



# Influence of Individual and Contextual Perceptions and of Multiple Neighborhoods on Depression

Médicoulé Traoré, Cécile Vuillermoz, Pierre Chauvin, Séverine Deguen

## ► To cite this version:

Médicoulé Traoré, Cécile Vuillermoz, Pierre Chauvin, Séverine Deguen. Influence of Individual and Contextual Perceptions and of Multiple Neighborhoods on Depression. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 2020, 17 (6), 10.3390/ijerph17061958 . hal-02538967

**HAL Id: hal-02538967**

**<https://ehesp.hal.science/hal-02538967>**

Submitted on 9 Apr 2020

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Article

# Influence of Individual and Contextual Perceptions and of Multiple Neighborhoods on Depression

Médicoulé Traoré <sup>1,\*</sup> , Cécile Vuillermoz <sup>1</sup>, Pierre Chauvin <sup>1</sup> and Séverine Deguen <sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> INSERM, Sorbonne Université, Institut Pierre Louis d'Épidémiologie et de Santé Publique, IPLESP, Department of social epidemiology, F75012 Paris, France; cecile.vuillermoz@inserm.fr (C.V.); pierre.chauvin@inserm.fr (P.C.); severine.deguen@ehesp.fr (S.D.)

<sup>2</sup> EHESP School of Public Health, F35043 Rennes, France

\* Correspondence: medicoule.traore@inserm.fr; Tel.: +33-6-95-16-43-70

Received: 15 January 2020; Accepted: 9 March 2020; Published: 17 March 2020



**Abstract:** The risk of depression is related to multiple various determinants. The consideration of multiple neighborhoods daily frequented by individuals has led to increased interest in analyzing socio-territorial inequalities in health. In this context, the main objective of this study was (i) to describe and analyze the spatial distribution of depression and (ii) to investigate the role of the perception of the different frequented spaces in the risk of depression in the overall population and in the population stratified by gender. Data were extracted from the 2010 SIRS (a French acronym for “health, inequalities and social ruptures”) cohort survey. In addition to the classic individual characteristics, the participants reported their residential neighborhoods, their workplace neighborhoods and a third one: a daily frequented neighborhood. A new approach was developed to simultaneously consider the three reported neighborhoods to better quantify the level of neighborhood socioeconomic deprivation. Multiple simple and cross-classified multilevel logistic regression models were used to analyze the data. Depression was reported more frequently in low-income (OR = 1.89; CI = [1.07–3.35]) or middle-income (OR = 1.91; CI = [1.09–3.36]) neighborhoods and those with cumulative poverty (OR = 1.64; CI = [1.10–2.45]). In conclusion, a cumulative exposure score, such as the one presented here, may be an appropriate innovative approach to analyzing their effects in the investigation of socio-territorial inequalities in health.

**Keywords:** depression; cumulative exposure score; contextual perceptions; multilevel analysis; neighborhood; daily mobility; life course; social inequalities

## 1. Introduction

Depression continues to increase exponentially worldwide. The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that mental disorders caused by depression are the primary risk factors leading to death or disability [1]. According to the WHO World Mental Health (WMH) Survey Initiative [2], France ranks first in the lifetime prevalence of major depressive episodes (21.0%) among the 18 countries that participate in the WMH surveys, ahead of the USA (19.2%), Brazil (Sao Paulo, 18.4%), the Netherlands (17.9%) and New Zealand (17.8%) [3]. In France, where the consumption of psychotropic drugs is four times higher than in other European countries [4], the prevalence of depression in the past 12 months in the 18–75-year-old population was 9.8% in 2017, and twice as high in women (13.0%) than in men (6.4%) [5]. In addition, the economic costs associated with depression are staggering: in 2007, the costs of depression in the European Economic Area amounted to €136.3 billion. The largest share of these costs stems from reduced productivity (€99.3 billion) and health-care costs (€37.0 billion) [6]. The prevalence of depression and its high costs explain why it is a major public health concern today [7,8].

The literature highlights that various risk factors for depressive episodes exist, including classically individual and biographical variables [9–14]. For instance, several studies show that they likely experience higher levels of socioeconomic disadvantage, resulting in more severe and chronic depression [15–19]. Additionally, it is widely reported in the literature that women are at greater risk for depression than men [15,16,20]; they also have more severe and longer episodes of depression than men.

More recently, biographical factors have been reported as affecting the risk of depression [13,21–24]. They include events that occur during childhood/adolescence (family disputes, serious parental disputes and sexual abuse) [23,24] or adulthood, such as limited mobility or a disability, an emotional or social breakdown (caused by major life events, such as bereavement, a break-up, job loss, home relocation, immigration or imprisonment), a suicide attempt, a negative body image and having experienced discrimination [10–12,14].

Beyond the above factors, contextual factors characterizing one's residential neighborhood have also been reported to be related to adverse outcomes, including a depressive episode [25–27].

While these contextual factors can be measured from census data (for instance, to characterize people who live in low-income neighborhoods), other measures are more subjective, such as having a weak sense of belonging [28], feeling unsafe [29,30], having low mutual support, and having few relationships with neighbors [31]. A recent meta-analysis reported that adulthood depression is significantly higher among urban residents than in rural populations, except in China [32]. A study concluded that neighborhood characteristics, especially in the case of more disadvantaged neighborhoods, were associated with an increased risk of depression [33]. Weden et al. show a slight influence of neighborhood disadvantage on health (objective constructions) compared to the perceived neighborhood quality (subjective constructions) and stress the importance of taking both approaches into account [31]. It is important to note that women's perceptions of a neighborhood are different from men's [34].

In addition, several studies have reported the importance of considering the different areas frequented by an individual in the course of a day (beyond their residential neighborhood) to avoid estimation biases [19,35–39], with reference to the concept of “spatial polygamy” [39]. Presently, this is of particular interest, given people's increased mobility, especially those living in urban areas. In Tucker et al.'s study, the risk of depression increased for individuals with low daily mobility: living in a more underprivileged neighborhood increased the risk of depression fourfold among the individuals with low mobility outside their residential neighborhood. However, this risk decreases among individuals with higher mobility, taking into account their demographics, their individual socioeconomic status and their functional limitation confounders [14].

In this context, one public health research question is this: does the combination of the various neighborhoods frequented by individuals influence the risk of mental health problems, and, more specifically, the risk of depression?

This present study aims to investigate this question in a population living in the Greater Paris area, which appears to be an ideal study location for many reasons. The capital of France, the Greater Paris area, covers 814 square kilometers and has 7 million inhabitants (approximately 10% of the French population). Paris is a world city, whose territory is marked by considerable socio-spatial segregation, which can be observed not only in residential areas, but also at all hours of the day [40,41]. The greatest segregation can be seen between two extremes of the social gradient: the wealthy elite and the most underprivileged social class [42,43], which is relegated to the most underprivileged neighborhoods in the northeastern suburbs of Paris. Previous work using the same data sources as this paper estimated that 12% of the adult population (18 years and older) in the Greater Paris area who showed signs of major depression were treated with antidepressants on the same day as the diagnosis [23]. This was significantly more common among those residing in poorer neighborhoods (17%).

The study is structured as follows:

- A description of the spatial distribution of depression in different neighborhoods in the Greater Paris area to identify places with a higher risk, and
- An investigation the role of individual and contextual perception of the neighborhood in the risk of depression and the socio-economic cumulative effect of different neighborhoods stratified for the overall population and stratified by gender.

## 2. Materials and Methods

### 2.1. Survey Design

This study is based on a cross-sectional analysis using data collected in the SIRS (a French acronym for “health, inequalities and social ruptures”) cohort study that involved a representative sample of French-speaking adults in the Paris metropolitan area. The overall objective of the cohort study was to investigate the relationships between individual, household and neighborhood social characteristics and health-related conditions. Data were collected during three waves, the first in 2005, the second in 2007 and the third in 2010. The analyses in the present study are based on data collected in 2010.

The SIRS survey employed a stratified, multistage cluster sampling procedure. The primary sampling units were census blocks, called “IRISs” (“IRIS” is a French acronym for “blocks for incorporating statistical information”). These are the smallest census spatial units in France (with about 2000 inhabitants each). In the SIRS survey, the Paris metropolitan area was divided into six strata according to the population’s socioeconomic profile [44], in order to over-represent the poorest neighborhoods. First, the census blocks were randomly selected within each stratum. In all, 50 census blocks were selected from the 2595 eligible census blocks in Paris and its suburbs. Second, within each selected census block, 60 households were randomly chosen from a complete list of households. Third, one adult was randomly selected from each household by the birthday method. Further details on the SIRS sampling methodology were previously published [45,46].

In our study, we used data collected on the 3006 people interviewed in the SIRS survey. A questionnaire containing numerous social and health-related questions was administered face-to-face during home visits.

