ARTICLES
https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01242-1

nature human behaviour

A mixed-methods, population-based study of a syndemic in Soweto, South Africa

Emily Mendenhall[1,2]✉, Andrew Wooyoung Kim[2,3], Anthony Panasci[1], Lindile Cele[2], Feziwe Mpondo[2,4], Edna N. Bosire[2,5,6], Shane A. Norris[2,7] and Alexander C. Tsai[3,8,9]

A syndemic has been theorized as a cluster of epidemics driven by harmful social and structural conditions wherein the interactions between the constitutive epidemics drive excess morbidity and mortality. We conducted a mixed-methods study to investigate a syndemic in Soweto, South Africa, consisting of a population-based quantitative survey (*N* = 783) and in-depth, qualitative interviews (*N* = 88). We used ethnographic methods to design a locally relevant measure of stress. Here we show that multimorbidity and stress interacted with each other to reduce quality of life. The paired qualitative analysis further explored how the quality-of-life impacts of multimorbidity were conditioned by study participants' illness experiences. Together, these findings underscore the importance of recognizing the social and structural drivers of stress and how they affect the experience of chronic illness and well-being.

Syndemic theory integrates two concepts: disease concentration and disease interaction[1]. The concept of disease concentration emphasizes how and where multiple epidemics cluster together as a result of large-scale political, economic, ecological and social forces (for example, systemic racism, gender inequities, structural violence, drought and heat intensification)[2]. The concept of disease interaction emphasizes the ways in which overlapping epidemics have mutually reinforcing effects on worsening health and disease via biological and social processes[3]. In this study, we evaluate which stressors interact, and how they interact, with convergent chronic conditions to influence quality of life in a population-based sample of adults living in a large, urban community in South Africa. We developed a locally defined measure of stress on the basis of two ethnographic studies investigating how people understand stress on their own terms amid living with chronic illness. We argue that disentangling 'what' drives disease concentrations from 'how' they interact is crucial for explaining how history and context shape the conditions of disease epidemics and determining when non-medical social interventions should be prioritized over (or augment) clinical interventions.

Anthropologists have long been concerned with the conventional practice of using standardized scales of stress and mental illness without considering local ways in which people experience stress and psychiatric disorders and communicate distress[4–7]. While the use of standardized instruments facilitates comparative studies of population mental health across contexts[8], building locally relevant tools to evaluate social impact in large-scale studies has become increasingly relevant and critical for interrogating syndemics. Weaver and Kaiser argue that a "study designed to assess a presumptive syndemic" should "begin with freelists, ethnographic interviews, observation, and/or focus group discussions to identify common elements" that shape disease conditions across multiple valences of influence[9]. For example, Brewis and colleagues conducted a combined analysis of data from an epidemiological survey and qualitative interviews to study how the consequences of chronic social inequality (crime, hunger and discrimination) drive health disparities across three low-resource but heterogeneous communities in Haiti. They analysed epidemiological survey data to understand differences in exposures across communities and textual data from focus groups and one-on-one interviews to understand "the nuance, context, and local embeddedness of core themes as they emerged from respondents' own words"[10]. This work emphasizes the need to focus on what they call "syndemic localization", a process by which social, political or ecological factors—defined and measured within and in relation to a local context—drive disease interactions differently within and between geographic areas.

Mixed-methods scholarship like this is increasingly needed to counter the idea of the "global syndemic"[11,12], a concept that threatens to erase local histories of inequity and oppression from contemporary accounts of disease morbidity and mortality. For instance, many researchers have demonstrated that the relationship between diabetes and depression is bidirectional[13] and is intensified by economic hardship around the world[14] in wealthy and poor countries alike[15,16]. In contrast, clinical work tends to gloss over how local identities and power relations contribute to how people experience the chronicity of illness as well as recommended clinical care[17]. One reason why this disconnect may occur is that risk is conceived in individual terms (for example, self-control) rather than social terms (for example, what conditions and intersectional identities shape experience), which embodies a broader framing of what drives diabetes in the first place[18,19]. Sangaramoorthy warns, in the context of HIV, that clinicians and counselors "are trained to be experts in the mediation of disease-specific risk, transforming individual client's perceptions of external risk into internal risk and obscuring other non-HIV/AIDS threats to well-being" (p. 303)[20]. For these reasons, a rigorous examination of how and why social dimensions

[1]Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA. [2]SAMRC Developmental Pathways for Health Research Unit, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa. [3]Center for Global Health, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA. [4]DSI-NRF Centre for Excellence in Human Development, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa. [5]Center for Innovation in Global Health, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA. [6]Kamuzu University of Health Sciences, Mahatma Gandhi, Blantyre, Malawi. [7]Global Health Research Institute, School of Health and Human Development, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. [8]Mongan Institute, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA. [9]Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA. ✉e-mail: em1061@georgetown.edu

Table 1 | Characteristics of the sample ($N = 783$)

Characteristic	Women ($N = 541$)		Men ($N = 242$)		Total sample ($N = 783$)	
Age (mean ± s.d.)	**46.6 ± 12.6**		**45.0 ± 13.1**		**46.1 ± 12.7**	
Number of assets in home (mean ± s.d.)	**7.9 ± 1.8**		**8.2 ± 2.2**		**8.0 ± 1.9**	
Perceived lack of safety (*N*, %)	356	(65.8)	109	(45.0)	465	(59.4)
Perceived social cohesion (*N*, %)	452	(83.5)	193	(79.8)	645	(82.4)
Soweto Stress Scale (mean ± s.d.)	48.9 ± 12.9		44.5 ± 12.5		47.6 ± 12.9	
Soweto Coping Scale (mean ± s.d.)	45.4 ± 9.3		45.5 ± 9.0		45.4 ± 9.2	
General Health Questionnaire-28, caseness (*N*, %)	66	(12.2)	14	(5.8)	80	(10.2)
World Health Organization Quality of Life-BREF	57.6 ± 18.9		60.1 ± 19.6		58.3 ± 19.1	
Number of medical conditions (mean ± s.d.)	0.71 ± 0.87		0.50 ± 0.78		0.65 ± 0.85	
None (*N*, %)	275	(50.8)	153	(63.2)	428	(54.7)
One (*N*, %)	171	(31.6)	65	(26.9)	236	(30.1)
Two (*N*, %)	72	(13.3)	17	(7.0)	89	(11.4)
Three or more (*N*, %)	23	(4.3)	7	(2.9)	30	(3.8)
Self-reported hypertension (*N*, %)	222	(41.0)	63	(26.0)	285	(36.4)
Self-reported type 2 diabetes (*N*, %)	39	(7.2)	13	(5.4)	52	(6.6)
Self-reported chronic pain (*N*, %)	76	(14.0)	31	(12.8)	107	(13.7)
Self-reported hyperlipidemia (*N*, %)	41	(7.6)	14	(5.8)	55	(7.0)
Self-reported cancer (*N*, %)	8	(1.5)	1	(0.4)	9	(1.1)
HIV-positive, based on either self-report or test (*N*, %)	120	(22.2)	36	(14.9)	156	(19.9)
Neighbourhood cluster (*N*, %)						
Cluster 1	145	(26.8)	63	(26.0)	208	(26.6)
Cluster 2	12	(2.2)	4	(1.7)	16	(2.0)
Cluster 3	31	(5.7)	17	(7.0)	48	(6.1)
Cluster 4	111	(20.5)	65	(26.9)	176	(22.5)
Cluster 5	94	(17.4)	32	(13.2)	126	(16.1)
Cluster 6	148	(27.4)	61	(25.2)	209	(26.7)

The columns present the summary characteristics of the subsample of women (column 1), the subsample of men (column 2) and the total sample. The cell contents correspond to mean ± s.d. for continuous variables and *N* (%) for categorical variables.

of stress fuel diabetes and its comorbid companions (such as depression, hypertension and HIV), particularly in settings of historically engrained racism and inequality such as South Africa, requires a mixed-methods (that is, combined anthropological and epidemiological) approach.

