Cole Faith (Orcid ID: 0000-0003-1078-1544)

1

Predictors of transitions across stages of alcohol use and disorders in an adult population with heterogeneous ethnic restrictions regarding drinking

Faith Cole[1*], Corina Benjet[2], Dirgha Ghimire[1], William G. Axinn[1]

[1]Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, U.S.A; [2] Epidemiology and Psychosocial Research, National Institute of Psychiatry, Mexico City, Mexico

*Corresponding authors: Faith Cole, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 426 Thompson St, Ann Arbor, MI, 48104-2321, U.SA.; Phone: +1-906-361-9938; Email: faithco@umich.edu

Running head: Transitions across stages of alcohol use

Word count: 3,475

Abstract (300 words)

Aims: To disaggregate associations with alcohol use disorder relative to those with early alcohol use stages in an adult population. We estimated prevalence rates and sociodemographic correlates for the opportunity to drink and transitions into lifetime alcohol use, regular use, and alcohol use disorder.

Design: A retrospective, cross-sectional population survey within a family panel study.

Setting: Chitwan in Nepal, an ethnically diverse setting with heterogeneous ethnic restrictions regarding alcohol.

Participants: 10,714 individuals aged 15 to 59 (response rate=93%).

Measurements: The Nepal-specific Composite International Diagnostic Interview assessed lifetime alcohol use opportunity, any use, regular use, disorder, and sociodemographic characteristics.

Findings: Seventy percent [95% confidence interval (CI)=69-71%] of the population had the opportunity to drink, 38% [95% CI=37-39%] had lifetime alcohol use, 32% [95% CI=32-33%] had regular alcohol use, and 6% [95% CI=6-7%] developed an alcohol use disorder. Compared with high caste Hindus, all other ethnicities had greater odds of early stage transitions (Odds ratios (OR) ranged from 1.3 [95%CI=1.2-1.5] to 2.0 [95%CI=1.8-2.2]), but not of development of disorder. Male sex was associated with greater odds of all transitions, from opportunity (OR=5.7; [95% CI=5.4-6.0]) to development of disorder (OR=2.0; [95% CI=1.4-2.8]). The youngest cohort had higher odds of all transitions, from opportunity (OR=4.9; [95% CI=4.5-5.3]) to development of disorder (OR=9.3; [95% CI=6.9-12.7]). Higher education was associated with lower odds of all transitions except opportunity (from use (OR=0.8; [95% CI=0.7-0.8]) to the development of disorder (OR=0.7; [95% CI=0.6-0.9]).

Conclusions: The prevalence of lifetime alcohol use among adults in Nepal appears to be low, but the overall prevalence of disorder is similar to other countries. Sociodemographic correlates of early alcohol use transitions differ from those associated with later transitions; while sex and

age cohort were associated with all transitions, ethnicity was associated with early transitions (opportunity, lifetime use, regular use), but not later transitions (use and regular use to disorder).

Keywords: alcohol use transitions, alcohol use disorders, South Asia, general population, epidemiology

Introduction

Alcohol use disorders (AUD) are formidable threats to health. They have been causally linked to over 60 diseases (1) and there were more than 3 million deaths from harmful alcohol use in 2016 (2). Thus, understanding the processes leading to AUD is a high scientific priority. Here we analyze new data from Nepal to provide important insights into the development of AUD.

Alcohol consumption is low in South Asia relative to European settings (2,3). In Nepal, until 1960, the legalized Hindu caste system prohibited certain caste/ethnic groups from drinking on religious grounds (4–8). Before the 1960s, there was no industrial production of alcohol in Nepal (9). Thus, Nepali society is historically divided between groups for whom alcohol use is socially acceptable (Matwali), many of whom produce alcohol within the home (9,10), and groups (non-Matwali) that are subjected to restrictions on drinking (6,8,9). Even as commercial production and availability of alcohol has grown, this history results in groups who have less opportunity to drink living next door to members of groups who have the opportunity to use alcohol regularly. This heterogeneity of alcohol use provides important comparison groups for understanding the association between exposure to alcohol and the development of AUD.

Exposure to the opportunity to drink is the first transition into alcohol use—one cannot be at risk for alcohol use or AUD without an opportunity to drink. Thus, understanding the risk factors associated with the opportunity to drink and the commencement of alcohol use is crucial for understanding the transitions into AUD. Research has shown that the sociodemographic factors

associated with early stages of alcohol involvement differ from those associated with the onset of AUD, suggesting that contextual factors may have a relatively greater influence on earlier alcohol use stages than later stages (11–14).

Despite the evidence demonstrating the importance of distinguishing risk factors associated with early alcohol use from those associated with disorders, the understanding of transitions into early alcohol use is limited by the relative scarcity of information from settings outside the European diaspora. Almost all of the studies predicting transitions into early alcohol use have been conducted in settings where use is widely accepted and practiced, limiting the study of factors associated with exposure to alcohol use because opportunity to drink is almost universal among adults. This limitation has led most studies to either exclude investigation of factors associated with opportunity, or investigate opportunity and initial use among adolescents.