### 2.2. Ethical Considerations

Legal authorization for the SIRS cohort study was obtained from two French authorities: the CCTIRS, (the French Advisory Committee on the Treatment of Information in Health Research) and the CNIL (the National Commission for Informatics and Liberties). The participants gave their verbal informed consent. Written consent was not necessary because this survey did not fall into the category of biomedical research (as defined by French law).

### 2.3. Outcome

Depression was assessed using the Mini-International Neuropsychiatric Interview (MINI) module pertaining to major depression, which is based on the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders-IV and International Classification of Diseases-10 criteria. The MINI has been used in many studies, and its validity has been well assessed [47]. The depression health outcome was recoded into a binary variable (yes/no).

### 2.4. Spatial Distribution of the Prevalence of Depression

To investigate the spatial distribution of the prevalence of depression by the mean yearly household income of 50 neighborhoods in the Greater Paris area, we created an IRIS spatial unit map. We classified the level of the prevalence of depression in neighborhoods in three categories (low (<11%), intermediary (11%–18%) and high (>18%)), based on Jenk’s method [48]. Mean yearly household income was estimated in euros per consumption unit and classified in three categories (low (<€6004/CU),

intermediary (€6004/CU–€67,153/CU), high (>€67,153/CU)), based on Jenk's method [48]. We used Arcgis 10 to do this mapping.

## 2.5. Study Variables

As described in the introduction, the factors that increase the risk of depression can be individual or contextual. The main hypothesis in this study was that depression was associated with certain individual characteristics, such as sociodemographic characteristics (low socioeconomic status) [9], negative perceptions (of oneself or of the neighborhood) [49,50] and difficult events [10]. We hypothesized that living in, working in and frequenting an deprived neighborhood (low income, low health-care density) and negative perceptions of the residential neighborhood were associated with depression [25–27].

### 2.5.1. Individual and perception characteristics

Individual risk factors and confounders cover various dimensions: sociodemographic characteristics, social support, difficult life events (more details are provided in Appendix A).

Sociodemographic, social support and difficult events were detailed in Appendix D. Concerning the perception measures, it includes:

- Activity space (large/not large) (more detail in Appendix B);
- Feeling ashamed of his/her bodyweight: bodyweight perception (positive/negative);
- Additionally, individual perception of his/her neighborhood of residence was collected through four binary variables: (i) the level of mutual aid between inhabitants (yes/no), (ii) feeling unsafe (yes/no), (iii) contact with neighbors (frequent/rare) and (iv) commercial density (sufficient/insufficient).

### 2.5.2. Neighborhood Characteristics

In our study, we define three types of neighborhoods: (i) the residential neighborhood, the census block where the inhabitant was living during the study period; (ii) the workplace neighborhood, the workplace census block, plus the adjacent census blocks; and (iii) the frequented neighborhood, the census block frequented most regularly (after the residential and the workplace census blocks). Individuals were asked to give the neighborhood (address, postcode, and if not metro, train, bus, town, country) where they regularly went to meet relatives, for hobbies or other activities.

For each individual, in order to identify the three different types of neighborhoods, the reported postal address was converted as their corresponding IRIS in order to define the neighborhood (IRIS plus adjacent IRISs).

### Income Level in the Three Types of Neighborhoods

We used the average income per consumption unit, estimated at the neighborhood level (defined as a measure of the residential IRIS plus the adjacent IRISs) using the data available from INSEE (French National Institute for Statistics and Economic Research) for 2010–2011. “Low”, “average” and “high” neighborhood income was defined according to the tertiles of the income distribution for all the IRISs that make up the Greater Paris area. If a participant did not have a job or did not declare a most frequented neighborhood, the income for these neighborhoods was considered missing and was classified in our results as “Not applicable”.

### Aggregated Inhabitant Perceptions of the Residential Neighborhood

For inhabitant perceptions, we aggregated the answers from the 3006 interviewees from each residential neighborhood and constructed aggregated variables in order to capture the most widespread perception (negative or positive) for each census block.

Aggregated perceptions of a neighborhood were as follows: (i) commercial density (this included post offices, bakeries, banks, hairdressers, restaurants, beauty treatments, grocery stores, sports and

hobby facilities, etc.) (insufficient/average/sufficient), (ii) the level of mutual aid between inhabitants (high/average/low), (iii) feeling unsafe (safe/somewhat safe/very unsafe) and (iv) contact with neighbors (frequent/occasional/rare).

In the following section, we will use the terms “residential neighborhood”, “workplace neighborhood” and “other frequented neighborhood” to refer to these three daily neighborhoods as previously defined.

### Cumulative Exposure Score

One of the main original aspects of this study was to consider simultaneously the income levels in the three neighborhoods to better quantify the level of neighborhood socioeconomic deprivation. The underlying idea was to take into account the accumulation of the neighborhood socioeconomic deprivation with regard to the number of neighborhoods frequented (from one, only the residential neighborhood for an individual who worked and engaged in leisure-time activities in that neighborhood, for instance, to three, for an individual who moved between three different neighborhoods). More precisely, the accumulation of the neighborhoods’ characteristics, when these neighborhoods are frequented on a daily basis, may impact an individual’s health, including the risk of depression.

The cumulative exposure score combined the low-, middle- and high-income categories for the three reported neighborhoods. Next, this score was classified in three different groups (Table 1 shows the distribution of the score by category):

- Group 1 included individuals who only frequented poor neighborhoods (all three reported neighborhoods). In other words, for each neighborhood, the income was classified in the low category. This corresponds to maximum sociospatial relegation.
- Group 2 is the opposite of Group 1, as it included individuals who lived in, worked in and frequented (for various reasons) wealthy neighborhoods only.
- Group 3 includes a mixture of the different types of neighborhoods. Here, there is no clear pattern because the neighborhoods are a combination of the low-, middle- and high-income categories.

**Table 1.** Distribution of cumulative exposure scores.

| Category                                  | <i>n</i> | %    |
|---|----------|------|
| Group 1: Poor neighborhoods only          | 254      | 12.1 |
| Group 2: Wealthy neighborhoods only       | 539      | 9.1  |
| Group 3: Neighborhoods of different types | 2213     | 78.8 |

### 2.6. Statistical Analysis


The statistical analysis was structured in many successive steps. Significant confounders in studying the association between individual characteristics (sociodemographics, social isolation, mental health and life events) and depression were identified with univariate logistic regression.

First, we implemented a simple multilevel logistic model between depression and the individual perceptions and the cumulative exposure score, adjusting for all the sociodemographic and difficult event variables; it corresponds to model M1. Given negative life events could be associated to neighborhood characteristics [42,51], we have adjusted our models on difficult event variables.

Second, a crossed-classified model was used to simultaneously account for the income level of the three types of neighborhoods (defining the model M2). This model enabled us to incorporate non-hierarchical nesting structures, where individuals were simultaneously nested within multiple non-hierarchical settings. The purpose of this step was to simultaneously examine the fixed and random effects, corresponding to the three types of neighborhoods. Thus, as shown Figure 1, in our cross-classified model, we included all the levels: Level 1 (individuals) and Level 2 (neighborhoods), the latter differentiated as follows: Level 2, the residential neighborhood; Level 2', the workplace



neighborhood; and Level 2'', the other frequented neighborhood. We have detailed the theoretical framework of the cross-classified multilevel model in Appendix C.



**Figure 1.** Cross-classified multilevel logistic models.

As widely reported in the literature, women are at greater risk for depression, and have more negative perceptions of residential neighborhoods, than men [5,15–20,52]. We therefore performed a gender-stratified analysis (models M1W and M2W for women, and M1M and M2M for men).

All variation inflation factor (VIF) values to confirm collinearity between variables were below 2, not showing any specific issues regarding collinearity.

### 2.7. Statistical Implementation

All the statistical analyses were performed using R software and Bayesian estimation procedures. All the descriptive prevalences and proportions were weighted inversely to each participant's inclusion probability, in accordance with the sampling design, with the "survey" package. We implemented a logistic regression to investigate our binary outcome: depression (yes/no). Model fit was assessed using the deviance information criterion (DIC), a Bayesian measure of model fit (analogous to Akaike Information Criterion in frequentist statistics). This test statistic yielded by the procedure assesses how well the model fits the data, with a penalty on model complexity, and is referred to as a "badness of fit" indicator. Therefore, higher DIC values indicate a poorer-fitting model.

## 3. Results


### 3.1. Description of Population

The gender ratio (M/F) was 0.65, and the average age was about 45 years. Most of the participants had a postsecondary level of education (31.2%), and 12.6% were foreigners. Of the total participants, 41.3% were single, and 53.6% were employed. Their average monthly income was €2014 per consumption unit. On average, the proportion of depression was 14.3% in the total population and 10.5% and 16.7% for men and women, respectively.