The research we present was originally based on two qualitative studies in Soweto, South Africa, that illustrated how people perceived social and personal stress to be more challenging than disease diagnoses[21–23]. The preliminary anthropological work illustrated how structural and social factors may impede people's abilities to manage their own care for chronic illnesses, including diabetes, cancer, depression, physical pain and infectious diseases. For example, women described how reconstructing their families and raising grandchildren after losing children to AIDS not only posed substantial psychological burdens but also affected how they ate and how they accepted and managed their diabetes. Many related diabetes treatment to shared AIDS nosologies, referring to diabetes as "the same" or "worse"[21]. A further analysis of survey data from 1,000 middle-aged women in Soweto found a 40% prevalence of elevated psychological distress; women who reported two diseases had increased rates of psychological distress, and this upward trend continued with each additional physical disease reported[24]. Yet, in a study of breast cancer survivors in Soweto, we found that women relied on radical acceptance of their disease diagnoses and illness prognoses, as well as on family support and the public health system, to cope and foster their own well-being[25].

Acknowledgment of the manifold ways that social and biological stress interact is particularly important in Soweto, as multiple comorbidity is an increasing public health concern. South Africa maintains (1) the highest number of people living with HIV globally, of which many also experience tuberculosis[26] and, increasingly, diabetes[27]; (2) elevated rates of automobile accidents, intimate partner violence, rape and murder[28,29]; (3) elevated rates of infant and maternal mortality, despite a high level of wealth in the aggregate compared with other countries in the region[30]; and (4) a massive rise in non-communicable diseases, including diabetes[31]. Focusing on social and economic factors that affect diabetes alone and together with other medical conditions thus provides a more realistic understanding of people's experiences with sickness and health.

A clinical study in Khayelitsha, a peri-urban settlement near Cape Town, South Africa, found that 45% of adults sought prescriptions for at least one of the following diseases: HIV, tuberculosis, diabetes and hypertension[32]. The increases in longevity among those living with HIV have led to increased risks of developing type 2 diabetes[33]. Additionally, one in four patients had multiple comorbidities, a phenomenon that generally increased with age, while those receiving antiretroviral therapy were more likely to develop diabetes at a younger age[32]. Cohort studies in Uganda and South Africa were some of the first to document the convergence of HIV with non-communicable diseases in sub-Saharan Africa[34–39]. These cohort studies suggested that having multiple conditions increases the likelihood of depression and that non-communicable diseases are less common among those without HIV than among people who are living with HIV[40]. Studies also point to the increasing salience of diabetes and tuberculosis[41], which is of concern in South Africa given that the country has one of the largest concentrations of tuberculosis worldwide[26]. The demand for chronic care associated with any combination of diabetes, HIV and tuberculosis poses extraordinary public health and health care challenges.

This article investigates how our locally constructed measure of stress interacts with multiple medical conditions among people residing in six different neighbourhoods in Soweto, an urban settlement in Johannesburg, South Africa. We first used ethnographic methods to shape the study questions and design locally valid measures, which we then applied to a large population-based study of Soweto residents. Finally, we tested the theory derived from our quantitative analysis by conducting a follow-up qualitative study of illness experiences among people with multiple comorbidities. In what follows, we describe the co-occurrence of these medical conditions and consider how these conditions interact with our locally designed measure of stress and other measures of psychological distress and well-being. In doing so, we discuss what interactions among medical and social conditions tell us about people's experiences

Table 2 | Correlates of quality of life as assessed using the 26-item World Health Organization Quality of Life-BREF ($N = 783$)

Explanatory variable	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	β	95% CI	*P*	*β*	95% CI	*P*	*β*	95% CI	*P*
Multimorbidity count	−4.803	(−6.242 to −3.364)	<0.001	−3.862	(−5.389 to −2.334)	<0.001	4.084	(−1.662 to 9.829)	0.163
Soweto Stress Scale	−0.529	(−0.623 to −0.435)	<0.001	−0.575	(−0.671 to −0.480)	<0.001	−0.475	(−0.593 to −0.356)	<0.001
Age				−0.179	(−0.281 to −0.077)	<0.001	−0.191	(−0.293 to −0.089)	<0.001
Male				−1.689	(−4.296 to 0.919)	0.204	−1.744	(−4.341 to 0.852)	0.188
Number of assets in home				0.534	(−0.088 to 1.157)	0.092	0.534	(−0.085 to 1.154)	0.091
Perceived lack of safety				−0.493	(−2.988 to 2.001)	0.698	−0.525	(−3.008 to 1.959)	0.678
Perceived social cohesion				−1.224	(−4.301 to 1.853)	0.435	−0.993	(−4.061 to 2.075)	0.525
HIV				−0.533	(−3.511 to 2.444)	0.725	−0.597	(−3.562 to 2.367)	0.693
Soweto Coping Scale				0.454	(0.323 to 0.585)	<0.001	0.445	(0.314 to 0.576)	<0.001
Neighbourhood cluster									
Cluster 1				Ref.			Ref.		
Cluster 2				4.215	(−4.264 to 12.694)	0.329	3.370	(−5.091 to 11.832)	0.434
Cluster 3				0.167	(−5.145 to 5.478)	0.951	0.427	(−4.864 to 5.718)	0.874
Cluster 4				4.301	(0.900 to 7.702)	0.013	4.447	(1.060 to 7.835)	0.010
Cluster 5				2.309	(−1.472 to 6.090)	0.231	2.296	(−1.468 to 6.060)	0.232
Cluster 6				−1.772	(−4.973 to 1.429)	0.277	−1.657	(−4.845 to 1.530)	0.308
Multimorbidity count × Soweto Stress Scale product term							−0.161	(−0.274 to −0.049)	0.005
Constant term	86.772	(82.116 to 91.427)	<0.001	72.549	(61.984 to 83.113)	<0.001	68.488	(57.597 to 79.380)	<0.001

Each column represents the output of a single multivariable linear regression model specifying quality of life as the dependent variable and the row variables as multiple explanatory variables. Model 1 includes medical comorbidities and the Soweto Stress Scale. Model 2 additionally includes age, sex, number of assets in home, perceived safety, perceived social cohesion, HIV, the Soweto Coping Scale and neighbourhood cluster. Model 3 additionally includes a product term to assess for a hypothesized interaction between multimorbidity and stress.

in Soweto and how this informs the study of syndemics more broadly.

Results

Epidemiological findings. Among the study participants who completed surveys and had complete data available ($N = 783$), there were 541 women and 242 men (Table 1). The mean age was 46.1 years (standard deviation, 12.7). Quality of life was slightly higher among men than among women (60.1 versus 57.6; $t = 1.67$; $P = 0.10$). Most participants reported no chronic medical comorbidities (428 (55%)), while 236 (30%) reported one comorbidity, 89 (11%) reported two comorbidities and 30 (3.8%) reported three or more comorbidities. On the emic measure of stress, women reported considerably higher levels of stress than men did (48.9 versus 44.5; $t = 4.50$; $P < 0.001$), differing by more than 0.3 standard deviation units. On the emic measure of coping, no gender-based differences were observed.

