

Disentangling the Mediation Pathways of Depression in Asian Students and Workers

Zhaojin Nan, Ran Chen*

Department of Statistics and Data Science, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO. 63130, USA

* Corresponding author: ran.c@wustl.edu

Abstract

Depression is a major global public health issue, shaped by cultural, demographic, and occupational factors. This study compares predictors of depression across student and working populations using datasets from India, Malaysia, and China. Since the India dataset includes both students and workers, it was divided into two groups based on participant status. The Malaysia dataset contains only students, and the China (CHARLS) dataset contains only workers. After harmonizing variables and standardizing depression scores, we applied logistic regression, random forest models, and causal forest methods to identify key predictors and examine subgroup-specific effects. Causal mediation analysis (CMA) was also used to assess whether predictors operate through intermediaries such as perceived pressure.

The models were trained on the training sets of the student data from India and the worker data from China. Among students, both logistic regression and random forest highlighted pressure, age, workload, financial stress, mental health history, and satisfaction as important predictors, and similar predictors were identified for workers. A notable finding is that age shows opposite associations across groups: younger students are more likely to experience depression, while older workers show higher risk. This may reflect academic pressure among younger students and job insecurity concerns among older workers. Model performance showed moderate internal accuracy, defined as testing on the held-out test sets from Indian students and Chinese workers, but lower external accuracy, defined as testing on Malaysian students and Indian workers. Random forest outperformed logistic regression in both cohorts, because it captures non-linear relationships in the data more effectively.

Causal forest results suggested limited heterogeneity in the influence of pressure, though age and satisfaction showed somewhat stronger conditional effects. CMA indicated that pressure does not mediate the relationship between age and depression; instead, pressure acts as a more direct driver, while satisfaction affects depression partly through pressure. Overall, pressure emerges as a consistent and strong predictor across populations, suggesting that interventions targeting academic and occupational stress, such as reducing workload and improving support systems, may be effective in reducing depressive symptoms.

Keywords

Depression, logistic regression, random forest, causal forest, causal mediation analysis

1 Introduction

Depression is a serious mental health disorder that can significantly impair daily functioning and quality of life. People experiencing depression often struggle with persistent sadness, loss of interest, disrupted sleep, poor concentration, and low motivation, making it difficult to work, study, or maintain social relationships. Over time, depression can also worsen physical health and contribute to disability. Globally, the number of people living with depressive disorders has grown substantially: in 2019, there were approximately 290 million new cases, a 59.3 % increase compared to 1990 (Wu et al., 2024). Much of this burden falls in Asia, and in particular, India and China report extremely high absolute numbers of depression cases. For instance, in 2019 India had over 54 million incident cases of depressive disorder, and China had over 41 million (Wu et al., 2024).

Although many studies have examined factors associated with depression, the existing research remains fragmented across specific age groups and regions. Studies conducted in Wuhan have identified old age, frailty, poor social support, and cognitive dysfunction as important predictors of depressive symptoms among older adults (Liu et al., 2021). Research using data from the China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS) highlights the roles of life satisfaction, self-reported memory, and self-reported health, while also showing that life satisfaction and purpose in life function as major protective factors against depression in later life (Li et al., 2024). Work from Chongqing further indicates that marriage status, disability, and self-reported health independently contribute to depression risk in older adults (Duan et al., 2020). Beyond China, studies in Bangladesh point to unsatisfactory sleep quality and anxiety as significant correlates of depression (Islam et al., 2022). Research from western India emphasizes gender, employment status, maternal education, and chronic medical conditions as separate, independent predictors, with unemployed females who have chronic conditions and low maternal education showing the highest depression scores (Lowe et al., 2009). In northern India, depression prevalence is higher among students attending government schools, students from rural areas, and those experiencing household stressors such as sharing crowded living spaces, being scolded, or being physically punished by family members, as well as those facing financial constraints (Singh et al., 2017). While these studies collectively identify a wide range of risk and protective factors, most focus on a specific demographic or region, making it difficult to compare how these predictors operate across different populations and cultural contexts.

The present study aims to address these gaps by comparing predictors of depression across student and working populations in three countries. By examining demographic characteristics, sleep quality, academic and occupational stress, financial pressure, and other psychosocial factors jointly, this study explores both shared and context-specific patterns associated with

depression. This approach allows us to evaluate how similar risk factors may operate differently depending on cultural background, life stage, and work or school environments. Additionally, the analytical methods used in this study make it possible to capture interactions among multiple stressors, offering a more complete picture than studies that focus on a single predictor or a single population. Through this comparative framework, the study contributes new evidence about the conditions under which depression risk increases or decreases and provides insights that may help guide more targeted and effective prevention and intervention strategies across diverse groups.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Dataset

This analysis draws upon three datasets from India, Malaysia, and China, each offering insight into depression and mental health factors across diverse populations. We focus on India and China because they report some of the highest rates of depression in the general population as well as among adolescents. Malaysia is also included in this study to represent additional cultural and socioeconomic contexts across Asia, spanning South Asia (India), East Asia (China), and Southeast Asia (Malaysia). While the datasets differ in sample size, measurement approaches, and variable coverage, they all include core demographic and psychological variables relevant to depression, academic stress, and mental health. This diversity allows for cross-national comparisons and integrated analysis across different contexts in Asia.