### 3.2. Spatial Distribution of Depression

The proportion of individuals with depression varied between a minimum of 0.9% and a maximum of 33.1% for the 50 residential neighborhoods in the SIRS survey (Figure 2). Depression was reported more frequently in the most deprived neighborhoods (those with a yearly household income <€6004

by consumption unit on average), which are located in the northern part of the study area, than in the < most privileged neighborhoods (those with a yearly household income >€67,153 by consumption unit on average), which are located in the center of Paris and in the western part of the study area.



**Figure 2.** Spatial distribution of the proportion of depression by category in the 50 residential neighborhoods in the SIRS survey (a French acronym for “health, inequalities and social ruptures”), Greater Paris area, 2010.

Cumulative exposure score: we observed that most of the participants (73.6%) frequented neighborhoods of different types, while 17.9% had frequented only poor ones, and 8.4% had frequented only wealthy ones (Table 1). The cumulative exposure score was significantly associated with depression (OR = 2.87; % 95% CI = [1.77–4.64]) (Table 2).

**Table 2.** Univariate analysis of the associations between contextual neighborhood characteristics and depression, SIRS, 2010.

| Contextual Characteristics           | N    | Percentage | Depression | OR 95% [CI]      | p-Value |
|--------------------------------------|------|------------|------------|------------------|---------|
| Mutual aid between inhabitants in RN |      |            |            |                  | 0.001   |
| Low                                  | 119  | 3.7        | 25.8       | 3.64 [1.92–6.92] |         |
| Average                              | 2647 | 88.5       | 13.7       | 1.67 [0.93–3.00] |         |
| High                                 | 240  | 7.8        | 8.7        | Ref.             |         |
| Feeling unsafe in RN                 |      |            |            |                  | 0.002   |
| Safe                                 | 1138 | 45.1       | 11.3       | Ref.             |         |
| Somewhat safe                        | 1203 | 40.9       | 14.8       | 1.37 [1.01–1.85] |         |
| Very unsafe                          | 665  | 14.0       | 19.0       | 1.85 [1.32–2.60] |         |



Table 2. Cont.

| Contextual Characteristics   | N    | Percentage | Depression | OR 95% [CI]      | p-Value      |
|------------------------------|------|------------|------------|------------------|--------------|
| Contact with neighbors in RN |      |            |            |                  | 0.034        |
| Frequent                     | 2105 | 75.5       | 12.8       | Ref.             |              |
| Occasional                   | 602  | 15.7       | 16.1       | 1.30 [0.94–1.81] |              |
| Rare                         | 299  | 8.8        | 18.1       | 1.51 [1.08–2.12] |              |
| Commercial density in RN     |      |            |            |                  | 0.500        |
| Insufficient                 | 1500 | 60.5       | 13.0       | 0.85 [0.52–1.40] |              |
| Average                      | 1084 | 30.7       | 15.0       | 1.00 [0.61–1.66] |              |
| Sufficient                   | 422  | 8.8        | 14.9       | Ref.             |              |
| Income level in RN           |      |            |            |                  | <b>0.001</b> |
| High                         | 479  | 32.8       | 7.5        | Ref.             |              |
| Average                      | 1198 | 47.6       | 14.8       | 2.16 [1.43–3.25] |              |
| Low                          | 1329 | 19.7       | 16.0       | 2.36 [1.57–3.54] |              |
| Income level in WN           |      |            |            |                  | <b>0.001</b> |
| High                         | 325  | 14.3       | 9.1        | Ref.             |              |
| Average                      | 737  | 30.9       | 11.4       | 1.29 [0.73–2.29] |              |
| Low                          | 600  | 17.4       | 10.4       | 1.16 [0.64–2.09] |              |
| Not applicable               | 1344 | 34.3       | 19.1       | 2.36 [1.40–3.96] |              |
| Income level in FN           |      |            |            |                  | 0.956        |
| High                         | 680  | 25.3       | 13.7       | Ref.             |              |
| Average                      | 754  | 27.1       | 13.7       | 1.00 [0.73–1.37] |              |
| Low                          | 376  | 10.7       | 14.9       | 1.10 [0.71–1.72] |              |
| Not applicable               | 1196 | 36.9       | 13.5       | 0.99 [0.74–1.32] |              |

RN: residential neighborhood; WN: workplace neighborhood; FN: frequented neighborhood. OR: odds ratio, CI: confidence interval, Ref.: reference group. In bold, these are statistically significant results at the threshold of a p-value of 0.05 or less.

### 3.3. Individual Factors Associated with Depression (Univariate Analysis)

As shown by Appendix D Table A1, the prevalence of depression was higher in women (OR = 1.71; 95% CI = [1.24–2.34]), and individuals with a low monthly household income (OR = 1.81; 95% CI = [1.16–2.83]), compared to those with a higher income, those who were unemployed (OR = 3.35; 95% CI = [1.68–3.29]) and compared to those who were active, those with perceived social isolation (OR = 5.58; 95% CI = [4.38–7.12]), handicapped or disabled individuals (OR = 4.98; 95% CI = [3.76–6.59]), individuals who had a relative or close friend with a serious disease (OR = 1.43; 95% CI = [1.11–1.84]), and those who had attempted suicide before the age of 18 years (OR = 5.23; 95% CI = [2.82–9.72]).

### 3.4. Contextual Factors Associated with Depression

According to Table 2, contextual factors associated with depression were: low mutual aid between inhabitants (OR = 3.64; 95% CI = [1.92–6.92]), feeling very unsafe (OR = 1.85; 95% CI = [1.32–2.60]), not having regular contact with neighbors (OR = 1.51; 95% CI = [1.08–2.60]), feeling very unsafe (OR = 1.62; 95% CI = [1.09–2.43]), residing in low and/or average neighborhoods (OR = 2.36; 95% CI = [1.57–3.54]) and (OR = 2.16; 95% CI = [1.43–3.25]).

### 3.5. Individual Perceptions Measures

Table 3 highlights that the following aggregated variables concerning neighborhood perception were associated with a higher prevalence of depression: bodyweight perception negative (OR = 1.38; 95% CI = [1.00–1.91]), feeling very unsafe (OR = 1.62; 95% CI = [1.09–2.43]), perceiving an insufficient commercial density within their neighborhood (OR = 1.38; 95% CI = [1.02–1.86]), and individuals who frequented neighborhoods of different types (OR = 2.0; 95% CI = [1.32–3.29]) and who frequented only poor neighborhoods (OR = 1.72; 95% CI = [1.16–2.55]).

**Table 3.** Multivariate analysis of the associations between individual perceptions measures, cumulative exposure score, contextual neighborhood characteristics and depression, SIRS, 2010.

|                                | M1               | M2               |
|--------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                                | OR 95% [CI]      | OR 95% [CI]      |
| Individual perception measures |                  |                  |
| Bodyweight perception          | <b>0.051</b>     | <b>0.051</b>     |
| Positive                       | Ref.             | Ref.             |
| Negative                       | 1.38 [1.00–1.91] | 1.37 [1.00–1.90] |
| Mutual aid between inhabitants | 0.430            | 0.574            |
| Yes                            | Ref.             | Ref.             |
| No                             | 0.89 [0.68–1.18] | 0.86 [0.65–1.15] |
| Feeling unsafe                 | <b>0.018</b>     | <b>0.009</b>     |
| No                             | Ref.             | Ref.             |
| Yes                            | 1.62 [1.09–2.43] | 1.62 [1.08–2.44] |
| Contact with neighbors         | 0.314            | 0.129            |
| Frequent                       | Ref.             | Ref.             |
| Rare                           | 1.32 [0.77–2.29] | 1.44 [0.83–2.49] |
| Commercial density             | <b>0.035</b>     | <b>0.033</b>     |
| Sufficient                     | Ref.             | Ref.             |
| Insufficient                   | 1.38 [1.02–1.86] | 1.45 [1.09–1.93] |
| Cumulative exposure score      |                  |                  |
| Wealthy neighborhoods only     | <b>0.005</b>     |                  |
| All types of neighborhoods     | 1.72 [1.16–2.55] |                  |
| Poor neighborhoods only        | 2.08 [1.32–3.29] |                  |
| Contextual measures            |                  |                  |
| Mutual aid between inhabitants |                  | <b>0.042</b>     |
| Low                            |                  | 1.71 [0.83–3.69] |
| Average                        |                  | 0.92 [0.51–1.78] |
| High                           |                  | Ref.             |
| Feeling unsafe                 |                  | 0.284            |
| Safe                           |                  | Ref.             |
| Somewhat safe                  |                  | 1.04 [0.75–1.43] |
| Very unsafe                    |                  | 1.50 [0.89–2.52] |
| Contact with neighbors         |                  | 0.145            |
| Frequent                       |                  | Ref.             |
| Occasional                     |                  | 0.83 [0.51–1.33] |
| Rare                           |                  | 1.25 [0.94–1.66] |
| Commercial density             |                  | 0.372            |
| Insufficient                   |                  | Ref.             |
| Average                        |                  | 1.16 [0.76–1.77] |
| Sufficient                     |                  | 1.46 [0.94–2.26] |
| Residential neighborhood       |                  | <b>0.043</b>     |
| High                           |                  | Ref.             |
| Average                        |                  | 2.02 [1.14–3.57] |
| Low                            |                  | 1.91 [1.07–3.42] |
| Workplace neighborhood         |                  | 0.056            |
| High                           |                  | Ref.             |
| Average                        |                  | 1.05 [0.56–1.97] |
| Low                            |                  | 0.64 [0.35–1.18] |
| Not applicable                 |                  | 1.49 [0.50–4.38] |
| Frequented neighborhood        |                  | 0.301            |
| High                           |                  | Ref.             |
| Average                        |                  | 0.86 [0.61–1.22] |
| Low                            |                  | 0.80 [0.52–1.21] |
| Not applicable                 |                  | 0.80 [0.56–1.14] |

