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Mental health has been included in the UN Sustainable Development Goals. However, uncertainty exists about the extent to which the major social determinants of mental disorders are addressed by these goals. The aim of this study was to develop a conceptual framework for the social determinants of mental disorders that is aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals, to use this framework to systematically review evidence regarding these social determinants, and to identify potential mechanisms and targets for interventions. We did a systematic review of reviews using a conceptual framework comprising demographic, economic, neighbourhood, environmental events, and social and culture domains. We included 289 articles in the final Review. This study sheds new light on how the Sustainable Development Goals are relevant for addressing the social determinants of mental disorders, and how these goals could be optimised to prevent mental disorders.

Introduction
The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), endorsed by all United Nations member states in 2015, represent an ambitious plan for sustainable human development by the year 2030.\(^1\) In a departure from the Millennium Development Goals, mental health and wellbeing are specifically addressed under SDG 3, which emphasises the inclusion of mental health care in universal health coverage. The acknowledgment of mental health in the SDGs is important, since the global human suffering and financial costs associated with mental disorders are substantial and growing.\(^2,3\) Investments in mental health care have the potential to increase the capabilities and productivity of affected individuals and families, as shown in a recent return on investment analysis.\(^4\)

However, there is growing global evidence that mental disorders in populations are strongly socially determined.\(^5\) The social determinants of mental disorders are the social and economic conditions that have a direct influence on the prevalence and severity of mental disorders in men and women across the life course. For example, adverse social and economic circumstances, including poverty, income inequality, interpersonal and collective violence, and forced migration, are key determinants of mental disorders.\(^6\)

Because mental disorders are so strongly socially determined, the global burden of these disorders is unlikely to be relieved by improved access to mental health treatments alone.\(^7\) In the words of the final report of the WHO Commission on the social determinants of health in 2008: “Why treat people only to send them back to the conditions that made them sick in the first place?”\(^8\) In this context, the SDGs have the potential to reduce the burden of mental disorders at the population level by addressing their upstream social determinants. For this reduction to occur, greater clarity is needed on which social determinants to target and how they are aligned with the SDGs.

To date, there is very little consolidated evidence, particularly from low-income and middle-income countries, regarding the socioeconomic and violence-related factors that should be targeted for the prevention of mental disorders.\(^9\) Although the SDGs set out to address several pressing global challenges—such as violence, climate change, displacement, and income inequality—little is known about the extent to which addressing these challenges might prevent or reduce the burden of specific mental disorders.

This study had two purposes: first, to develop a preliminary conceptual framework for the social determinants of mental disorders that is aligned with the SDGs; and second, to use this framework to systematically review evidence regarding the social determinants of mental disorders, with a view to identifying potential mechanisms and targets for interventions that address these determinants. This task requires the collection of available research literature on social determinants of mental illness across the life course from low-income, middle-income, and high-income countries. Such an approach has the potential to increase alignment between the SDGs and reductions in the burden of mental disorders, and suggest possibilities for action across a range of sectors. It might also reveal potential mechanisms of interaction between socioeconomic factors and mental disorders. This, in turn, could provide an opportunity to shape the existing strategies for poverty alleviation and violence reduction set out in the SDGs to prevent the development of mental disorders in populations.

Conceptual framework
We developed a novel conceptual framework that summarised the major social determinants of mental health disorders and linked them with the SDGs. First, we identified the key domains of the social determinants of mental disorders, on the basis of available epidemiological data, namely: demographic, economic, neighbourhood, environmental events, and social and culture domains. The definitions of these domains are stated in the panel. These domains were based on previous conceptual work that we had done on the social...
determinants of mental health. The domains were chosen on the basis of their conceptual coherence and distinctness and the extent to which they could include both distal and proximal levels of effect on an individual’s mental health outcomes. Second, we then examined these domains in relation to the WHO Commission on the Social Determinants of Health frameworks, to ensure that all key constructs were covered (for example, the use of a multilevel approach and the inclusion of a life-course dimension). Finally, we matched the SDGs with the specific domains for which they appeared to be most relevant. When an SDG appeared to be relevant for more than one domain, we selected the domain for which it seemed most relevant, by consensus among the group of authors.