Table 2 shows the results of the multivariable regression models. In the fully adjusted multivariable regression model, the multimorbidity sum score (β = −3.86; 95% confidence interval (CI), −5.39 to −2.33; $P < 0.001$) and stress (β = −0.58; 95% CI, −0.67 to −0.48; $P < 0.001$) both had statistically substantial negative associations with quality of life. The disaggregated model in Supplementary Table 1 suggests that the multimorbidity estimates were primarily driven by diabetes (β = −9.06; 95% CI, −14.1 to −4.05; $P < 0.001$) and cancer (β = −12.8; 95% CI, −23.9 to −1.76; $P = 0.02$). When the multimorbidity and stress product term was added to the model, the product term was statistically substantial, suggestive of an interaction in which the negative association between multimorbidity and quality of life was amplified in the presence of high stress (β = −0.16; 95% CI, −0.27 to −0.05; $P = 0.005$). Sensitivity analyses yielded estimates that were substantively similar to the primary analysis (Table 3): the binary measures of caseness had statistically substantial associations with quality of life, although the interaction between caseness on the 28-item General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-28) and multimorbidity was not statistically substantial; and the quintiles of the stress scale showed increasingly stronger associations, and stronger interactions with multimorbidity, with increasing levels of stress.

Qualitative findings. Table 4 describes key themes and sub-themes that emerged from the interviews, along with exemplar quotations, for each sub-group. Study participants with diabetes, hypertension and high levels of stress (Group 2) often described a constant fear of having a debilitating medical complication (for example, amputation). They also described financial burdens associated with paying for medications and food, and social burdens such as those due to family conflict. Study participants with diabetes and HIV or tuberculosis (Group 3) reported similar concerns over access to care, the importance of self-care and financial stressors.

In contrast, study participants with diabetes and hypertension but low levels of stress (Group 1) commonly described more social support, less trouble accessing or managing medication and care-seeking, acceptance of their illness, and a more positive

Table 3 | Correlates of quality of life as assessed using the 26-item World Health Organization Quality of Life-BREF, with alternative specifications for the measurement of stress ($N = 783$)

Explanatory variable	Caseness for stress measured with the Soweto Stress Scale			Caseness for stress measured with the GHQ-28			Soweto Stress Scale categorized into quintiles		
	β	95% CI	*P*	*β*	95% CI	*P*	*β*	95% CI	*P*
Multimorbidity count	−3.361	(−5.197 to −1.525)	<0.001	−4.464	(−6.169 to −2.759)	<0.001	−1.844	(−5.182 to 1.493)	0.278
Caseness for stress	−9.831	(−13.438 to −6.224)	<0.001	−10.546	(−16.051 to −5.041)	<0.001			
Soweto Stress Scale quintiles									
Least stressed (quintile 1)							Ref.		
Less stressed							−5.119	(−9.535 to −0.704)	0.023
Middle							−10.018	(−14.691 to −5.346)	<0.001
More stressed							−13.012	(−17.674 to −8.350)	<0.001
Most stressed (quintile 5)							−16.831	(−21.664 to −11.997)	<0.001
Age	−0.155	(−0.261 to −0.049)	0.004	−0.139	(−0.248 to −0.031)	0.012	−0.188	(−0.291 to −0.084)	<0.001
Male	−1.195	(−3.897 to 1.508)	0.386	−0.465	(−3.238 to 2.309)	0.742	−1.532	(−4.173 to 1.108)	0.255
Number of assets in home	0.806	(0.163 to 1.450)	0.014	0.841	(0.179 to 1.503)	0.013	0.495	(−0.135 to 1.125)	0.123
Perceived lack of safety	−1.986	(−4.544 to 0.572)	0.128	−2.806	(−5.425 to −0.188)	0.036	−0.815	(−3.334 to 1.704)	0.525
Perceived social cohesion	−0.707	(−3.900 to 2.486)	0.664	−0.980	(−4.272 to 2.311)	0.559	−0.972	(−4.099 to 2.155)	0.542
HIV	−0.528	(−3.619 to 2.563)	0.738	−1.282	(−4.454 to 1.891)	0.428	−0.599	(−3.630 to 2.432)	0.698
Soweto Coping Scale	0.446	(0.310 to 0.582)	<0.001	0.358	(0.215 to 0.501)	<0.001	0.444	(0.312 to 0.577)	<0.001
Neighbourhood cluster									
Cluster 1	Ref.			Ref.			Ref.		
Cluster 2	2.299	(−6.490 to 11.088)	0.608	2.323	(−6.726 to 11.373)	0.614	1.380	(−7.195 to 9.956)	0.752
Cluster 3	−0.506	(−6.016 to 5.005)	0.857	−2.688	(−8.326 to 2.950)	0.350	0.525	(−4.869 to 5.918)	0.849
Cluster 4	3.592	(0.068 to 7.116)	0.046	2.429	(−1.183 to 6.042)	0.187	4.188	(0.749 to 7.627)	0.017
Cluster 5	2.133	(−1.791 to 6.056)	0.286	1.748	(−2.295 to 5.791)	0.396	2.166	(−1.665 to 5.998)	0.267
Cluster 6	−0.677	(−3.985 to 2.632)	0.688	−0.539	(−3.944 to 2.866)	0.756	−1.422	(−4.666 to 1.821)	0.389
Multimorbidity count × stress product term	−3.682	(−6.865 to −0.499)	0.023	−1.990	(−7.027 to 3.047)	0.438			
Multimorbidity count × Soweto Stress Scale quintile 1 product term							Ref.		
Multimorbidity count × Soweto Stress Scale quintile 2 product term							−0.362	(−5.025 to 4.302)	0.879
Multimorbidity count × Soweto Stress Scale quintile 3 product term							−1.309	(−5.788 to 3.169)	0.566
Multimorbidity count × Soweto Stress Scale quintile 4 product term							−2.093	(−6.456 to 2.270)	0.347
Multimorbidity count × Soweto Stress Scale quintile 5 product term							−5.396	(−9.894 to −0.898)	0.019
Constant term	45.360	(35.673 to 55.047)	<0.001	48.209	(38.069 to 58.348)	<0.001	54.972	(45.058 to 64.887)	<0.001

Each column represents the output of a single multivariable linear regression model specifying quality of life as the dependent variable and the row variables as multiple explanatory variables. The first column displays the results of a multivariable regression model in which caseness for stress is specified as a binary variable equal to 1 if the study participant's Soweto Stress Scale score was greater than or equal to the 75th percentile. This binary variable was also interacted with the multimorbidity sum score variable. The second column displays the results of a multivariable regression model in which caseness for stress is identified using the GHQ-28, also interacted with the multimorbidity sum score variable. The third column displays the results of a multivariable regression model in which the Soweto Stress Scale values were used to partition the sample into quintiles, ranging from least stressed to most stressed, also interacted with the multimorbidity sum score variable.