OR: Odds Ratio, CI: Confidence Interval, Ref.: reference group. In bold, these are statistically significant results at the threshold of a *p*-value of 0.05 or less.

### 3.6. Contextual Factors Associated with Depression

According to Table 3, the prevalence of depression was higher in individuals residing in a neighborhood with a low and average household monthly income (respectively, OR = 1.91, 95% CI = [1.07–3.42]; OR = 2.02, 95% CI = [1.14–3.57]), compared to those living in a neighborhood with a high household monthly income. However, the prevalence of depression was not significantly different in individuals in a workplace or frequented neighborhood with a low or average household monthly income, compared to the neighborhoods with a higher household monthly income.

Models 1 (M1) and 2 (M2) were adjusted for individual characteristics (gender, monthly household income, employment status, relationship status, perceived social isolation, handicapped or disabled, serious illness or friend/family member, serious familial disputes before 18, sexual abuse during childhood, attempted suicide before 18).

### 3.7. Comparison between Women and Men

We will focus now on the differences that can exist between women and men.

Among women, Table 4 reveals that the individual perceptions measures associated with depression were: bodyweight perception negative (OR = 1.44; 95% CI = [1.03–2.01]), perceived an insufficient commercial density within their neighborhood (OR = 1.41; 95% CI = [1.02–1.96]) and the women who frequented neighborhoods of different types (OR = 1.51; 95% CI = [1.04–2.17]). The contextual characteristics associated with depression among women were the ones who resided in a neighborhood with a low and average household monthly income (respectively, OR = 2.50, 95% CI = [1.10–5.67]; OR = 2.18, 95% CI = [1.05–4.50]).

Among men, Table 4 reveals that the individual perceptions measures associated with depression were: felt unsafe (OR = 2.23; 95% CI = [1.14–4.38]), did not have regular contact with their neighbors (OR = 2.48; 95% CI = [0.95–6.51]), and the men who frequented neighborhoods with cumulative poverty (OR = 3.69; 95% CI = [1.03–13.25]). The only contextual characteristics associated with depression among men is to feel unsafe (OR = 4.57; 95% CI = [2.04–10.27]).

**Table 4.** Multivariate analysis of the associations between contextual neighborhood characteristics and depression in women and men, SIRS, 2010.

|                                | Women            |                  | Men              |                  |
|--------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                                | M1W              | M2W              | M1M              | M2M              |
|                                | OR 95% [CI]      | OR 95% [CI]      | OR 95% [CI]      | OR 95% [CI]      |
| Individual perception measures |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Bodyweight perception          | <b>0.033</b>     | <b>0.016</b>     | 0.404            | 0.598            |
| Positive                       | Ref.             | Ref.             | Ref.             | Ref.             |
| Negative                       | 1.44 [1.03–2.01] | 1.54 [1.16–2.04] | 1.24 [0.75–2.04] | 1.39 [0.84–2.30] |
| Mutual aid between inhabitants | 0.816            | 0.726            | 0.272            | 0.864            |
| Yes                            | Ref.             | Ref.             | Ref.             | Ref.             |
| No                             | 0.96 [0.70–1.32] | 0.99 [0.74–1.32] | 0.74 [0.43–1.27] | 0.87 [0.51–1.49] |
| Feeling unsafe                 | 0.122            | 0.064            | <b>0.020</b>     | <b>0.022</b>     |
| No                             | Ref.             | Ref.             | Ref.             | Ref.             |
| Yes                            | 1.44 [0.91–2.30] | 1.46 [0.95–2.24] | 2.23 [1.14–4.38] | 2.25 [1.29–3.95] |
| Contact with neighbors         | 0.982            | 0.373            | 0.064            | 0.195            |
| Frequent                       | Ref.             | Ref.             | Ref.             | Ref.             |
| Occasional                     | 1.01 [0.53–1.93] | 1.16 [0.63–2.11] | 2.48 [0.95–6.51] | 1.65 [0.70–3.90] |
| Commercial density             | <b>0.039</b>     | 0.072            | 0.431            | 0.277            |
| Sufficient                     | Ref.             | Ref.             | Ref.             | Ref.             |
| Insufficient                   | 1.41 [1.02–1.96] | 1.36 [0.99–1.86] | 1.26 [0.71–2.26] | 1.34 [0.80–2.24] |

Table 4. Cont.

|                                | Women            |                  | Men               |                   |
|--------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                                | M1W              | M2W              | M1M               | M2M               |
|                                | OR 95% [CI]      | OR 95% [CI]      | OR 95% [CI]       | OR 95% [CI]       |
| Cumulative exposure score      | <b>0.087</b>     |                  | <b>0.057</b>      |                   |
| Wealthy neighborhoods only     | Ref.             |                  | Ref.              |                   |
| All types of neighborhoods     | 1.51 [1.04–2.17] |                  | 1.95 [0.57–6.65]  |                   |
| Poor neighborhoods only        | 1.34 [0.73–2.45] |                  | 3.69 [1.03–13.25] |                   |
| Individual perception measures |                  |                  |                   |                   |
| Mutual aid between inhabitants |                  | <b>0.009</b>     |                   | 0.836             |
| Low                            |                  | 1.40 [0.53–3.64] |                   | 1.71 [0.50–5.88]  |
| Average                        |                  | 0.64 [0.31–1.32] |                   | 1.52 [0.54–4.29]  |
| High                           |                  | Ref.             |                   | Ref.              |
| Feeling unsafe                 |                  | 0.884            |                   | <b>0.009</b>      |
| Safe                           |                  | Ref.             |                   | Ref.              |
| Somewhat safe                  |                  | 0.89 [0.55–1.44] |                   | 1.35 [0.79–2.31]  |
| Very unsafe                    |                  | 0.83 [0.35–1.98] |                   | 4.57 [2.04–10.27] |
| Contact with neighbors         |                  | 0.896            |                   | 0.068             |
| Frequent                       |                  | Ref.             |                   | Ref.              |
| Occasional                     |                  | 1.18 [0.67–2.08] |                   | 0.43 [0.23–0.81]  |
| Rare                           |                  | 1.01 [0.55–1.85] |                   | 1.43 [0.77–2.65]  |
| Commercial density             |                  | 0.839            |                   | 0.211             |
| Insufficient                   |                  | 0.94 [0.52–1.72] |                   | 1.06 [0.54–2.09]  |
| Average                        |                  | 0.92 [0.49–1.74] |                   | 1.10 [0.46–2.65]  |
| Sufficient                     |                  | Ref.             |                   | Ref.              |
| Residential neighborhood       |                  | <b>0.029</b>     |                   | 0.731             |
| High                           |                  | Ref.             |                   | Ref.              |
| Average                        |                  | 2.18 [1.05–4.50] |                   | 1.57 [0.56–4.41]  |
| Low                            |                  | 2.50 [1.10–5.67] |                   | 1.25 [0.43–3.64]  |
| Workplace neighborhood         |                  | 0.883            |                   | <b>0.001</b>      |
| High                           |                  | Ref.             |                   | Ref.              |
| Average                        |                  | 0.85 [0.45–1.61] |                   | 1.32 [0.41–4.28]  |
| Low                            |                  | 0.84 [0.47–1.51] |                   | 0.37 [0.11–1.26]  |
| Not applicable                 |                  | 0.78 [0.25–2.40] |                   | 2.06 [0.77–5.48]  |
| Frequented neighborhood        |                  | 0.346            |                   | <b>0.015</b>      |
| High                           |                  | Ref.             |                   | Ref.              |
| Average                        |                  | 1.39 [0.89–2.17] |                   | 0.52 [0.23–1.14]  |
| Low                            |                  | 0.98 [0.54–1.79] |                   | 0.69 [0.35–1.37]  |
| Not applicable                 |                  | 0.96 [0.58–1.59] |                   | 0.72 [0.36–1.43]  |

OR: Odds Ratio, CI: Confidence Interval, Ref.: reference group. In bold, these are statistically significant results at the threshold of a p-value of 0.05 or less.

