% (95% CI: 16.7;21.7). Depressive symptoms were more frequent among female participants, at the extremes of age (age 50–59 and age 80 or more) and among browns and blacks, being lower in those with higher education (nine or more years) and decreased with individual income.

Considering the health descriptor variables, the prevalence of depressive symptoms was higher among participants with poorer health assessment, subjectively (negative self-rated health) or objectively (presence of chronic diseases) (Table 1).

Table 2 shows the distribution of the study population and depressive symptoms according to the social support items in their structural and functional dimensions. The most frequently observed items corresponding to low social support belong to the structural dimension: not married (37.4%) and living alone (20.4%). For the other items, the frequencies of those corresponding to low social support were lower than 10%. In almost all social support items investigated (the exception was living alone) of both dimensions, the proportion of participants positive for CES-D8 ≥ 4 was higher in the presence of low social support, and all differences were significant ($p < 0.05$), except for talking on the phone weekly with children, relatives or friends. The item living alone (structural social support) presented a different behavior from that observed for the other items: depressive symptoms were more frequent among those who did not live alone (positive social support), but the difference was not significant ($p \geq 0.05$) (Table 2) alone.

Table 2. Proportional distribution (%)[#] of depressive symptoms, according to social support items, in their structural and functional dimensions, among older Brazilian adults (n=8,074), Brazilian Longitudinal Study on Aging (ELSI-Brasil), 2022.

Characteristics	Total (n=8,074)	Depressive symptoms (CES-D8 ≥ 4)		P-value*
		Yes (n=1,501) % (95% CI) ^ψ	No (n=6,573) % (95% CI) ^ψ	
<i>Structural Social Support</i>				
Married				
Yes	62.6	17.3 (15.0–20.0)	82.7 (80.0–85.1)	<0.001
No	37.4	22.0 (18.8–25.6)	88.0 (74.4–81.2)	
Lives alone				
No	79.6	19.2 (16.2–22.2)	80.8 (77.9–83.4)	0.648
Yes	20.4	18.5 (15.7–21.7)	81.5 (78.3–84.3)	
Meet with a child, relative, or friend at least once a week.				
Yes	97.6	18.9 (16.5–21.6)	81.1 (78.4–83.5)	0.049
No	2.4	25.4 (19.0–33.0)	74.6 (67.1–81.0)	
Talks to children, relatives, or friends by phone or Internet at least once a week				
Yes	93.5	18.8 (16.3–21.5)	81.3 (78.5–83.7)	0,095
No	6.5	23.8 (18.3–30.3)	76.2 (69.7–81.7)	

<i>Functional social support</i>				
There are those who help with homework due to illness				
Yes	98.2	18.8 (16.4-21.4)	71.2 (78.6-83.6)	<0.001
No	1.8	33.6 (25.5-42.8)	66.4 (57.2-74.5)	
There are those who help with shopping and activities outside the home due to illness.				
Yes	98.4	18.9 (16.6-21.6)	81.1 (78.4-83.5)	0.015
No	1.6	28.0 (20.2-37.3)	72.0 (62.7-79.8)	
Have someone you can trust or confide in				
Yes	94	18.3 (15.9–20.9)	81.7 (79.1-84.1)	<0.001
No	6.0	32.0 (26.6–38.0)	68.0 (62.0-73.4)	
You have someone you can borrow money or an object from if you need to				
Yes	92.1	18.0 (15.6–20.7)	72.0 (79.3-84.4)	<0.001
No	7.9	31.7 (26.5–37.4)	68.3 (62.6-73.5)	

weighted values

Ψ 95% Confidence Interval

* Obtained by Pearson's chi-square, with Rao-Scott correction factor; significant when <0.05.