Table 4 | Primary themes from the qualitative interviews ($N = 88$)

Group	Key themes	Sub-themes	Exemplar quotations
Group 1: Diabetes, hypertension and low stress ($N = 15$)	Acceptance	[a]Many accepted their illnesses and coped well	"I don't dwell on it a lot, if you dwell on a sickness that is when you get sicker."
	Positive attitude	Many demonstrated flourishing	"When you are happy, there is no way your BP can be high."
			"A lot of people hide the fact that they have diabetes. This may be because they are afraid of dying."
	Support mechanisms	Family and religion were key sources of support	"My family is very supportive. They help me with the things that I can't do myself, for instance, my son, he can sit with me in hospital until I have recovered."
		Hospital provided support through information	"I am diabetic, and I am hypertensive, so I go to the chronic clinic and tell them what is going on and they tell me what to do."
	Self-care	Many took charge of their own self-care	"I do exercise and take my medications to be well."
		Taking medication	"If I feel pain or anything, I take aspirin and I just tell myself that aspirin makes my blood flow and that's my pain killer and I don't have nothing prescribed."
		Taking over-the-counter medication	
		Five participants mentioned taking traditional medication	
Group 2: Diabetes, hypertension and high stress ($N = 19$)	Diabetes-related stress	[a]Participants prioritized diabetes stress over other stressors, including other illnesses: diabetes management, fear of stroke, amputation or death	"With diabetes, if you have not eaten, it is a problem. You eat, your sugar levels increase. You eat the right things, and your levels decrease, they decrease too much, and you die!"
	Other stressors	Multiple morbidity stress	"You can feel as your blood pressure goes up, even when you eat atchaar or snoekfish, you can feel that you are eating wrong foods. Blood pressure also affects my diabetes because I am not supposed to be angry, I must always be calm."
		Disease interaction	"I do get stressed; sometimes you find that I owe people money because at home there's no one that's employed."
		Pill burden	
		Financial stress	
		Family conflicts, children stress, death of family members	
	Access to care	Visiting different hospitals or clinics	"I go to Tshepisong [clinic], I started in Orlando [hospital] but I it was far, so they gave me a transfer letter, I go there [Orlando] once every 3 months."
		Doctors'/nurses' negative attitudes	"I had to sit for 4 days without medication, and when I got back my diabetes had gone up, so those are the type of things that are happening in these clinics."
		Drug stock-outs	"For me to feel better I have to take pills and I buy [over-the-counter medication] Grand-Pa or Panados and I will feel better."
		Long queues/waiting times	
		Over-the-counter medication	
		Lack of or limited access to mental health care	
		[a]Many reported distrust in hospital care	
	Self-care	Many used a glucometer to check their blood sugar	"I exercise in the house. Also, the work in the house, to walk around, where I live until Bara [hospital] is part of exercise."
		Exercise, sleep, reading a book or reading the Bible, visiting friends or family, and/or prayer	"Sometimes I forget and skip taking my pills, they hurt taking pills every day."
		[a]Seven participants mentioned that they skipped taking medication	
	Support mechanisms	Family and friends' support	"The most important people in my life are my children. They support me, lots of support on my illnesses."
		Religion	"They [nurses] gave me counselling and after that, I did not stress again."
		Counselling/psychotherapy	

Continued

Table 4 | Primary themes from the qualitative interviews (N = 88) (Continued)

Group	Key themes	Sub-themes	Exemplar quotations
Group 3: Diabetes and infection (*N* = 7)	Access to care	[a]Visiting primary health clinics for care/management	"I am the type of person that believes that when you go to the clinic and take the medication that the doctor has prescribed for you, then you will be fine. When I or my wife are sick, we go to the clinic."
		Participants mentioned having received support from the clinics	"Yes, I eat more veggies. I was told at the clinic to eat more veggies and that I should refrain from consuming sugar and using fish oil to cook."
		[a]Hospital is a key source of information	
	Self-care	Taking pills/medication	"I like walking so when I feel tired, I sleep to just relax a bit."
		Sleep, finding a quiet space, taking walks or taking time to calm down and think	"I take my pills. One in the evening and this one at night before supper."
	Stressors	Skip taking medication	"Sometimes, I skip the medication. You take advantage because you feel like you are feeling better knowing very well that you could get attacked again."
		Disease interaction	
		Negative attitudes from providers, drug stock-outs, lack of transport to the hospital	
		Financial stress, unemployment	
	Alternative medicine	Reluctance to use alternative medicines (due to fear of side effects)	"I'm scared to drink it [traditional medicine] because I don't know if it'll increase my diabetes."
			"I am scared of traditional medicine because, I don't want to cause further damage."
	Social support	Family, friends, religion, clinic	"I pray and go to church often. There's a lady at church who also offers counselling."
		Received counselling	
Group 4: No diagnoses (*N* = 47)	Feeling healthy	[a]Generally, participants in this category described feeling healthy	"No, not for me, nothing like that. As long as I do the house chores, I take that as my daily exercise, I feel healthy."
			"I am also well because I go and sleep and when I wake up I am fresh and I am all right, I don't have pain, I don't have anything."
		Many did not go to the hospital, including for check-ups, but presented at the clinic only when ill	"When I'm sick I go to the clinic so that I can find out how I am, I get the medication I need so I can use it."
	Stressors	[a]Emphasis on financial stress, unemployment or underemployment, and family conflict/stress rather than health-related stress	"The thing I can say makes me sick, it was just money, it was just that."
			"I feel so stressed at the end of the month. During that time, I'm stressed because I have just been paid and I don't earn a lot of money but have a lot of responsibilities. So, the money that I get is not enough to cover everything I need to pay for."
			"I do have stress; like now my husband and I are stressed because he's the only child at home, his parents died and so the family, the aunt's children; they're fighting with us for that house where we live. the house is my husband's mother; they want to rent it out for themselves."
	Access to care	Distrust in hospital care	"I self-medicate when I have a headache, I'll buy Grandpa for that."
		Self-medication—Med-Lemon (for nausea), Panado (for gastrointestinal distress) and Grandpa (for headache)	"I'll use Med-Lemon and Disprin to sweat it out and get better; but for now there's nothing else that infects me."
	Self-care	Socializing, relaxation, reading, prayer	"I like going out. Two weeks back I went out with the ladies to spoil myself at a spa; and I said it is all about me. When you talk to someone you know, you feel much better."
			"I do exercise, gardening and walking and avoid grudges because they can also have a negative effect in my life."

[a]Dominant sub-theme.

outlook on their illness and future. This perspective was more aligned with that most commonly described among study participants who reported no medical comorbidities, who rarely sought care or focused on their health (Group 4).

Nearly everyone reported feelings of stress about financial difficulties. Most described finding comfort in being able to access health care through the public system (even when voicing concerns about stockouts or long waits). Although few relied on traditional

herbal remedies to care for physical illness, most people described how they coped with psychological distress through individual religious practices (for example, prayer and reading the Bible) and group or social religious practices (for example, small-group Bible study, attending services and church-based counselling).

Discussion

Developing methods to evaluate syndemic theory poses challenges and opportunities as more scholars adopt a syndemic orientation for understanding and developing interventions for communities facing multiple clustered social and health conditions. Syndemic theory is predicated on the idea that social and structural factors precipitate disease concentration and disease interaction, and that local phenomena may differentially affect disease interactions and disease experiences across contexts. In previous work anthropological work, we have argued that structural violence, social trauma and chronic distress all have important roles to play in shaping syndemic experiences. In this article, we evaluated, through a combined ethnographic and epidemiological lens, how such experiences cluster with multiple convergent conditions and therefore become syndemic.

First, we argue that our theoretical postulates hold up for stress and multimorbidity. Our strongest finding in this study reveals a robust interaction between a locally designed stress scale and multimorbidity. This finding was consistent with our ethnographic findings, which showed that stress was associated with medical complications, financial difficulties, family discord and an unsettled future, while people doing well were more likely to describe social and emotional well-being—even when financial difficulties were common. Taken together, these mixed-methods findings support the important interplay between stress and living with multiple chronic illnesses. The high burden of physical and mental illness in this population substantiates this point.

Second, the study reveals the importance of grounding epidemiological work in detailed ethnographic study[42]. Constructing a locally relevant scale revealed the complex roles of various stressors (such as financial stress, which is embedded in the local political economy), as defined by participants, in conditioning the associations between multimorbidity and quality of life. Similarly, the coping scale emphasizes the fundamental importance of religious practices, social cohesion and caring for others in this community—thereby underscoring how *ubuntu*, or thinking about the self in relation to others, may play a role in reducing stress and fostering quality of life[43]. Using a generic life events scale, however useful, could have missed what people in this context themselves define as most critical for determining quality of life. The priority that our interlocutors put on these life stressors would probably have been less fully understood in a 'rapid' or strictly quantitative study.