Models 1 and 2 of women (M1W and M2W, respectively) and men (M1M and M2M, respectively) were adjusted for individual characteristics (monthly household income, employments status, relationship status, perceived social isolation, handicapped or disabled, serious illness or friend/family member, serious familial disputes before 18, sexual abuse during childhood, attempted suicide before 18).

## 4. Discussion

### 4.1. Main Findings

In this study, the prevalence of depression was higher among people living in poor neighborhoods. Furthermore, after adjusting for individual characteristics and difficult life events, this study indicated that depression was associated with a negative perception of one's bodyweight, feeling unsafe and a perception of one's neighborhood as being deprived, in terms of income and available services. There is also a higher risk of depression among people who frequented only poor and/or mixed neighborhoods.

### 4.2. Comparison with Previous Studies

Our study confirms previous classical findings regarding the individuals' risk factors of depression. Whereas numerous previous studies have shown that certain neighborhood characteristics, such as income and a built environment, may be associated with a higher 'ecological' risk of depression, this study is the first one in France to consider the contextual characteristics of both residential and nonresidential neighborhoods in multilevel models, that take into account individual characteristics and/or perceptions of their residential neighborhood.

Comparing our results with those found in the literature is difficult because of differences in the contextual characteristics examined in each study. Most studies agree that neighborhood income level has a significant influence on depression [26,27,53]. Neighborhood income could be considered as a proxy for other neighborhood characteristics, such as social cohesion, safety, the services offered or a built environment (not to mention biases in the socio-economic neighborhood when used without adjustment for the inhabitants' individual characteristics in a merely ecological analysis). A study showed that people residing in the most underprivileged neighborhoods had a higher risk of depression than those living in privileged neighborhoods [52]. Some studies suggested that the esthetic quality of a neighborhood (such as introducing more appealing elements, such as green spaces, in order to create a pleasant environment) could be associated with people's health [54]. However, Burt et al. showed that access to green spaces was only beneficial to men's mental health and that it varied with age [54]. Furthermore, Choi et al. showed that feeling unsafe within a residential neighborhood significantly increased the risk of depression [29]. In addition, they found that people who lived in neighborhoods with strong social cohesion are more likely to have a stronger sense of belonging, which, in turn, can have an influence on their health. Finally, studies have also shown that certain difficult life and contextual factors are associated with a higher risk of depression [22,27,53].

The neighborhood characteristics for women with depression include a low household income, a negative self-image, feeling different from their neighbors, a low density of services in the area, and residing in a low- or average-income neighborhood. These results could be partially explained by the fact that women tend to have a more negative and more selective representation than men. This difference between men and women increases when focusing the analysis among women with children because:

- mothers are typically the main household manager in a family's daily life [22];
- women depend more on emotional support and personal relationships in which emotional intimacy, trust and solidarity are exchanged than men [19];
- a disadvantaged socio-economic situation may therefore be the main explanation for the higher level of depression among women [17].

Some models showed that the gender gap in depression could also be due to higher exposure of difficult events [19].

The last point concerns the socioeconomic diversity score. To our knowledge, no study constructing this type of score has been constructed and used. Of course, for future surveys, the score could be improved to better identify individuals' frequented destinations, in addition to the three neighborhoods of interest in this study, and/or look at others socioeconomic characteristics



other than the neighborhood's average household income. In addition, we recognize that the score estimated for people included in the group 3 could characterize various socioeconomic situations. Indeed, whereas the score estimated for people included in group 1 and group 2 could reflect their individual socioeconomic position, for those in group 3, it would provide an incorrect assessment of their socioeconomic position. For instance, people may have a high individual socioeconomic position (as a general practitioners or a lawyer) but working in a poor neighborhood, and inversely. To improve the interpretation of people classified in group 3, it would be appropriate to combine the socioeconomic diversity score with information on occupational status. However, this information was not available in the SIRS cohort.

#### 4.3. Limitations and Strengths

First, we note a limitation concerning the existence of inter-individual variability in defining a "neighborhood" and its boundaries [23]. Using the residential neighborhood as an example, the boundaries and area of a perceived neighborhood vary from one individual to another (it was observed that they were perceived to be smaller in the inner city of Paris than in the suburbs) [23,24]. In addition, the responses may have varied according to the manner in which the questions were worded. A person could delimit his/her neighborhood of residence as a small building block around his/her apartment building when defining his/her built environment (e.g., visible from its windows), but then widen the space when assessing the density of shops or services accessible by foot.

Second, there was a possibility of same-source bias, because the outcome affects the perception of the neighborhood attribute. However, previous studies indicated that the aggregation of the responses of the same neighborhood, as we did, permit to reduce the same-source bias because the measurement error in individuals' responses was averaged [53,55].

Thirdly, there was a possibility of self-selection bias. The self-selection bias concerns the predisposition (i) of people to settle in different neighborhoods from their wishes (the most precarious) (ii) and certain people to be able to choose their neighborhood (the most affluent) [55]. James et al. claim that sometimes these constraints can lead some individuals with a high BMI to move to neighborhoods that have lower density and accessibility.

The measures of association with depression could be affected if individuals with depression are "more likely to live" in underprivileged neighborhoods and, conversely, if individuals in good mental health are "more likely to live" in more advantaged neighborhoods. Julie Vallée et al. showed that people with depression are more likely to report that their residential neighborhood has problems or a low level of social cohesion [23,24]. These biases are not incurred when objective indicators (from census data or household income tax data), or combined aggregate-level subjective neighborhood data, are used.

This study has some strengths. First, we have a representative sample of the Paris metropolitan area which takes into account these specificities [56]. Second, in our study, defining a "neighborhood" (residential, workplace or frequented) was left to the respondent's judgment. Despite the fact that, for the purposes of the analysis, all the neighborhoods were redefined using the address provided by the individual and then grouped by IRIS and adjacent IRISs, on average, the neighborhoods were 2.55-km<sup>2</sup> polygons, with a population of 16,305 inhabitants. This systematization simplifies the diversity of the situations observed and reported in the literature [57]. Third, the SIRS survey contains various variables, which allowed it to take into account the complexity of the mechanisms of depression, and the relationship between individual and contextual factors.

## 5. Conclusions

Our study confirmed the existence of a significant association between the socioeconomic status of a residential neighborhood and depression. It also highlighted a gender-modifying effect when measuring the association between residential factors and depression. For women, self-help and a neighborhood's average monthly household income were significantly associated with depression, while for men, only

feeling unsafe was significant. This study also showed the importance of a cumulative approach to socioeconomic diversity in the multiple contextual characterization of individuals when considering their multiple frequented spaces. This score can be considered as an alternative approach to analyze the effects of contextual characteristics in the investigation of socio-territorial inequalities in health. However, the contextual effect of the three combined neighborhoods could be improved if the relative time spent within each neighborhood were measured, which would permit a more complete study on the impact of an individual's contextual exposure and his/her risk of depression [58,59]. For future research in this area, one interesting challenge to consider would be to shift towards more dynamic forecasts, by using short-term time scales. A solution to this problem is found in the latest methodological advances, which make it possible to examine a variable place as a function of time and duration, in order to better characterize exposure to the different environments frequented and traversed by individuals [60]. For example, neighborhood mobility factors may play a role in the period in which participants are exposed to impoverished contexts, which may, in turn, influence their susceptibility to react negatively to daily stressors. Others studies suggest finding an alternative to help identify a critical or sensitive time period in which a person may be exposed to daily stressors in a neighborhood [27,61].

**Author Contributions:** M.T.: performed literature search, data extraction, and data analysis; drafted the manuscript; incorporated comments for the final version of manuscript. P.C.: oversaw conceptualization and design of the study, provided advice for data analysis and interpretation of results, and reviewed the manuscript. C.V.: gave advice for the interpretation of results, and reviewed the manuscript. S.D.: contributed in conceptualization and design of the study, gave advice for the interpretation of results, and reviewed the manuscript. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Funding:** This work has been supported by the Agence Régionale de Santé Ile-de-France (Regional Health Agency of Ile-de-France).

**Acknowledgments:** In this section you can acknowledge any support given which is not covered by the author contribution or funding sections. This may include administrative and technical support, or donations in kind (e.g., materials used for experiments).