The domains were organised into the conceptual framework. Both distal and proximal determinants in each domain act on mental disorders, mediated by family-level and biological variables. Following Bronfenbrenner’s ecological approach, proximal factors refer to people, objects, or events in the immediate external environment with which the individual interacts that increase or reduce risk of mental disorders. Distal factors refer to the broader structural arrangements or trends in society which exert their influence on mental disorders in populations, frequently mediated by proximal factors. This framework seeks to capture the importance of an ecological approach and the complex multidimensional way in which social determinants interact with key genetic determinants to affect mental disorders. The domains also incorporate each of the SDGs, illustrated by mapping each SDG onto the domains of the social determinants framework in figure 1.

**Methods**

We searched three databases (PubMed, PsycINFO, and Scopus) for studies. The Scopus database enabled searching Embase for articles not indexed on PubMed or MEDLINE. Individual search strategies were developed for each domain, and searches were run in November, 2016, for each database (see appendix for full search terms). The search strategies were intentionally broad to capture the diversity of potential determinants of mental disorders, and were aligned with the conceptual framework for each of the social determinant domains. We used database-specific strategies according to the search terms in each domain. To manage the scope of this Review, we focused on relationships with mental disorders, for which there is a more robust evidence base than for positive aspects of mental health and wellbeing.

After removing any duplicates, we identified 13706 abstracts for initial review (figure 2). One author (CB-S) reviewed titles and abstracts for these articles using bibliographic software. The overlap and interrelatedness of the concepts in the five domains was evidenced by articles being retrieved in more than one domain search, and articles from one domain search (eg, demographic) being more relevant for another domain (eg, environmental events). Abstracts retrieved in one domain that were more relevant to another domain were transferred to the more relevant domain in a further sorting stage. Subsequently, 699 full articles for the final list of included abstracts were accessed and reviewed by two to three authors for each domain. Articles not meeting the inclusion criteria at this stage were excluded.

**Data analysis**

Data from included studies were extracted into a standardised table independently by two to three authors.
per domain (appendix). Data extracted were the risk and protective factors (separated into proximal and distal factors), the hypothesised pathways for mediation of this risk or protection (as proposed by authors of the included studies), and the mental disorder outcomes, by age and gender. The strength-of-evidence scores were assigned to each factor on a scale of 0 to 10 according to each author’s judgment, based on their review of the evidence in their assigned domain. We took care not to assign all studies with similar designs equal levels of evidence, and critically examined their designs and methods, to draw our own conclusions regarding the strength of the evidence in each case. Systematic reviews with meta-analyses were judged as providing stronger evidence than narrative, critical, and integrative reviews. Additionally, we rated the quality of each included study using the AMSTAR tool.2 Data extraction tables were shared between authors, and key concepts were agreed for each domain. Once the data extraction tables were completed, authors worked in pairs to draft summaries that synthesised the main findings for each domain. This approach was taken because of the large number and heterogeneity of reviews, to try and provide an integrative and consolidated review of the evidence base.

**Results**

In total, 289 full-text articles were included in the final Review: 135 for the demographic domain, 63 for the economic domain, 31 for the neighbourhood domain, 26 for the environmental events domain, and 34 for the social and cultural domain (appendix).

**Demographic domain**

Demographic factors included gender, age, ethnicity, life expectancy, and longevity, making them particularly relevant for SDG 5 (achieving gender equality).2

---

Figure 1: Social and cultural determinants of mental disorders and the Sustainable Development Goals: a conceptual framework.
The female gender is associated with increased risk of major depressive disorder at different life stages, beginning in adolescence,28–30 in many diverse settings.14–16 The same female preponderance is also observed in relation to anxiety19 and eating disorders.20 Conversely, the male gender is associated with increased risk of substance use disorders.21 Boys also have increased risk of childhood behavioural and developmental disorders, such as behavioural disorder, autism spectrum disorder, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, Tourette syndrome, and early-onset schizophrenia.22,23 Additionally, some responses to fetal stress appear to be sex-specific, for example the risk of developing schizophrenia.24 Although there is a higher prevalence of self-harm among adolescent girls than in adolescent boys,25 being male is associated with an increased probability of dying by suicide in a wide range of populations.26–28