Third, the qualitative data enriched our understanding of the epidemiological data by explaining what types of social stresses emerged within each group and how those social stressors clustered together and in relation to multiple morbidities. The qualitative data show how interlocking stresses produced undue burden on our study participants and affected their quality of life in more severe or enduring ways, or, in some cases, in ways that were mutually reinforcing with their co-occurring health conditions. People faced different challenges depending on their previous diagnoses, their outlook on those illnesses, the level of social support available to them and their financial security. In other words, the effects of multimorbidity on quality of life differed for people who had the same co-occurring diagnoses in part because of non-medical social and structural factors such as family stress and fear. We emphasize that, while the negative association between multimorbidity and quality of life is amplified by high levels of stress, it is not wholly explained by and cannot be reduced to that variable. People with diabetes and hypertension may perceive their illnesses differently if they report more or less psychological morbidity. Recognizing how people live well with multiple illnesses therefore requires critical attention to the non-medical factors that shape living with chronic illnesses, especially when they overlap and cause multiple burdens of medication, care-seeking and living well. Individual and group religious practices (such as prayer, small-group gathering and attending services) featured in many people's narratives of what non-medical factors are crucial to good health[43,44]. Moreover, many people without previous medical diagnoses tended to avoid clinics and hospitals, even for preventive care, which substantiates the point that people with multiple conditions are often diagnosed only when severe symptoms force them to seek urgent or acute care[45]. These qualitative data thus demonstrate how social and medical conditions are not isolated experiences but instead are interactive and contingent with social experiences.

Interpretation of our findings is subject to several important limitations. First, we had planned on surveying a much larger sample of study participants, but data collection was stopped prematurely due to the first surge of the COVID-19 pandemic. Second, very few people in our sample reported both diabetes and an infectious disease (either HIV or tuberculosis). This finding may have resulted from our study design: 121 people refused to test for HIV, which is not uncommon in this context[46,47]. Third, and related to the previous limitation, the data on medical comorbidities (along with the data on stress and coping) were self-reported. While there is no practical way of understanding stress and coping without using self-reported measures, it is likely that some of the medical comorbidities, particularly HIV and tuberculosis, were subject to underreporting given the stigma that has been attached to HIV and tuberculosis in this context[48]. Such underreporting could have biased our estimates of the association between quality of life and HIV. More generally, however, if people with higher quality of life were more likely to underreport medical comorbidities, this would have biased our estimates of the association between medical comorbidity and quality of life toward the null rather than away from the null. Fourth, the cross-sectional design prevented us from assessing both disease and coping trajectories, which could have provided a more nuanced understanding of living with multimorbidity. Indeed, such an approach could change how syndemics are framed: rather than focusing on individuals as subjects of syndemics, it would recentre their agency as individuals who respond to, cope with and make sense of their illness, despite structural violence and social challenges.

This study illustrates the importance of grounding an epidemiological analysis of a syndemic in long-term ethnographic work. We argue that there is a need for more mixed-methods studies that draw from knowledge situated within contexts and developed with multidisciplinary teams, so that the field can better understand how and why syndemics emerge, given local structural and social conditions. Our data emphasize the role of non-medical factors in explaining how people live well with or suffer from multiple chronic conditions. Although many people described some satisfaction with their care in the public system (despite common critiques of wait times for clinicians and drug stock-outs), it was very clear that not all health and healing could come from the public health care system. Moving some of this care from the clinic to the church or community, at scale, may be an effective way to promote social well-being, good mental health and more effective management of physical conditions such as diabetes and hypertension in Soweto and other similar contexts in urban South African neighbourhoods.

How scholars measure syndemics will probably continue to change. Syndemics inherently differ from place to place. The roles of historical, ecological, political-economic and socio-cultural factors in shaping or perpetuating syndemics should be central to any investigation into what constitutes a syndemic. Untangling what factors are most relevant to disease concentration and disease

interaction matters a great deal for a more precise and contextually relevant understanding of overlapping disease epidemics and future social interventions for public health, and can provide important contributions to future scholarship on syndemics.

Methods

Setting. We conducted this study in collaboration with the Developmental Pathways for Health Research Unit (DPHRU), a research unit associated with the South African Medical Research Council and the University of the . and based at Chris Hani Baragwanath Hospital in Soweto, South Africa. Research assistants were based at the DPHRU research station and fluent in multiple languages spoken in Soweto. The surveys for the Phase 1 epidemiological study were administered in people's homes. The interviews for the Phase 2 qualitative study were conducted at the research station. All research participants were residents of Soweto.

Soweto is an urban settlement in Johannesburg, the largest city in South Africa. More than one million people reside in Soweto; most are Black South Africans, representing various ethnic identities, including Zulu, Sotho, Tswana, Tsonga and others. We use the term 'Black' to describe the study participants while acknowledging a problematic history of this identity as a political category instituted by apartheid to distinguish 'Black' from 'Coloured' and 'White'[49]. Soweto is economically diverse, with middle-class neighbourhoods, working-class communities and informal settlements. The marginalization of Black South Africans and other non-white communities during apartheid and the decades afterwards have contributed to poor housing, lack of sanitation, unhealthy food access and deficient educational opportunities in the present day. These problems have been associated with the unequal burden of HIV and tuberculosis among Black compared with white South Africans, compounded by costly health care services in the private sector and systemic barriers in the public sector[49].

Sampling. The Phase 1 epidemiological study was embedded within the infrastructure of a larger study being conducted through the DPHRU. No statistical method was used to predetermine sample size. Given the size of Soweto (200 km^2), we sampled study participants in clusters based on churches, which are widely distributed throughout Soweto. Starting with a list of geolocations of each church structure, fieldworkers visited each church and verified its existence. The churches were used to identify 30 community clusters, each with a one-kilometre radius. For the purposes of our study, six clusters were randomly selected and then enumerated. Within each cluster, the research team walked down the streets, engaged potential participants and interviewed available people in their homes who were willing to participate in the study. If the person approached did not fit the inclusion criteria (described in more detail below), another member of the household who did meet these criteria was then approached. The Phase 1 epidemiological study participants were interviewed in their homes and were not provided with any compensation or study incentive. The University of the Witwatersrand Human Research Ethics Committee approved this study (M180544). All participants provided written informed consent before participating and were free to stop the survey at any time.

Phase 1: epidemiological survey data collection and analysis. For the Phase 1 study, we visited the six neighbourhood clusters over a period of one year (April 2019–March 2020). We finished 783 complete surveys before the study was shut down due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The response rate was 86%. Measurements were taken from this sample at a single time point. No data were excluded from the analyses. We enrolled participants 25 years of age or older who lived within each identified cluster and who considered themselves to be regular members of the household (that is, who had spent most nights in the home during the three months preceding the interview). Participation was limited to people 25 years of age and older because of our focus on chronic multimorbidity and because we wished to avoid interfering with recruitment for a concurrent study that was enrolling young adults. The exclusion criteria included people younger than 25 years of age; people who did not consider themselves to be residents of Soweto; and individuals who could not meaningfully communicate with the study team, such as people with cognitive impairments, people who were acutely intoxicated upon approach, people who were too ill or people who threatened our team with harassment or violence.

Our field teams collected survey data using tablets programmed with Research Electronic Data Capture. The primary outcome was quality of life, which we measured using the 26-item World Health Organization Quality of Life-BREF[50]. The primary explanatory variables of interest were multimorbidity (namely, the sum score of the most commonly reported medical comorbidities, including type 2 diabetes, hypertension, chronic pain, high cholesterol and cancer) and stress (measured using the 21-item Soweto Stress Scale, a locally developed and validated emic scale based on our ethnographic work conducted in Soweto over the past decade[51]).