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## Appendix A Variables Definition

### Appendix A.1 Construction of the Variable “Perceived Social Isolation”

The question was “Generally speaking, did you feel very alone, rather alone, rather supported or very supported?” Participants who answered “very or rather alone” were classified in “perceived social isolation” and participants who answered “rather or very supported” were classified in “not perceived social isolation”.

### Appendix A.2 Construction of the Variable “Ashamed of One’s Bodyweight”

Step 1: After showing the participants images of different silhouettes, we asked them the following question to see which one corresponds to them the best.

| Presently, Would You Prefer To | Response |
|--------------------------------|----------|
| Maintain your current weight   | 1        |
| Lose weight                    | 2        |
| Gain weight                    | 3        |
| It doesn’t matter to me        | 4        |

Step 2: We placed those who wanted to gain or lose weight in the category “negative perception of their build” and the others in the category “positive perception of their build”.

*Appendix A.3 Formulation of the Questions about the Neighborhood*

| With Regard to Your Neighborhood, Please Reply to the Following Statement and Questions   | Possible Answers           |
|---|----------------------------|
| People who live there readily help each other   | Yes/no                     |
| Do you personally feel unsafe in your neighborhood?   | Yes/no                     |
| Apart from simple greetings, how often do you have face-to-face contact with neighbors, shopkeepers or other people in your neighborhood? | More often than not/Rarely |
| Do you think there are enough businesses and miscellaneous stores in your neighborhood (commercial density)?                              | Yes/no                     |

**Appendix B Definition of the Activity Space Score**

In this paper, activity space was measured from the respondents' statements about the location of their domestic and social activities. In the SIRS survey, people were asked where they usually (1) went food shopping; (2) used services (e.g., bank and post office); (3) went for a walk; (4) met friends; and (5) went to a restaurant. For each of these five activities, there were three answer options: (1) mainly within your residential neighborhood; (2) mainly outside your residential neighborhood; and (3) both within and outside your residential neighborhood.

An activity space measure was subsequently created: activities said to be done mainly within the neighborhood were assigned a value of 1, while those done both within and outside the neighborhood or mainly outside the neighborhood were assigned a value of 0.5 and 0, respectively. By adding these values together and dividing the sum by the total number of reported activities, we obtained an individual score, measuring the concentration of daily activities in the perceived neighborhood. The respondents were then ranked on the basis of this score (variable called "final score"). It ranged from 0 (for individuals who reported doing all the activities of interest mainly outside their neighborhood of residence) to 1 (for people who reported doing all the activities of interest, mainly within their neighborhood of residence), and can be considered a proxy of personal exposure to the residential neighborhood [23].

**Appendix C Theoretical Framework of the Cross-Classified Multilevel Model**

Theoretically, in a cross-classified multilevel model, an individual (*i*) simultaneously belongs to three non-nested contexts, here the residential neighborhood (*j*), the workplace neighborhood (*h*) and another frequented neighborhood (*k*). Thus, since our outcome (*Y*) is a binary variable, the probability of depression for an individual *i* living in a residential neighborhood *j* and travelling to a workplace neighborhood *h* and another frequented neighborhood *k* is modeled in null or intercept-only (i.e., a model without covariates) regression as follows:

$$\text{Logit}(\Pi_{i(jhk)}) = \beta_0 + \mu_{0j} + \mu_{0h} + \mu_{0k} + \varepsilon_{0(jhk)}$$

where:

- the fixed effect parameter,  $\beta_0$ , refers to the overall probability mean of the outcome *Y* across all residential, workplace and frequented neighborhoods,
- $\mu_{0j}$  refers to the random effect for residential neighborhoods,  $\mu_{0h}$  for workplace neighborhoods and  $\mu_{0k}$  for other frequented neighborhoods, and  $\varepsilon_{0(jhk)}$  to the random effect for the individual with the combination of *j* residential neighborhood, *h* workplace neighborhood and *k* other frequented neighborhood.

Therefore, in this model, we compared the relative variance contribution of residential neighborhood, workplace neighborhood, frequented neighborhood, by comparing variance contributions (i.e., random effects) across models. The null model describe in the equation above can

be extended to include covariates (i.e., fixed effects) at each level of analysis; it corresponds to the previously defined model M2.

## Appendix D Individual Social Support and Difficult Events

**Table A1.** Univariate analysis of the association between individual characteristics, individual perception of neighborhood, and the cumulative exposure score and depression, SIRS, 2010.

|   | N    | Percentage | Depression | OR 95% [CI]      | p-Value |
|---|------|------------|------------|------------------|---------|
| Gender                                      |      |            |            |                  | 0.001   |
| Man   | 1187 | 46.9       | 10.5       | Ref.             |         |
| Woman                                       | 1819 | 53.1       | 16.7       | 1.71 [1.24–2.34] |         |
| Age   |      |            |            |                  | 0.398   |
| 18–29 years                                 | 208  | 14.3       | 12.5       | Ref.             |         |
| 30–44 years                                 | 796  | 30.5       | 12.4       | 0.99 [0.62–1.58] |         |
| 45–59 years                                 | 857  | 26.6       | 15.2       | 1.26 [0.82–1.94] |         |
| 60 and over                                 | 1145 | 28.6       | 14.5       | 1.19 [0.77–1.82] |         |
| Nationality                                 |      |            |            |                  | 0.370   |
| French                                      | 2002 | 66.6       | 13.2       | Ref.             |         |
| Mixed                                       | 610  | 20.8       | 16.1       | 1.26 [0.91–1.74] |         |
| Foreigner                                   | 394  | 12.6       | 12.9       | 0.97 [0.66–1.42] |         |
| Monthly household income (€/CU)             |      |            |            |                  | 0.001   |
| <1116                                       | 855  | 25.0       | 19.9       | 2.35 [1.68–3.29] |         |
| 1116–1733                                   | 764  | 24.8       | 14.1       | 1.56 [1.17–2.09] |         |
| 1734–2605                                   | 714  | 25.3       | 11.6       | 1.24 [0.86–1.80] |         |
| ≥2606                                       | 673  | 25.0       | 9.5        | Ref.             |         |
| Employment status                           |      |            |            |                  | 0.001   |
| Active                                      | 1596 | 56.7       | 10.9       | Ref.             |         |
| Student                                     | 111  | 7.7        | 9.4        | 0.85 [0.40–1.78] |         |
| Unemployed                                  | 212  | 7.6        | 29.1       | 3.35 [2.06–5.45] |         |
| Retired                                     | 796  | 19.8       | 15.4       | 1.48 [1.14–1.93] |         |
| Inactive                                    | 265  | 7.3        | 19.2       | 1.94 [1.23–3.08] |         |
| Social support                              |      |            |            |                  |         |
| Relationship status                         |      |            |            |                  | 0.001   |
| Living with partner                         | 1766 | 64.3       | 10.9       | Ref.             |         |
| Not living with partner                     | 1240 | 35.7       | 18.9       | 1.91 [1.48–2.47] |         |
| Perceived social isolation                  |      |            |            |                  | 0.001   |
| Isolated                                    | 2469 | 86.5       | 10.0       | Ref.             |         |
| Not isolated                                | 525  | 13.2       | 38.4       | 5.58 [4.38–7.12] |         |
| Difficult life events                       |      |            |            |                  |         |
| Handicapped or disabled                     |      |            |            |                  | 0.001   |
| No  | 2648 | 91.0       | 11.3       | Ref.             |         |
| Yes   | 358  | 9.0        | 38.8       | 4.98 [3.76–6.59] |         |
| Friend/family member with a serious disease |      |            |            |                  | 0.001   |
| No  | 1524 | 49.7       | 11.9       | Ref.             |         |
| Yes   | 1413 | 47.3       | 16.3       | 1.45 [1.16–1.8]  |         |
| Serious familial disputes before age 18     |      |            |            |                  | 0.001   |
| No  | 2405 | 81.4       | 12.6       | Ref.             |         |
| Yes   | 601  | 18.6       | 19.0       | 1.63 [1.29–2.06] |         |
| Attempted suicide before age 18             |      |            |            |                  | 0.001   |
| No  | 2881 | 96.5       | 12.4       | Ref.             |         |
| Yes   | 125  | 3.5        | 50.2       | 5.23 [2.82–9.72] |         |
| Sexual abuse during childhood               |      |            |            |                  | 0.002   |
| No  | 2884 | 96.9       | 27.8       | 2.51 [1.38–4.55] |         |
| Yes   | 122  | 3.1        | 13.3       | Ref.             |         |

Table A1. Cont.

