#### Do Children's New Mental Health Conditions Spillover onto Parents and Siblings?

Michael Cassidy, Princeton University Emily Cuddy, Duke University Janet Currie, Princeton University



### Motivation

- U.S. children are experiencing a mental health crisis.
  - 7.5% of children aged 3-17 have experienced anxiety or depression (CDC, 2022).
    - ~30% increase 2016-2020 (Lebrun-Harris et. al., 2022).
  - 42% of high schoolers had persistent feelings of sadness of hopelessness in 2021, up from 28% in 2011 (CDC, 2023). 57% of females; 69% of LGBTQ+.
  - 22% of high schoolers seriously considered suicide (CDC, 2023).
  - Oct 2021: AAP, AACAP, CHA declare National State of Emergency in Children's Mental Health.
- Many MH disorders first manifest during childhood/adolescence and can have lifelong consequences.
- Treatment is consequential and can be inertial.
- Early, accurate diagnoses can improve wellbeing and save money.

### This Paper

#### Are there mental health spillovers among siblings during childhood?

In particular, does a new diagnosis of anxiety, depression, or adjustment disorders with features of anxiety or depression (DAA) for one child effect the diagnosis and treatment of their siblings?

- Focus on anxiety/depression/adjustment because at core of current crisis.
- Focus initial episodes for exogeneity + agenda setting.
- Focus on siblings because understudied and potentially important channel.
- Not a priori clear:
  - What mechanisms are involved.
  - Whether spillovers are harmful or helpful.

### Some Hypotheses

#### Why sibling spillovers?

- Spillovers are directly causal (Eisenberg et. al., 2014; Breining, 2014; Aizer, 2008).
- Common shock: e.g., household stress.
- Revelation of shared genetics/environment (Pettersson et. al., 2016; Golberstein et. al., 2019; Bubonya et al, 2017).
- Confirmation bias: typecasting families (Persson et. al., 2021). (not mutually exclusive)

#### Consequently, implications can be good or bad (or a mix).

- Individual or aggregate shocks are distressing.
- Early detection.
- Misdiagnosis + wasteful/harmful treatment.

#### **Other Themes from the Family Spillovers Literature**

- Consistent positive correlations in intrafamily mental health
  - Spillovers between adults: Fletcher, 2009; Fletcher and Marksteiner, 2017; Wittenberg et. al., 2013; Mervin and Frijters, 2014; Marcus, 2013
  - Spillovers from parents to children: Brown et. al., 2019; Ahammer and Packham, 2020; Schepman et. al, 2011; Dahlen, 2016
  - Spillovers from children to parents: Daysal et. al., 2022; Wittenberg et. al., 2013
- Sibs of children with MH conditions more likely to also be diagnosed
  - Ma et. al., 2015, Barnett and Hunter, 2011
- Gaps
  - Little focus on sibling spillovers.
  - Little focus on causality in medical and psychology literatures.

### Main Results

#### • Notable sibling effects on mental health diagnosis, treatment, and spending.

- $\sim 25\%$  increases in MH diagnosis and treatment in first 6 months, concentrated on DAA.
- Equally large reversal within first year.
- Consistent with early detection hypothesis.
- Clinical response favors therapy over drugs.
- May suggest mental health benefits from spillovers.

#### • No evidence of effects on acute or chronic physical health or overall health spending.

- Also consistent with early detection.
- Avoidance of adverse consequences bolsters the case for salubrious spillovers.

#### Contributions

- First evidence in economics about sibling depression/anxiety/adjustment spillovers.
- Policy relevance: early detection valuable; families can be a revelation mechanism.
- Extension of stacking solution to TWFE DID problems to setting where outcomes are conditional on treatment.

### **BCBS** Data

Data are from Blue Cross Blue Shield Alliance for Health Research (BCBS) Axis database, the largest source of commercial insurance claims data in the U.S.

- Full professional, facility, and pharmacy claims by all members.
- Pros: large; decade-long; national; administrative; info on diagnoses + treatment..
- Cons: health ≠health claims; limited demographics/socioeconomics.
- Overall: 118.8m people; 69.1m kids; 4.9m kids w/ DAA.

### Sample

All families with a child with an observed first DAA diagnosis, 2012-2022.

How we get there:

- All children <18, observed before age 10, with +/-months coverage around first DAA.
- Additional restrictions: never pharmacy carve out; consistent demographics; technical stuff.
- Link family members by subscriber.
- Take 10% random sample of index children
- Result: 30.6k families; 119.4k people; 71.3k kids; 37.8k kids w/ DAA.
  - For reference, full BCBS data includes ~10.9m families w/o DAA and ~2.7m families w/ DAA.

