1. Introduction

The continuous expansion of urban regions constitutes one of the most radical changes in our environment at the beginning of the 21st century. It is estimated that by the year 2050, 67% of the global population will live in urban areas (United Nations, 2012). In addition to profound effects on economy and ecology, this process has major implications for health. Both physical and mental health of city dwellers may be affected by varying degrees of population density, social interaction, physical activity and exposure to noise, toxins and light. In general, health is better in urban than in rural areas, mainly because of better education, higher rates of employment and easier access to health care (Dye, 2008). However, reliable information on these conditions is hard to extract, as the urban environment is inhomogeneous. Therefore, the statement of a health advantage of city dwellers may be correct on a general level, however, it may not apply for specific diseases or for inhabitants of a distinct neighbourhood.

2. Urban-rural differences in mental disorder risk

Despite the general health advantage of city dwellers, incidence (the rate at which new disease events occur in a population) and prevalence (the number of events, e.g., a given disease, in a given population at a designated time) of specific mental disorders seem to be increased in this population. Meta-analytic studies report that among individuals living in cities, the prevalence of all psychiatric disorders is increased by 38%, of mood disorders by 39%, and of anxiety disorders by 21%, as compared to inhabitants of rural areas (Peen et al., 2010). Adjustment for potential confounders like age, gender, marital status, social class or ethnicity had limited impact on these findings, indicating that these population characteristics do not substantially contribute to the observed disparities.

The most striking urban-rural difference in mental disorder risk is the increased incidence of schizophrenia in people born and raised in urban areas (van Os et al., 2010). Schizophrenia is a serious mental disorder affecting approximately 0.5–1% of the world population, leading to major suffering and disability in many patients (Insel, 2010). The first report on the increased incidence of schizophrenia in urban areas dates back to 1939 (Faris and Dunham, 1939), when increased incidence rates for this disorder were observed in densely populated inner city areas of Chicago, as compared to the city's periphery. The increased schizophrenia incidence in urban areas has been corroborated by subsequent studies (Häfner et al., 1965; Mortensen et al., 1999; Kirkbride et al., 2006), including demonstration of a dose–response relationship (Pedersen and Mortensen, 2001). A systematic review of the literature reported an increase in schizophrenia risk among city dwellers of 1.92 in males and 1.34 in females (Kelly et al., 2011). Interestingly, the effect of exposure to the urban environment seems to be strongest during the time period from birth to age 15 (Pedersen and Mortensen, 2001), as compared to exposure later in life (Marcelis et al., 1999).
Many researchers believe that urbanicity stands as a proxy for environmental factors that await identification. Possibilities discussed in the literature (Krabbendam and van Os, 2005) include socioeconomic adversities, environmental pollution, exposure to toxins and infectious agents, drug abuse, and others. However, the difference in schizophrenia incidence persisted when analyses were adjusted for many of these variables, indicating that these factors probably exert no major effect on the association. The social drift hypothesis also addressed this issue and proposed that individuals with pre-existing mental disorders tend to move to a socioeconomic lower status and to cluster in urban areas, thus raising the false impression that city living predisposes to increased psychosis risk. However, several observations argue against this hypothesis. First, there is both a dose–response relationship between duration of exposure to urbanicity and morbidity risk and a nearly linear association between city size and psychosis incidence, indicating that the urban-rural difference constitutes the etiologic factor (Pedersen and Mortensen, 2001). Second, in subjects with high psychosis risk, moving to a rural area attenuates schizophrenia incidence (Pedersen and Mortensen, 2001). This reversibility also argues in favour of urbanicity itself, not social drift, as the causative agent. Third, in migrants, the effect of city living on schizophrenia incidence is greatest among second-generation individuals (Cantor-Graae and Selten, 2005). This observation is not easily explained by social drift as the primary event. In conclusion, the factors mentioned above seem an unlikely explanation for the observed urban-rural difference in mental disorders incidence. Currently, many researchers favour the hypothesis that the urban environment stands as a proxy for increased exposure to social stress.

