

ARTICLES | [ONLINE FIRST](#)

New WHO prevalence estimates of mental disorders in conflict settings: a systematic review and meta-analysis

[Fiona Charlson, PhD](#) • [Mark van Ommeren, PhD](#)   • [Abraham Flaxman, PhD](#) • [Joseph Cornett, BS](#) • [Prof Harvey Whiteford, PhD](#) • [Shekhar Saxena, MD](#)

[Open Access](#) • Published: June 11, 2019 • DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(19\)30934-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(19)30934-1)

 PDF [1 MB]  Figure[Summary](#)[Introduction](#)[Methods](#)[Results](#)[Discussion](#)[Supplementary](#)[Material](#)[References](#)[Article Info](#)[Figures](#)[Tables](#)[Linked Articles](#)

Summary

Background

Existing WHO estimates of the prevalence of mental disorders in emergency settings are more than a decade old and do not reflect modern methods to gather existing data and derive estimates. We sought to update WHO estimates for the prevalence of mental disorders in conflict-affected settings and calculate the burden per 1000 population.

Methods

In this systematic review and meta-analysis, we updated a previous systematic review by searching MEDLINE (PubMed), PsycINFO, and Embase for studies published between Jan 1, 2000, and Aug 9, 2017, on the prevalence of depression, anxiety disorder, post-traumatic stress disorder, bipolar disorder, and schizophrenia. We also searched the grey literature, such as government reports, conference proceedings, and dissertations, to source additional data, and we searched datasets from existing literature reviews of the global prevalence of depression and anxiety and reference lists from the studies that were identified. We applied the Guidelines for Accurate and Transparent Health Estimates Reporting and used Bayesian meta-regression techniques that adjust for predictors of mental disorders to calculate new point prevalence estimates with 95% uncertainty intervals (UIs) in settings that had experienced conflict less than 10 years previously.