TECHNICAL COMMENTARY

Worldwide prevalence

Introduction

Prevalence quantifies the proportion of individuals in a population who have a disease during a specific time period, while incidence refers to the number of new cases of disease that develop in a population during a specific time period. In disorders of short duration, incidence and prevalence rates may be similar, however with disorders of long duration such as with bipolar disorder there can be variation between the two. Point prevalence is the proportion of individuals who manifest a disorder at a given point in time, period measures the proportion of individuals who manifest a disorder during a specified period (e.g. 1 year), lifetime is the proportion of individuals in the population who have ever manifested a disorder who are alive on a given day, and lifetime morbid risk also includes those deceased at the time of the survey.

Method

We have included only systematic reviews (systematic literature search, detailed methodology with inclusion/exclusion criteria) published in full text, in English, from the year 2010 that report results separately for people with a diagnosis of bipolar or related disorders. Reviews were identified by searching the databases MEDLINE, and PsycINFO. Hand searching reference lists of identified reviews was also conducted. When multiple copies of review topics were found, only the most recent and/or comprehensive review was included. Reviews with pooled data were given priority for inclusion.

Review reporting assessment was guided by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) checklist that describes a preferred way to present a meta-analysis[1]. Reviews with less than 50% of items checked have been excluded from the library. The PRISMA flow diagram is a suggested way of providing information about studies included and excluded with reasons for exclusion. Where no flow diagram has been presented by individual reviews, but identified studies have been described in the text, reviews have been checked for this item. Note that early reviews may have been guided by less stringent reporting checklists than the PRISMA, and that some reviews may have been limited by journal guidelines.

Evidence was graded using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) Working Group approach where high quality evidence such as that gained from randomised controlled trials (RCTs) may be downgraded to moderate or low if review and study quality is limited, if there is inconsistency in results, indirect comparisons, imprecise or sparse data and high probability of reporting bias. It may also be downgraded if risks associated with the intervention or other matter under review are high. Conversely, low quality evidence such as that gained from observational studies may be upgraded if effect sizes are large, there is a dose dependent response or if results are reasonably consistent, precise and direct with low associated risks (see end of table for an explanation of these terms)[2]. The resulting table represents an objective summary of the available evidence, although the conclusions are solely the opinion of staff of NeuRA (Neuroscience Research Australia).

Results

We found one systematic review that met our inclusion criteria[3].

- Moderate to high quality evidence suggests the lifetime worldwide prevalence for bipolar disorder is around 1%, and the one-year prevalence is around 0.5%. Rates were higher for bipolar I disorder than for bipolar II disorder.

Moreira ALR, Van Meter A, Genzlinger J, Youngstrom EA

Review and meta-analysis of epidemiologic studies of adult bipolar disorder

Journal of Clinical Psychiatry 2017; 78: e1259-e69

View review abstract online

Comparison	**Worldwide prevalence of bipolar disorders.**
Summary of evidence	**Moderate to high quality evidence (large samples, inconsistent, mostly precise, direct) suggests the lifetime worldwide prevalence for bipolar disorder (any diagnosis) is around 1%, and the one-year prevalence is around 0.5%. Rates were higher for bipolar I disorder than for bipolar II disorder.**

Bipolar disorder

85 studies, 44 countries, N = 9,696,193

Lifetime prevalence

Bipolar spectrum disorders: 85 studies, 1.02%, 95%CI 0.81 to 1.29, I^2 = 99%

Bipolar I disorder: 45 studies, 0.62%, 95%CI 0.44 to 0.86, I^2 = 99%

Bipolar II disorder: 27 studies, 0.36%, 95%CI 0.23 to 0.55, I^2 = 98%

Bipolar I and II disorders: 41 studies, 0.87%, 95%CI 0.63 to 1.19, I^2 = 99%

Bipolar not otherwise specified: 22 studies, 0.96%, 95%CI 0.56 to 1.63, I^2 = 99%

One-year prevalence

Bipolar I disorder: 22 studies, 0.49%, 95%CI 0.32 to 0.78, I^2 = 98%

Bipolar II disorder: 13 studies, 0.14%, 95%CI 0.08 to 0.26, I^2 = 89%

Bipolar I and II disorders: 25 studies, 0.58%, 95%CI 0.32 to 1.04, I^2 = 99%

Bipolar not otherwise specified: 9 studies, 0.34%, 95%CI 0.17 to 0.71, I^2 = 96%

Rates from Africa and Asia were less than half of those from North and South America.

There was no moderating effect of year of publication after controlling for study design.

Consistency in results[‡]	Inconsistent
Precision in results[§]	Mostly precise
Directness of results[‖]	Direct

Worldwide prevalence

Explanation of acronyms

CI = confidence interval, I^2 = measure of heterogeneity across study results, N = number of participants, p = statistical probability of obtaining that result ($p < 0.05$ generally regarded as significant)

TECHNICAL COMMENTARY

Worldwide prevalence

Explanation of technical terms

* Bias has the potential to affect reviews of both RCT and observational studies. Forms of bias include; reporting bias – selective reporting of results, publication bias - trials that are not formally published tend to show less effect than published trials, further if there are statistically significant differences between groups in a trial, these trial results tend to get published before those of trials without significant differences; language bias – only including English language reports; funding bias - source of funding for the primary research with selective reporting of results within primary studies; outcome variable selection bias; database bias - including reports from some databases and not others; citation bias - preferential citation of authors. Trials can also be subject to bias when evaluators are not blind to treatment condition and selection bias of participants if trial samples are small[4].