The only study that investigates factors associated with exposure to opportunity in an adult population examined sex differences only (15). Wells and co-authors (2011) found that sex differences in the opportunity for substance use and the commencement of use vary greatly across countries (15), providing evidence that contextual factors may be especially important in determining opportunity to drink. Although norms surrounding alcohol are contextual factors that affect who has an opportunity (15), few studies have investigated settings with social restrictions against use. Therefore, the scientific understandings of how social factors differentially affect characteristics associated with opportunity to drink, commencement of use, and subsequent AUD is limited.

The present study uses the first large, general population study of AUD in Nepal to address this important gap and identify social factors likely to produce heterogeneity in exposure to opportunity to drink, onset of alcohol use and regular use, and development of AUD. By studying these transitions in a setting of ethnic variations in restrictions against alcohol use, we have a population with heterogeneity in exposure to and consumption of alcohol. We use this heterogeneity to distinguish associations with opportunity to drink and alcohol consumption from associations with AUD in an adult population. To do this we estimated the total prevalence rates, conditional prevalence rates, and risk of transition by ethnicity, sex, birth cohort, and educational level.

Methods

Design

This is a retrospective, cross-sectional survey that was conducted from 2016-2018 among participants in the Chitwan Valley Family Study (CVFS), a 25-year longitudinal panel study that is representative of the general population in Western Chitwan, Nepal (16). The region makes up approximately 2% of Nepal's population and is known to be particularly diverse by ethnicity (17,18). Age and gender distributions are similar to the national population (17). Respondents had experience of CVFS confidentiality protections before they reported alcohol use behavior to the ethnically diverse, professionally-trained interviewers. All analyses are based on reports of alcohol use behaviors over the respondents' lifetime until the age of interview. The survey used computer assisted personal interviewing (CAPI) and a Life History Calendar (LHC) (17,19).

Sample

Respondents were 10,714 individuals aged 15-59 in Western Chitwan, Nepal. The response rate was 93%. Respondents were recruited via an in-person visit or phone call, depending on the respondent's location at the time of recruitment. CVFS sampling procedures are described in previous publications (16,20). See Table 1 for the sample description and Table S1 for the sample description stratified by sex.

[Insert Table 1 here]

Measures

Alcohol use and AUD were retrospectively measured using the Nepal-specific version of the World Mental Health-Composite International Diagnostic Interview 3.0 (CIDI). The CIDI is a fully structured diagnostic interview that evaluates psychiatric disorders over the respondents lifetime (21,22), including AUD, according to the diagnostic criteria of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders Fourth Edition (DSM-IV) (23).

Alcohol Use Disorders

For AUD, the instrument measures whether the respondent met diagnostic criteria alcohol abuse (ALA) and alcohol dependence (ALD) at any point in their lifetime and the age at which respondents first met diagnostic criteria, which we refer to as age-of-onset. We combined ALA and ALD into alcohol use disorders (AUD), defined as any lifetime ALA or ALD. The Nepal CIDI integrated a LHC to improve retrospective reporting of alcohol use and disorder symptoms

(19). The Nepal-specific LHC-CIDI was translated through a multi-step iterative process to

insure validity in the local context (19,24). Clinical validation of the Nepal LHC-CIDI against

the clinician-administered Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV (SCID-IV) demonstrated

high concordance, comparable to validation studies of US and European CIDI instruments (19).

Alcohol Use

Measures of alcohol use include indicators of lifetime opportunity to drink, alcohol use, and

regular alcohol use. For opportunity to drink, we used responses to the CIDI item, "About how

old were you the very first time you had an opportunity to drink alcohol?" Opportunity to drink

is defined as, "anytime someone either offered you alcohol or you were present when others

were drinking and could have drunk if you wanted to." For lifetime alcohol use, we used

responses to, "How old were you the very first time you ever drank an alcoholic beverage?" The

definition of alcoholic beverages included local alcoholic beverages (jad and rakshy), beer, wine,

and hard liquors like vodka, gin, or whiskey. For regular alcohol use, we used responses to,

"How old were you when you first started drinking at least 12 drinks in a year?" Respondents

were given examples of the quantity considered one drink for each beverage type. All alcohol

use indicators were coded as a dichotomous measure, 0 if the answer was "Never" and 1 if the

respondent reported an age of onset for that outcome.[1] These questions to measure opportunity,

---

[1] 207 individuals who reported alcohol use but no opportunity were recoded from 0 to 1 for opportunity. 9 individuals who met diagnostic criteria for AUD but reported no regular alcohol use were recoded from 0 to 1 for regular alcohol use.

first use, and regular use are standard indicators used in multiple studies and settings (11–15,25–27).

Sociodemographic Measures

Although Nepal has over 100 recognized ethnic groups (28), scholars generally simplify discussion of ethnicity in Nepal using five broad categories: Brahmin/Chhetri (high caste Hindu), Hill Janajati (multiple ethnicities of Tibetan origin), Dalits (low caste Hindus), Newar (heterogeneous in terms of caste and religion), and Terai Janajati (multiple plains ethnicities, primarily of Burmese decent). This categorization has been shown to capture sufficient variation in ethnicity in the study area (29). We use these five ethnic categories. The 91 respondents who identified as an "Other" ethnicity were excluded. Respondents of Brahmin/Chhetri ethnicity were considered non-Matwali by the caste system legalized until 1960 (6), and were therefore subjected to legal sanctions against alcohol consumption until 1960, and still face social restrictions against use (6–8). The other ethnicities included were all considered Matwali, and therefore do not face the same restrictions; rather, many Matwali produce alcohol in their homes (9,30).