Economic domain

The economic domain includes income, expenditure, debt, assets, food security, employment status, housing, income inequality, macroeconomic trends such as recessions, and subjective financial strain. Several SDGs are relevant for the economic domain, namely SDG 1 (ending poverty), SDG 2 (ending hunger), SDG 8 (decent work and economic growth), SDG 9 (industry, innovation, and infrastructure), and SDG 10 (reducing inequalities). The effects of poverty on mental illness are more pronounced among women29 (particularly during the perinatal period³), adolescents,30 and people with chronic diseases, such as diabetes.31 A lower economic status, diminished wealth, and unemployment are associated with suicidal ideation and suicidal behaviour in low-income, middle-income, and high-income countries, although the effects of specific aspects of poverty vary.32–35

The association between poverty and mental disorders does not imply that people in poorer countries are at increased risk of mental disorders compared with people in wealthier countries. The association between poverty and mental disorders is complex and bidirectional, characterised by both social causation and social drift.36 These bidirectional influences act across the life course, from childhood to old age,37 and interact with environmental events.38

Homelessness is associated with increased risk of depression, anxiety, and suicidal ideation in
school-aged children and adolescents. Inadequate housing, including structural housing quality and overcrowding, is associated with increased risk of common mental disorders in adults. Providing permanent housing in the community for people with severe mental illness can reduce hospital admissions.

Employment is an important protective factor against mental disorders, and is associated with better social functioning, less severe symptoms, higher quality of life, and improved self-esteem in people living with schizophrenia and bipolar disorder. Employment is also robustly associated with reduced symptoms of depression and anxiety and decreased suicide prevalences, especially among men.

Food insecurity has been consistently associated with increased risk of adult common mental disorders in low-income and middle-income countries, and inadequate nutrition has been consistently associated with poor cognitive, motor, and social-emotional development in children. Indebted individuals have higher rates of depression and more suicidal ideation than those without debt.

At a national level, macroeconomic decline has been associated with increased risk of depression, anxiety, suicide, and alcohol abuse, mainly through effects on employment, income, insecurity, and loss of social networks. In relation to income inequality at a national level, countries that are more unequal have been reported to have increased schizophrenia incidence in adults. Increased prevalence of depression, anxiety, substance abuse, decreased general happiness, and decreased child wellbeing indices have also been reported in countries with more income inequality. However, these associations seem to be more prominent in high-income countries than in low-income countries.

In addition to this correlational evidence, several studies have tested the causal effect of economic interventions on mental illness with, for example, randomised experiments of cash transfer programmes, which have been shown to decrease stress and depression. Numerous employment intervention studies have shown improvement in mental health and functioning among people living with disorders such as schizophrenia and depression, although the quality of the evidence is mixed, and not all outcomes were positive.

Finally, housing and gardening interventions have shown mixed effects on mental disorder outcomes. However, individual programmes, such as the Moving to Opportunity programme in the USA, led to increases in psychological wellbeing.

**Neighbourhood domain**

Neighbourhoods constitute constellations of environmental risk factors (e.g., safety, deprivation at neighbourhood level, access to recreational facilities, and availability of services). Neighbourhood level effects are those that remain even after controlling for individual or family level socioeconomic deprivation and other exposures. Frequently, these neighbourhood risk factors interact with coexisting individual factors. SDG 6 (clean water and sanitation), SDG 7 (affordable and clean energy), SDG 11 (sustainable cities and communities), and SDG 12 (sustainable consumption and production) are particularly relevant goals for the neighbourhood domain, although they are also relevant for broader societal characteristics.