Rationale

- Want to make sure we're not missing anything (that we can control).
- Want to capture first diagnosis.

### **Context: First DAA Diagnoses**

- $\sim$  500k BCBS children observed for 10 years.
- 15% of children observed from age 0 will receive a DAA diagnosis by age 10 (left).
- 35% of children observed from age 8 will receive a DAA diagnosis by age 18 (right).
- Suggests  $\sim$ 45% of children receive a DAA diagnosis.



## **Empirical Design**

- Extension of stacked cohort solution for TWFE DID ((Fadlon and Nielsen, 2019; Deshpande and Li, 2019) to setting where outcome is conditional on treatment.
- Under parallel trends and no-anticipation assumptions, conventional dynamic (event study) differencein-differences estimated using two-way fixed effects consistently estimates the average treatment effect on the treated (ATT) IF treatment occurs at a single point in time or effects are homogenous across individuals.
- Problems when treatment is staggered in calendar time and treatment effects may be heterogenous.
- Carefully choosing comparison cohorts and stacking them (into a new panel), avoids forbidden comparisons under the assumption that among similar individuals, the timing of treatment is as good as random within small windows.
- BUT when outcome of interest is conditional on treatment, comparison to units treated slightly later will create mechanical zeros.

### The Stacking Process

1) Choose symmetric analysis bandwidth around treatment month (12 months).

#### 2) For each month *C* in data:

- 1) Assign **treatment** to any child (a) whose first-DAA-diagnosed sibling is first diagnosed month *C*, and (b) who has never yet been DAA diagnosed themselves.
- 2) Assign **control** to any child who (a) has *any* sibling first DAA diagnosed at month C+BW, and (b) has never yet been DAA diagnosed themselves.

Note: Conventionally, the control group would be children whose first-DAA-diagnosed sibling is first diagnosed month C+BW, but this would mean the child of interest has no chance of being diagnosed within BW.

- 3) Then month C forms a cohort where
  - a) Month C is the true treatment month for the treatment group
  - b) Month C = true treatment month bandwidth for the control group.

#### 3) Stack the cohorts together into a reformulated panel.

- 1) Individuals can appear more than once, as both treatment and control.
- 2) To guard against reverse causality, we exclude all families with two children diagnosed in the same month.
- 3) 99 cohorts (1/2013-3/2021); 41.3k cohort-siblings; 1.03m observations.

#### Intuition



Variable	Control	Treatment -	Difference	
			Coef	SE
Female	0.481	0.482	0.001	0.005
Age	8.68	8.75	0.07	0.06
Index Child Age	9.73	10.11	0.38**	0.08
Index Child Female	0.53	0.507	-0.023**	0.007
Index Child Younger	0.365	0.327	-0.038**	0.006
Index Child Same Sex	0.501	0.5	-0.001	0.005
Sibling Count	2.79	2.76	-0.03*	0.01
Family Size	4.47	4.44	-0.04*	0.02
Any Mental Health Diagnosis $(0/1)$	0.039	0.04	0.001	0.002
Any Non-MH Diagnosis $(0/1)$	0.298	0.293	-0.005	0.005
Dep/Anx/Adj Diagnosis (0/1)	0	0	0	0
ADHD (0/1)	0.014	0.016	0.002	0.001
MH Evaluation $(0/1)$	0.012	0.013	0.001	0.001
Therapy $(0/1)$	0.01	0.012	0.001	0.001
Log (Total Allowed Amt)	1.682	1.663	-0.019	0.03
Log (Non-MH Allowed Amount)	1.549	1.517	-0.032	0.028
Log (MH Allowed Amt)	0.211	0.215	0.004	0.011
Allowed Amt>0	0.319	0.317	-0.002	0.006
Non-MH Allowed Amt>0	0.298	0.293	-0.005	0.005
MH Allowed Amt>0	0.038	0.039	0.001	0.002
Hospitalization $(0/1)$	0	0.001	0	0
ER Visit $(0/1)$	0.009	0.008	-0.001	0.001
Asthma $(0/1)$	0.012	0.011	-0.001	0.001
Injury Diagnosis (0/1)	0.029	0.029	0	0.002
Wellness Visit (0/1)	0.068	0.064	-0.004	0.003
Any Mental Health Drugs $(0/1)$	0.036	0.037	0.001	0.002
Total Individuals	18,947	22,318		
Total Families	13.549	16.046		

#### Sample Means, Period M=-1

### **Estimating Equation**

For child *i* of cohort *c* in calendar month *t*,

$$Y_{ict} = \alpha_i + \psi_c + \delta T_{ic} + \sum_{\substack{m \neq -1; \\ m = -12}}^{12} \gamma_m \mathbb{1}[M_{ct} = m] + \sum_{\substack{m \neq -1; \\ m = -12}}^{12} \tau_m \mathbb{1}[M_{ct} = m] \times T_{ic} + \beta \mathbf{X}_{ict} + \varepsilon_{ict}$$

where cohort indexes treatment date and:

- $Y_{ict}$  is an outcome
- $\alpha_i$  are an individual fixed effects
- $\psi_c$  are cohort fixed effects
- $T_{ic}$  is an indicator for being a member of the treatment group
- $M_{ct}$  are a series of indicators for months relative to treatment month, i.e.,  $M_{ct} = t c$
- **X**<sub>it</sub> is a vector of time/cohort-varying covariates (age, index child age, family size, number of siblings)
- Standard errors are clustered by cohort

# Results

# Mental Health Diagnoses







### How large are these effects?

Two helpful baselines:

#### • Control group means in months 0-11

- 1.6% chance of DAA diagnosis in given month
- Suggests effect size  $\approx 0.005/0.016 = +31\%$  in first 6 months
- $\approx -0.0075/0.016 = -47\%$  in months 10-11
- Full BCBS data diagnosis rates by age
  - Mean sibling in our sample is  $\sim$ 9 years old
  - In full data, Pr(DAA diagnosis for 9-yo by age 10 | no prior diagnosis)  $\approx 0.035$
  - Cumulative effect peak  $\approx 0.01$  at month 6-7
  - Suggests effect size of 0.01/0.035 = +29%



#### Sibling DiD Time Trends: Any Mental Health Diagnosis (0/1) Discrete Outcomes .09 -.08 .07 .06 .05 .04 -6 -12 12 0 6 Focal Month

• Control • Treatment

## Treatment









# Overall Health & Wellbeing

#### Sibling Any Non-MH Diagnosis (0/1) Diff-in-Diff Event Study Discrete Outcomes .04 .02 Outcome $\circ$ -.02 -.04 12 -12 -6 6 **Relative Month**





# Spending





### What's Next?

#### • Robustness

- Varied bandwidths
- Alternative outcomes
- More time-varying covariates (e.g., pre-period spending)
- Allow for cohort-specific treatment effect heterogeneity

#### • Heterogeneity & Mechanisms

- Severity: if spillovers directly causal, severity should matter
- Specific conditions: if spillovers revelatory, would expect similarity in diagnoses

#### • Parents

• Do children's mental health affect their parents?

### Robustness

#### Sibling Dep/Anx/Adj Diagnosis (0/1)

Diff-in-Diff Event Study Cumulative Outcomes



#### Sibling Any Mental Health Diagnosis (0/1) Diff-in-Diff Event Study Cumulative Outcomes



Sibling Dep/Anx/Adj Diagnosis (0/1)

#### Diff-in-Diff Event Study Discrete Outcomes





# Heterogeneity

Sibling Dep/Anx/Adj Diagnosis (0/1) by Female Placebo Diff-in-Diff Event Study, Discrete Outcomes



Sibling Dep/Anx/Adj Diagnosis (0/1) by Family Size



### **Effect Sizes**

- Using control groups means as baseline, we have first 6 months effects of:
  - DAA: 0.5 pp (+31%)
  - Any MH: 0.6 pp (+10.5%)
  - Therapy: 0.5 pp (+22%)
  - Log(MH spending): +4.1%
- And months 10-11 effects of
  - DAA: -0.75pp (-47%)
  - Any MH: -0.75pp (-13%)
  - Therapy: -0.6pp (-26%)
  - Log(MH spending): -5.1%
- Similar for other outcomes

### **Summary of Findings**

#### • Notable sibling effects on mental health diagnosis, treatment, and spending.

- Increased incidence of MH detection and services in first 6 months.
- Gradual fade out leading to full reversal within first year.
- Consistent with early detection hypothesis.
- Clinical response favors therapy over drugs.
- May suggest mental health benefits from spillovers.
- No evidence of effects on acute or chronic physical health or overall health spending.
  - Also consistent with early detection.
  - Avoidance of adverse consequences bolsters the case for salubrious spillovers.

### Policy Implications (so far)

- Your siblings affect your mental health.
  - Possibly in a net good way, even when things are going bad for them.
- Early detection may improve outcomes.
- Families can be a diagnostic device.

### As for the hypotheses,

- Spillovers are directly causal.
  - Largest effect on adjustment disorders.
  - Should look at severity; pre-treatment spending.
- Common shock: e.g., household stress.
  - By design, some temporal spacing between sib diagnoses.
- Revelation of shared genetics/environment.
  - Early detection theme.
  - Should look at diagnosis correspondence.
- Confirmation bias: typecasting families.
  - Little evidence so far.