

Use of services and associated costs for young adults with childhood hyperactivity/conduct problems: 20-year follow-up

Francesco D'Amico, Martin Knapp, Jennifer Beecham, Seija Sandberg, Eric Taylor, Kapil Sayal

London School of Economics and Political Science & University of Nottingham

#### **Background**

- Children who have received a clinical diagnosis of ADHD are likely to use more services and incur greater public costs than children without ADHD (findings from USA)
- With regards to UK, a study has quantified that child psychiatric disorders totalled £1.47bn in 2008 (Snell et al., 2013).
- Supplementary evidence suggests that the economic impact of ADHD is about three times greater in relation to affected adults than children and adolescents.

#### **Background**

- The size of costs in the adulthood for problems related to ADHD is critical, as avoiding that the disease persist after infancy would potentially save considerable resources.
- Furthermore, ADHD is a risk factor for the development of additional problems including:
  - □ other psychiatric disorders
  - ☐ substance misuse
  - educational underachievement
  - difficulties with employment and/or with relationship
  - criminal activities

### Aims of the study

- In relation to young adults who had hyperactivity and/or conduct problems during childhood, the aim of the study is:
  - ☐ To describe the use of services and calculate recent (past 6 months) and early adulthood (since the age of 18 years) public expenditure costs incurred by.
  - ☐ To investigate clinical and socioeconomic predictors of early adulthood costs of illness as well as employment outcomes.

#### Baseline data (original study)

- The sample used in this study is the second follow-up of a cohort of 3,215 six to seven years old boys resident in Newham (London), attending mainstream schools.
- The baseline study took place in 1981-1983.
- Hyperactivity and conduct disorders in the boys was assessed using parent-rated Rutter A(2) and teacher-rated B(2) scores.
- The threshold scores represented severity of the behavioural problems rather than the exact diagnostic criteria. Boys with additional emotional problems have been excluded because of a different aetiology.

#### **Group allocation**

- Hyperactivity only: boys who scored high on hyperactivity on both parents' and teachers' questionnaires but below the conduct problems threshold.
- Conduct problems only: boys who scored high on either parents' or teachers'-rated questionnaires, but did not have pervasive hyperactivity.
- Mixed problems: boys who scored high for both hyperactivity and conduct problems.
- <u>Control group</u>: boys who didn't score for neither of the behavioural problems.



#### Illnesses' characteristics

#### **Hyperactivity:**

- Attention deficit
- Impulsive behaviour
- Problems with executive functions

#### **Conduct disorder:**

- Anti-social behaviour
- Violation of social norms
- Violence toward animals, peers, etc.

#### Follow-up data (our study)

- Of the 120 boys from the original sample, 83 (69%) were successfully followed up and grouped by baseline "diagnosis":
- oxdots 24 participants with hyperactivity only (63% of the original group).
- **□** 18 with conduct problems only (75% of the original group).
- oxdot 16 with mixed problems (64% of the original group).
- 25 controls (76% of the original group).

 No meaningful differences were found between those who were and those who were not followed up.