Additional sociodemographic measures include sex, birth cohort, and education. Birth cohort is categorized into four groups: 1992-2004, 1982-1991, 1972-1981, and before 1972. We measure education with a dichotomy indicating whether or not the respondent received their School Leaving Certificate (S.L.C.), awarded to students who pass a national exam offered after completing 10th grade.

Analyses

We estimated the total prevalence, conditional prevalence, and sociodemographic correlates of

transitions into four alcohol use stages (opportunity to drink, lifetime alcohol use, regular use,

and AUD). The overall prevalence of each was estimated as the proportion of respondents who

transitioned into that alcohol use stage at any point prior to the interview. We used the full

sample for overall prevalence rates (N=10,623). Conditional prevalence of each alcohol use stage

was calculated as the proportion of respondents who had transitioned into that stage given they

met criteria for the prior stage. The conditional prevalence of AUD was calculated among

lifetime alcohol users (N=4,043).

We estimated associations between sociodemographic correlates and the odds of transition into

alcohol use stages. Using the full life histories, we began the analyses at age 10 and examined

the annual rate of transition to each subsequent alcohol use stage. The CVFS LHC instruments

were designed to enable discrete-time survival (event history) models, using person-years as the

unit of analysis (31). The discrete-time approach has many advantages, eliminating parametric

assumptions in the baseline survival function, such as proportionality (32,33). Respondents were

considered at risk of transitioning if they met criteria for the prior alcohol use stage. A

dichotomous variable was created for each transition where the year of transition was coded 1

and previous years were coded 0. Transitions included: onset of opportunity, commencing use,

use to regular use, use to AUD, and regular use to AUD. We present survival coefficients as odds

ratios (OR) adjusted for all covariates and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). Age was the only

variable treated as a time-varying predictor. All significance tests were evaluated at p<.05 with two-sided tests. Analyses were conducted in STATA 15 (34) using the command "logistic." We also ran all analyses stratified by sex. The analysis in the study was not pre-registered and should be considered exploratory.

Ethics and consent

All respondents provided written or verbal informed consent prior to the interview. Verbal consent was witnessed and formally recorded. The survey was conducted in a private setting. Procedures involving human subjects were approved by the University of Michigan Health Sciences and Behavioral Sciences Institutional Review Board and the Nepal Health Research Council.

Results

Table 2 presents the prevalence of alcohol use stages in the total population by sociodemographic correlates; tables S2 and S3 show these same estimates stratified by sex. 69.95% of the population had the opportunity to drink. Although opportunity was almost ubiquitous in males (94.48%), less than half of females (49.12%) had an opportunity to drink. The ethnic group with the highest prevalence of opportunity were the Hill Janajati (79.91%). The Brahmin/Chhetri had the least opportunity (61.22%). Lifetime alcohol use (38.06%) and regular alcohol use (32.37%) were low, due in part to low rates of lifetime and regular alcohol use in females (8.39% and 4.56% respectively) compared to males (73.02% and 65.13% respectively).

The Brahmin/Chhetri had the lowest rates of lifetime (29.91%) and regular (25.05%) alcohol use. AUD was 6.04% in the total population (12.53% among males and 0.54% among females). Both the Brahmin/Chhetri and Newar ethnic groups had the lowest prevalence of AUD (4.29% and 5.00% respectively). The youngest birth cohort (1992-2004) had the lowest prevalence of AUD (3.52%) compared to 8.21% for the oldest birth cohort (before 1972), as did those with S.L.C. (4.06%) compared to those without S.L.C. (7.28%).

[Insert Table 2 here]

Table 3 shows conditional prevalence rates of alcohol use stages (see Tables S4 and S5 for estimates stratified by sex). Slightly more than half of those with the opportunity to drink have done so (54.41%) and a majority of those who have had a drink (85.06%) had regular alcohol use. Among those with lifetime alcohol use, the prevalence of AUD was 15.88%. Though the Brahmin/Chhetri had the lowest prevalence of lifetime alcohol use among those with an opportunity (48.85%), the differences between ethnic groups for all other conditional transition prevalence rates were attenuated. Those born before 1972 had the highest prevalence of lifetime use given opportunity (68.47%) and regular use given lifetime use (90.97%). The youngest cohort had the lowest prevalence of AUD given lifetime use (12.41 %).

[Insert Table 3 here]

We present the results of the discrete-time survival models for the association of sociodemographic factors with transitions into alcohol use stages in Table 4. Male sex was

associated with increased odds of all transitions between alcohol stages; males were more than five times more likely than females to have an opportunity, eleven times more likely to drink given the opportunity, four times more likely to transition to regular use, three times more likely to transition to AUD from lifetime use, and nearly twice as likely to transition from regular use to AUD. Non-Brahmin/Chhetri ethnicity was associated with 58-87% higher odds of opportunity to drink, 77-98% higher odds of commencing drinking, and 31-49% higher odds of transitioning to regular use, but was not associated with developing AUD either from lifetime use or regular use.[2] Overall, younger cohorts had higher odds of all transitions between alcohol stages, with greater magnitude of ORs in later stages. Although the prevalence rates of the older cohorts were higher than those of the youngest cohort (shown in Table 2), the higher ORs for the younger cohorts can be explained by the younger ages of onset of all alcohol use stages. For example, the median ages of onset for the youngest cohort ranged from 17 for opportunity to 19 for AUD whereas the mean ages of onset for the oldest cohort ranged from 23 for opportunity to 35 for AUD (results not shown in table). Education was not associated with opportunity to drink, but having S.L.C. was associated with 23-31% lower odds of all other transitions. Though age was positively associated with all transitions, age squared was negatively associated with onset of opportunity, commencing use, and regular use (though the ORs were close to 1.00); in other words, as time passes, those who did not previously transition have reduced odds of doing so with each additional year.