Table 3 shows the results of the univariate and multivariate analyses of the association between social support and depressive symptoms. With the mutual adjustment for all social support items in both dimensions, meeting with children, relatives, or friends weekly and having someone help with household chores and chores outside the home when sick were no longer associated with depressive symptoms. After multiple adjustments for sociodemographic characteristics and health conditions, only one item of the structural dimension and two items of the functional dimension of social support were independently associated with depressive symptoms. The prevalence of depressive symptoms was significantly higher among older adults who reported not being married (RP=1.24; 95% CI: 1.07–1.44), not having whom to trust (RP=1.31; 95% CI: 1.10–1.56) or whom to borrow money or an object in case of need (RP=1.46; 95% CI: 1.21–1.75).

Table 3. Results of univariate and multivariate analyses of the association between social support (structural and functional dimensions) and depressive symptoms (CES-D8 ≥ 4), Brazilian Longitudinal Study on Aging (ELSI-Brasil), 2022.

Social Support	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	RP	95%CI	RP	95%CI	RP	95%CI
<i>Structural dimension</i>						
Married						
Yes	1.00		1.00			
No	1.27	(1.11 - 1.46)	1.37	(1.18 - 1.59)	1.24	(1.07 - 1.44)
Lives alone						
No	1.00		1.00			
Yes	0.96	(0.81 - 1.14)	0.79	(0.66 - 0.95)	-	-
Meet with a child, relative, or friend at least once a week						
Yes			1.00			
No	1.34	(1.01 - 1.78)	1.27	(0.92 - 1.74)	-	-
Talks to children, relatives, or friends by phone or Internet at least once a week						
Yes	1.00		1.00			
No	1.27	(0.96 - 1.68)	1.14	(0.86 - 1.51)	-	-
<i>Functional social support</i>						
There are those who help with homework due to illness						
Yes	1.00		1.00			
No	1.79	(1.38 - 2.32)	1.36	(0.94 - 1.96)	-	-
There are those who help with shopping and activities outside the home due to illness						
Yes	1.00		1.00			
No	1.48	(1.10 - 1.99)	0.68	(0.46 - 1.00)	-	-
Have someone you can trust or confide in						
Yes	1.00		1.00		1.00	

No	1.76	(1.47 - 2.09)	1.43	(1.17 - 1.74)	1.31	(1.10 - 1.56)
You have someone you can borrow money or an object from if you need to						
Yes	1.00		1.00		1.00	
No	1.76	(1.44 - 2.14)	1.56	(1.25 - 1.94)	1.46	(1.21 - 1.75)

RP (95% CI) = Prevalence Ratio (95% Confidence Interval), crude (model 1) and adjusted (models 2 and 3), obtained using the Poisson Regression model.

Model 1 = Univariate analysis.

Model 2 = Multivariate analysis, with mutual adjustment of social support items (both dimensions).

Model 3 = Model 2 + gender + age + education + skin color + individual income (in quartiles) + health self-assessment + number of chronic diseases (see methodology for disease discrimination).

BJP PRE-PROOF

DISCUSSION

The present study showed that approximately one in five older Brazilian adults (19.1%) had CES-D \geq 4, indicating the presence of depressive symptoms, with 20.9% among participants aged 50–59 and 17.3% among older adults aged 60 or older. The findings also revealed a negative and independent association between depressive symptoms and three items of social support in both dimensions (structural and functional). Regarding the structural dimension of social support, the prevalence of depressive symptoms was significantly higher among older adults who reported not being married. As for the functional dimension, participants who reported having no one to trust or to borrow money or an object from in case of need had a higher prevalence of depressive symptoms.

The prevalence of depressive symptoms observed in the present study is part of the wide range of values observed in different populations of the same age group (50/55 years and over), in which the CES-D (in its complete and short versions – respectively, CES-D20, CES-D10, and CES-D8) was used. The prevalence detected here was higher than observed among Taiwanese (5.2%) using the CES-D20²⁰ but lower than the 27.0% detected in a study carried out among Canadians using the CES-D10.²¹ Two studies using the CES-D8 version found prevalences of 14.4% and 19.8%, among Americans²² and the Irish, respectively.²³

Specifically, in terms of older adult populations (age 60 or older), the prevalence of depressive symptoms was higher in this study, compared to 9.8% detected among older American and Australian adults,²⁴ but lower than that observed among Indians (29.0%)²⁵ and Chinese (37.9%)²⁶; in the latter, CES-D10 was used in the screening of depressive symptoms.

