

BMJ Paediatrics Open

BMJ Paediatrics Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Paediatrics Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjpaedsopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Paediatrics Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjpo@bmj.com

BMJ Paediatrics Open

Financial crises and child health - reflections from Iceland

Journal:	<i>BMJ Paediatrics Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjpo-2017-000168
Article Type:	Editorial
Date Submitted by the Author:	24-Jun-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Gunnlaugsson, Geir; Faculty of Social and Human Sciences, University of Iceland
Keywords:	Health Service, Comm Child Health

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Review Only

Financial crises and child health - reflections from Iceland

Geir Gunnlaugsson, MD, PhD, MPH

Professor in Global Health

Faculty of Social and Human Sciences

University of Iceland

Email: geirgunnlaugsson@hi.is

Tel. +354-843 6237

June 24, 2017

Editorial

In 2007, Iceland ranked first on the Human Development Index, reinforcing the pervasive idea at the time that Iceland was 'best.' The economic meltdown in October 2008 crushed this national illusion, and the social fabric of the country was severely shaken. Other European countries came also to confront a profound economic challenge, such as Ireland, Spain, Portugal and Greece. Consequently, European governments implemented diverse array of austerity measures that have the potential to hurt the health and wellbeing of children and their families. In Iceland, the government sought help from and collaboration with the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and cut costs across the whole public sector. The welfare system, its most costly component, was not spared despite efforts to alleviate the burdens of those most vulnerable (1).

The socioeconomic situation of families is an important determinant for their health and wellbeing, and in times of economic crisis they may risk to gradually slide below the poverty line with risks for the health and wellbeing of their children (2). This entails but is not limited to worse housing, low-quality nutrition, general stress and worse mental health. Further, in times of crisis the family's access to healthcare services is at risk to be curtailed if measures are not taken to effectively protect them. How did Iceland fare and respond to the economic crisis, and how was child health affected?

In Iceland, surprisingly little impact was seen on a myriad of commonly used child health indicators, including mortality, nine poverty related morbidities, and access to preventive and curative maternal and child healthcare services (3). Yet, a cause for concern was the increased prevalence rate of newborns given the International Classification of Diseases (ICD)-10 diagnosis of small-for-gestational age (SGA), from on average 2.0% before the crisis (2003-2008) to 3.4% after the crisis (2009-2013). A recent analysis of delivery data for the period 2005-2012, with gestational age based on ultra-sound determination, concludes that the rate of SGA indeed did increase following the crisis, in particular babies of parents with low socioeconomic status (4). There was also evidence of increased incidence of low-birth weight babies, but not as sustained as that of SGA. This indicates the insidious impact chronic stress and economic

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

difficulties may have on the growing foetus with potential negative consequences on later child health.

Another reason for concern was the decreased use of maternal/paternity leave following cuts in benefits after the crisis, in particular by fathers, and is an example of one misguided policy measure (3). This trend is still continuing while recent raise in benefits aims to halt and reverse this development. Yet, of interest is that fertility rates in Iceland have abruptly fallen from 2.22 in 2009 to 1.75 children per woman in 2016, and has never been so low since its measurement began in 1853. This fall may indicate a secular trend Iceland is experiencing later than neighbouring countries, compounded by young couples' decision to delay having children as a consequence of fears of economic difficulties caused by recent sharp increase in rental and housing costs. Further, the rapid economic recovery, driven by a booming tourist service industry, may also be an influential factor for this historically low fertility rate.

A third reason for concern is the increased privatization in the healthcare services following the crisis (3). Since 2015, this trend has accelerated. For example, GPs are now allowed to open and run their own primary healthcare services, based on a contract with the government, in direct competition with funds formerly earmarked for the state-run primary healthcare system with reach-out to all corners of the country. Not surprisingly, the first large privately run GP clinic recently opened up in Reykjavík Capital Area. At the same time, user-fees were raised for direct consultation with private specialists without a referral note from a GP, including for children, a service provision that despite the crisis remained popular among families. Further, there is continuing divide between claimed political intentions to strengthen the University Hospital and actual practice. Without any decisive action taken by the government, there is a real risk that its services and teaching will suffer in quality as new for-profit clinics (and even hospitals) are established outside government control while still being reimbursed by public funds. In general, these clinics attend health problems of less severity or urgency, previously delivered in the University Hospital. This development is in sharp contrast to the opinion of the population as repeatedly confirmed in surveys.

