medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.21.20073049; this version posted April 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

What can trends in hospital deaths from COVID-19 tell us about the progress and peak of the pandemic? An analysis of death counts from England announced up to 20 April 2020

David A Leon*[1] , Christopher I Jarvis[1] , Anne Johnson[2] , Liam Smeeth[1] , Vladimir M Shkolnikov[3]

[1] Faculty of Epidemiology & Population Health, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, Keppel St, London WC1E 7HT UK
[2] UCL Institute of Global Health, Mortimer Market Centre, Off Capper Street, London WC1E 6JB UK
[3] Laboratory of Demographic Data, Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research, Konrad-Zuse-Str. 18057 Rostock, Germany
* corresponding author david.leon@lshtm.ac.uk

Abstract

Background Reporting of daily hospital COVID-19 deaths in the UK are promoted by the government and scientific advisers alike as a key metric for assessing the progress in the control of the epidemic. These data, however, have certain limitations, among which one of the most significant concerns the fact that the daily totals span deaths that have occurred between 1 and 10 days or more in the past.

Data and methods We obtained daily data published published by NHS England up to and including April 21 in the form of Excel spreadsheets in which deaths counts are presented by date of death according to age and region. Simple descriptive analyses were conducted and presented in graphical and tabular form which were aimed at illustrating the biases inherent in focussing on daily counts regardless of when the deaths occurred. We then looked at how a less biased picture could be obtained by looking at trends in death counts stratifying by individual period of delay in days between occurrence of death and when the death was included in the daily announcement.

Findings The number of hospital COVID-19 deaths announced daily overestimates the maximum number of deaths actually occurring so far in the epidemic in the UK, and also obscures the pattern of decline in deaths. Taking account of reporting delays suggests that for England as a whole a peak in hospital COVID-19 deaths may have been reached on April 8 with a subsequent gradual decline suggested. The same peak is also seen among those aged 60-79 and 80+, although there is less evidence of a decline in the oldest age group after April 9. Among those aged 40-59 years a later peak on April 11 is evident. London shows a peak on April 8 and a clearer pattern of subsequent decline compared to England as a whole.

Interpretation Analyses of mortality trends must take account of delay, and in communication with the public more emphasis should be placed on looking at trends based on deaths that occurred 5 or more days prior to the announcement day. The weak decline seen at age 80+ may reflect increased hospitalisation of people from care homes, whereas the later peak under the age of 60 years may reflect higher proportions of people of these younger being admitted to critical care, extending life for some days.

Competing interests: All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf and declare: no support from any organization for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organizations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years other than LS who reported grants from Wellcome, MRC, NIHR, GSK, BHF, Diabetes UK all outside the submitted work; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work other than LS who is a Trustee of the British Heart Foundation and AJM who is a member of the Royal Society Delve Committee.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.21.20073049; this version posted April 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Background

Determining if and when the mortality peak of the current COVID-19 epidemic has been reached in any particular country is a key input into government, health service planning and guiding public health strategy. It is also crucial information to communicate to the public who in most countries have been subject to varying degrees of limitation and restriction on social interaction, work and movement (lockdown). While it is repeatedly stated by politicians and scientific experts that there is inevitably a delay between the point at which social distancing, individual protection and lock-down measures are imposed and the point when this may result in declining mortality, the uncertainty about when the daily toll of deaths is likely to decline will add to widespread public anxiety about the epidemic (1).

A full understanding of the dynamics of this and any other epidemic requires information on transmission, incidence of new cases and prevalence of active infection and immunity in the population (2). Reliable data of these epidemiological parameters is fragmentary in many countries. In the UK, the absence of large-scale testing for active infection has been regarded as a particular problem (3), with an almost exclusive focus until recently on testing among those admitted to hospital (4). Testing of people admitted to hospital with suspect COVID-19 infection is common in many countries and is recommended as a key priority within an overall testing strategy (2, 5). It provides a transparent and standardised metric of the epidemic burden : the numbers of people dying in hospital who were COVID-19 positive at the time of death. In the UK, the number of hospital deaths with COVID-19 is one of the headline figures provided daily, and the trajectory of the cumulative number of such deaths are the basis for many widely disseminated comparisons of how the UK is doing compared to others (6).

The interpretation of trends in the daily headline count of COVID-19 deaths in the UK is problematic for a number of reasons. One of the key challenges is that this number is comprised of COVID-19 deaths in hospital reported for the first time to the relevant authorities in a defined 24 hour period regardless of when each death actually occurred. The reasons for delayed reporting are several and will reflect pressures across the hospital system during the epidemic as well as pre-existing variation in quality and efficiency of data infrastructure. Thus for any particular reporting day, deaths are included whose reporting was delayed by 1, 2, 3 or more days. While this is clearly stated by NHS England on their website (7), this distinction appears to be lacking in most public debate and discussion relating to the figures.

In this paper we utilised datasets on COVID-19 deaths in hospital from NHS England that have been published by NHS England and announced to the public on a daily basis since early April to i) quantify the bias inherent in using the total number of such reported deaths as a metric of intensity and trajectory of mortality; ii) examine whether there is evidence of a downturn in hospital mortality once delays in reporting of these deaths are taken into account; iii) critically examine the strengths and weaknesses of these data as indicators of the burden of COVID-19 in the UK.