Neighbourhood level socioeconomic deprivation is strongly associated with increased prevalence of psychotic disorders, depression, common mental disorders in young people (aged 10–20 years), and reduced cognitive function in older adults. Individuals in neighbourhoods with low socioeconomic status can have more life stressors (e.g., exposure to violence, unemployment, under-resourced facilities) and fewer sources of support and resources to deal with them, thus increasing vulnerability. Social drift might also explain the movement of people living with mental illness into more deprived neighbourhoods.

Living in an urban environment has been reported to increase risk of developing schizophrenia and mood and anxiety disorders. Structural features of the neighbourhood (e.g., built environment) also affect mental disorders. Neighbourhoods that are more walkable and provide leisure opportunities are associated with a reduced prevalence of depression and alcohol abuse. Other structural features, including racial segregation and community instability, are associated with depression and psychotic disorders. A high density of a particular ethnic group might have benefits for individuals of that ethnicity (e.g., reduced risk of psychoses, depression, and anxiety disorders). This might be mediated by the increase of social support, stronger sense of identity, and positive self-evaluation.

Accumulating evidence indicates that neighbourhood crime-related safety and the fear of crime can have a substantial effect on mental illness, sometimes combining with other negative factors in the environment. Exposure to community level violence (such as prevalence of criminal violence per neighbourhood) has been linked to post-traumatic stress disorder in low-income and middle-income countries, and high-income countries. In children and adolescents, community violence, including gang violence, has been linked to substance abuse, externalising behaviours, and bullying perpetration, as well as compromised developmental outcomes. Community violence itself is linked to more upstream or distal determinants, including population density, family composition, deficits in supportive social institutions and networks, and housing conditions. These neighbourhood factors frequently interact with demographic factors, such as...
Community-based mental health interventions (including strengthening social networks, prosocial behaviour, and community mobilisation) are associated with reductions in prevalence of substance use.135

**Environmental events domain**

Environmental events are defined as serious disruptions of community functioning that exceed the ability of the community to cope by use of its own resources.137 These events include disasters triggered by natural hazards (e.g., earthquakes), industrial events (e.g., chemical spills), armed conflict and displacement (e.g., war, political violence), and ecosystem hazards due to climate change or increased population (e.g., droughts or flooding). SDG 13 (climate change action) and SDG 16 (peace, justice, and strong institutions) are particularly relevant for the environmental events domain.

The most frequently measured outcomes that are associated with these disasters and hazards are symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder, anxiety, and depression, which are estimated to be three to four times higher among survivors than in the general population.118–126 Behavioural and emotional symptoms, sleep problems, disturbed play, and psychosomatic symptoms are common among children exposed to war, conflict, terrorism, and displacement.127 Meta-analyses of studies in children affected by armed conflict have shown an overall pooled prevalence estimate of post-traumatic stress disorder of 47%.128 Disaster survivors also reported high prevalences of generalised anxiety.129 Ecosystem hazards have been associated with depression, anxiety, and suicide.130 Specific environmental toxins also have negative mental health consequences—for example, lead exposure has been associated with emotional and behavioural problems in 3–5-year-old children in China.131 Some reviews show the increased risk of substance abuse128,132 and problematic substance use among individuals with pre-existing problems who experienced an environmental event.133 Complex emergencies (such as war, armed conflicts, and mass displacement) and human trafficking are associated with an increased prevalence of mental disorders,132,133 which tends to remain high for years after displacement as a result of war.111 Torture has been robustly associated with risk of post-traumatic stress disorder and has also been linked to depression.134 Estimating the prevalence of mental disorders in the context of environmental events is challenged by difficulties in separating expected psychological distress from a disorder and by insufficient socio-culturally validated measures.135

Risk factors for the development of mental disorders in the context of environmental events include: higher level of exposure to the event, previous mental disorder, female gender, being unmarried, younger and older age, low socioeconomic status, lower educational attainment, minority group status, unemployment, and insecurity.123,125,130,134,136–137 Violence before, during, and after forced migration is also a risk factor, together with harsh living conditions, uncertainty, loss of social status, and difficulties with the language and culture of the new setting.138 Older people who had a higher socioeconomic status and educational attainment before being displaced, but a reduced socioeconomic status in their new settings, have an increased risk for the development of mental disorders.139 Social support is a protective factor in the context of environmental events.138,140