To our knowledge, there are no population-based studies that have estimated the prevalence of depressive symptoms in the Brazilian population aged 50 or older and that have used the CES-D8 (or any other screening instrument) for this, which makes it impossible to compare our results directly. Lopes et al. (2022)²⁷ used data from the 2013 and 2019 editions of the National Health Survey (*Pesquisa Nacional de Saúde – PNS*) to evaluate the trend of prevalence of depressive symptoms among Brazilians, having found

prevalences of 11.9%, 10.5%, and 11.1% for the age groups 40–59, 60–69 and age 70 or more, respectively, estimated using the PHQ-9. These prevalences are lower than those observed among ELSI participants aged 50–59 and 60 or older. As in the present study, the prevalence for older adult age groups was lower than those of the immediately preceding age groups.

Particularly regarding the older adult populations (age 60 or above), the prevalence verified in the present study was higher than the 14.2% observed for São Paulo⁹ and the 15.2% for Pelotas²⁸ but lower than the 23.9% estimated for Florianópolis,²⁹ studies in which the versions 10 and 15 of the GES-D were used. Our prevalence estimate is still in the range of values (between 7.1% and 39.6%) described in a systematic review of Brazilian studies on the subject, published between 2000 and 2017, which mainly used the GDS-15 to screen for depressive symptoms.⁵

There are several plausible explanations for the discrepancies in the prevalence of depressive symptoms among epidemiological studies. Methodological differences in the study design and population, especially the screening instrument used, contribute to this. When comparing the results of the present study with those from the literature, although population-based studies with older adults living in the community were favored, the screening instruments were diverse. The prevalence of depressive symptoms may vary depending on the screening tests used, and the same test may have different sensitivity and specificities depending on the cutoff points adopted. In turn, more sensitive tests tend to produce higher prevalence estimates, while more specific tests may underestimate them.²⁸ For example, a systematic review restricted to Brazilian studies showed that the 12-item version (GHQ-12) of the General Health Questionnaire detected the highest prevalence of depression in older adults, although most studies used the GDS-15 version.⁵ In a systematic review and meta-analysis covering 48 articles published between 2000 and 2021 involving older adult populations from different countries and continents, the prevalences produced by GDS-15 were higher than those produced by CES-D.³⁰ Another study detected a variation in the sensitivity and specificity of CES-D in the screening of depressive symptoms among Hispanic and Latin American older adults due to different cutoff points adopted.³¹

In addition, different authors draw attention to the impact of socioeconomic, cultural, and environmental contexts on the occurrence of depressive symptoms. Populations with higher rates of economic and social deprivation tend to have a worse quality of life and, because of this, are more prone to depression. Economic deprivation, in turn, hinders access to health services and treatment of the disease. In many populations, the demand for health services to treat depression can also be inhibited due to cultural and religious stigmas involving mental health problems.^{28,30}

The only item in the structural dimension of social support to be independently associated with depressive symptoms was being married or not married, with a higher prevalence of depressive symptoms among people who reported not being married. Such a finding is in line with evidence found in other countries^{11,32} and Brazil.³³ These results indicate that spousal support can be a consistent protective factor among older adults, although conditioned to a good marital relationship, as a conflictual relationship can be a strong determinant of depressive symptoms.³⁴ The higher prevalence of depressive symptoms among unmarried people may be associated with the fact that they experience more loneliness, less self-confidence, and less social support, which is, in this case, provided by the spouse.³⁵ The spouse can offer emotional support through love, affection, understanding, and comprehension, which, in the case of the latter, are also present in the support provided by a confidant or friend.³²