2.1.1 India

The India dataset is obtained from Kaggle. It was collected via an anonymous survey conducted between January and June 2023 across several cities. The survey aimed to identify risk factors for adult depression, targeting respondents from varied professional and social backgrounds. The dataset, compiled by Radhika Rao, Deepak Gujral, and Dr. Samay Pathak, includes responses from 2,556 individuals across 24 variables. Depression is measured as a binary outcome, with 455 participants (approximately 18%) reporting symptoms of depression. Key variables include demographics (age, gender, city), academic and occupational stressors (e.g., academic pressure, job satisfaction, sleep duration), lifestyle factors (diet, work/study hours), and mental health indicators (e.g., suicidal ideation, family history of mental illness).

2.1.2 Malaysia

The Malaysia dataset is obtained from Kaggle. Collected via a Google Form survey, the Malaysian dataset targets university students from the International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM) and assesses their mental health and academic stress. Compiled by MD Shariful Islam, the dataset consists of 101 responses and 12 variables. Depression is measured as a binary outcome, with approximately 35% of participants reporting depressive symptoms. Other variables include demographic details (age, gender), academic information (course of study,

CGPA, academic year), and mental health indicators such as anxiety, panic attacks, and prior mental health treatment.

2.1.3 China

The Chinese dataset is drawn from the Harmonized China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS), which was developed with funding from the National Institute on Aging. Detailed documentation on the study design is available in Zhao et al. (2014). This large-scale dataset includes 25,586 responses and 3,400 variables. Depression is recorded as a binary variable, with 5,090 respondents (about 20%) reporting depressive symptoms. Variables cover a broad spectrum, including demographic information (age, gender), physical and mental health status (e.g., self-reported memory, life satisfaction, sleep duration), lifestyle habits (physical activity, work hours), and financial conditions (income, loans, housing wealth, and financial stress).

Dataset	Source	Sample Size	Depression Prevalence	Population	Number of Features	Key Features
India	Kaggle	2556	18% (455 participants)	Students and Workers	24	Demographics, stressors, lifestyle, mental health
Malaysia	Kaggle	101	35% (35 participants)	Students	12	Demographics, academic stress, GPA, anxiety
China	CHARLS	25586	20% (5090 participants)	Workers	3400	Demographics, health status, lifestyle, finances

Table 1. Summary of the Three Datasets

2.2 Data Cleaning and Imputation

To ensure consistency and comparability across the three national datasets, a common set of variables was first identified. These included gender, age, academic performance (for students), perceived pressure, workload, financial stress, mental health history, sleep quality, life satisfaction, anxiety (students only), social support, extracurricular (students) or physical (workers) activities, and future concern. Notably, while the Malaysia dataset consist exclusively of student responses and the Chinese dataset comprises only working adults, the Indian dataset includes both students and working professionals. To minimize population heterogeneity that could confound the analysis, the Indian dataset was split into two subgroups, India students and India workers, based on the “Working.Professional.or.Student” field. Subsequent cleaning and imputation were performed separately on student-oriented datasets (India students and Malaysia) and working-adult datasets (India workers and China), enabling more meaningful comparisons within similar population groups.

In all datasets, binary depression responses ("Yes"/"No") were recoded as 1 and 0, respectively. Binary and categorical variables were uniformly encoded; for instance, gender was coded as 1

for “Male” and 0 for “Female,” while mental health history was coded as 1 for “Yes” and 0 for “No.” Academic performance, originally reported through CGPA or similar formats, was standardized to an ordinal 0-5 scale. Pressure and workload measures were drawn from relevant fields such as academic pressure, peer pressure, study load, or weekly work time and similarly scaled. Financial stress was recorded using various loan stress or financial concern indicators and transformed to a 1-5 range. Sleep quality was estimated from reported sleep duration and categorized into a 0-5 ordinal scale. Satisfaction, drawn from life satisfaction or job/study satisfaction, was standardized to a 0-5 range. Social support, extracurricular/physical activity, and future concern were encoded on ordinal scales between 0 and 5 (or 0-3 for social support). Anxiety was recorded on different scales and normalized to a 0-1 range.

To address partially missing features, we applied random imputation: for each variable with missing data, values were sampled from the observed (non-missing) values within the same combined population group (students or workers). This strategy preserved each feature’s original distribution while avoiding potential bias from external sources.




Figure 1. Flowchart of the Data Cleaning and Imputation Procedure

2.3 Predictive Model Development

To investigate the factors associated with depression, we developed and evaluated two types of predictive models: logistic regression and random forest. These models were applied separately to two target datasets: the India student dataset and the China dataset, both of which contain binary depression outcomes. To assess the generalizability of each model, external validation was performed using the Malaysia dataset (as a student population comparator) and the India workers dataset (as a working population comparator). For the student sample analysis, the India student dataset ($N = 502$) was randomly partitioned into a training set ($N = 401$) and a test set ($N = 101$), with the test set size chosen to match the sample size of the Malaysia dataset for later comparative evaluation. For the working population, the Chinese dataset ($N = 25,586$) was split into a training set ($N = 23,030$) and a test set ($N = 2,556$). Again, the test set size was selected to mirror the India workers dataset. This parallel setup enabled a consistent and controlled

evaluation framework, where the performance of each model trained on a large base dataset could be compared against both internal (same-population) and external (cross-population) samples of equivalent size.