Model 1 specifies a multivariable linear regression model to estimate stress and medical comorbidities as correlates of quality of life. We then added a vector of additional covariates (Model 2): age; sex; household asset wealth, measured using a 13-item checklist of assets in the household; perceived lack of neighbourhood safety, measured using two questions about feeling safe during the day and night; perceived neighbourhood social cohesion[52]; HIV status, measured by an at-home rapid test kit; coping, measured using the 14-item Soweto Coping Scale, an emic scale designed to measure different aspects of problem/emotion-focused and religious coping, also based on our ethnographic work conducted in Soweto; and neighbourhood cluster. In the final regression model, we added a product term to assess for an interaction between multimorbidity and stress (Model 3).

We used multiple specifications to probe for this hypothesized interactive relationship. First, we treated the stress scale as binary, with caseness denoted as a stress scale value greater than or equal to the 75th percentile. Second, because an arbitrary 75th-percentile threshold for the locally derived stress scale has no empirical precedent, we substituted for the Soweto Stress Scale the GHQ-28 (refs. [53,54]) in the regression model. The GHQ-28 is a non-specific measure of psychological distress but has been used in global health studies for decades with well-established thresholds for caseness. Third, because a dichotomous variable may mask variability in quality of life at more granular levels of stress, we examined the interaction between multimorbidity and the stress scale split into quintiles, where each group represented 20% of the sample, ranging from the least stressed (first quintile) to the most stressed (fifth quintile). Fourth, we eliminated possible high leverage points to assess whether the estimated associations were dependent on extreme values. Last, to compare the estimates associated with the multimorbidity sum score variable versus the individual conditions that comprise it, we disaggregated the sum score and analysed the individual conditions separately[55].

The statistical analyses were conducted using R version 3.6.3 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). Two-sided tests were used throughout.

Phase 2: qualitative data collection and analysis. We then conducted in-depth, semistructured qualitative interviews with 88 participants from the epidemiological survey. The aim of these qualitative interviews was to explore major life events, disease-related stress, challenges associated with living with one of the comorbidities of focus, major barriers to or facilitators of health, challenges associated with care-seeking and comorbidity, systemic barriers to or facilitators of health care, and self-care regimens. These individuals were purposively sampled on the basis of their membership in one of several comorbidity clusters: Group 1 (diabetes, hypertension and low stress; $N=15$), Group 2 (diabetes, hypertension and high stress; $N=19$), Group 3 (diabetes and either HIV or tuberculosis; $N=7$) and Group 4 (people living healthy lives without any medical diagnoses; $N=47$). Phase 2 qualitative interviews were conducted at the DPHRU research station, and each participant was reimbursed 150 South African Rand (approximately US$12 at the time the study was conducted) for transportation to the research station. A handful of in-home qualitative interviews were conducted for participants who could not travel.

We transcribed all interviews verbatim. Audio from vernacular languages was transcribed and translated into English, while maintaining consistency with their original meaning. We used an inductive method that involved reading and rereading the transcripts and field notes while comparing the two to ensure that no data were misinterpreted. The study team designed a codebook on the basis of this inductive analysis, which included 30 main codes. These codes were well defined and collectively agreed on, and were reflected in the interview guide, field notes, selected transcripts and in-depth discussions. Each code was identified, defined, applied, revised and discussed among five core members of the research team. We attached the codes to each transcript using Dedoose software (version 7.0.23, SocioCultural Research Consultants, Los Angeles, Calif.), with a primary coder and two secondary coders reviewing and applying codes to each transcript. Further information about the methods and findings of the qualitative study are described elsewhere[44].

Reporting Summary. Further information on research design is available in the Nature Research Reporting Summary linked to this article.

Data availability

The data that support the findings of this study cannot be shared publicly due to the risk of patient identification where small numbers of patients per neighbourhood cluster are included (that is, clusters 2 and 3). Researchers interested in inquiring about access to confidential data should contact the corresponding author.

Code availability

The code that supports the findings of this study is available from the corresponding author upon request.

Received: 7 July 2021; Accepted: 22 October 2021;
Published online: 23 December 2021

References

1. Singer, M., Bulled, N., Ostrach, B. & Mendenhall, E. Syndemics and the biosocial conception of health. *Lancet* **389**, 941–950 (2017).