Regarding the functional dimension of social support, two items were independently associated with depressive symptoms: having someone to trust and having someone to borrow money or an object from in case of need. Our findings regarding the association between depressive symptoms and having someone to trust are consistent with other studies that have evaluated the theme. Among Canadian older adults, the presence of a confidant was negatively associated with depressive symptoms,³⁴ similar to that found in a community in southern India, although in this case, the number of confidants (four or more) was decisive.³⁶ Also, among older adults Brazilians, having the support of family and friends was negatively associated with the presence of depressive symptoms in older adults.¹⁶

Three other studies of longitudinal design pointed out the protective effect of the presence of confidants in relation to the development of depressive

symptoms. Koizumi et al. (2005)³⁷ used a five-item measure (including having someone to consult with when having problems) to prospectively assess the association between social support and depressive symptoms, finding a significantly increased risk for developing depressive symptoms among older Japanese adults with insufficient social support. In another study, among older Chinese adults, having relatives and/or friends willing to listen to them "when they wanted to talk about something" decreased the risk for depressive symptoms,³⁸ while among older American adults, the frequency with which they can open up to family and friends about their problems, and the perception that they will receive help from them to solve them, protected against the development of depressive symptoms.¹⁴

Our study also pointed out that the prevalence of depressive symptoms was lower among older adults who reported having someone to borrow money or an object from in case of need. Financial support is considered one of the aspects of instrumental/material support.³⁹ In our bibliographic research, we found only one study that addressed the specific association between this item of social support and depressive symptoms. Among older Chinese adults, the regular receipt of financial support was negatively associated with the incidence of depressive symptoms.³⁸

The different ways of measuring social support can make it difficult to compare the results with other available studies. Some studies use a scale to measure social support based on the score of the items included in the different questions, generating a global score calculated from the score attributed to the respondents' answers. From this perspective, higher score values indicate higher levels of social support. In these studies, the negative association between social support and depressive symptoms has been consistently identified.¹³

Another issue is the variation of the questions used to measure social support items. Sometimes, it prevents the detection of a specific item or component of social support, even though it is possible to identify the dimension to which the item belongs. For example, a Brazilian study based on data from the PNS-2019 showed that among older Brazilian adults, having family and friends whom they could count on in good or bad moments of life (structural dimension of social support) was negatively associated with the presence of

depressive symptoms.¹⁶ These questions, while distinct, can somehow intersect with our questions about having a confidant and having someone to borrow money or an object from should the need arise. It is not unreasonable to think that the perception of being able to count on someone in the worst moments of life constitutes social support that can, in practice, be equivalent to the perception of having someone to trust (and share life problems) and/or someone to turn to in case of financial need.

Over the last decades, several authors^{39,40} have attempted to investigate and propose models to explain how social support relates to mental health and well-being. In its structural dimension, the availability of social support can be gauged by the presence of an important interpersonal relationship, such as with a spouse, close relatives, or friends. This can buffer stress, most likely because, on average, long-lasting, intimate relationships provide the sense that one's needs will be met.⁴⁰ On the other hand, social ties represent defined roles in the social structure (husband/wife, father/son, friend/friend), which establish rights, commitments, and responsibilities between partners, pressuring people to engage in self-care for health. Social relationships and interactions help us be clear about our role before others and provide purpose and meaning to life, which can protect against anxiety and existential despair.³⁹

In its functional dimension, social support mitigates the demands arising from stressful events, reducing the degree of perceived threat and cushioning its possible harmful effects (both physical and mental). In this perspective, emotional support contributes to the person feeling esteemed and accepted, strengthening their self-esteem, which is negatively associated with the presence of symptoms of anxiety and depression, and balancing the feelings of powerlessness that commonly occur in the stress response. Instrumental support, in turn, helps reduce stress and avoid negative experiences, such as economic and legal problems, or solve them directly, making more time available for relaxation or entertainment activities. In summary, in its structural and functional dimensions, social support can provide people with regular positive experiences, positive affect, and a sense of predictability and stability in life itself, decreasing the likelihood of developing depressive symptoms.^{39,40}