3. Social stress — risk factor for mental disorders

During evolution, processing and performing complex social interaction emerged as a key factor driving the development of larger brains in primates and humans (Dunbar and Shultz, 2007). Social skills that are necessary for profiting from diversification of knowledge, for refining commercial relationships or for building tactical alliances in order to expand power, substantially contributed to the success of the human species. A supportive social environment turned out as one of the most important conditions necessary for mental and physical health. Therefore, acute loss of group support may be perceived as fundamental threat, eliciting a stress reaction comparable to acute physical endangerment (Eisenberger and Cole, 2012). But also more chronic forms of social stress are of interest, as exposure to a socially stressful environment often expands over a period of weeks, months or years. For example, long-lasting social isolation has a considerable impact on both physical and mental health, as it is associated with an increased risk of depression, anxiety, coronary heart disease, and death (House, 2001). The impact of social stress as a risk factor for both mental and physical disease is corroborated by findings that highlight the beneficial impact of social support. This factor emerged as a powerful resource to mitigate the effects of acute stress (Heinrichs et al., 2003). Finally, the presence of this factor is associated with a reduction of mortality exceeding the influence of physical activity, smoking cessation and lower body-mass index (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2010).

Stress research, neuroscience and epidemiology have substantially contributed to elucidate the role of social stress as a risk factor for mental disorders. Stress research has identified potent ingredients of acute social stress. Exposure to tasks that were uncontrollable and included social threat, i.e. failure in front of significant others, were associated with the most profound activation of the endocrine stress response (Dickerson and Kemeny, 2004). Pathways through which stress exposure increases the risk of disease manifestation have been investigated in most major mental disorders. They vary according to type of stressor, exposure time and subject characteristics. In 1997, Walker and Diforio (Walker and Diforio, 1997) proposed the “neural diathesis-stress model”, and suggested that the interaction of specific genetic and environmental factors resulted in increased stress system activation, thus facilitating onset, exacerbation and relapse of schizophrenia. According to this model, stressful events are associated with an abnormal activity of the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal(HPA) axis, triggering a cascade of events leading to dysfunction of dopaminergic neurotransmission and neural circuits relevant for psychosis symptom generation (van Winkel et al., 2008). Significant stress-associated dopamine release in the ventral striatum in healthy volunteers (Pruessner et al., 2004) and stress-responsive system dysfunction in schizophrenic patients upon exposure of to an experimental social stressor (Brenner et al. 2009) both support this hypothesis. Furthermore, prolonged exposure to stress seems to be capable of inducing architectural changes in specific brain areas such as the prefrontal cortex which mediates the highest-order cognitive abilities (Arnsen, 2009). Chronic stress was also found to be associated with a decrease in volumes of the hippocampus, a structure central to memory storage and retrieval (Sapolsky, 1996). Interestingly, the hippocampus is also involved in HPA system regulation, as this structure exerts a tonic inhibition on stress system activity, which subsides with stress exposure. Through this mechanism, hippocampal damage may result in enduring HPA system overactivity, further aggravating damage to brain structures via prolonged cortisol exposure.

Neuroscience has made substantial progress in exploring the neural circuits that support social function and process social stress. Segmentation of social cognition differentiates social perception, attribution and categorization. During these processes, social stimuli that arise from other group members are detected and analysed, and behaviour is interpreted as indicating a specific mental state (Meyer-Lindenberg and Tost, 2012). The emotional and motivational appraisal of social stimuli is processed in a neural mutually interacting circuit involving the brain regions amygdala, insulate, subgenual anterior cingulate cortex (ACC) as well as the orbitofrontal cortex. This circuit closely interacts with the brain structures that direct the stress-responsive systems including the HPA system. The smooth functioning of these neural circuits may be endangered by genetic and environmental factors. Several lines of evidence indicate that the maturing brain is vulnerable to environmental stressors especially in genetically predisposed subjects (Heim and Binder, 2012). For example, the action of the hypothalamic neuropeptides oxytocin and vasopressin differs in carriers of certain genetic variants encoding the receptor for these molecules (Chen et al., 2011; Hammock and Young, 2005). Exposure to social stress is associated with a profound effect on these receptors, affecting function and structure of hypothalamic-limbic circuits. In the case of schizophrenia, animal data indicate that early life exposure to social stress is associated with both increased mesolimbic dopamine reactivity and psychosis related phenotype in adulthood (Lieberman et al., 1997).