2. Mendenhall, E. Beyond comorbidity: a critical perspective of syndemic depression and diabetes in cross-cultural contexts. *Med. Anthropol. Q.* **30**, 462–478 (2015).
3. Tsai, A. C., Mendenhall, E., Trostle, J. & Kawachi, I. Co-occurring epidemics, syndemics, and population health. *Lancet* **389**, 978–982 (2017).
4. Mendenhall, E., Yarris, K. & Kohrt, B. A. Utilization of standardized mental health assessments in anthropological research: possibilities and pitfalls. *Cult. Med. Psychiatry* **40**, 726–745 (2016).
5. Kohrt, B. A. et al. Cultural concepts of distress and psychiatric disorders: literature review and research recommendations for global mental health epidemiology. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* **43**, 365–406 (2014).
6. Kaiser, B. N. et al. Scale properties of the Kreyòl Distress Idioms (KDI) screener: association of an ethnographically-developed instrument with depression, anxiety, and sociocultural risk factors in rural Haiti. *Int. J. Cult. Ment. Health* **8**, 341–358 (2015).
7. Kaiser, B. N., Kohrt, B. A., Keys, H. M., Khoury, N. M. & Brewster, A. R. T. Strategies for assessing mental health in Haiti: local instrument development and transcultural translation. *Transcult. Psychiatry* **50**, 532–558 (2013).
8. Kessler, R. C. et al. Lifetime prevalence and age-of-onset distributions of mental disorders in the World Health Organization's World Mental Health Survey Initiative. *World Psychiatry* **6**, 168–76 (2007).
9. Weaver, L. J. & Kaiser, B. N. Syndemics theory must take local context seriously: an example of measures for poverty, mental health, and food insecurity. *Soc. Sci. Med.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113304 (2020).
10. Brewis, A., Wutich, A., Galvin, M. & Lachaud, J. Localizing syndemics: a comparative study of hunger, stigma, suffering, and crime exposure in three Haitian communities. *Soc. Sci. Med.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113031 (2020).
11. Swinburn, B. A. et al. The global syndemic of obesity, undernutrition, and climate change: the lancet commission report. *Lancet* **393**, 791–846 (2019).
12. Mendenhall, E. & Singer, M. The global syndemic of obesity, undernutrition, and climate change. *Lancet* **393**, 741 (2019).
13. Renn, B. N., Feliciano, L. & Segal, D. L. The bidirectional relationship of depression and diabetes: a systematic review. *Clin. Psychol. Rev.* **31**, 1239–1246 (2011).
14. Snoek, F. J., Bremmer, M. A. & Hermanns, N. Constructs of depression and distress in diabetes: time for an appraisal. *Lancet* **3**, 450–460 (2015).
15. Bukhman, G. et al. Endemic diabetes in the world's poorest people. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol.* **3**, 402–403 (2015).
16. Agardh, E., Allebeck, P., Hallqvist, J., Moradi, T. & Sidorchuk, A. Type 2 diabetes incidence and socio-economic position: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* **40**, 804–818 (2011).
17. Smith-Morris, C. "The Chronicity of Life, the Acuteness of Diagnosis." in *Chronic Conditions, Fluid States: Chronicity and the Anthropology of Illness* (eds Manderson, L. & Smith-Morris, C.) (Rutgers Univ. Press, 2010), pp. 21–37.
18. Cuj, M., Grabinsky, L. & Yates-Doerr, E. Cultures of nutrition: classification, food policy, and health. *Med. Anthropol.* **40**, 79–97 (2021).
19. Carruth, L. & Mendenhall, E. 'Wasting away': diabetes, food insecurity, and medical insecurity in the Somali Region of Ethiopia. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **228**, 155–163 (2019).
20. Sangaramoorthy, T. Treating the numbers: HIV/AIDS surveillance, subjectivity, and risk. *Med. Anthropol.* **31**, 292–309 (2012).
21. Mendenhall, E. & Norris, S. A. When HIV is ordinary and diabetes new: remaking suffering in a South African township. *Glob. Public Health* **10**, 449–462 (2015).
22. Mendenhall, E., Bosire, E. N., Kim, A. W. & Norris, S. Cancer, chemotherapy, and HIV: living with cancer amidst comorbidity in a South African township. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **237**, 112461 (2019).
23. Mendenhall, E. Syndemic suffering in Soweto: violence and inequality at the nexus of health transition in South Africa. *Ann. Anthropol. Pract.* **38**, 302–318 (2015).
24. Mendenhall, E., Richter, L. M., Stein, A. & Norris, S. A. Psychological and physical co-morbidity among urban South African women. *PLoS ONE* **8**, e78803 (2013).
25. Wooyoung Kim, A., Kaiser, B., Bosire, E., Shahbazian, K. & Mendenhall, E. Idioms of resilience among cancer patients in urban South Africa: an anthropological heuristic for the study of culture and resilience. *Transcult. Psychiatry* **56**, 720–747 (2019).
26. Karim, S. A., Churchyard, G., Karim, Q. A. & Lawn, S. D. HIV infection and tuberculosis in South Africa: an urgent need to escalate the public health response. *Lancet* **374**, 921–933 (2009).
27. Clark, S. J. et al. Cardiometabolic disease risk and HIV status in rural South Africa: establishing a baseline. *BMC Public Health* **15**, 135 (2015).
28. Seedat, M., Van Niekerk, A., Jewkes, R., Suffla, S. & Ratele, K. Violence and injuries in South Africa: prioritising an agenda for prevention. *Lancet* **374**, 1011–1022 (2009).
29. Jewkes, R. K., Dunkle, K., Nduna, M. & Shai, N. Intimate partner violence, relationship power inequity, and incidence of HIV infection in young women in South Africa: a cohort study. *Lancet* **376**, 41–48 (2010).
30. Chopra, M. et al. Achieving the health Millennium Development Goals for South Africa: challenges and priorities. *Lancet* **374**, 1023–1031 (2009).
31. Baleta, A. & Mitchell, F. Country in focus: diabetes and obesity in South Africa. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol.* **2**, 687–688 (2014).
32. Oni, T. et al. Patterns of HIV, TB, and non-communicable disease multi-morbidity in peri-urban South Africa—a cross sectional study. *BMC Infect. Dis.* **17**, 20 (2015).
33. Bor, J., Herbst, A. J., Newell, M.-L. & Bärnighausen, T. Increases in adult life expectancy in rural South Africa: valuing the scale-up of HIV treatment. *Science* **339**, 961–965 (2013).
34. Nyirenda, M. et al. Health, wellbeing, and disability among older people infected or affected by HIV in Uganda and South Africa. *Glob. Health Action* **6**, 19201 (2013).
35. Nyirenda, M. et al. An investigation of factors associated with the health and well-being of HIV-infected or HIV-affected older people in rural South Africa. *BMC Public Health* **12**, 259 (2012).
36. Gomez-Oliver, F. X. et al. Social conditions and disability related to the mortality of older people in rural South Africa. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* **43**, 1531–1541 (2014).
37. Scholten, F. et al. Health and functional status among older people with HIV/AIDS in Uganda. *BMC Public Health* **11**, 886 (2011).
38. Siedner, M. J. Aging, health, and quality of life for older people living with HIV in sub-Saharan Africa: a review and proposed conceptual framework. *J. Aging Health* **31**, 109–138 (2019).
39. North, C. M. et al. HIV infection, pulmonary tuberculosis, and COPD in rural Uganda: a cross-sectional study. *Lung* **196**, 49–57 (2018).
40. Mugisha, J. O. et al. Chronic disease, risk factors and disability in adults aged 50 and above living with and without HIV: findings from the Wellbeing of Older People Study in Uganda. *Glob. Health Action* **9**, 31098 (2016).
41. Knut, L., Roglic, G. & Harries, A. D. Improving tuberculosis prevention and care through addressing the global diabetes epidemic: from evidence to policy and practice. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol.* **2**, 730–739 (2014).
42. Sangaramoorthy, T. & Benton, A. Enumeration, identity, and health. *Med. Anthropol.* **31**, 287–291 (2012).
43. Cele, L., Willen, S. S., Dhanuka, M. & Mendenhall, E. Ukuphumelela: flourishing and the pursuit of a good life, and good health, in Soweto, South Africa. *Soc. Sci. Med. Ment. Health* **1**, 100022 (2021).
44. Bosire, E., Cele, L., Potelwa, X., Cho, A. & Mendenhall, E. God, church water and spirituality: perspectives on health and healing in Soweto, South Africa. *Glob. Public Health.* https://doi.org/10.1080/17441692.2021.1919738 (2021).
45. Goudge, J., Gilson, L., Russell, S., Gumede, T. & Mills, A. Affordability, availability and acceptability barriers to health care for the chronically ill: longitudinal case studies from South Africa. *BMC Health Serv. Res* **18**, 1–18 (2009).
46. Connolly, C., Colvin, M., Shishana, O. & Stoker, D. Epidemiology of HIV in South Africa—results of a national, community-based survey. *S. Afr. Med. J.* **94**, 776–781 (2004).
47. Reynolds, L., Cousins, T., Newell, M.-L. & Imrie, J. The social dynamics of consent and refusal in HIV surveillance in rural South Africa. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **77**, 118–125 (2013).
48. Daftary, A. HIV and tuberculosis: the construction and management of double stigma. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **74**, 1512–1519 (2012).
49. Coovadia, H., Jewkes, R., Barron, P., Sanders, D. & McIntyre, D. The health and health system of South Africa: historical roots of current public health challenges. *Lancet* **374**, 817–834 (2009).
50. *World Health Organization Quality of Life (WHOQOL)-BREF* (WHO, 2004).
51. Mpondo, F., Kim, A. W., Tsai, A. C. & Mendenhall, E. Development and validation of the Soweto Stress Scale: mixed-methods, population-based study of adults living in Soweto, South Africa. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **281**, 114023 (2021).
52. Pronyk, P. M. et al. Can social capital be intentionally generated? A randomized trial from rural South Africa. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **67**, 1559–1570 (2008).
53. Goldberg, D. & Hillier, V. A scaled version of the General Health Questionnaire. *Psychol. Med.* **9**, 139–145 (1979).
54. Goldberg, D. et al. The validity of two versions of the GHQ in the WHO study of mental illness in general health care. *Psychol. Med.* **27**, 191–197 (1997).
55. Tsai, A. C. & Venkataramani, A. S. Syndemics and health disparities: a methodological note. *AIDS Behav.* **20**, 423–430 (2016).