	Training Set	Internal Test Set	External Test Set
Student group	India students (N = 401)	India students (N = 101)	Malaysia (N = 101)
Worker group	China (N = 23,030)	China (N = 2,556)	India workers (N = 2,556)

Table 2. Summary of Training and Test Sets

Logistic regression is used to model a qualitative response variable Y with two levels, typically coded as 0 and 1. For observation i , let

$$p_i = P(Y_i = 1) \quad (1)$$

denote the probability of belonging to the positive class. The model assumes that the log-odds of the event are a linear function of the predictors:

$$\log\left(\frac{p_i}{1-p_i}\right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \cdots + \beta_p x_{ip} \quad (2)$$

Solving for p_i yields the logistic function:

$$p_i = \frac{e^{\beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^p \beta_j x_{ij}}}{1 + e^{\beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^p \beta_j x_{ij}}} \quad (3)$$

A prediction is obtained by assigning $Y_i = 1$ when p_i exceeds a chosen threshold (commonly 0.5). The decision boundary corresponds to

$$p_i = 0.5 \Leftrightarrow \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \cdots + \beta_p x_{ip} = 0 \quad (4)$$

which forms a linear separating surface in the predictor space.

A full logistic regression model was first fitted using all available predictors. Stepwise model selection was then performed using the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), employing both forward and backward selection procedures to optimize model parsimony and explanatory power. The final models retained a subset of statistically significant predictors, with lower AIC values compared to the full models, indicating better balance between fit and complexity. To assess model performance, we computed confusion matrices and accuracy on both the training and testing datasets. These metrics were also calculated on the external validation datasets (Malaysia and India workers) to evaluate generalizability across population types and national contexts.

Random forest is an ensemble learning method that constructs a large collection of decision trees and aggregates their predictions. Each tree is trained on a bootstrap sample of the data, and at

every split a random subset of predictors is considered, introducing additional randomness that reduces correlation among trees. For a binary response, the prediction for observation i is obtained by majority vote:

$$\hat{Y}_i = \text{mode}\{T_1(x_i), T_2(x_i), \dots, T_M(x_i)\} \quad (5)$$

where $T_m(\cdot)$ denotes the prediction from tree m , and M is the total number of trees. The estimated class probability is given by the proportion of trees voting for class 1:

$$\hat{p}_i = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M I(T_m(x_i) = 1) \quad (6)$$

Random forests naturally capture nonlinear relationships and high-order interactions without requiring explicit model specification.

In our random forest model, 500 trees were grown with default settings for maximum depth and minimum samples per leaf. Feature importance scores were extracted based on mean decrease in Gini impurity:

$$G = 1 - \sum_{k=1}^K p_k^2 \quad (7)$$

where K is the number of classes and p_k is the proportion of samples in the node that belong to class k , to identify the most influential predictors of depression. As with the logistic regression model, confusion matrices and accuracy scores were computed on the training, testing, and external validation datasets.

The use of both logistic regression and random forest allows for complementary insights: logistic regression offers interpretable coefficients and statistical significance testing, while random forest, as a non-parametric ensemble learning method, is capable of capturing nonlinear relationships and high-order interactions between predictors.

2.4 Causal Inference

2.4.1 Causal Forest

Previous analyses on the India student dataset identified pressure as the strongest predictor associated with depressive symptoms. To further examine whether the effect of pressure varies across individuals, in other words whether the association exhibits treatment effect heterogeneity, a causal forest model was implemented on the India student dataset, treating pressure as the treatment variable.

Causal forest is a nonparametric ensemble method designed to estimate individual treatment effects in observational data. Let Y denote the outcome, $W \in \{0,1\}$ the treatment indicator, and X the vector of covariates. The target quantity is the conditional average treatment effect (CATE), defined as

$$\tau(x) = \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0)|X = x] \quad (8)$$

where $Y(1)$ and $Y(0)$ are the potential outcomes under treatment and control, respectively.

A causal forest extends the random forest framework by constructing honest trees, meaning the data are randomly split into two subsamples: one for determining tree splits and one for estimating treatment effects within the resulting leaves. For each tree b , the treatment effect estimate at point x is computed as the difference in average outcomes between treated and control units within the leaf containing x :

$$\hat{\tau}_b(x) = \bar{Y}_{1,b}(x) - \bar{Y}_{0,b}(x) \quad (9)$$

The overall forest estimate is the average across B trees:

$$\hat{\tau}(x) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \hat{\tau}_b(x) \quad (10)$$

Tree splits are chosen to maximize heterogeneity in treatment effects across child nodes, allowing the forest to identify subgroups for which pressure may exert stronger or weaker associations with depression.

The causal forest model was trained on the same processed dataset used for the previous models, ensuring comparability in variable definitions and scaling. All relevant covariates were included as potential moderators to capture heterogeneity in the relationship between pressure and depression. After fitting the model, individualized treatment effect estimates $\hat{\tau}(x_i)$ were obtained for each student, representing the predicted change in depression likelihood associated with experiencing high pressure for individuals with covariate profile x_i .