The main limitation of this study is inherent to its cross-sectional nature, which prevents the establishment of a causal relationship since it is not possible

to examine the temporal sequence between exposure and event. The study was developed from the perspective that social support (considering the dimensions and items analyzed) would impact depressive symptoms. Still, it is reasonable to assume the presence of depressive symptoms generates thoughts and behaviors that result in a decrease in social support, either by moving away from social life or by the feeling of isolation, distrust, and decreased self-esteem. A longitudinal study have identified a bidirectional association between social support and depressive symptoms. Among older American adults, both the perception of social support acted as a protective factor against the development of depressive symptoms and the presence of depressive symptoms decreased the perception of social support.¹⁴

On the other hand, the strength of this study derives from the representativeness and size of the population sample, which allows the production of robust results and can be inferred for the Brazilian population aged 50 or older.

Our results corroborate the evidence produced in different populations and scenarios, indicating that the mental health of older adults is not just related to physical health conditions and highlighting the importance of social relationships in determining this event. Despite the importance of medications and psychotherapy to address depressive symptoms, the social environment cannot be neglected when considering interventions aimed at preventing this health condition in older adults. Public policies aimed at strengthening social networks and stimulating social interactions can positively impact the mental health of this age group.

The association between social support and health outcomes, including mental health, has been considerably studied in recent decades, and the importance of these factors for quality of life is unequivocal. However, in the Brazilian context, there are few studies evaluating social support items as factors associated with the presence of depressive symptoms. We hope that the present study can contribute to broadening the understanding of the role of social support in determining depression and that future studies will investigate this association, especially from a longitudinal perspective. In this way, it will be possible to have a more accurate understanding of a possible causal relationship between social support and depression and thus propose

interventions based on more precise scientific evidence, aiming to prevent and mitigate the occurrence of depressive symptoms in older adults.

Acknowledgments

ELSI-Brazil was funded by the Ministry of Health: DECIT/SCTIE (Processes: 404965/2012-1 and TED 28/2017); COPID/DECIV/SAPS (Processes: 20836, 22566, 23700, 25560, 25552 and 27510).

Author Contributions: CRediT Taxonomy Beatriz Carvalho Conceptualization-Equal, Formal analysis-Equal, Investigation-Equal, Methodology-Equal, Validation-Equal, Visualization-Equal, Writing – original draft-Equal, Writing – review & editing-Equal Erico Castro-Costa Conceptualization-Equal, Formal analysis-Supporting, Investigation-Equal, Methodology-Equal, Supervision-Supporting, Validation-Equal, Visualization-Equal, Writing – original draft-Equal, Writing – review & editing-Equal Antônio Loyola Filho Conceptualization-Equal, Data curation-Supporting, Formal analysis-Lead, Investigation-Equal, Methodology-Equal, Supervision-Lead, Validation-Equal, Visualization-Equal, Writing – original draft-Equal, Writing – review & editing-Equal Maria Lima-Costa Data curation-Lead, Funding acquisition-Lead, Methodology-Equal, Validation-Equal, Visualization-Equal, Writing – original draft-Supporting, Writing – review & editing-Equal

Edited by: Leandro Malloy-Diniz

References

1. Malhi GS; Mann JJ. Depression. *Lancet* 2018; 392 (10161): 2299–2312.
2. WHO. World mental health report. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2022.
3. Abdoli N; Salari N; Darvishi N; Jafarpour S; Solaymani M; Mohammadi M; Shohaimi S. The global prevalence of major depressive disorder (MDD) among the elderly: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* 2022, 132, 1067-1073.