Acknowledgements

We are greatly indebted to the participants, their families and our research assistants, as this study would not have existed without them. We thank X. Potelwa, S. Kunene, J. Mabasa, S. Mavi, G. Morsi, Z. Mpanza and S. Sihlangu for their collaborative work on the study. We also thank the front-line and community health workers who are working endlessly to keep Soweto and the rest of South Africa healthy and safe during this challenging time. The project benefited substantially from the support of M. Beery. The research was funded by US National Institutes of Health (NIH) grant nos R21TW010789

(E.M., S.A.N. and A.C.T.) and D43TW010543 (A.W.K.), the South African Medical Research Council (S.A.N.) and the Department of Science and Innovation–National Research Foundation Centre of Excellence in Human Development (S.A.N.). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish or preparation of the manuscript.

Author contributions

E.M. conceived, designed and supervised the project; led and oversaw the analysis; and wrote the paper. A.W.K. organized the data collection and analysis and commented on the manuscript. A.P. analysed the survey data and commented on the manuscript. L.C. collected the data, analysed the qualitative data, prepared some of the tables and commented on the manuscript. F.M. validated the Soweto Syndemics Scale and commented on the manuscript. E.N.B. analysed the qualitative data, helped prepare the tables and commented on the manuscript. S.A.N. conceived and designed the project and commented on the manuscript. A.C.T. conceived and designed the project, led the conceptualization and execution of the quantitative data analysis, and substantially edited the manuscript.

Competing interests

E.M. reports receiving a financial stipend from Elsevier for her work as co-editor-in-chief of *SSM-Mental Health*. A.C.T. reports receiving a financial stipend from Public Library of Science for his work as specialty consulting editor of *PLoS Medicine* and from Elsevier for his work as co-editor-in-chief of *SSM-Mental Health*.

Additional information

Supplementary information The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01242-1.

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to Emily Mendenhall.

Peer review information *Nature Human Behaviour* thanks Cassandra Workman for their contribution to the peer review of this work.

Reprints and permissions information is available at www.nature.com/reprints.

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

nature portfolio

Corresponding author(s): Emily Mendenhall

Last updated by author(s): Oct 6, 2021

Reporting Summary

Nature Portfolio wishes to improve the reproducibility of the work that we publish. This form provides structure for consistency and transparency in reporting. For further information on Nature Portfolio policies, see our Editorial Policies and the Editorial Policy Checklist.

Statistics

For all statistical analyses, confirm that the following items are present in the figure legend, table legend, main text, or Methods section.

n/a	Confirmed	
☐	☒	The exact sample size (*n*) for each experimental group/condition, given as a discrete number and unit of measurement
☐	☒	A statement on whether measurements were taken from distinct samples or whether the same sample was measured repeatedly
☐	☒	The statistical test(s) used AND whether they are one- or two-sided *Only common tests should be described solely by name; describe more complex techniques in the Methods section.*
☐	☒	A description of all covariates tested
☐	☒	A description of any assumptions or corrections, such as tests of normality and adjustment for multiple comparisons
☐	☒	A full description of the statistical parameters including central tendency (e.g. means) or other basic estimates (e.g. regression coefficient) AND variation (e.g. standard deviation) or associated estimates of uncertainty (e.g. confidence intervals)
☐	☒	For null hypothesis testing, the test statistic (e.g. *F*, *t*, *r*) with confidence intervals, effect sizes, degrees of freedom and *P* value noted *Give P values as exact values whenever suitable.*
☒	☐	For Bayesian analysis, information on the choice of priors and Markov chain Monte Carlo settings
☒	☐	For hierarchical and complex designs, identification of the appropriate level for tests and full reporting of outcomes
☒	☐	Estimates of effect sizes (e.g. Cohen's *d*, Pearson's *r*), indicating how they were calculated

Our web collection on statistics for biologists contains articles on many of the points above.

Software and code

Policy information about availability of computer code

Data collection	Survey data were captured using tablets programmed with Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap). Qualitative interviews were audio recorded, transcribed verbatim, and imported into Dedoose software (SocioCultural Research Consultants, Los Angeles, Calif.).
Data analysis	Statistical analyses were conducted using R version 3.6.3. Qualitative analyses were conducted using Dedoose software (SocioCultural Research Consultants, Los Angeles, Calif.).

For manuscripts utilizing custom algorithms or software that are central to the research but not yet described in published literature, software must be made available to editors and reviewers. We strongly encourage code deposition in a community repository (e.g. GitHub). See the Nature Portfolio guidelines for submitting code & software for further information.

Data

Policy information about availability of data

All manuscripts must include a data availability statement. This statement should provide the following information, where applicable:

- Accession codes, unique identifiers, or web links for publicly available datasets
- A description of any restrictions on data availability
- For clinical datasets or third party data, please ensure that the statement adheres to our policy

The data that support the findings of this study cannot be shared publicly due to the risk of patient identification where small numbers of patients per neighborhood cluster are included (i.e., clusters 2 and 3). Researchers interested in inquiring about access to confidential data should contact the corresponding author.

Field-specific reporting

Please select the one below that is the best fit for your research. If you are not sure, read the appropriate sections before making your selection.

☐ Life sciences ☒ Behavioural & social sciences ☐ Ecological, evolutionary & environmental sciences

For a reference copy of the document with all sections, see nature.com/documents/nr-reporting-summary-flat.pdf

Behavioural & social sciences study design

All studies must disclose on these points even when the disclosure is negative.

Study description	Mixed-methods (qualitative cross-sectional) study.
Research sample	We used ethnographic methods to shape the study questions and design a locally valid measure of stress, which we then applied to a large population-based study of adults in Soweto, South Africa. We then conducted a follow-up qualitative study of illness experiences among people with multiple comorbidities.
Sampling strategy	The Phase 1 epidemiological study was nested within the infrastructure of an ongoing study in Soweto focused on young adults. A universal list of churches in Soweto was used to define the sampling frame of 30 community clusters, each with a 1-kilometre radius. For the present study, six clusters were randomly selected then enumerated. The Phase 2 qualitative study used purposive sampling.
Data collection	Survey data were collected using tablets programmed with Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap). Research assistants interviewed study participants in private settings, either in the field (Phase 1) or at the research station (Phase 2).
Timing	The Phase 1 epidemiological survey data were collected during the period April 2019-March 2020. The Phase 2 qualitative survey data were collected during the period July 2019-August 2020.
Data exclusions	No data were excluded from the analyses.
Non-participation	The response rate was 86 percent.
Randomization	No randomization was conducted.

Reporting for specific materials, systems and methods

We require information from authors about some types of materials, experimental systems and methods used in many studies. Here, indicate whether each material, system or method listed is relevant to your study. If you are not sure if a list item applies to your research, read the appropriate section before selecting a response.

Materials & experimental systems

n/a	Involved in the study
☒	☐ Antibodies
☒	☐ Eukaryotic cell lines
☒	☐ Palaeontology and archaeology
☒	☐ Animals and other organisms
☐	☒ Human research participants
☒	☐ Clinical data
☒	☐ Dual use research of concern

Methods

n/a	Involved in the study
☒	☐ ChIP-seq
☒	☐ Flow cytometry
☒	☐ MRI-based neuroimaging

Human research participants

Policy information about studies involving human research participants

Population characteristics	See above
Recruitment	For the Phase 1 epidemiological study, within each cluster, the research team walked down the streets, engaged potential participants, and interviewed available people in their homes who were willing to participate in the study. If the person approached did not fit the inclusion criteria (described in more detail below), another member of the household who did meet these criteria was then approached. Phase 1 study participants were interviewed in their homes and were not provided with any compensation or study incentive. For the Phase 2 qualitative study, we used purposive sampling. Qualitative study participants were asked to come to the research station for interviews and were provided with a transportation reimbursement.

Ethics oversight	The University of the Witwatersrand Human Research Ethics Committee approved this study (M180544).

Note that full information on the approval of the study protocol must also be provided in the manuscript.