To assess the reliability and stability of these estimates, the calibration test was applied. This diagnostic test evaluates whether the predicted CATEs align with the observed treatment effects across subgroups, essentially checking whether the model accurately captures genuine heterogeneity rather than random variation. A non-significant calibration test would indicate that the estimated heterogeneity patterns are consistent with the data.

2.4.2 Causal Mediation Analysis

The results of the causal forest indicated that age, academic performance, satisfaction, and anxiety exhibited the highest CATE in relation to pressure. To further investigate whether pressure serves as a potential mediator in these relationships, we conducted a causal mediation analysis (CMA) on the India student dataset to decompose the total effect of each predictor into direct and indirect components.

CMA is used to decompose the total effect of an exposure X on an outcome Y into an indirect effect operating through a mediator M and a direct effect not explained by the mediator. Under the counterfactual framework, let $Y(x, m)$ denote the potential outcome if exposure is set to x and mediator to m , and let $M(x)$ be the mediator under exposure x .

The indirect effect and direct effect are defined as:

$$\text{indirect effect} = \mathbb{E}[Y(1, M(1)) - Y(1, M(0))] \quad (11)$$

$$\text{direct effect} = \mathbb{E}[Y(1, M(0)) - Y(0, M(0))] \quad (12)$$

The total effect decomposes as

$$\text{total effect} = \text{indirect effect} + \text{direct effect} \quad (13)$$

Estimation typically relies on fitting both a mediator model $M|X$ and an outcome model $Y|X, M$, with identification requiring assumptions such as sequential ignorability. Sequential ignorability consists of two conditional independence assumptions: (1) ignorability of the treatment (given covariates), meaning after conditioning on pre-treatment covariates X , treatment assignment is assumed to be independent of the potential mediator and potential outcomes, and (2) ignorability of the mediator (given treatment and covariates), meaning that after conditioning on treatment and X , the mediator is assumed to be independent of the potential outcomes.

We first built an outcome model using logistic regression, as the dependent variable (depression) is binary, and included all relevant predictors to adjust for potential confounding. Next, mediator models were constructed as linear regressions, with pressure as the mediator and the remaining predictors as explanatory variables. Depending on the pathway of interest, different variables were treated as the exposure. More specifically, age served as the treatment when assessing whether pressure mediates the effect of age on depression; similarly, academic performance, anxiety and satisfaction were each treated as the exposure when evaluating their respective mediation mechanisms through pressure. These outcome and mediator models were then combined using the CMA framework to estimate both the direct and indirect effects.

However, during analysis, we encountered an interpretational challenge. It was not immediately clear whether pressure mediates the effect of satisfaction on depression or vice versa, as both causal directions are theoretically plausible. To address this, we fitted an alternative mediator model with satisfaction as the response variable and performed the causal mediation analysis again. Interestingly, the results showed that both the direct and indirect effects remained significant, suggesting that the causal direction between pressure and satisfaction cannot be conclusively determined based solely on CMA results.

2.4.3 Directionality

To determine the correct causal direction between pressure and satisfaction, we first applied the approach proposed in “Error-Predictor Independence to Detect Causal Direction” by Wiedermann and von Eye (2016). They proposed a residual-based statistical method to test whether a proposed mediation model reflects the true causal direction. This method is grounded in the Darrois-Skitovich Theorem and a decision rule framework that relies on testing the statistical independence between model residuals and predictors.

The underlying assumption is that in the correctly specified model, residuals should be independent of the predictors, whereas in a misspecified model, particularly when the true predictor is non-normally distributed, this independence will be violated. In practice, this method involves fitting both competing regression models and computing the covariance between the squared predictor and the residuals from the alternative model.

In our application, however, the covariances for both competing models (pressure → satisfaction and satisfaction → pressure) were non-significant. This suggested that the independence-based test was inconclusive in determining a dominant causal direction.

Given this ambiguity, we designed a series of numerical experiments to further explore how the relative magnitudes of direct and indirect effects obtained through CMA could inform causal directionality. The simulations were constructed to represent different theoretical causal structures and to verify whether CMA could distinguish between them based on the estimated effect sizes. Finally, we applied this experimental reasoning framework to the India student dataset to re-examine the directionality between pressure and satisfaction.

3 Results

3.1 Identified Significant Features

For student coherent, the final logistic regression model identified several significant predictors of depression, including age, pressure, workload, financial stress, mental health history, and satisfaction, with pressure as the most significant predictor. More specifically, the model suggests that students who are younger, have a history of mental health disorders, experience higher levels of pressure, workload, and financial stress, and report lower life satisfaction are more likely to show symptoms of depression. The model achieved an AIC of 338.35, with a prediction accuracy of 0.76 on the India students test set. When applied to the Malaysia dataset, the model reached an accuracy of 0.55, suggesting limited generalizability across different populations. The random forest model outperformed logistic regression slightly, achieving a prediction accuracy of 0.81 on the India student test set and 0.58 on the Malaysia dataset. Feature importance analysis showed a similar pattern to the logistic regression results, with pressure, age, and financial stress ranking highly.