# Summary statistics at baseline

Control group (n=25)		Hyperactive group (n=24)		Conduct problems (n=18)		Mixed group (n=16)		P-value
4.16	(3.33)	12.29	(7.42)	11.61	(2.57)	15.38	(5.9)	0.00
9.48	(5.24)	15	(6.92)	10.11	(4.61)	16.06	(4.12)	0.00
4.92	(0.76)	4.71	(0.95)	4.89	(0.76)	4.81	(0.91)	0.83
4.44	(1.36)	4.13	(1.33)	4.39	(1.04)	5.5	(1.63)	0.02
2.28	(1.37)	2.67	(1.27)	2.44	(0.92)	3.13	(1.45)	0.21
3/22	(14%)	1/19	(5%)	0/17	(0%)	4/15	(27%)	0.10
E /2.4	(24%)	0./20	(40%)	E /47	(20%)	4/4F	(270/)	0.57
					,		, ,	0.57
			, ,					0.27
	gro (n= 4.16 9.48 4.92 4.44 2.28	group (n=25) 4.16 (3.33) 9.48 (5.24) 4.92 (0.76) 4.44 (1.36) 2.28 (1.37) 3/22 (14%) 5/24 (21%) 3 (12)	group (n=25) (n=  4.16 (3.33) 12.29  9.48 (5.24) 15  4.92 (0.76) 4.71  4.44 (1.36) 4.13  2.28 (1.37) 2.67  3/22 (14%) 1/19  5/24 (21%) 8/20  3 (12) 6	group (n=25)       group (n=24)         4.16 (3.33)       12.29 (7.42)         9.48 (5.24)       15 (6.92)         4.92 (0.76)       4.71 (0.95)         4.44 (1.36)       4.13 (1.33)         2.28 (1.37)       2.67 (1.27)         3/22 (14%)       1/19 (5%)         5/24 (21%)       8/20 (40%)         3 (12)       6 (25)	group (n=25)         group (n=24)         prob (n=24)           4.16 (3.33)         12.29 (7.42)         11.61           9.48 (5.24)         15 (6.92)         10.11           4.92 (0.76)         4.71 (0.95)         4.89           4.44 (1.36)         4.13 (1.33)         4.39           2.28 (1.37)         2.67 (1.27)         2.44           3/22 (14%)         1/19 (5%)         0/17           5/24 (21%)         8/20 (40%)         5/17           3 (12)         6 (25)         1	group (n=25)         group (n=24)         problems (n=18)           4.16 (3.33)         12.29 (7.42)         11.61 (2.57)           9.48 (5.24)         15 (6.92)         10.11 (4.61)           4.92 (0.76)         4.71 (0.95)         4.89 (0.76)           4.44 (1.36)         4.13 (1.33)         4.39 (1.04)           2.28 (1.37)         2.67 (1.27)         2.44 (0.92)           3/22 (14%)         1/19 (5%)         0/17 (0%)           5/24 (21%)         8/20 (40%)         5/17 (29%)           3 (12)         6 (25)         1 (6)	group (n=25)         group (n=24)         problems (n=18)         group (n=24)           4.16 (3.33)         12.29 (7.42)         11.61 (2.57)         15.38           9.48 (5.24)         15 (6.92)         10.11 (4.61)         16.06           4.92 (0.76)         4.71 (0.95)         4.89 (0.76)         4.81           4.44 (1.36)         4.13 (1.33)         4.39 (1.04)         5.5           2.28 (1.37)         2.67 (1.27)         2.44 (0.92)         3.13           3/22 (14%)         1/19 (5%)         0/17 (0%)         4/15           5/24 (21%)         8/20 (40%)         5/17 (29%)         4/15           3 (12)         6 (25)         1 (6)         4	group (n=25)         group (n=24)         problems (n=18)         group (n=16)           4.16 (3.33)         12.29 (7.42)         11.61 (2.57)         15.38 (5.9)           9.48 (5.24)         15 (6.92)         10.11 (4.61)         16.06 (4.12)           4.92 (0.76)         4.71 (0.95)         4.89 (0.76)         4.81 (0.91)           4.44 (1.36)         4.13 (1.33)         4.39 (1.04)         5.5 (1.63)           2.28 (1.37)         2.67 (1.27)         2.44 (0.92)         3.13 (1.45)           3/22 (14%)         1/19 (5%)         0/17 (0%)         4/15 (27%)           5/24 (21%)         8/20 (40%)         5/17 (29%)         4/15 (27%)           3 (12)         6 (25)         1 (6)         4 (25)