4. Zenebe Y; Akele B; Necho M. Prevalence and determinants of depression among old age: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Annals of general psychiatry* 2021, 20(1), 1-19.
5. Meneguci J; Meneguci CAG; Moreira MM; Pereira KR; Tribess S; Sasaki JE; Virtuoso JS. Prevalência de sintomatologia depressiva em idosos brasileiros: uma revisão sistemática com metanálise. *Jornal Brasileiro de Psiquiatria* 2019, 68, 221-230.
6. Liu Q; He H; Yang J; Feng X; Zhao F; Lyu J. Changes in the global burden of depression from 1990 to 2017: Findings from the Global Burden of Disease study. *Journal of psychiatric research* 2020, 126, 134-140.
7. Valera Ortín J; LUCERÓN Lucas-Torres MI. Suicide related factors in the elderly: a systematic review. *Revista española de salud pública* 2021, 95, e202110166-e202110166.
8. Grochtdreis T; Brettschneider C; Bjerregaard F; Bleich C; Boczor S; Härter, M et al. Cost-effectiveness analysis of collaborative treatment of late-life depression in primary care (GermanIMPACT). *European Psychiatry* 2019, 57, 10-18.
9. Mendes-Chiloff CL; Lima MCP; Torres AR; Santos JLF; Duarte YO; Lebrão ML; Cerqueira ATAR. Depressive symptoms among the elderly in São Paulo city, Brazil: prevalence and associated factors (SABE Study). *Rev Bras Epidemiol* 2019; 21Suppl 02(Suppl 02):e180014.
10. Zhang Y; Chen Y; Ma L. Depression and cardiovascular disease in elderly: Current understanding. *Journal of Clinical Neuroscience* 2018, 47, 1-5.
11. Tengku Mohd TAM; Yunus RM; Hairi F; Hairi NN; Choo WY. Social support and depression among community dwelling older adults in Asia: a systematic review. *BMJ Open*. 2019 Jul 17;9(7):e026667.
12. Due P, Holstein B, Lund R, Modvig J, Avlund K. Social relations: network, support and relational strain. *Soc Sci Med*. 1999 Mar;48(5):661-73. doi: 10.1016/s0277-9536(98)00381-5. PMID: 10080366.
13. Zhang L; Shooshtari S; St. John P; Menec VH. Multimorbidity and depressive symptoms in older adults and the role of social support: Evidence using Canadian Longitudinal Study on Aging (CLSA) data. *PLoS ONE* 2022; 17(11): e0276279.

14. Bui BKH. The relationship between social network characteristics and depressive symptoms among older adults in the United States: Differentiating between network structure and network function. *Psychogeriatrics* 2020, 20(4), 458-468.
15. Ramos M; Wilmoth J. Social Relationships and Depressive Symptoms Among Older Adults in Southern Brazil. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B* 2003; 58(4): S253–S261.
16. Andrade TB; Andrade FB; Viana MC. Prevalence of depressive symptoms and its association with social support among older adults: The Brazilian National Health Survey. *Journal of Affective Disorders* 2023, 333, 468-473.
17. Lima-Costa MF; Mambrini JVM; Andrade FB; Souza Jr PRB; Vasconcellos MTL; Neri AL et al. Cohort Profile: The Brazilian Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSI-Brazil). *International Journal of Epidemiology* 2023; 52 (1): e37-e65.
18. Zivin, K., Llewellyn, D. J., Lang, I. A., Vijan, S., Kabeto, M. U., Miller, E. M., & Langa, K. M. (2010). Depression among older adults in the United States and England. *American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, 18, 1036-1044. doi: 10.1097/JGP.0b013e3181dba6d2.
19. Missinne S, Vandeviver C, Van de Velde S, Bracke P. Measurement equivalence of the CES-D 8 depression-scale among the ageing population in eleven European countries. *Soc Sci Res.* 2014 Jul;46:38-47. doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2014.02.006.
20. Wu CS; Yu SH; Lee CY; Tseng HY; Chiu YF; Hsiung CA. Prevalence of and risk factors for minor and major depression among community-dwelling older adults in Taiwan. *International psychogeriatrics* 2017, 29(7), 1113-1121.
21. MacNeil A; Birk S; Villeneuve PJ; Jiang Y; Groh M; Fuller-Thomson E. Incident and Recurrent Depression among Adults Aged 50 Years and Older during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Longitudinal Analysis of the Canadian Longitudinal Study on Aging. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 2022; 19(22), 15032.
22. Zivin K; Pirraglia PA; McCammon RJ; Langa KM; Vijan S. Trends in depressive symptom burden among older adults in the United States from 1998 to 2008. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2013 Dec;28(12):1611-9.