We identified a large body of literature on intervention responses to the human suffering caused by environmental events. Although the focus of this Review does not allow for a detailed presentation of these responses, it is important to note the growing evidence base for interventions that are primarily used in the context of reducing environmental stressors. These include psychological first aid,137,141 narrative exposure therapy,142,143 and the common elements treatment approach.144 Overall, there is a need to bridge the large gap that exists between population approaches (more commonly focused on addressing risks and strengths in the social environment) and the focus of researchers on evaluating specialised and largely individual psychotherapeutic approaches.145

**Social and cultural domain**

The social and cultural domain encompasses education, family and peer relationships, social capital, social networks, culture, and group membership. SDG 4 (quality education) is relevant for this domain.

Lower levels of education and literacy are strongly linked to development of dementia.146–150 although higher levels of education can be associated with a faster disease progression.146 Education is believed to affect the brain (for example, by increasing synapse numbers or vascularisation), creating cognitive reserve and resilience against dementia.147 Low levels of education, potentially acting through reduced self-efficacy and cognitive function, have also been associated with late life depression151 and depression in young people who have not completed school.152 Suicide has also been linked to low education, with the association being stronger in men than in women. Being less educated has been linked to reduced social cohesion, poor social capital, and chronic stress.153

In terms of social relationships, intimate partner abuse during pregnancy is strongly linked to increased risk of depression, anxiety, and post-traumatic stress disorder for women in the postnatal period.154–156 Low empathy and support from a partner,157 low emotional and practical support from other sources, and being unmarried also increases the risk of common mental disorders158 and suicidal thoughts and behaviours in women.159 Conversely, perceived social support and marital satisfaction might be protective against antenatal depression and anxiety.160 Befriending programmes and enhancing social support can decrease depression.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic domain</th>
<th>SDG 5: gender equality</th>
<th>Gender and sex, age, ethnicity</th>
<th>Differential exposure to adversity, social norms, discrimination, early life onset, and gene-environment interactions in sensitive developmental windows (pregnancy, early childhood, and adolescence)</th>
<th>Depression, anxiety, substance abuse, psychosis, child and adolescent behavioural and developmental disorders, and dementia</th>
<th>Reduction of gender-based violence (H), child maltreatment (H), and racial discrimination and xenophobia (H)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic domain</td>
<td>SDG 1: no poverty; SDG 2: zero hunger; SDG 8: decent work and economic growth; SDG 9: industry, innovation, and infrastructure; SDG 10: reduced inequalities</td>
<td>Income security, debt, assets, food security, employment, housing, income inequality, macroeconomic recessions, and subjective financial strain</td>
<td>Social causation: insecurity, stress, helplessness, external locus of control, low social status, worse physical health status, social comparison, undernutrition, antisocial coping behaviours, and entrapment linked to suicide; social disintegration: increased health-care expenditure, disability, and stigma</td>
<td>Depression, anxiety, substance abuse, psychosis, suicide, dementia, and childhood internalising and externalising disorders</td>
<td>Cash transfers or basic income grants (H), reductions in income inequality (M), and improved employment (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood domain</td>
<td>SDG 6: clean water and sanitation; SDG 7: affordable and clean energy; SDG 11: sustainable cities and communities; SDG 12: responsible consumption and production</td>
<td>Structural characteristics of neighbourhoods including infrastructure, safety, aggregate socioeconomic deprivation, built environment, leisure opportunities, urbanicity, crime, community violence, and social cohesion</td>
<td>Urban migration, dopamine dysregulation, insecurity, exposure to violence, and disempowerment</td>
<td>Depression, anxiety, substance abuse, psychosis, child and adolescent substance abuse, and externalising behaviours</td>
<td>Improved housing (M), safe neighbourhoods (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental events domain</td>
<td>SDG 13: climate action; SDG 16: peace, justice, and strong institutions</td>
<td>Natural hazards, industrial disasters, armed conflict, displacement, and disasters triggered by ecosystem hazards due to climate change or increased population</td>
<td>Trauma (episodic and continuous), severe stress, adversity, insecurity, and loss of social support systems</td>
<td>PTSD, depression, anxiety, suicide, and childhood internalising and externalising disorders</td>
<td>Reductions in violence (H), early response to environmental events (H), and action on protecting vulnerable ecosystems (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and cultural domain</td>
<td>SDG 4: quality education</td>
<td>Education, social cohesion, social capital, culture, and social class</td>
<td>Cognitive reserve, self-efficacy, social skills, social support, trust, parenting, bullying, and discrimination</td>
<td>Depression, anxiety, dementia, psychosis, and child and adolescent internalising disorders</td>
<td>Improved education (H), strengthened social capital (M), and improving social support and networks for older adults (H)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SDG**=sustainable development goal. PTSD=post-traumatic stress disorder. *SDG 3 is not listed in this table because the focus of this Review is on the SDGs that address the upstream social determinants of mental disorders. | The strength of the effect of potential interventions is rated as low (L), moderate (M), or high (H). |