The challenges facing the Icelandic population and its government were daunting in 2008/2009 to safeguard the favourable position of the healthcare services in general, but in particular that for children and their families. With the reservations given above, evidently the policies were mostly successful. One additional evidence to its success is that Iceland was ranked 2nd (after Andorra) on the recently published Healthcare Access and Quality Index based on mortality to amenable diseases for the period 1990-2015 (5). Thus, there might be lessons to be drawn for other nations despite the country's particular geography and small population.

One potential contributory factor to the success of Iceland in its response to the crisis may be the robust welfare system that has been in the making for decades in line with other Nordic countries, in sharp contrast to some other European countries such as Greece (1). Before the crisis, Iceland had publicly funded welfare services that reached all, irrespective of employment and socioeconomic status, and these were staffed with well trained and resourceful professionals who stood up to the challenge to continue to deliver high quality healthcare services despite cuts in costs. Another contributory factor might be that pregnant women and children continued to enjoy good access to primary healthcare and hospital services with

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

diverse service provision for preventive and curative care, without user-charges. This did not change much during the crisis, and the services even improved in some aspects (3). A third factor may have been the many labour market initiatives that were taken by the government after the crisis with the over-all claimed aim 'inactivity is not an option' (1). This benefited in particular young people, that is, those most likely to have children. Yet, despite evident success in many respects, over-all the cuts in the welfare system may have been too deep from which it still suffers with consequences to be seen.

In conclusion, despite on-going controversy on the direction of the welfare system and its organization, it was the backbone of the response to the crisis. Amidst an economic collapse and popular protests the Icelandic government aimed to protect those most vulnerable to the negative consequences of the crisis. Over-all, it was mostly successful in doing so. In the end, protection of children and families is a conscious political decision.

References

1. Gunnlaugsson G, Einarsdóttir J. "All's well in Iceland?" Austerity measures, labour market initiatives, and health and well-being of children. *Nordic Welfare Research*. 2016 Nov;1(1):30–42.
2. Wickham S, Whitehead M, Taylor-Robinson D, Barr B. The effect of a transition into poverty on child and maternal mental health: a longitudinal analysis of the UK Millennium Cohort Study. *The Lancet Public Health*. 2017;2(3):e141–8.
3. Gunnlaugsson G. Child health in Iceland before and after the economic collapse in 2008. *Arch Dis Child*. 2016;101:489–96. Online First October 15, 2015.
4. Eiríksdóttir VH. Maternal health indicators during pregnancy and birth outcomes during times of great macroeconomic instability: the case of Iceland [Doctoral dissertation]. Reykjavík: University of Iceland; 2016.
5. Barber RM, Fullman N, Sorensen RJD, Bollyky T, McKee M, Nolte E, et al. Healthcare Access and Quality Index based on mortality from causes amenable to personal health care in 195 countries and territories, 1990–2015: a novel analysis from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2015. *The Lancet* 2017;0(0). Online First May 18.

BMJ Paediatrics Open

Financial crises and child health - reflections from Iceland

Journal:	<i>BMJ Paediatrics Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjpo-2017-000168.R1
Article Type:	Editorial
Date Submitted by the Author:	25-Jul-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Gunnlaugsson, Geir; Faculty of Social and Human Sciences, University of Iceland
Keywords:	Health Service, Comm Child Health

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Review Only

1
2
3 **Financial crises and child health -reflections from Iceland**
4
5

6
7 *Geir Gunnlaugsson, MD, PhD, MPH*
8
9 *Professor in Global Health*
10
11 *Faculty of Social and Human Sciences*
12
13 *University of Iceland*
14 *Email: geirgunnlaugsson@hi.is*
15
16 *Tel. +354-843 6237*
17

18
19 *Words: 1195*
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Confidential: For Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

In 2007, Iceland ranked first on the Human Development Index, reinforcing the pervasive idea at the time that Iceland was 'best.' The economic meltdown in October 2008 crushed this national illusion, and the social fabric of the country was severely shaken. The government sought help from and collaboration with the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and cut costs across the whole public sector complemented with tax hikes. The welfare system, its most costly component, was not spared despite efforts to alleviate the burdens of those most vulnerable (1).