---

[2] When compared to Newar ethnicity, there was one exception to this result: Dalit had 52% and 54% greater odds than Newar to develop AUD from lifetime use and regular use, respectively (this result is not shown in tables).

[Insert Table 4 here]

Tables S6 and S7 show the results stratified by sex, annotated to indicate which correlates displayed a statistically significant interaction with gender. The observed gender difference in the hazard of opportunity to drink was statistically significant for all ethnic groups, indicating that all groups increased the odds of opportunity for females more than males. Gender differences were significant for commencing use for Hill Janajati and Terai Janajati, but were not significant for later transitions. Significant gender differences were also found in early transitions for birth cohort, S.L.C., age, and age squared (see Table S6 and S7).

Discussion

South Asia is home to nearly 2 billion people, approximately one quarter of humanity. Though there is some information about prevalence and correlates of AUD in this important population (35–40), rarely do those studies feature clinically validated measurements conducted with rigorous survey methodology among a large, general population sample (17,19). An important exception is a study in Sri Lanka which documented 63.1% lifetime alcohol use and 6.2% prevalence of AUD (3). Thus, one key contribution of this study is to provide a rigorous and detailed view of AUD prevalence and correlates in a large, South Asian sample. A further contribution is that some South Asian ethnic groups have restrictions on alcohol consumption, resulting in heterogeneity within a controlled comparison that provides a special window into the *development of AUD*.

We found that male sex and younger cohorts had greater odds of transitioning to every alcohol use stage relative to female sex and the oldest cohort. Respondents with higher education had decreased odds of every transition (except opportunity, for which those with S.L.C. had increased odds for females, but decreased odds for males). These findings for sex, cohort, and education are similar to those from other settings such as the United States (13), Brazil (12), South Africa (11,25), China (14), New Zealand (15,26), and Northern Ireland (27); the new data from Nepal provides more evidence these associations may be consistent across diverse settings.

Nepal's heterogeneous ethnic groups, however, demonstrate a setting-specific story. Groups without ethnic restrictions on alcohol use had higher odds of opportunity, lifetime use, and regular use. But these same ethnic differences produced no statistically significant differences in the transitions from either lifetime use or regular use to AUD. That is, widespread adult restrictions on alcohol use are quite consequential for alcohol use, but have relatively no bearing on who makes the transition from lifetime or regular use to AUD among those who drink. This contributes to growing evidence that contextual factors, like accessibility and tolerance, contribute to earlier but not later stages of alcohol involvement. This is particularly relevant because many public policies that aim to reduce accessibility or influence norms may have little impact upon AUD beyond reduction of alcohol use in general (which in and of itself may be important).

Although the overall prevalence of any lifetime alcohol use in Nepal (38.06%) was lower than the mean prevalence of lifetime alcohol use (80%) in 29 WMH countries, most of which are

higher-income and westernized (41), overall prevalence of AUD in Nepal (6.04%) is not much lower than the mean prevalence in these same countries (8.6%). Further, conditional prevalence of AUD among those with lifetime use is twice as high in Nepal (15.88%) as the mean in these WMH countries (7.1%) (41). As alcohol becomes more available and alcohol consumption increases in South Asia and the Western Pacific (2) and in populations with social restrictions against use (9,30,42), the treatment needs for alcohol use disorder may increase.

Readers should consider our findings within the context of the following limitations. First is the retrospective assessment of AUD: recall bias may have led to underreporting of AUD or bias in accuracy in reported ages of onset (43). We minimized this bias with the life history calendar approach which has been shown to improve retrospective measurement of disorder prevalence and timing (19). Second, social restrictions surrounding alcohol use may have led to ethnic bias in willingness to report alcohol use, which could account for ethnic differences in early stages of alcohol use. However, if ethnic bias in reporting alcohol use played an important role in these findings, we would also have expected to see ethnic differences in transitions to later stages of alcohol involvement, which we did not. Third, our measure of opportunity does not explicitly address community-level availability. Fourth, individuals with AUD could have more frequently refused to participate in the survey. Although response rate for this survey is exceptionally high (93%), it is plausible that our results were biased because individuals with AUD might have been less likely to participate (44). Finally, because persons with AUD may experience cognitive impairment as symptoms, we might have excluded sub-threshold or atypical cases of AUD that

could have qualified for treatment in a clinical setting. Despite these limitations, this large representative sample from an understudied region of the world provides important insights into the predictors of transitions through stages of alcohol involvement and has implications for public policy.