Recent work has combined functional magnetic resonance imaging techniques and stress research tools to identify the brain mechanisms that are involved in translating the effect of city living on social stress processing (Lederbogen et al., 2011). It was shown that in healthy adults, exposure to an urban environment during the first 15 years of life was associated with an increased activation of the ACC, a key structure of the limbic system involved in both processing social information and regulating stress-responsive system activation. The association between early-life urbanicity
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and increased ACC activation during social stress processing followed a dose–response relationship and was specific for this brain area and for stress processing. Furthermore, this neurobiological region is known to be central for exactly those disorder groups (schizophrenia and depression) that are found to be increased in city dwellers, making it plausible that social stress processing is a mediator for increased psychiatric risk in the urban environment.

Epidemiologic work has described in great detail the magnitude of mental disorders that follow social isolation, neglect and abuse. Adverse social conditions during childhood showed powerful associations with many types of mental disorders, including anxiety, mood, disruptive behaviour and substance use disorders (Kessler et al., 2010). The maladaptive family functioning cluster (parental mental illness, substance use disorder, and criminality; family violence; physical abuse; sexual abuse; and neglect) were the strongest correlates of disorder onset (Green et al., 2010). These epidemiologic data suggest that 45% of childhood-onset disorders and 29% of later-onset disorders are associated with adverse social conditions during childhood.

Chronic social adversity and discrimination pose also during adolescence a major social stressor to the individual. These factors have been identified as a major risk factor for psychotic episodes and schizophrenia (Veling et al., 2007) and have been thoroughly studied in specific minority groups including first and second generation migrants. These cohorts, e.g., individuals who have migrated from the Caribbean Islands to the United Kingdom and elsewhere, carry a substantially increased risk of schizophrenia (Kirkbride et al., 2012a). It has been demonstrated that this phenomenon does not reflect an increased schizophrenia risk in the country of origin, but rather depends on the ethnic density of the environment where the migrant is actually living (Boydell et al., 2001; Veling et al., 2008). Notably, the presence of a large ethnic group to which the migrant belongs to attenuates the increase of psychosis risk in migrants. Detailed examination of the sociospatial distribution of psychosis risk in three neighbouring, ethnically diverse and socially deprived inner-city boroughs of East London demonstrated that the incidence of non-affective psychoses (e.g., schizophrenia) was independently associated with increased deprivation, income inequality and population density. Ethnic separation and ethnic density were associated with psychosis risk for people of black Caribbean and black African origin (Kirkbride et al. 2012b). These data support the hypothesis that characteristics that define individuals as being different from most other people in the local environment may increase psychosis risk. The observation that the increase in schizophrenia risk is higher in individuals with dark skin living in a white neighbourhood (Cantor-Graae and Selten, 2005) gives further support to the assumption that the feeling of being strange and different from others defines the core of this form of social stress.

Also during adulthood, social stressors have been recognized as risk factors for mental disorders. Longitudinal data indicate that adverse life events are associated with a substantial increase of psychotic symptoms in the general population (Wiles et al., 2006). Repeated exposure to these events seems to exert a cumulative effect, as psychosis risk increases with number of adverse life events experienced (Shevlin et al., 2008). Stressful life events are also associated with a fivefold increase of major depression, identifying this factor as one of the most important external causes of this affective disorder (Kendler et al., 1999).

