Last update: 25/02/2020

Metadata - Good self-rated health

Description	Proportion of persons aged 15 years or more who assess their health as good or very good. It is a global measure that includes physical and mental health as well as social life. It varies due to the presence of specific health problems, limitations or illnesses.
Rationale	Subjective health measurement is contributing to the evaluation of the health status, the burden of diseases and health care needs at the population level. Perceived health status is not a substitute for more objective indicators but rather complements these measures. Studies have shown perceived health to be a good predictor of functional disability (1), an indicator of the health care needs (2) and of subsequent mortality (3). This indicator is recommended by ECHI (4) and is also a European indicator of the health and long term care strand (5). It makes also part of the so-called Minimum European Health Module (MEHM) in the European SILC surveys.
Primary Data source	Sciensano Health Interview Surveys (HIS) Belgium 1997-2001-2004-2008-2013- 2018 (6) EU-SILC for international comparisons
Indicator source	Sciensano: Belgian HIS Eurostat : EU-SILC for international comparisons
Periodicity	Every 3-5 years in the HIS Every year at EU-level (SILC)
Technical definitions	The numerator is the number of people assessing their health either as very good or good; the denominator is the number of respondents to this question in the HIS. Results are weighted to account for the survey design. The indicator is based on the HIS question (SH01): 'How is your health in general?', which contains five answering categories; 1) very good, 2) good, 3) fair, 4) bad, 5) very bad.
International comparability	Availability: Yes, the values of the indicator are available in Eurostat EU-SILC. Comparability: The harmonization of this health question between the European countries was problematic until 2007 (different wordings and categories). Since then, some efforts were made but the process is still on-going and the comparability of the results is to be further improved for some countries. The major progress was reached between 2007 and 2008 based on an agreement on harmonization and guidelines provided by Eurostat to the Member States with the wording used in the European health survey as the golden standard. (http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/cache/metadata/en/hlth_silc_01_esms.htm) In addition to the issues of standardization of the question, social and cultural differences between countries can influence the way of answering this question (7).

Reference List

- (1) Galenkamp H, Braam AW, Huisman M, Deeg DJH. Seventeen-year time trend in poor selfrated health in older adults: changing contributions of chronic diseases and disability. Eur J Public Health 2013 Jun 1;23(3):511-7.
- (2) Bardel A, Wallander MA, Svardsudd K. Reported current use of prescription drugs and some of its determinants among 35 to 65-year-old women in mid-Sweden: A population-based study. J Clin Epidemiol 2000 Jun;53(6):637-43.
- (3) Lima-Costa MF, Cesar CC, Chor D, Proietti FA. Self-rated Health Compared With Objectively Measured Health Status as a Tool for Mortality Risk Screening in Older Adults: 10-Year Follow-up of the Bambu+; Cohort Study of Aging. Am J Epidemiol 2012 Feb 1;175(3):228-35.
- (4) Verschuuren M, Achterberg PW, Gijsen R, Harbers MM, Vijge E, Wilk EA, et al. ECHI Indicator Development and Documentation Joint action for ECHIM final Report Part II. II ed. RIVM; 2012.
- (5) Eurostat. Eurostat database: Indicators of the health and long term care strand. 2012.
- (6) Van der Heyden J, Charafeddine R, Drieskens S, Demarest S, Gisle L, Tafforeau J. Enquête de santé 2013, rapport 1 : Etat de santé et bien-être. 1 ed. Brussels: Scientific Institute of Public Health; 2015.
- (7) Sen A. Health: perception versus observation. 324 ed. 2002.