Globalization means that sub-populations with restrictions on alcohol use who were once mainly in a single place, such as Hindus in South Asia, are now settled worldwide. As a result, treatment of AUD globally faces challenges of tailoring interventions to prevent and treat differently those who are exposed to alcohol from early childhood versus those who are restricted from drinking but may do so anyway. Careful study of the differences across such sub-populations has the potential to reveal more specific and effective strategies for prevention of transitions through alcohol use stages. Furthermore, as access to alcohol and restriction on use change over time, potentially increasing use in some world regions (2,9,30,42), the risk of AUDs may drastically increase. This is most likely in younger cohorts. Thus, treatment needs and adverse health consequences of alcohol can be expected to increase in these regions.

References

1. Room R, Babor T, Rehm J. Alcohol and public health. The Lancet. 2005 Feb 5;365(9458):519–30.

2. World Health Organization. WHO | Global status report on alcohol and health 2018 [Internet]. World Health organization; 2018 [cited 2019 Apr 30]. Available from: http://www.who.int/substance_abuse/publications/global_alcohol_report/gsr_2018/en/

3. Zavos HMS, Siribaddana S, Ball HA, Lynskey MT, Sumathipala A, Rijsdijk FV, et al. The prevalence and correlates of alcohol use and alcohol use disorders: a population based study in Colombo, Sri Lanka. BMC Psychiatry. 2015 Jul 14;15(1):158.

4. Adhikari DP. The history of Nepalese nationalism. Kathmandu: Jeewan Printing Support Press; 1998.

5. Maskey G. Social Life of Nepal: From tradition to modernity 1901-1925. New Delhi: Anmol Publications Pvt. Ltd.; 1996.

6. Höfer A. The History of the Muluki Ain: The Caste Hierarchy and the State in Nepal: A Study of the Muluki Ain of 1854. Innsbruck: Universitätsverlag Wanger; 1979.

7. Gellner DN. Nationalism and Ethnicity in a Hindu Kingdom: The Politics and Culture of Contemporary Nepal. Newark, NJ: Harwood Academic Publisher; 1997. 3–31 p.

8. Gellner DN. Caste, Ethnicity and Inequality in Nepal. Economic and Political Weekly. 2007;42(20):1823–8.

9. Dhital R, Subedi G, Gurung YB, Hamal P. Alcohol and Drug Use in Nepal. Kathmandu: Child Workers in Nepal Concerned Centre; 2001.

10. Niraula S, Shyangwa P, Jha N, Paudel R, Pokharel P. Alcohol Use among Women in a Town of Eastern Nepal. JNMA [Internet]. 2004 Sep 1 [cited 2019 Apr 24];43(155). Available from: http://www.jnma.com.np/jnma/index.php/jnma/article/view/491

11. Suliman S, Seedat S, Williams DR, Stein DJ. Predictors of Transitions Across Stages of Alcohol Use and Alcohol-Use Disorders in South Africa. J Stud Alcohol Drugs. 2010 Sep 1;71(5):695–703.

12. Silveira CM, Siu ER, Viana MC, Andrade LH, Guerra de Andrade A, Anthony JC. Sociodemographic Correlates of Transitions from Alcohol Use to Disorders and Remission

in the São Paulo Megacity Mental Health Survey, Brazil. Alcohol and Alcoholism. 2011 Mar 17;46(3):324–32.

13. Kalaydjian A, Swendsen J, Chiu W-T, Dierker L, Degenhardt L, Glantz M, et al. Sociodemographic predictors of transitions across stages of alcohol use, disorders, and remission in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. Comprehensive Psychiatry. 2009 Jul 1;50(4):299–306.

14. Lee S, Guo W-J, Tsang A, He Y-L, Huang Y-Q, Zhang M-Y, et al. Associations of cohort and socio-demographic correlates with transitions from alcohol use to disorders and remission in metropolitan China. Addiction. 2009 Aug 1;104(8):1313–23.

15. Wells JE, Haro JM, Karam E, Lee S, Lepine J-P, Medina-Mora MaE, et al. Cross-National Comparisons of Sex Differences in Opportunities to Use Alcohol or Drugs, and the Transitions to Use. Substance Use & Misuse. 2011 Jun 7;46(9):1169–78.

16. Barber JS, Shivakoti GP, Axinn WG, Gajurel K. Sampling strategies for rural settings: A detailed example from Chitwan Valley Family Study, Nepal. Nepal Population Journal. 1997;6(5):193–203.

17. Scott KM, Zhang Y, Chardoul S, Ghimire DJ, Smoller JW, Axinn WG. Resilience to mental disorders in a low-income, non-Westernized setting. Psychological Medicine. 2020;1–10.

18. Central Bureau of Statistics. National Population and Housing Census 2011 (National Report). Kathmandu, Nepal: National Planning Commission Secretariat, Government of Nepal; 2012.

19. Axinn WG, Chardoul S, Gatny H, Ghimire DJ, Smoller JW, Zhang Y, et al. Using life history calendars to improve measurement of lifetime experience with mental disorders. Psychol Med. 2020;50(3):515–22.

20. Axinn WG, Ghimire DJ, Williams NE. Collecting survey data during armed conflict. J Off Statistics. 2012 Jun;28(2):153–71.

21. Kessler RC, Üstün TB. The World Mental Health (WMH) Survey Initiative version of the World Health Organization (WHO) Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI). International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research. 2004 Jun 1;13(2):93–121.