# Summary statistics at follow-up

Variable		Control		Hyperactive		Conduct		ced		
variable	group		group		problems		group		P-value	
	(n=25)		(n=24)		(n=18)		(n=16)			
Age, years: mean (s.d.)	27.36	(1.47)	27.71	(1.27)	27.61	(1.04)	27.69	(0.70)	0.74	
GP (past 6 months)	15	(60%)	12/22	(55%)	7	(39%)	13	(81%)	0.09	
General hospital out-patient or A&E	1	(16%)	4/23	(17%)	1	(6%)	5	(21%)	0.26	
(past 6 months)	4	(16%)	4/23	(17/0)		(0/0)	<u> </u>	(31%)	0.20	
A&E	12	(48%)	15	(63%)	12	(67%)	10/15	(67%)	0.54	
General hospital out-patient	16/22	(73%)	17/23	(74%)	11	(61%)	12	(75%)	0.78	
General hospital admission	5	(20%)	10	(42%)	7	(39%)	7/15	(47%)	0.27	
Psychiatric out-patient	5	(20%)	4	(17%)	1	(6%)	0	(0%)	0.18	
Psychiatric hospital admission	1	(4%)	2	(8%)	0	(0%)	0	(0%)	0.66	
Received medication for anxiety/depression	4	(16%)	3	(13%)	2	(11%)	1	(6%)	0.83	
Any police contact	15	,		,			<u>.</u> 11	(378)		
Employed	22	,		, ,		,	13			
No/rare absenteeism	11/23	(48%)	15/21	(71%)	4/17	(24%)	7/14	(50%)	0.03	

#### **Unit costs**

- Health care-related unit costs for hospital services were obtained from National Health Service (NHS) reference costs for 2009/10.
- Unit costs for GP visits, nurse consultations, counselling and social care support were taken from the PSSRU volume for 2010.
- Values for DLA, JSA and housing benefits (to assist with costs of accommodation rent) were obtained using averages obtainable from public sources (www.direct.gov.uk).
- Unit costs for court appearances and prison stays were also obtained from Ministry of Justice reports.



## Costs' descriptive statistics

Variable	Control group (n=25)		Hyperactive group (n=24)		Conduct problems (n=18)		Mixed group (n=16)	
Past 6 months:								
Total benefits	68	(341)	160	(547)	519	(1457)	611	(2443)
	[-73	209]	[-71	391]	[-206	1243]	[-691	1912]
Health and social care	694	(1829)	442	(765)	413	(945)	689	(1160)
	[-61	1449]	[111	773]	[-57	883]	[-71	1307]
Total	762	(1849)	609	(1053)	932	(1822)	1299	(2994)
	[-1.17	1525]	[154	1064]	[26	1838]	[-296	2895]
Since age of 18 years:								
Criminal justice	1294	(4448)	1001	(3801)	3561	(9511)	539	(953)
	[-542	3130]	[-604	2606]	[-1169	8290]	[31	1047]
Health and social care	1563	(2797)	2099	(2662)	2670	(5758)	2010	(2016)
	[408	2717]	[975	3222]	[-193	5533]	[935	3084]
Total	2856	(6945)	3099	(4950)	6231	(14985)	2549	(2244)
	[-10	5723]	[1009	5189]	[-1221	13682]	[1353	3744]

## Childhood predictors of early adulthood costs

Variable	Model A (95% CI)	Model B (95% CI)	Model C (95% CI)		
Hyperactive	1.09 (0.36-3.32)	1.70 (0.76-3.79)	1.74 (0.83-3.63)		
Conduct problems	2.15 (0.52-8.97)	3.25* (1.05-10.0)	2.63 (0.98-7.03)		
Hyperactive x conduct problems	0.40 (0.08-2.03)	0.23 (0.05-1.01)	0.26* (0.07-0.94)		
Age	-	0.81 (0.62-1.07)	0.78 (0.57-1.06)		
IQ	-	0.98* (0.96-0.99)	0.98 (0.96-1.00)		
Household size (factor 1)	-	-	1.20 (0.88-1.64)		
Housing problems (factor 2)	-	-	0.92 (0.71-1.19)		
Father's work status (factor 3)	-	-	1.20 (0.89-1.62)		
Observations	83	83	83		

#### Main conclusions

- High levels of childhood conduct problems -> about 3 times increase in early adulthood costs, mainly driven by criminal justice contacts.
- Mixed problems group presented highest recent costs in terms of receipt of benefits and health and social care, but they had the lowest criminal justice lifetime cost.
- The "real-life" character of the sample may make it a powerful tool.
- However, possible misallocations and small numbers may be a limitation.



### Thank you.

damico@lse.ac.uk