The socioeconomic situation of families is an important determinant for their health and wellbeing, and in times of economic crisis they may gradually slide below the poverty line with risks for the health and wellbeing of their children (2). This entails but is not limited to worse housing, low-quality nutrition, general stress and worse mental health. Further, in times of crisis the family's access to healthcare services is at risk to be curtailed if measures are not taken to effectively protect them.

Populations across Europe felt the impact of the crisis through decreased household income and less public expenditure on health, followed by reforms that for example entailed increased co-payments (3). Unemployment rates rose, affecting particularly young people, and the proportion of children at risk of poverty increased in countries such as Greece (4), Italy (5), Spain (6), Portugal (7), and the UK (8). Impact on infant mortality rates has not been observed, with the exception of Greece where it increased by 43% in 2011 compared to 2008, and there was substantial increase in the proportion of low-birth weight babies and still-births (4). In Italy, fertility rates have fallen (5). In Spain (6) and Portugal (7), vulnerable groups of children were most affected, for example evidenced through increased use of supplementary food services. In the UK, child homelessness and youth suicide rates increased, while subjective wellbeing of children stopped improving (8).

In Iceland, little or no impact was seen on a myriad of commonly used child health indicators, including infant mortality, nine poverty related morbidities, and access to preventive and curative maternal and child healthcare services that continued to free of charge (9); in 2007, the proportion of children less than 18 years at risk of poverty was 11.9% compared to 12.2% in 2013. Yet, a cause for concern was the increased prevalence rate of newborns given the International Classification of Diseases (ICD)-10 diagnosis of small-for-gestational age (SGA), from on average 2.0% before the crisis (2003-2008) to 3.4% after the crisis (2009-2013). A recent analysis of delivery data for the period 2005-2012, with gestational age based on ultrasound determination, concludes that the rate of SGA indeed did increase following the crisis, in particular babies of parents with low socioeconomic status (10). There was also evidence of increased incidence of low-birth weight babies, but not as sustained as that of SGA. This indicates the insidious impact chronic stress and economic difficulties may have on the growing foetus with potential negative consequences on later child health.

Another reason for concern was the decreased use of maternal/paternity leave following cuts in benefits after the crisis, in particular by fathers, and is an example of one misguided policy measure (9). This trend is still continuing while recent raise in benefits aims to halt and reverse this development. Yet, of interest is that fertility rates in Iceland have abruptly fallen from 2.22 in 2009 to 1.75 children per woman in 2016, and has never been so low since its measurement

1
2
3 began in 1853. This fall may indicate a secular trend Iceland is experiencing later than
4 neighbouring countries, compounded by young couples' decision to delay having children as a
5 consequence of fears of economic difficulties caused by recent sharp increase in rental and
6 housing costs. Further, the rapid economic recovery, driven by a booming tourist service
7 industry, may also be an influential factor for this historically low fertility rate.
8
9

10 A third reason for concern is increasing privatization in the healthcare services following the
11 crisis (9). Since 2015, this trend has accelerated. For example, GPs are now allowed to open and
12 run their own primary healthcare services, based on a contract with the government, in direct
13 competition with funds formerly earmarked for the state-run primary healthcare system. At the
14 same time, user-fees were raised in May 2017 for direct consultation with private specialists
15 without a referral note from a GP, including for children, yet with thresholds for cost per month,
16 year, and families. Further, there is continued divide between claimed political intentions to
17 strengthen the University Hospital and actual practice. There is a real risk that its services and
18 teaching will suffer in quality as new for-profit clinics (and even hospitals) are established
19 outside government control while still being reimbursed by public funds. In general, these
20 clinics attend health problems of less severity or urgency, previously reserved for the
21 University Hospital.
22
23
24
25