	Estimate	Std. Error	Z value	Pr(> z)	Significant?
Intercept	-0.90658	0.97452	-0.930	0.3522	no
Gender1	0.40513	0.28328	1.430	0.1527	no
Age	-0.15725	0.03127	-5.029	4.94e-07	yes
Pressure	1.10325	0.12647	8.723	<2e-16	yes
Workload	0.40261	0.08386	4.801	1.58e-06	yes
Financial_stress	0.72721	0.11394	6.382	1.75e-10	yes
Mental_health_history1	0.64661	0.28144	2.298	0.0216	yes
Satisfaction	-0.67976	0.11218	-6.059	1.37e-09	yes

Table 3. Estimated coefficients from the logistic regression model applied to the India student dataset




Figure 2. Feature importance from the random forest model applied to the India student dataset

For the worker cohort, the logistic regression model identified several significant predictors of depression, including gender, age, pressure, financial stress, mental health history, sleep quality, and satisfaction. Among these, pressure again emerged as the strongest predictor, followed by financial stress and sleep quality. More specifically, workers who are older, male, experience high levels of pressure and financial stress, have a prior mental health history, report lower life satisfaction, and have poorer sleep quality are more likely to exhibit symptoms of depression. The model achieved an internal prediction accuracy of 0.73 on the China dataset, with an external accuracy of 0.67 when applied to the India workers dataset. The random forest model performed comparably on the internal dataset, achieving an accuracy of 0.73, but demonstrated improved generalizability with an external accuracy of 0.70. Feature importance analysis revealed that pressure, age, and financial stress were again among the top contributors, with sleep quality and satisfaction also ranking highly.

	Estimate	Std. Error	Z value	Pr(> z)	Significant?
Intercept	-0.771862	0.155917	-4.950	7.40e-07	yes
Gender1	-0.220466	0.032162	-6.855	7.14e-12	yes
Age	0.008434	0.001601	5.269	1.37e-07	yes
Pressure	0.451198	0.010119	44.591	<2e-16	yes
Workload	-0.014319	0.012958	-1.105	0.269130	no
Financial_stress	0.084830	0.032052	2.647	0.008129	yes
Mental_health_history1	0.291837	0.082491	3.538	0.000403	yes
Sleep_quality	-0.246395	0.013056	-18.872	<2e-16	yes
Satisfaction	-0.257390	0.020227	-12.725	<2e-16	yes
Social_support	-0.036294	0.033979	-1.068	0.285470	no
Future_concern	0.017814	0.012684	1.404	0.160189	no
Physical_activities	-0.002739	0.012658	-0.216	0.828685	no

Table 4. Estimated coefficients from the logistic regression model applied to the China dataset




Figure 3. Feature importance from the random forest model applied to the China dataset

Cohort	Model	Internal Accuracy	External Accuracy	Internal Test Dataset	External Test Dataset
Students	Logistic Regression	0.76	0.55	India student	Malaysia
Students	Random Forest	0.81	0.58	India student	Malaysia
Workers	Logistic Regression	0.73	0.67	China	India worker
Workers	Random Forest	0.73	0.70	China	India worker

Table 5. Model performance results

These findings suggest that while several predictors of depression are consistent across populations, cross-national performance drops notably, highlighting the influence of cultural, demographic, and contextual factors on how depression manifests and is reported. Across both groups, pressure consistently emerged as the most direct and powerful predictor of depression, supported by both logistic regression and random forest analyses. This relationship persisted even after accounting for other variables such as satisfaction and anxiety, suggesting that stress-related mechanisms play a central role in shaping mental health outcomes.

3.2 Causal Inference & Mediation Pathways

The causal forest analysis produced a mean forest prediction coefficient of 1.003, indicating that the model accurately recovered the average treatment effect. The calibration test further suggested an absence of meaningful treatment-effect heterogeneity, implying that treatment effects were largely consistent across individuals rather than varying substantially across subgroups.

Despite the overall homogeneity, several predictors exhibited relatively higher conditional average treatment effects (CATEs) with respect to pressure. Age (CATE = 0.099), academic performance (CATE = 0.109), satisfaction (CATE = 0.168) and anxiety (CATE = 0.221) emerged as the most influential factors. These findings indicate that pressure might play a stronger mediating role in shaping depression outcomes among individuals with higher anxiety or lower satisfaction, as well as among those with lower academic performance. Collectively, these results highlight that while the average treatment effect is stable across the sample, certain

psychological and academic factors may amplify the extent to which pressure contributes to depressive symptoms.

variable	CATE estimate
Gender 0	0.010301
Gender1	0.011391
Age	0.098745
Academic_performance	0.109025
Workload	0.078958
Financial_stress	0.058074
Mental_health_history1	0.025666
Sleep_quality	0.045189
Satisfaction	0.168255
Anxiety	0.220806
Social_support	0.058524
Extracurricular_activities	0.050115
Future_concern	0.064951

Table 6. Estimated CATEs from Causal Forest with Pressure as Mediator

The CMA provided additional insight into whether pressure serves as a meaningful mediator of the relationships between the selected predictors and depression. For age, the estimated average causal mediation effect (ACME) was extremely small and statistically non-significant ($ACME_{avg}=0.00041$, $p=0.648$), indicating that pressure does not mediate the effect of age on depression. In contrast, the average direct effect (ADE) was negative and highly significant ($ADE_{avg} = -0.00904$, $p<2e-16$), suggesting that older students report lower levels of depression primarily through a direct pathway that is independent of perceived pressure. The total effect was also significant and negative, and the proportion mediated was close to zero and non-significant. Together, these results show that the association between age and depression is almost entirely direct rather than operating through pressure.