4. Stress-related risk factors in urban environments

At present, social networks are subject to profound transformation. Electronic communication enables many individuals to meet friends without personal contact. However, it seems unclear whether these virtual social networks exert similar effects on health outcomes as the real-world encounters (Wang and Wellmann, 2010). This issue seems important, since social network size is reflected by the amygdala, a brain structure that is involved in governing the stress response (Bickart et al., 2011). Preliminary results indicate that electronic friends may also shape the functioning of distinct brain structures (Kana et al., 2012). However, it is unclear whether there is an urban–rural difference in this process.

Furthermore, it has not been clarified whether urban life, as compared to living in a rural environment, is associated with increased social stress (Krabbendam and van Os, 2005). Thus, an important link in the chain of arguments explaining increased schizophrenia risk associated with city living is missing. The concept of social capital, describing features of social life that enable participants to act together more effectively, fits in well as a factor that protects against social stress (McKenzie et al., 2002). But again, the urban–rural contrast is unknown.

Overcrowding has been proposed as another factor promoting increased social stress in cities. Neuroscientific observations indicate that the amygdala is also linked with sense of personal space (Kennedy et al., 2009). It has been observed that living in a densely populated area was associated with a feeling of loss of control, a factor that has been identified as a negative promoter of mental health (Fleming et al., 1987). However, methodological obstacles have blurred the clarity of this observation, as overcrowding is often associated with socioeconomic deprivation, increased violence and an increased feeling of threat and danger (Wallace and Wallace, 1998).

Lack of green zones constitutes another factor how social stress may negatively affect mental health in urban areas (van den Berg et al., 2010). Access to green space may attenuate the level of perceived stress by several mechanisms, including physical activity, which is often associated with attendance to green space and has itself positive effects on emotional well-being, and attenuation of stress levels by direct interaction with nature (Ulrich et al., 1991).

Environmental pollutants and other factors may exert unspecified unfavourable effects on mental functioning that modifies social interaction. For example, airplane traffic noise decreases children’s capacity of learning and memory (Stansfeld et al., 2005). In an animal model, air pollution was associated with deficits of mental functioning (Fonken et al., 2011). In this way, chronic exposure to these environmental pollutants of urban life may change the social capacity and lead to increased susceptibility to social stress. Alternatively, pollutants like carbon monoxide or benzene may act directly on the central nervous system, causing subtle deficits that predispose individuals to mental disorders (Pedersen et al., 2004). Infectious agents and malnutrition constitute other environmental factors that may induce subtle brain damage. For example, in densely populated urban areas, increased transmission of influenza and rubella viruses may damage the nervous system during its development (Brown, 2011), leading to the cascade of events detailed above.

5. Perspective

The goal of understanding how social stress acts as a risk factor for mental disorders in urban populations may be pursued on several levels. Effects of infrastructure (population density, access to green space), economic issues (rates of employment, working conditions), environmental pollutants (air pollution, noise, toxins, light) and social conditions (social coherence, density of social networks) need to be considered and weighted in order to identify the most potent contributors to social stress. Vice versa, it should not be missed to have a closer look at probably protective factors of...
the rural environment. Better education, higher employment and easier access to health care have been identified as factors contributing to improved health in cities, but these factors have to be actively created and maintained through policy interventions (Rydin et al., 2012). Investigations aimed at a better understanding of social stress in the urban environment should have a high spatial resolution, combining tools from different fields like epidemiology, environmental science, social sciences, and medicine. Tools are available for measuring size and complexity of social networks, perceived social standing, subjective stress level, major life events, and others (Abbott, 2012). Increasingly, cross-sectional studies with single time points of observation are replaced by studies focusing the daily flow of life and longitudinal observations of cohorts, often starting with birth or young age. Also, it has been successful to probe hypotheses on neural social stress processing by applying modern imaging techniques in healthy volunteers. Detecting the major factors which contribute to the increased risk for mental illness in urban environments might not only give valuable insights into etiological aspects of mental disorders but also inform policy makers about relevant health risks of one of our most important environments.
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