|                                       | N    | Percentage | Depression | OR 95% [CI]      | <i>p</i> -Value |
|---------------------------------------|------|------------|------------|------------------|-----------------|
| <b>Had been in prison</b>             |      |            |            |                  | <b>0.135</b>    |
| No                                    | 2935 | 97.9       | 12.4       | Ref.             |                 |
| Yes                                   | 71   | 2.1        | 50.2       | 2.09 [0.79–5.49] |                 |
| <b>Individual perception measures</b> |      |            |            |                  |                 |
| <b>Activity space</b>                 |      |            |            |                  | <b>0.996</b>    |
| Large                                 | 2439 | 81.2       | 13.8       | 1.00 [0.71–1.42] |                 |
| Not large                             | 567  | 18.8       | 13.8       | Ref.             |                 |
| <b>Bodyweight perception</b>          |      |            |            |                  | <b>0.001</b>    |
| Positive                              | 1510 | 49.8       | 10.9       | Ref.             |                 |
| Negative                              | 1496 | 50.2       | 16.7       | 1.64 [1.27–2.12] |                 |
| <b>Mutual aid between inhabitants</b> |      |            |            |                  | <b>0.147</b>    |
| Yes                                   | 1523 | 50.9       | 12.9       | Ref.             |                 |
| No                                    | 1483 | 49.1       | 14.7       | 1.71 [0.95–1.44] |                 |
| <b>Feeling unsafe</b>                 |      |            |            |                  | <b>0.001</b>    |
| No                                    | 2361 | 82.3       | 11.9       | Ref.             |                 |
| Yes                                   | 645  | 17.7       | 22.6       | 2.16 [1.52–3.08] |                 |
| <b>Contact with neighbors</b>         |      |            |            |                  | <b>0.001</b>    |
| Frequent                              | 2606 | 86.6       | 13.4       | Ref.             |                 |
| Rare                                  | 400  | 13.4       | 13.8       | 1.62 [1.31–2.00] |                 |
| <b>Commercial density</b>             |      |            |            |                  | <b>0.002</b>    |
| Insufficient                          | 745  | 19.4       | 18.2       | 1.52 [1.17–1.98] |                 |
| Sufficient                            | 2261 | 80.6       | 12.7       | Ref.             |                 |
| <b>Cumulative exposure score</b>      |      |            |            |                  | <b>0.001</b>    |
| Wealthy neighborhoods only            | 539  | 12.1       | 7.7        | Ref.             |                 |
| All types of neighborhoods            | 2213 | 78.8       | 13.6       | 1.88 [1.19–2.98] |                 |
| Poor neighborhoods only               | 254  | 9.1        | 19.4       | 2.87 [1.77–4.64] |                 |

OR: Odds Ratio, CI: Confidence Interval, Ref.: reference group. In bold, these are statistically significant results at the threshold of a *p*-value of less than 0.05.

## References

1. WHO Depression. Available online: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/depression> (accessed on 12 December 2019).
2. Kessler, R.C.; Aguilar-Gaxiola, S.; Alonso, J.; Chatterji, S.; Lee, S.; Üstün, T.B. The WHO World Mental Health (WMH) Surveys. *Psychiatrie* **2009**, *6*, 5.
3. Kessler, R.C.; Bromet, E.J. The epidemiology of depression across cultures. *Annu. Rev. Public Health* **2013**, *34*, 119–138. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
4. Ritchie, K.; Artero, S.; Beluche, I.; Ancelin, M.-L.; Mann, A.; Dupuy, A.-M.; Malafosse, A.; Boulenger, J.-P. Prevalence of DSM-IV psychiatric disorder in the French elderly population. *Br. J. Psychiatry* **2004**, *184*, 147–152. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
5. Léon, C.; Chan, C.C.; Du Roscoät, E. La dépression en France chez les 18–75 ans: Résultats du Baromètre santé 2017. *Bull. Épidémiol. Hebd.* **2018**, *32–33*, 637–644.
6. Smit, F.; Shilds, L.; Petrea, I. *Preventing Depression in the WHO European Region*. (2016); World Health Organization European Region: Copenhagen, Denmark, 2017; p. 15.
7. Whiteford, H.A.; Ferrari, A.J.; Degenhardt, L.; Feigin, V.; Vos, T. The global burden of mental, neurological and substance use disorders: An analysis from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *PLoS ONE* **2015**, *10*, e0116820. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
8. Moore, T.H.M.; Kesten, J.M.; López-López, J.A.; Ijaz, S.; McAleenan, A.; Richards, A.; Gray, S.; Savović, J.; Audrey, S. The effects of changes to the built environment on the mental health and well-being of adults: Systematic review. *Health Place* **2018**, *53*, 237–257. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]



9. Zuelke, A.E.; Luck, T.; Schroeter, M.L.; Witte, A.V.; Hinz, A.; Engel, C.; Enzenbach, C.; Zachariae, S.; Loeffler, M.; Thiery, J.; et al. The association between unemployment and depression—Results from the population-based LIFE-adult-study. *J. Affect. Disord.* **2018**, *235*, 399–406. [CrossRef]
10. Wahl, H.-W.; Iwarsson, S.; Oswald, F. Aging well and the environment: Toward an integrative model and research agenda for the future. *Gerontologist* **2012**, *52*, 306–316. [CrossRef]
11. Augustin, T.; Glass, T.A.; James, B.D.; Schwartz, B.S. Neighborhood psychosocial hazards and cardiovascular disease: The Baltimore Memory Study. *Am. J. Public Health* **2008**, *98*, 1664–1670. [CrossRef]
12. Söderström, O.; Abrahamyan Empson, L.; Codeluppi, Z.; Söderström, D.; Baumann, P.S.; Conus, P. Unpacking “the City”: An experience-based approach to the role of urban living in psychosis. *Health Place* **2016**, *42*, 104–110. [CrossRef]
13. Fu, Q. Communal space and depression: A structural-equation analysis of relational and psycho-spatial pathways. *Health Place* **2018**, *53*, 1–9. [CrossRef]
14. Tucker, I.; Smith, L.-A. Topology and mental distress: Self-care in the life spaces of home. *J. Health Psychol.* **2014**, *19*, 176–183. [CrossRef]
15. Leroux, I.; Morin, T. Facteurs de risque des épisodes dépressifs en population générale—Ministère des Solidarités et de la Santé. Available online: <https://drees.solidarites-sante.gouv.fr/etudes-et-statistiques/publications/etudes-et-resultats/article/facteurs-de-risque-des-episodes-depressifs-en-population-generale> (accessed on 12 December 2019).
16. National Institute of mental health NIMH Depression. Available online: <https://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/topics/depression/index.shtml> (accessed on 12 December 2019).
17. Lorant, V.; Delière, D.; Eaton, W.; Robert, A.; Philippot, P.; Ansseau, M. Socioeconomic inequalities in depression: A meta-analysis. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* **2003**, *157*, 98–112. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
18. Crimmins, E.M.; Kim, J.K.; Solé-Auró, A. Gender differences in health: Results from SHARE, ELSA and HRS. *Eur. J. Public health* **2011**, *21*, 81–91. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
19. Van de Velde, S.; Bracke, P.; Levecque, K. Gender differences in depression in 23 European countries. Cross-national variation in the gender gap in depression. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **2010**, *71*, 305–313. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
20. Wang, K.; Lu, H.; Cheung, E.F.C.; Neumann, D.L.; Shum, D.H.K.; Chan, R.C.K. “Female Preponderance” of Depression in Non-clinical Populations: A Meta-Analytic Study. *Front. Psychol.* **2016**, *7*, 1398. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
21. Lewicka, M. Place attachment: How far have we come in the last 40 years? *J. Environ. Psychol.* **2011**, *31*, 207–230. [CrossRef]
22. Melchior, M.; Berkman, L.; Niedhammer, I.; Zins, M.; Goldberg, M. The mental health effects of multiple work and family demands: A prospective study of psychiatric sickness absence in the French GAZEL study. *Soc. Psychiatry Psychiatr. Epidemiol.* **2007**, *42*, 573–582. [CrossRef]
23. Vallée, J.; Cadot, E.; Roustit, C.; Parizot, I.; Chauvin, P. The role of daily mobility in mental health inequalities: The interactive influence of activity space and neighbourhood of residence on depression. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **2011**, *73*, 1133–1144. [CrossRef]
24. Roustit, C.; Cadot, E.; Renahy, E.; Chauvin, P. Effects of living in a poor neighborhood on depression: A multilevel analysis of the SIRS cohort data, the Paris metropolitan area, France. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* **2008**, *167*, S36.
25. Herjean, P. L’approche multiniveau de la santé. *Cah. Géogr. Qué.* **2006**, *50*, 347–355. [CrossRef]
26. Elliott, M. The stress process in neighborhood context. *Health Place* **2000**, *6*, 287–299. [CrossRef]
27. Cutrona, C.E.; Wallace, G.; Wesner, K.A. Neighborhood Characteristics and Depression: An Examination of Stress Processes. *Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci.* **2006**, *15*, 188–192. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
28. Whitehead, M.; Pennington, A.; Orton, L.; Nayak, S.; Petticrew, M.; Sowden, A.; White, M. How could differences in “control over destiny” lead to socio-economic inequalities in health? A synthesis of theories and pathways in the living environment. *Health Place* **2016**, *39*, 51–61. [CrossRef]
29. Choi, Y.J.; Matz-Costa, C. Perceived Neighborhood Safety, Social Cohesion, and Psychological Health of Older Adults. *Gerontologist* **2018**, *58*, 196–206. [CrossRef]
30. Ruijsbroek, A.; Droomers, M.; Hardyns, W.; Groenewegen, P.P.; Stronks, K. The interplay between neighbourhood characteristics: The health impact of changes in social cohesion, disorder and unsafety feelings. *Health Place* **2016**, *39*, 1–8. [CrossRef]