22. Haro JM, Arbabzadeh-Bouchez S, Brugha TS, De Girolamo G, Guyer ME, Jin R, et al. Concordance of the Composite International Diagnostic Interview Version 3.0 (CIDI 3.0)

with standardized clinical assessments in the WHO World Mental Health Surveys. International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research. 2006 Dec 1;15(4):167–80.

23.   American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. Fourth Edition. Washington, D.C: American Psychiatric Association; 1994.

24.   Ghimire DJ, Axinn WG, Gatny H, Chardoul S. Preparing a culturally appropriate translation of a survey questionnaire. SAGE Research Method Cases [Internet]. 2017; Available from: https://methods.sagepub.com/case/preparing-culturally-appropriate-translation-survey-questionnaire

25.   Harker Burnhams N, Bharat C, Williams DR, Stein DJ, Myers B. Transitions between lifetime alcohol use, regular use and remission: Results from the 2004 South African Stress and Health Survey. South African Medical Journal; Vol 109, No 1 (2019) [Internet]. 2018 Dec 13; Available from: http://www.samj.org.za/index.php/samj/article/view/12507

26.   Rapsey CM, Wells JE, Bharat MC, Glantz M, Kessler RC, Scott KM. Transitions Through Stages of Alcohol Use, Use Disorder and Remission: Findings from Te Rau Hinengaro, The New Zealand Mental Health Survey. Alcohol and Alcoholism. 2018 Sep 27;54(1):87–96.

27.   Bunting B, Bharat C. Alcohol use, regular use, disorder and remission from use disorders in Northern Ireland: a prevalence study. Addiction Research & Theory. 2019 Jul 4;27(4):347–53.

28.   Pradhan R, Shrestha A. Ethnic and caste diversity: implications for development. In Asian Development Bank; 2005. Available from: http://hdl.handle.net/11540/3290

29.   Axinn WG, Yabiku ST. Social change, the social organization of families, and fertility limitation. American Journal of Sociology. 2001 Mar 1;106(5):1219–61.

30.   Thapa N, Aryal KK, Puri R, Shrestha S, Shrestha S, Thapa P, et al. Alcohol Consumption Practices among Married Women of Reproductive Age in Nepal: A Population Based Household Survey. PLOS ONE. 2016 Apr 1;11(4):e0152535.

31.   Barber JS, Murphy SA, Axinn WG, Maples J. Discrete-Time Multilevel Hazard Analysis. Sociological Methodology. 2000;30(1):201–35.

32.   Petersen T. The statistical analysis of event histories. Sociological Methods & Research. 1991;19:270–323.

33.   Yamaguchi K. Event History Analysis. Newberry Park, CA: Sage Publications; 1991.

34. StataCorp. Stata Statistical Software: Release 15. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC; 2017.

35. Jhingan HP, Shyangwa P, Sharma A, Prasad KMR, Khandelwal SK. Prevalence of alcohol dependence in a town in Nepal as assessed by the CAGE questionnaire. Addiction. 2003 Mar 1;98(3):339–43.

36. Pradhan B, Chappuis F, Baral D, Karki P, Rijal S, Hadengue A, et al. The alcohol use disorders identification test (AUDIT): validation of a Nepali version for the detection of alcohol use disorders and hazardous drinking in medical settings. Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention, and Policy. 2012 Oct 5;7(1):42.

37. Chen C-C, Yin S-J. Alcohol abuse and related factors in Asia. International Review of Psychiatry. 2008 Jan 1;20(5):425–33.

38. Neupane SP, Bramness JG. Prevalence and correlates of major depression among Nepalese patients in treatment for alcohol-use disorders. Drug and Alcohol Review. 2013 Mar 1;32(2):170–7.

39. Kumar AM, Ramaswamy G, Majella MG, Bharadwaj B, Chinnakali P, Roy G. Alcohol, harmful use and dependence: Assessment using the WHO Alcohol Use Disorder Identification Test tool in a South Indian fishermen community. Ind Psychiatry J. 2018;27(2):259–63.

40. Sujiv A, Chinnakali P, Balajee K, Lakshminarayanan S, Kumar SG, Roy G. Alcohol use and alcohol use disorder among male outpatients in a primary care setting in rural Puducherry. Ind Psychiatry J. 2015;24(2):135–9.

41. Glantz MD, Bharat C, Degenhardt L, Sampson NA, Scott KM, Lim CCW, et al. The epidemiology of alcohol use disorders cross-nationally: Findings from the World Mental Health Surveys. Addictive Behaviors. 2020 Mar 1;102:106128.

42. Prasad R. Alcohol use on the rise in India. The Lancet. 2009 Jan 3;373(9657):17–8.

43. Wells JE, Horwood LJ. How Accurate is Recall of Key Symptoms of Depression? A Comparison of Recall and Longitudinal Reports. Psychol Med. 2004;34(6):1001–11.

44. Eaton WW, Anthony JC, Tepper S, Dryman A. Psychopathology and Attrition in the Epidemiologic Catchment Area Surveys. American Journal of Epidemiology. 1992;135(9):1051–9.