23. Briggs R; Mcdowell CP; Looze C; Kenny RA; Ward M. Depressive symptoms among older adults pre–and post–COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association* 2021, 22(11), 2251-2257.
24. Mohebibi M; Agustini B; Woods RL; McNeil JJ; Nelson MR; Shah RC et al; ASPREE Investigator Group. Prevalence of depressive symptoms and its associated factors among healthy community-dwelling older adults living in Australia and the United States. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry* 2019; 34(8): 1208-1216.
25. Ansari S; Anand A; Hossain B. Multimorbidity and depression among older adults in India: Mediating role of functional and behavioural health. *PLoS ONE* 2022, v. 17, n. 6.
26. Guan L; Liu Q; Chen D; Chen C; Wang Z. Hearing loss, depression, and medical service utilization among older adults: evidence from China. *Public Health* 2022, 205, 122-129.
27. Lopes CDS; Gomes NL; Junger WL; Menezes PR. Trend in the prevalence of depressive symptoms in Brazil: results from the Brazilian National Health Survey 2013 and 2019. *Cadernos de saude publica* 2022, 38, e00123421.
28. Hellwig N; Munhoz TN; Tomasi E. Sintomas depressivos em idosos: estudo transversal de base populacional. *Ciência & Saúde Coletiva* 2016, v. 21, p. 3575-3584.
29. Borges LJ; Benedetti TRB; Xavier AJ; D'Orsi E. Fatores associados aos sintomas depressivos em idosos: estudo EpiFloripa. *Revista de Saúde Pública* 2013, 47, 701-710.
30. Hu T; Zhao X; Wu M; Li Z; Luo L; Yang C; Yang, F. Prevalence of depression in older adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychiatry research* 2022, 311, 114511.
31. Lopez AO; Martinez MN; Garcia JM; Kunik ME; Medina LD. Self-report depression screening measures for older Hispanic/Latin American adults: A PRISMA systematic review. *Journal of affective disorders* 2021, 294, 1-9.
32. Schwarzbach, M; Luppia M; Forstmeier S; König HH; Riedel-Heller SG. Social relations and depression in late life—a systematic review. *International journal of geriatric psychiatry* 2014; 29(1), 1-21.

33. Gullich I; Duro SMS; Cesar JA. Depressão entre idosos: um estudo de base populacional no Sul do Brasil. *Revista Brasileira de Epidemiologia* 2016, 19, 691-701.
34. Mechakra-Tahiri S; Zunzunegui MV; Préville M; Dubé M. Social relationships and depression among people 65 years and over living in rural and urban areas of Quebec. *International journal of geriatric psychiatry* 2009, 24(11), 1226-1236.
35. Yan XY; Huang SM; Huang CQ; Wu WH; Qin Y. (2011). Marital status and risk for late life depression: a meta-analysis of the published literature. *Journal of International Medical Research*, 39(4), 1142-1154.
36. Rajkumar AP; Thangadurai P; Senthilkumar P; Gayathri K; Prince M; Jacob KS. Nature, prevalence, and factors associated with depression among the elderly in a rural south Indian community. *International psychogeriatrics* 2009, 21(2), 372-378.
37. Koizumi Y; Awata S; Kuriyama S; Ohmori K; Hozawa A; Seki T. et al. Association between social support and depression status in the elderly: Results of a 1-year community-based prospective cohort study in Japan. *Psychiatry and clinical neurosciences* 2005, 59(5), 563-569.
38. Chao SF. Assessing social support and depressive symptoms in older Chinese adults: a longitudinal perspective. *Aging & Mental Health* 2011, 15 (6): 765–774.
39. Thoits PA. Mechanisms linking social ties and support to physical and mental health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 2011; 52 (2): 145–161.
40. Cohen S; Wills TA. Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin* 1985; 98 (2): 310–357.