31. Egan, M.; Kearns, A.; Mason, P.; Tannahill, C.; Bond, L.; Coyle, J.; Beck, S.; Crawford, F.; Hanlon, P.; Lawson, L.; et al. Protocol for a mixed methods study investigating the impact of investment in housing, regeneration and neighbourhood renewal on the health and wellbeing of residents: The GoWell programme. *BMC Med. Res. Methodol.* **2010**, *10*, 41. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
32. Purtle, J.; Nelson, K.L.; Yang, Y.; Langellier, B.; Stankov, I.; Diez Roux, A.V. Urban-Rural Differences in Older Adult Depression: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Comparative Studies. *Am. J. Prev. Med.* **2019**, *56*, 603–613. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
33. Kim, D. Blues from the neighborhood? Neighborhood characteristics and depression. *Epidemiol. Rev.* **2008**, *30*, 101–117. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
34. Robin, M. Perception de l'espace résidentiel et urbain chez des femmes ayant un premier enfant. In *Femmes et villes*; Denèfle, S., Ed.; Perspectives Villes et Territoires; Presses Universitaires François-Rabelais: Tours, France, 2004; pp. 65–75, ISBN 978-2-86906-324-2.
35. Walthery, P.; Stafford, M.; Nazroo, J.; Whitehead, M.; Dibben, C.; Halliday, E.; Povall, S.; Popay, J. Health trajectories in regeneration areas in England: The impact of the New Deal for Communities intervention. *J. Epidemiol. Community Health* **2015**, *69*, 762–768. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
36. Won, J.; Lee, C.; Forjuoh, S.N.; Ory, M.G. Neighborhood safety factors associated with older adults' health-related outcomes: A systematic literature review. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **2016**, *165*, 177–186. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
37. Paczkowski, M.M.; Galea, S. Sociodemographic characteristics of the neighborhood and depressive symptoms. *Curr. Opin. Psychiatry* **2010**, *23*, 337–341. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
38. Gong, Y.; Palmer, S.; Gallacher, J.; Marsden, T.; Fone, D. A systematic review of the relationship between objective measurements of the urban environment and psychological distress. *Environ. Int.* **2016**, *96*, 48–57. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
39. Matthews, S.A.; Yang, T.-C. Spatial Polygamy and Contextual Exposures (SPACES): Promoting Activity Space Approaches in Research on Place and Health. *Am. Behav. Sci.* **2013**, *57*, 1057–1081. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
40. Vallée, J. Urban isolation and daytime neighborhood social composition from Twitter data. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **2018**, *115*, E11886. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
41. Vallée, J. The daycourse of place. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **2017**, *194*, 177–181. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
42. King, K.; Ogle, C. Negative Life Events Vary by Neighborhood and Mediate the Relation between Neighborhood Context and Psychological Well-Being. *PLoS ONE* **2014**, *9*, 935–939. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
43. Vallée, J. L'influence croisée des espaces de résidence et de mobilité sur la santé. L'exemple des recours aux soins de prévention et de la dépression dans l'agglomération parisienne. *Bull. Assoc. Géogr. Fr.* **2012**, *89*, 269–275. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
44. Préteceille, E. *La division sociale de l'espace francilien. Typologie socioprofessionnelle et transformations de l'espace résidentiel 1990–99*; Observatoire sociologique du changement: Paris, France, 2003.
45. Chauvin, P.; Parizot, I. Les inégalités sociales et territoriales de santé dans l'agglomération parisienne: Une analyse de la cohorte SIRS Paris. In *Les Documents de l'ONZUS*; Délégation interministérielle à la ville: Pessac, France, 2009; p. 106.
46. Renahy, E.; Parizot, I. Chauvin La recherche d'informations sur la santé sur Internet: Une double fracture? Résultats d'une enquête représentative dans l'agglomération parisienne, France, 2005–2006. *BMC Public Health* **2008**, *8*, 69.
47. Sheehan, D.V.; Lecrubier, Y.; Sheehan, K.H.; Amorim, P.; Janavs, J.; Weiller, E.; Hergueta, T.; Baker, R.; Dunbar, G.C. The Mini-International Neuropsychiatric Interview (M.I.N.I.): The development and validation of a structured diagnostic psychiatric interview for DSM-IV and ICD-10. *J. Clin. Psychiatry* **1998**, *59* (Suppl. 20), 22–33.
48. INSEE. *Guide de Sémiologie Cartographique*; Institut National de la Statistique et des Études Économiques, Direction de la Diffusion et de l'Action régionale: Paris, France, 2018; p. 30.
49. Weden, M.M.; Carpiano, R.M.; Robert, S.A. Subjective and objective neighborhood characteristics and adult health. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **2008**, *66*, 1256–1270. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
50. Wen, M.; Hawkey, L.C.; Cacioppo, J.T. Objective and perceived neighborhood environment, individual SES and psychosocial factors, and self-rated health: An analysis of older adults in Cook County, Illinois. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **2006**, *63*, 2575–2590. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)

51. Lantz, P.; House, J.; Mero, R.; Williams, D. Stress, Life Events, and Socioeconomic Disparities in Health: Results from the Americans 'Changing Lives Study. *J. Health Soc. Behave.* **2005**, *46*, 274–288. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
52. Walton, E. The meaning of community in diverse neighborhoods: Stratification of influence and mental health. *Health Place* **2018**, *50*, 6–15. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
53. Diez Roux, A.V.; Mair, C. Neighborhoods and health. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* **2010**, *1186*, 125–145. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
54. Wood, L.; Hooper, P.; Foster, S.; Bull, F. Public green spaces and positive mental health—investigating the relationship between access, quantity and types of parks and mental wellbeing. *Health Place* **2017**, *48*, 63–71. [[CrossRef](#)]
55. James, P.; Hart, J.E.; Arcaya, M.C.; Feskanich, D.; Laden, F.; Subramanian, S.V. Neighborhood Self-Selection: The Role of Pre-Move Health Factors on the Built and Socioeconomic Environment. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2015**, *12*, 12489–12504. [[CrossRef](#)]
56. Warnet, S.; Ouharzoune, Y.; Clément, R. Entretien avec Claude Évin, directeur de l'Agence régionale de santé d'Île-de-France. *Rév. Infirm.* **2011**, *60*, 4–6.
57. Vallée, J.; Chauvin, P. Investigating the effects of medical density on health-seeking behaviours using a multiscale approach to residential and activity spaces: Results from a prospective cohort study in the Paris metropolitan area, France. *Int. J. Health Geogr.* **2012**, *11*, 54. [[CrossRef](#)]
58. Graif, C.; Arcaya, M.C.; Diez Roux, A.V. Moving to opportunity and mental health: Exploring the spatial context of neighborhood effects. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **2016**, *162*, 50–58. [[CrossRef](#)]
59. Chaix, B.; Merlo, J.; Evans, D.; Leal, C.; Havard, S. Neighbourhoods in eco-epidemiologic research: Delimiting personal exposure areas. A response to Riva, Gauvin, Apparicio and Brodeur. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **2009**, *69*, 1306–1310. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
60. Scott, S.B.; Munoz, E.; Mogle, J.A.; Gamaldo, A.A.; Smyth, J.M.; Almeida, D.M.; Sliwinski, M.J. Perceived neighborhood characteristics predict severity and emotional response to daily stressors. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **2018**, *200*, 262–270. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
61. Ramadier, T. Mobilité quotidienne et attachement au quartier: Une question de position? In *Le Quartier: Enjeux Scientifiques, Actions Politiques et Pratiques Sociales*; La Découverte: Paris, France, 2007; pp. 127–138, ISBN 978-2-7071-5071-4.



© 2020 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).