### Table: Social determinants of mental disorders, hypothesised pathways, related outcomes, and potential interventions

Reduced social participation and contact are associated with onset of dementia. Some evidence exists that social media and other online social interactions are linked to increased social capital and self-esteem, but they can also be associated with increased social isolation and depression, particularly in the case of cyberbullying. Reduced social participation and contact are associated with onset of dementia. Some evidence exists that social media and other online social interactions are linked to increased social capital and self-esteem, but they can also be associated with increased social isolation and depression, particularly in the case of cyberbullying.

**Discussion**

**From evidence to action: recommendations for policy and future research**

The findings of this Review summarise a broad body of evidence that outlines the social determinants of mental disorders, and their relevance for the SDGs. Several key factors, hypothesised pathways, specific mental disorder outcomes, and potential interventions can be identified and linked to the SDGs (table). Importantly, social determinants do not act uniformly for all mental disorders in all circumstances, and there is considerable heterogeneity according to gender, developmental stage, local context, and specific mental disorder outcomes. Nevertheless, the findings point to synergy between the SDGs and many of the key social determinants of mental disorders. The shared family environment has important effects on the development and clustering of mental disorders, including child behavioural problems, oppositional defiant disorder, anxiety, depression, and substance abuse. Identifying as part of a social group creates social connections and provides opportunities to give and receive support. Social capital is associated with a decreased prevalence of depression and is protective for mental health, particularly in older people. Higher individual cognitive social capital (trusting in the community and actively participating) is also protective against common mental disorders. Individuals who develop a psychotic disorder have reduced social networks before the disorder, not just as a consequence of social exclusion due to the presence of the disorder. Shared meaning and identity associated with culture have been shown to be protective of mental health. Loss of cultural identity—for example, in the context of forced migration—has been associated with negative mental health outcomes. Particularly negative experiences in the social environment, such as discrimination and bullying, are associated with increased stress, depressive or childhood internalising symptoms linked to reduced self-esteem, and experience of social isolation.

Reduced social participation and contact are associated with onset of dementia. Some evidence exists that social media and other online social interactions are linked to increased social capital and self-esteem, but they can also be associated with increased social isolation and depression, particularly in the case of cyberbullying.
mental disorders, because many of the determinants documented in this Review are also targeted by the SDGs.

The data extraction table for this study (appendix) integrates findings from 289 reviews reporting on social determinants of mental disorders, with ratings for strength of evidence and study quality. We envisage this Review as a potential resource for researchers, policy makers, and organisations working in the field of mental health and sustainable development.