26 The challenges facing the Icelandic population and its government were daunting in 2008/2009
27 to safeguard the favourable position of the healthcare services in general, but in particular that
28 for children and their families. With the reservations given above, evidently the policies were
29 mostly successful. One additional evidence to its success is that Iceland ranked 2nd (after
30 Andorra) on the recently published Healthcare Access and Quality Index based on mortality to
31 amenable diseases for the period 1990-2015 (11). Thus, there might be lessons to be drawn for
32 other nations despite the country's particular geography and small population.
33
34

35 One potential contributory factor to the success of Iceland in its response to the crisis may be
36 the robust welfare system that has been in the making for decades in line with other Nordic
37 countries (1), in contrast to some other European countries such as Greece (4), Spain (6) and
38 Portugal (7). Before the crisis, Iceland had publicly funded welfare services that reached all,
39 irrespective of employment and socioeconomic status, and these were staffed with well trained
40 and resourceful professionals who stood up to the challenge to continue to deliver high quality
41 healthcare services despite cuts in costs. Another contributory factor might be that pregnant
42 women and children continued to enjoy good access to primary healthcare and hospital
43 services with diverse service provision for preventive and curative care, without user-charges.
44 This did not change much during the crisis, and the services even improved in some aspects (9).
45 A third factor may have been the many labour market initiatives that were taken by the
46 government after the crisis with the over-all claimed aim 'inactivity is not an option' (1). This
47 benefited in particular young people, that is, those most likely to have children. Yet, despite
48 evident success in many respects, over-all the cuts in the welfare system were too deep from
49 which it still suffers with consequences to be seen.
50
51
52
53
54

55 In conclusion, despite on-going controversy on the direction of the welfare system and its
56 organization, it was the backbone of the response to the crisis. Amidst an economic collapse
57 and popular protests the Icelandic government aimed to protect those most vulnerable to the
58
59
60

negative consequences of the crisis. Over-all, it was mostly successful in doing so. In the end, protection of children and families is a conscious political decision.

References

1. Gunnlaugsson G, Einarsdóttir J. "All's well in Iceland?' Austerity measures, labour market initiatives, and health and well-being of children. *Nordic Welfare Research*. 2016;1(1):30–42.
2. Wickham S, Whitehead M, Taylor-Robinson D, Barr B. The effect of a transition into poverty on child and maternal mental health: a longitudinal analysis of the UK Millennium Cohort Study. *The Lancet Public Health*. 2017 Feb 15;2(3):e141–8.
3. Maresso A, Mladovsky P, Thomson S, Sagan A, Karanikolos M, Richardson E, et al., editors. Economic crisis, health systems and health in Europe: country experience. *Observatory Studies Series Nr. 41*. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe and European Health Observatory on Health Systems and Policies; 2015, 554p.
4. Kentikelenis A, Karanikolos M, Reeves A, McKee M, Stuckler D. Greece's health crisis: from austerity to denialism. *The Lancet* 2014;383(9918):748–53.
5. Curtis MD. Economic recession and maternal and child health in Italy. *The Lancet*. 2014;383(9928):1546–7.
6. Rajmil L, Siddiqi A, Taylor-Robinson D, Spencer N. Understanding the impact of the economic crisis on child health: the case of Spain. *Int J Equity Health* 2015;14:95.
7. Sakellarides C, Castelo-Branco L, Barbosa P, Azevedo H. The impact of the financial crisis on the health system and health in Portugal. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe and European Health Observatory on Health Systems and Policies; 2014, 44p.
8. Bradshaw J. Child poverty and child well-being. In: *In Defence of Welfare 2*. Policy Press of Bristol University and Social Policy Association; 2015, p. 62–4.
9. Gunnlaugsson G. Child health in Iceland before and after the economic collapse in 2008. *Arch Dis Child*. 2016;101:489–96. Online First 15 Oct 2015.
10. Eiríksdóttir VH. Maternal health indicators during pregnancy and birth outcomes during times of great macroeconomic instability: the case of Iceland [Doctoral dissertation]. Reykjavík: University of Iceland; 2016.
11. Barber RM, Fullman N, Sorensen RJD, Bollyky T, McKee M, Nolte E, et al. Healthcare Access and Quality Index based on mortality from causes amenable to personal health care in 195 countries and territories, 1990–2015: a novel analysis from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2015. *The Lancet* 2017;0(0). Online First May 18.