---

† Different effect measures are reported by different reviews.

Prevalence refers to how many existing cases there are at a particular point in time. Incidence refers to how many new cases there are per population in a specified time period. Incidence is usually reported as the number of new cases per 100,000 people per year. Alternatively some studies present the number of new cases that have accumulated over several years against a person-years denominator. This denominator is the sum of individual units of time that the persons in the population are at risk of becoming a case. It takes into account the size of the underlying population sample and its age structure over the duration of observation.

Reliability and validity refers to how accurate the instrument is. Sensitivity is the proportion of actual positives that are correctly identified

(100% sensitivity = correct identification of all actual positives) and specificity is the proportion of negatives that are correctly identified (100% specificity = not identifying anyone as positive if they are truly not).

Weighted mean difference scores refer to mean differences between treatment and comparison groups after treatment (or occasionally pre to post treatment) and in a randomised trial there is an assumption that both groups are comparable on this measure prior to treatment. Standardized mean differences are divided by the pooled standard deviation (or the standard deviation of one group when groups are homogenous) that allows results from different scales to be combined and compared. Each study's mean difference is then given a weighting depending on the size of the sample and the variability in the data. 0.2 represents a small effect, 0.5 a medium effect, and 0.8 and over represents a large effect[4].

Odds ratio (OR) or relative risk (RR) refers to the probability of a reduction (< 1) or an increase (> 1) in a particular outcome in a treatment group, or a group exposed to a risk factor, relative to the comparison group. For example, a RR of 0.75 translates to a reduction in risk of an outcome of 25% relative to those not receiving the treatment or not exposed to the risk factor. Conversely, a RR of 1.25 translates to an increased risk of 25% relative to those not receiving treatment or not having been exposed to a risk factor. A RR or OR of 1.00 means there is no difference between groups. A medium effect is considered if RR > 2 or < 0.5 and a large effect if RR > 5 or < 0.2[5]. lnOR stands for logarithmic OR where a lnOR of 0 shows no difference between groups. Hazard ratios measure the effect of an explanatory variable on the hazard or risk of an event.

Correlation coefficients (eg, r) indicate the strength of association or relationship between variables. They are an indication of

prediction, but do not confirm causality due to possible and often unforseen confounding variables. An r of 0.10 represents a weak association, 0.25 a medium association and 0.40 and over represents a strong association. Unstandardised (b) regression coefficients indicate the average change in the dependent variable associated with a 1 unit change in the independent variable, statistically controlling for the other independent variables. Standardised regression coefficients represent the change being in units of standard deviations to allow comparison across different scales.

---

‡ Inconsistency refers to differing estimates of treatment effect across studies (i.e. heterogeneity or variability in results) that is not explained by subgroup analyses and therefore reduces confidence in the effect estimate. I² is the percentage of the variability in effect estimates that is due to heterogeneity rather than sampling error (chance) - 0% to 40%: heterogeneity might not be important, 30% to 60%: may represent moderate heterogeneity, 50% to 90%: may represent substantial heterogeneity and over is considerable heterogeneity. I² can be calculated from Q (chi-square) for the test of heterogeneity with the following formula;

$$I^2 = \left(\frac{Q - df}{Q}\right) \times 100\%$$

---

§ Imprecision refers to wide confidence intervals indicating a lack of confidence in the effect estimate. Based on GRADE recommendations, a result for continuous data (standardised mean differences, not weighted mean differences) is considered imprecise if the upper or lower confidence limit crosses an effect size of 0.5 in either direction, and for binary and correlation data, an effect size of 0.25. GRADE also

recommends downgrading the evidence when sample size is smaller than 300 (for binary data) and 400 (for continuous data), although for some topics, this criteria should be relaxed[6].

‖ Indirectness of comparison occurs when a comparison of intervention A versus B is not available but A was compared with C and B was compared with C that allows indirect comparisons of the magnitude of effect of A versus B. Indirectness of population, comparator and or outcome can also occur when the available evidence regarding a particular population, intervention, comparator, or outcome is not available so is inferred from available evidence. These inferred treatment effect sizes are of lower quality than those gained from head-to-head comparisons of A and B.

NeuRA | Worldwide prevalence

October 2021

Margarete Ainsworth Building, Barker Street, Randwick NSW 2031. Phone: 02 9399 1000. Email: info@neura.edu.au
To donate, phone 1800 888 019 or visit www.neura.edu.au

Page 5

References

1. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, PRISMAGroup (2009): Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *British Medical Journal* 151: 264-9.
2. GRADEWorkingGroup (2004): Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *British Medical Journal* 328: 1490.
3. Moreira ALR, Van Meter A, Genzlinger J, Youngstrom EA (2017): Review and meta-analysis of epidemiologic studies of adult bipolar disorder. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry* 78: e1259-e69.
4. CochraneCollaboration (2008): Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. Accessed 24/06/2011.
5. Rosenthal JA (1996): Qualitative Descriptors of Strength of Association and Effect Size. *Journal of Social Service Research* 21: 37-59.
6. GRADEpro (2008): [Computer program]. Jan Brozek, Andrew Oxman, Holger Schünemann. *Version 32 for Windows*.