Several policy recommendations can be drawn from these findings. Although this Review has largely presented observational evidence, several potential universal, selective, and indicated prevention interventions can be recommended to address the social determinants of mental disorders (table). We acknowledge that some of these recommended actions have not yet been shown in trials to have a direct effect on mental disorders, and that many implementation challenges remain unresolved. Nevertheless, we believe that identifying these candidate interventions on social determinants is an important first step in setting a policy agenda to prevent mental disorders at a population level, in alignment with the SDGs.

It is crucial to create robust indicators to track both the social determinants of mental disorders and the mental health status of populations and subpopulations (eg, men and women, old and young, susceptible groups) in a manner that is relevant for the existing SDG indicators. The current global indicators are insufficient to track crucial pathways, interventions, and outcomes for the prevention of mental disorders. In our view, the key risk and protective factors and their pathways identified in the table represent an important starting point for expanding the SDG indicator set.

This Review has highlighted several potential areas for future research. During the past 10 years, millions of dollars in research funding have been committed to assessing the treatment of mental disorders in low-resource settings, but little research has been done on interventions that might address the social determinants of mental disorders, or examining the mechanisms by which social determinants affect mental disorders and mental health at a population level. A range of intervention study designs are required: robust, randomised controlled trials to answer specific effectiveness and efficacy questions, qualitative research to address questions around context and culture, and mixed-method implementation science approaches to assess the scaling up of evidence-based interventions. Given the substantial heterogeneity noted in this Review, intervention developers need to understand this complexity and develop local contextual solutions rather than imposing universal solutions. Regarding observational research, there is an urgent need for adequately powered longitudinal studies, especially in low-income and middle-income settings, that integrate social, economic, and biological (particularly genetic) data. These multicentre longitudinal studies are required to shed more light on the mechanisms by which social determinants act on population mental health across the life course. Research into specific gene–environment interactions for different mental disorders, to understand the interplay between social and biological factors, will be a key approach for future research. Additionally, we detected a dearth of research in some crucial areas, such as resilience in the context of social determinants and quantifying the links between the SDGs and positive aspects of mental health and wellbeing.

Finally, there are several major future social and economic trends and risks that might affect mental...
disorders at the population level. Chief among these threats is the reality of climate change. Apart from the long-term threat to the survival of many species, including human beings, the early stages of climate change bring together several simultaneously interacting risk factors for mental health. The evidence for the effects of these threats is already available in the research literature presented in this Review, including economic insecurity, environmental events such as extreme weather, diminished social cohesion, violence, and income inequality. From a mental health perspective, we join the global call for urgent action on climate change.

Limitations
The following limitations of our study need to be acknowledged. First, although we put considerable effort into ensuring that the domains of the conceptual framework were coherent and minimised overlap, some degree of overlap is still present. Second, the broad search strategy limited the degree to which comparison across studies was possible and to which specific research questions related to individual mental disorders could be examined. Third, restricting eligible papers to reviews might mean that some social determinants of mental health are not covered. Fourth, it was difficult to standardise the rating of the strength of evidence for each factor in each domain (from 0 to 10). Fifth, not all SDGs fit neatly into each domain, and many applied across multiple domains. Nevertheless, we believe that the SDGs in the conceptual framework are linked to the domain for which they are most relevant, on the basis of available evidence and the premise that the SDGs are intended to be mutually reinforcing. Sixth, we need to acknowledge that the SDGs did not set out to improve mental health, and their ambition addresses a far wider range of social, environmental, and economic goals. Our intention in this Review was to draw the attention of the international development community to the potential alignment of the SDGs with the goals of reducing the global burden of mental disorders.

Conclusion
Addressing the SDGs that are relevant for the social determinants of mental disorders requires a coordinated, truly global effort by governments, civil societies, and the private sector. The interruption of negative cycles of poverty, violence, environmental degradation, and mental disorders is possible, as is establishing virtuous cycles of mental health, wellbeing, and sustainable development. Evidence presented in this study indicates opportunities for action in demographic, economic, neighbourhood, environmental events, and social and cultural domains. This study is an initial effort to develop a framework, which we hope will provide a platform for further research in this area, focusing on mechanisms and opportunities for intervention.
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