Author Manuscript

Table 1: Sample Description

	CVFS Sample 2016-18 (N=10,623)[1]	
Total	n	%
Sex		
Male	4,878	45.92
Female	5,745	54.08
Birth Cohort		
1992-2004	3,441	32.39
1982-1991	3,001	28.25
1972-1981	2,135	20.10
before 1972	2,046	19.26
Ethnicity		
Brahmin/Chhetri	4,634	43.62
Hill Janajati	2,106	19.82
Dalit	1,301	12.25
Newar	640	6.02
Terai Janajati	1,942	18.28
Level of education		
S.L.C. or more[2]	4,066	38.28
Below S.L.C.	6,556	61.72
Missing	1	0.01

1. 91 respondents of "other" ethnicity were excluded from our analyses due to low cell counts.
2. S.L.C.=School Leaving Certificate

Table 2: Overall lifetime prevalence of alcohol use stages by sociodemographic correlates (N=10,623[1])

	Lifetime opportunity to drink (N=10,623)			Lifetime alcohol use (N=10,623)			Regular alcohol use (N=10,623)			Alcohol use disorder[2] (N=10,623)		
	n	%	(95% CIs)	n	%	(95% CIs)	n	%	(95% CIs)	n	%	(95% CIs)
Total	7430	69.95	(69.08, 70.82)	4043	38.06	(37.14, 38.99)	3439	32.37	(31.48, 33.27)	642	6.04	(5.60, 6.50)
Sex												
Male	4608	94.48	(93.84, 95.13)	3561	73.02	(71.77, 74.26)	3177	65.13	(63.80, 66.48)	611	12.53	(11.60, 13.45)
Female	2822	49.12	(47.83, 50.41)	482	8.39	(7.67, 9.11)	262	4.56	(4.02, 5.10)	31	0.54	(0.35, 0.73)
Ethnicity												
Brahmin/Chhetri	2837	61.22	(59.82, 62.62)	1386	29.91	(28.59, 31.23)	1161	25.05	(23.81, 26.30)	199	4.29	(3.71, 4.88)
Hill Janajati	1683	79.91	(78.20, 81.63)	955	45.35	(43.22, 47.47)	812	38.56	(36.48, 40.64)	155	7.36	(6.24, 8.48)
Dalit	952	73.17	(70.76, 75.59)	559	42.97	(40.27, 45.66)	486	37.36	(34.72, 39.99)	107	8.22	(6.73, 9.72)
Newar	475	74.33	(70.94, 77.73)	268	41.94	(38.10, 45.78)	225	35.16	(31.45, 38.87)	32	5.00	(3.31, 6.70)
Terai Janajati	1483	76.36	(74.47, 78.26)	875	45.06	(42.84, 47.27)	755	38.88	(36.71, 41.05)	149	7.67	(6.49, 8.86)
Birth Cohort												
1992-2004	2284	66.38	(64.80, 67.96)	975	28.33	(26.83, 29.84)	738	21.45	(20.08, 22.82)	121	3.52	(2.90, 4.13)
1982-1991	2157	71.90	(70.29, 73.51)	1111	37.03	(35.30, 38.76)	939	31.29	(29.63, 32.95)	192	6.40	(5.52, 7.27)
1972-1981	1565	73.30	(71.42, 75.18)	982	46.00	(43.88, 48.11)	875	40.98	(38.90, 43.07)	161	7.54	(6.42, 8.66)
before 1972	1424	69.60	(67.60, 71.59)	975	47.65	(45.49, 49.82)	887	43.35	(41.20, 45.50)	168	8.21	(7.02, 9.40)

Level of Education

S.L.C. or more[3]	2923	71.89	(70.51, 73.27)	1399	34.41	(32.95, 35.87)	1103	27.13	(25.76, 28.49)	165	4.06	(3.45, 4.66)
Below S.L.C.	4507	68.75	(67.62, 69.87)	2644	40.33	(39.14, 41.52)	2336	35.63	(34.47, 36.79)	477	7.28	(6.65, 7.90)

1. 91 respondents of "other" ethnicity were excluded from our analyses due to low cell counts.
2. Alcohol use disorder (AUD) refers to any lifetime AUD, including abuse (ALA) or dependence (ALD).
3. S.L.C.=Schooling Leaving Certificate.

Table 3: Conditional lifetime prevalence of alcohol use stages

	Lifetime alcohol use among those with lifetime opportunity (N= 7,430)			Regular alcohol use among lifetime alcohol users (N= 4,043)			AUD[1] among lifetime alcohol users (N=4,043)		
	n	%	(95% CIs)	n	%	(95 CIs)	n	%	(95% CIs)
Total	4043	54.41	(53.28, 55.55)	3439	85.06	(83.96, 86.16)	642	15.88	(14.75, 17.01)
Sex									
Male	3561	77.28	(76.07, 78.49)	3177	89.22	(88.20, 90.24)	611	17.16	(15.92, 18.40)
Female	482	17.08	(15.69, 18.47)	262	54.36	(49.89, 58.82)	31	6.43	(4.23, 8.63)
Ethnicity									
Brahmin/Chhetri	1386	48.85	(47.01, 50.69)	1161	83.77	(81.82, 85.71)	199	14.36	(12.51, 16.21)
Hill Janajati	955	56.74	(54.37, 59.11)	812	85.03	(82.76, 87.29)	155	16.23	(13.89, 18.57)
Dalit	559	58.72	(55.59, 61.85)	486	86.94	(84.14, 89.74)	107	19.14	(15.87, 22.41)
Newar	268	56.42	(51.95, 60.90)	225	83.96	(79.53, 88.38)	32	11.94	(8.03, 15.85)
Terai Janajati	875	59.00	(56.50, 61.51)	755	86.29	(84.00, 88.57)	149	17.03	(14.53, 19.52)
Birth Cohort									
1992-2004	975	42.69	(40.66, 44.72)	738	75.69	(73.00, 78.39)	121	12.41	(10.34, 14.48)
1982-1991	1111	51.51	(49.40, 5362)	939	84.52	(82.39, 86.65)	192	17.28	(15.06, 19.51)
1972-1981	982	62.75	(60.35, 65.15)	875	89.10	(87.15, 91.06)	161	16.40	(14.08, 18.71)
before 1972	975	68.47	(66.05, 70.89)	887	90.97	(89.17, 92.78)	168	17.23	(14.86, 19.61)
Level of Education									
S.L.C. or more[2]	1399	47.86	(46.05, 49.67)	1103	78.84	(76.70, 80.98)	165	11.79	(10.10, 13.49)