	Estimate	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	p-value	Significant?
ACME (average)	0.00040549	-0.00084534	0.00298294	0.648	no
ADE (average)	-0.00903773	-0.01217454	-0.00411760	<2e-16	yes
Prop. Mediated (average)	-0.04697428	-0.31880593	0.12181186	0.648	no
Total Effect	-0.00863224	-0.00989752	-0.00436634	<2e-16	yes

Table 7. Estimated ACME and ADE from CMA with Age as Treatment and Pressure as Mediator

For academic performance, neither the ACME nor the ADE was statistically significant ($ACME_{avg}=-0.00392$, $p=0.662$; $ADE_{avg}=-0.001$, $p=0.938$). The total effect was similarly non-significant ($p=0.75$). Although the estimated proportion mediated was large in magnitude, its

confidence interval was extremely wide and included both negative and positive values, indicating substantial statistical uncertainty and no meaningful mediation. These findings reflect the fact that academic performance itself was not a significant predictor of depression, and therefore pressure does not operate as a mediator in this context.

	Estimate	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	p-value	Significant?
ACME (average)	-0.0039229	-0.0220516	0.0142870	0.662	no
ADE (average)	-0.0010019	-0.0306868	0.0322418	0.938	no
Prop. Mediated (average)	0.7965580	-5.2354503	7.3300634	0.668	no
Total Effect	-0.0049248	-0.0377757	0.0329792	0.750	no

Table 8. Estimated ACME and ADE from CMA with Academic Performance as Treatment and Pressure as Mediator

Similarly, for anxiety, the indirect effect of anxiety on depression through pressure was not statistically significant ($ACME_{avg}=0.01550$, $p=0.584$). The direct effect was also non-significant ($ADE_{avg}=0.06119$, $p=0.252$), and the total effect did not reach significance ($p=0.212$). As with academic performance, the mediation proportion was imprecisely estimated and non-significant. These results indicate that anxiety was not a significant predictor of depression. Consequently, pressure does not appear to mediate the anxiety-depression relationship in a meaningful way.

	Estimate	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	p-value	Significant?
ACME (average)	0.015499	-0.041100	0.073037	0.584	no
ADE (average)	0.061191	-0.041971	0.156801	0.252	no
Prop. Mediated (average)	0.202100	-2.408252	2.970615	0.540	no
Total Effect	0.076690	-0.035392	0.190540	0.212	no

Table 9. Estimated ACME and ADE from CMA with Anxiety as Treatment and Pressure as Mediator

For satisfaction, the results revealed that both the direct ($ADE_{avg}=-0.07494$, $p<2e-16$) and indirect effects ($ACME_{avg}=-0.01337$, $p=0.026$) were statistically significant. This indicates a complex interplay between satisfaction, pressure, and depression, where satisfaction not only influences depression directly but also exerts an indirect effect through its association with pressure. We also fitted an alternative mediator model with satisfaction as the response variable and performed the causal mediation analysis again. Again, both ACME ($ACME_{avg}=0.005830$, $p=0.014$) and ADE ($ADE_{avg}=0.090263$, $p<2e-16$) are significant. Due to this, the analysis alone

cannot conclusively determine whether satisfaction mediates the effect of pressure on depression or vice versa.

	Estimate	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	p-value	Significant?
ACME (average)	-0.0133744	-0.0226746	-0.0023896	0.026	yes
ADE (average)	-0.0749430	-0.0858862	-0.0577707	<2e-16	yes
Prop. Mediated (average)	0.1514359	0.0288389	0.2595222	0.026	yes
Total Effect	-0.0883174	-0.0969341	-0.0699297	<2e-16	yes

Table 10. Estimated ACME and ADE from CMA with Satisfaction as Treatment and Pressure as Mediator

	Estimate	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	p-value	Significant?
ACME (average)	0.00583017	0.00104967	0.01061572	0.014	yes
ADE (average)	0.09026304	0.07496172	0.10344495	<2e-16	yes
Prop. Mediated (average)	0.06067205	0.01111353	0.10968615	0.014	yes
Total Effect	0.09609321	0.07956479	0.10835281	<2e-16	yes

Table 11. Estimated ACME and ADE from CMA with Pressure as Treatment and Satisfaction as Mediator

3.4 Directionality

For each simulation group, we generated x, y, error, and z according to the formulas summarized in Table 12. We then fitted three models: (1) an outcome model, in which z was regressed on x and y; (2) a mediator model with y as the response and x as the predictor (mediator model 1); and (3) a mediator model with x as the response and y as the predictor (mediator model 2). Based on the data-generating mechanisms, we derived the expected values of the ACME and ADE for each scenario. We then applied CMA using the outcome model paired with each mediator model to obtain the real ACME and ADE values.

	x generation	y generation	error	z generation
Group 1	Sampling 3,000 values between 1 and 10,000	Sampling 3,000 values between 1 and 10,000	Sampling 3,000 values between 1 and 10 with replacement	$z = x + \text{error}$
Group 2.1	Sampling 3,000 values between 1 and 10,000	Sampling 3,000 values between 1 and 10,000	Sampling 3,000 values between 1 and 10 with replacement	$z = x + y + \text{error}$

Group 2.2	Sampling 3,000 values between 1 and 10,000	Sampling 3,000 values between 1 and 10,000	Sampling 3,000 values between 1 and 10 with replacement	$z = 0.8x + 0.2y + \text{error}$
Group 3.1	Sampling 3,000 values between 1 and 10,000	$y = x + \text{error}$	Sampling 3,000 values between 1 and 10 with replacement	$z = x + y + \text{error}$
Group 3.2	Sampling 3,000 values between 1 and 10,000	$y = 1000x + \text{error}$	Sampling 3,000 values between 1 and 10 with replacement	$z = x + y + \text{error}$
Group 3.3	Sampling 3,000 values between 1 and 10,000	$y = 0.1x + \text{error}$	Sampling 3,000 values between 1 and 10 with replacement	$z = x + y + \text{error}$
Group 3.4	Sampling 3,000 values between 1 and 10,000	$y = 0.001x + \text{error}$	Sampling 3,000 values between 1 and 10 with replacement	$z = x + y + \text{error}$

Table 12. Summary of Data Generation Process

	Expected ACME for x-y-z	Real ACME for x-y-z	Expected ACDE for x-y-z	Real ADE for x-y-z
Group 1	Around 0 (no mediation)	-3.47e-08	Around 1	0.99999
Group 2.1	Around 0 (no mediation)	0.0113	Around 1	0.99996
Group 2.2	Around 0 (no mediation)	0.00227	Around 0.8	0.79997
Group 3.1	Around 1	1.00669	NA	0.99327
Group 3.2	Around 1000	1006.741	NA	-5.74054
Group 3.3	Around 0.1	0.10063	NA	0.99933
Group 3.4	Around 0.001	0.00096	NA	1

Table 13. Results for x-y-z Mediation Pathway

	Expected ACME for y-x-z	Real ACME for y-x-z	Expected ADE for y-x-z	Real ADE for y-x-z
Group 1	Around 0 (no mediation)	0.01099	Around 0	-3.06E-06
Group 2.1	Around 0 (no mediation)	0.01099	Around 1	0.99999
Group 2.2	Around 0 (no mediation)	0.00879	Around 0.2	0.19999
Group 3.1	Similar to that for x-y-z	0.9933	NA	1.00674
Group 3.2	Much smaller than that for x-y-z	-0.0057	NA	1.00674
Group 3.3	Larger than that for x-y-z	9.9965	NA	1.00674
Group 3.4	Much larger than that for x-y-z	505.0021	NA	1.00674

Table 14. Results for y-x-z Mediation Pathway

As shown in Tables 13 and 14, the estimated CMA results closely matched the expected values across all simulation settings. In cases where the mediation structure was correctly specified, the estimated indirect effects aligned with the true coefficient linking the treatment and mediator. Conversely, when the mediation direction was misspecified, the CMA output produced implausible or highly unstable indirect effects, reflecting the incorrect causal structure. Overall, the simulation results confirm that CMA reliably recovers the true mediation effect when the underlying causal pathway is correctly identified.

In the India student dataset, the estimated indirect effect for pressure was 0.07514, while that for satisfaction was -0.12755. The coefficients from the linear mediator models were satisfaction = -0.105pressure + other covariates, and pressure = -0.1088satisfaction + other covariates.

	Expected ACME	Real ACME
Pressure-satisfaction-depression	Around -0.105	0.075137
Satisfaction-pressure-depression	Around -0.1088	-0.12755

Table 15. CMA Results on India student dataset

If satisfaction were the true mediator, the indirect effect of pressure would be expected to be close to -0.105. However, this was not observed. Conversely, if pressure were the true mediator, the indirect effect of satisfaction should approximate -0.1088, which aligns closely with the observed value of -0.12755. Given both the direction and magnitude of these effects, the findings suggest that pressure functions as a mediator between satisfaction and depression, that is, satisfaction influences depression primarily through its impact on perceived pressure. Pressure, in turn, exerts a more direct and substantial effect on depression, reinforcing its central role as a key driver in the causal pathway.

4 Discussion

The present study identified several significant predictors of depression across student and worker populations, including pressure, age, workload, financial stress, mental health history, and satisfaction. These predictors largely align with patterns reported in prior research, which has consistently shown that stress exposure, financial strain, and life satisfaction are key determinants of mental health across various Asian populations (Islam et al., 2022; Lowe et al., 2009; Singh et al., 2017). A notable contribution of this study, however, is the direct comparison of two distinct population groups, students and workers, using harmonized variables and parallel modeling frameworks. This allowed us to uncover an important divergence in the role of age: younger individuals were more likely to experience depression in the student cohort, whereas older adults faced higher risk in the worker cohort. This may reflect academic pressure among younger students and job insecurity concerns among older workers. Prior studies often focused on only one population at a time, making such contrasts difficult to observe. Additionally, by evaluating both internal and external prediction accuracy, the study revealed substantial declines in model performance when models were applied across national contexts. This suggests that cultural norms, socioeconomic environments, academic or workplace expectations, and mental

health reporting behaviors influence the expression and detectability of depression. These findings highlight the need for future research to incorporate culture- and context-specific variables, such as family structure, workplace pressure norms, or stigma surrounding mental health, to improve model transportability and predictive accuracy across countries.