Below S.L.C.   2644   58.66   (57.23, 60.10)   2336   88.35   (87.13, 89.57)   477   18.04   (16.57, 19.51)

1. Alcohol Use Disorder (AUD) refers to any lifetime AUD, including abuse (ALA) or dependence (ALD).
2. S.L.C.=Schooling Leaving Certificate.

Table 4: Sociodemographic correlates of transitions into alcohol use stages[1]

	Opportunity (N=10,623[2])		Commencing use (N=7,430)		Lifetime use to regular use (N=4,043)		Lifetime use to AUD[3] (N=4,043)		Regular use to AUD (N=3,439)	
	OR	(95% CI)	OR	(95% CI)	OR	(95% CI)	OR	(95% CI)	OR	(95% CI)
Sex										
Male	5.71***	(5.41, 6.03)	11.19***	(10.11,12.39)	4.37***	(3.82, 5.00)	3.13***	(2.18,4.51)	1.95***	(1.35, 2.81)
Female (ref.)	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)
Ethnicity										
Brahmin/Chhetri(ref.)	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)
Hill Janajati	1.87***	(1.75, 2.00)	1.91***	(1.74, 2.09)	1.44***	(1.30, 1.59)	1.15	(0.92, 1.43)	1.10	(0.88, 1.38)
Dalit	1.58***	(1.45, 1.71)	1.77***	(1.59, 1.97)	1.31***	(1.16, 1.47)	1.27	(0.99, 1.63)	1.24	(0.97, 1.59)
Newar	1.62***	(1.46, 1.80)	1.86***	(1.61, 2.14)	1.49***	(1.28,1.74)	0.84	(0.57, 1.22)	0.81	(0.55, 1.17)
Terai Janajati	1.80***	(1.68, 1.94)	1.98***	(1.81, 2.18)	1.46***	(1.32, 1.62)	1.19	(0.95, 1.49)	1.13	(0.90, 1.42)
Birth Cohort										
1992-2004	4.86***	(4.47, 5.29)	2.15***	(1.94, 2.39)	3.96***	(3.51, 4.47)	8.39***	(6.17,11.41)	9.34***	(6.88,12.70)
1982-1991	2.17***	(2.01, 2.34)	1.29***	(1.17, 1.42)	1.68***	(1.52, 1.86)	3.21***	(2.51, 4.10)	3.39***	(2.65,4.33)
1972-1981	1.32***	(1.23, 1.43)	1.06	(0.96, 1.16)	1.11*	(1.01, 1.23)	1.35**	(1.08, 1.70)	1.39**	(1.11,1.75)
before 1972 (ref.)	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)
Level of Education										
S.L.C. or more	1.04	(0.99, 1.11)	0.77***	(0.71, 0.83)	0.69***	(0.64, 0.75)	0.67***	(0.55,0.81)	0.73**	(0.59,0.89)
Below S.L.C. (ref.)[4]	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)
Age	1.64***	(1.60, 1.67)	1.58***	(1.53, 1.62)	1.70***	(1.64, 1.75)	1.36***	(1.30,1.43)	1.36***	(1.29,1.42)
Age2 (age decay)[5]	0.99***	(0.99, 0.99)	0.99***	(0.99, 0.99)	0.99***	(0.99, 0.99)	1.00***	(0.99, 1.00)	1.00***	(1.00,1.00)
Constant	0.00***	(0.00, 0.00)	0.00***	(0.00,0.00)	0.00***	(0.00, 0.00)	0.00***	(0.00, 0.00)	0.00***	(0.00, 0.00)
N	10,623		7,430		4,043		4,043		3,439	
Person-Years	156,727		116,964		57,101		101,430		88,269	

| **-2 Log Likelihood** | -25,613.02 | -14,918.76 | -11,516.20 | -3,663.50 | -3,586.53 |

Exponentiated coefficients; 95% confidence intervals in parentheses; * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

1. Models are adjusted for all covariates.
2. 91 respondents of "other" ethnicity were excluded from our analyses due to low cell counts.
3. Alcohol use disorder (AUD) refers to any lifetime AUD, including abuse (ALA) or dependence (ALD).
4. S.L.C.=School Leaving Certificate.
5. Age squared is an indicator of the decaying effect of age.