Beyond identifying predictors, this study also contributes to ongoing discussions about the mechanisms through which pressure and life satisfaction shape mental health. Existing literature consistently indicates that both high perceived pressure and low life satisfaction are associated with depressive symptoms (Li et al., 2024), yet most studies consider these variables independently and rarely examine their causal relationship within the same analytical framework. Direct head-to-head comparisons of their relative influence are uncommon, and evidence regarding their interplay has remained inconclusive. Through the integration of causal forest analysis, causal mediation analysis, and simulation-based directionality checks, the present study offers insight into how these factors interact. The findings suggest that pressure operates primarily as a direct driver of depression, whereas satisfaction influences depression partly through its effect on perceived pressure. This mediation pattern provides a more nuanced understanding of how subjective well-being and stress interact to influence mental health outcomes. At the same time, because our data are cross-sectional, causal direction cannot be established definitively. Future work should employ longitudinal or experimental designs to better evaluate temporal ordering and verify whether reducing pressure indeed mediates the positive impact of improved life satisfaction.

5 Conclusions

This study examined predictors of depression across student and worker populations in India, Malaysia, and China, highlighting both shared influences and context-specific patterns. Across all groups, pressure emerged as the strongest and most consistent predictor, underscoring its central role in shaping mental health. By comparing two distinct populations and evaluating model accuracy across national contexts, this study demonstrated that factors such as age, cultural environment, and social conditions meaningfully shape risk patterns and model performance. The mediation and directionality analyses further clarified the interplay between pressure and satisfaction, suggesting that pressure functions as a more direct driver of depressive symptoms, whereas satisfaction influences depression primarily through its effect on pressure.

Overall, the study demonstrates the value of combining predictive and causal methods to understand depression in diverse populations. Future research would benefit from longitudinal data, culturally tailored predictors, and experimental designs that can more definitively identify causal pathways and guide targeted interventions.

Data Availability

All datasets were publicly available and downloaded from Kaggle and CHARLS.

India data Link: <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/sumansharmadataworld/depression-surveydataset-for-analysis>

Malaysia data Link: <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/shariful07/student-mental-health/data>

China data Link: https://charls.charlsdata.com/pages/Data/harmonized_charls/en.html

Funding

This research was supported by a cash funding from the Office of Undergraduate Research at Washington University in St. Louis.

Acknowledgements

I gratefully acknowledge Washington University in St. Louis and the Office of Undergraduate Research for financially supporting this project.

References

- Yuhang Wu, L. F., Fan Xia, Yunzhe Zhou, Haiyan Wang, Lijuan Feng, Shudong Xie, Wendi Xu, Zhiqin Xie, Jing He, Dan Liu, Sui He, Yuting Xu, Jing Deng, Tingting Wang, Lizhang Chen. (2024). Global, regional, and national time trends in incidence for depressive disorders, from 1990 to 2019: an age-period-cohort analysis for the GBD 2019. *Annals of General Psychiatry*, 23, Article 28. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12991-024-00513-1>
- Aihong Liu, Y. P., Wenli Zhu, Yanling Zhang, Shihui Ge, Yun Zhou, Kemeng Zhang, Zhaohui Wang, Ping He. (2021). Analysis of Factors Associated With Depression in Community-Dwelling Older Adults in Wuhan, China. *Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience*, 13, Article 743193. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnagi.2021.743193>
- Rulin Li, X. W., Lanjun Luo, Youwei Yuan. (2024). Identifying the most crucial factors associated with depression based on interpretable machine learning: a case study from CHARLS. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, Article 1392240. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1392240>
- Jingxi Duan, X. W., Weihua Yu, Yongtao Deng, Qi Tu, Mohan Giri, Mingzhao Xiao, Yang Lv. (2020). Risk factors associated with depressive symptoms in older people based on comprehensive geriatric assessment in Chongqing China. *Research Square*. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-40283/v1>
- Saiful Islam, R. A., Tajuddin Sikder, Mark D. Griffiths. (2022). Prevalence and Factors Associated with Depression and Anxiety Among First-Year University Students in Bangladesh: A Cross-Sectional Study. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 20, 1289–1302. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-020-00242-y>
- Gillian Lowe, G. L., Ronald Young. (2009). Factors Associated with Depression in Students at The University of the West Indies, Mona, Jamaica. *West Indian Medical Journal*, 58, 21–27.
- Man Mohan Singh, M. G., Sandeep Grover. (2017). Prevalence & factors associated with depression among schoolgoing adolescents in Chandigarh, north India. *Indian Journal of Medical Research*, 205–215. https://doi.org/10.4103/ijmr.IJMR_1339_15
- Wolfgang Wiedermann, A. v. E. (2016). Directionality of Effects in Causal Mediation Analysis. *Statistics and Causality: Methods for Applied Empirical Research*, 63–106. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118947074.ch4>