Methods

Since April 4 on a daily basis the number of COVID-19 deaths occurring in hospital in England up until 5pm the previous day, are published by the NHS. COVID-19 deaths in this context are those that occur in hospital of patients that had tested positive for the virus at the time of death. They are reported centrally through the COVID-19 Patient Notification System. The headline figure that attracts attention in the media is the total number of deaths that are announced for the 24 hours up to 5pm the previous day. For example, on 14 April a total of 744 deaths were announced. These represent deaths reported to the centre in the period from 5pm 12 April to 5pm 13 April.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.21.20073049; this version posted April 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

We downloaded the daily Excel spreadsheets from the Department of Health website (7) published each day from April 2 to April 21. These showed numbers of deaths reported by actual date of death for all ages combined, and separately for 5 age groups (0-19, 20-39, 40-59, 60-79 and 80+ years). Further breakdown by sex was not available. In our analyses we focus on all ages and the three older age groups as the number of deaths under the age of 40 was very small and thus not meaningful to analyse separately. For the whole of the epidemic up until the April 21 data publication only 123 of the total of 15607 deaths were in this youngest age group.

In the first analyses we examine the delay in reporting of COVID-19 hospital deaths and look at how this can bias impressions about trends. We then present analyses that aim to provide a less biased impression of the trajectory of the epidemic in so far as it is measured by daily counts of COVID-19 deaths in hospital. We did this by looking at the trend over time in the numbers of deaths reported within a particular period of delay. While the absolute numbers of deaths seen with 1, 2 or even 5 days delay represent an underestimate of the total deaths occurring on any one day, focussing on trends within single days of delay periods allows a fairer, more like with like comparison of death counts by date of death.

Results

Figure 1 shows how the COVID-19 deaths published by NHS England on one of four arbitrarily selected days are comprise of deaths that actually occurred over a span of a wide range of previous days. For any one day of death, the maximum number of deaths are announced with a delay of 2 days. An appreciable number of deaths are included with greater delays. Over the reporting period from April 2 to April 20, on average 90% of deaths announced were included after 5-days. What is also evident from Figure 1 is that over time that has been a slight but noticeable decline in the delays of reporting, with a tighter and more symmetrical distribution of deaths by delay evident for daily announced deaths up to April 20.

Figure 2 addresses the extent to which the total number of daily deaths published by the NHS provides a somewhat misleading impression of levels of and trends in actual daily mortality based on the date of death per se. Looking at the maximum level of daily announced deaths (blue line) this has a maximum (866 on April 10) that is higher than the observed maximum of daily deaths (red line) by date of occurrence (801 on April 8). More importantly, the trajectory of the daily announced deaths is more unstable than the trajectory shown for deaths by date of occurrence. Specifically, there is an indication that the maximum total number of hospital deaths occurred on April 8, which is just not evident when looking at trends in daily announced deaths.

Figure 3 provides further insights into how the correspondence between the dates of the announcement and the dates of occurrence affects the temporal pattern of deaths at all ages and in specific age groups. It shows for all deaths and those in selected age groups trends in total numbers of deaths that occurred on any particular day that were reported with delays of between 1 and 7 days. The numbers on which these Figures are based are shown in Table 1. Note that the numbers of deaths shown as occurring for any one day for a given delay are the sum of all deaths on that day cumulated across preceding delay periods. For example, looking at all deaths in panel (a) one can see that there were 140 deaths on April 8 that were reported with 1 day's delay (i.e. announced on April 9). However, taking account of deaths reported with both 1 and 2 day's delay, the number of deaths seen for April 8 rose to 496.

Examination of the overall pattern seen for all deaths (Figure 3, panel (a)) reveals that the highest number of deaths within each delay period is April 8 other than for 1 day's delay. This is confirmed in Table 1. From April 8 there is good evidence of a decline, with a small perturbation on April 11. For

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.21.20073049; this version posted April 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

deaths aged 40-59 years (panel (b)) the peak appears to occur 3 days later on April 11. However, at ages 60-79 and 80+ the April 8 peak is evident, although as in the youngest age group there is evidence of a small peturbation on April 11. The oldest age group is notable in that although the peak on April 8 is clear, there is less evidence of a decline after April 9, with indications of a plateau having been reached.

The patterns by English region vary. Equivalent plots and numbers are given in Figure 4 and Table 2 for London and the Midlands. The picture for London is relatively convincing for a decline since April 8, although there is evidence of a slightly higher peak earlier than this on April 4. In contrast, while in the Midlands there is a peak on April 8, there is less evidence of a steady decline afterwards, with a further smaller peak on April 15.

Discussion

In this paper, we have illustrated the problems and biases inherent in using the total number of daily COVID-19 deaths published by NHS England and announced to the public as a guide both to the trajectory as well as the level of daily deaths by date of occurrence. Our analysis that makes a more like with like comparison over days by taking account of delay periods suggests that there may have been a peak of hospital COVID-19 deaths on April 8. This is consistent with the results of a more formal statistical approach to dealing with the problem of delay (8). However, this pattern varies somewhat by age and by region. Whether this really is the case will become clear when several more days of data have become available.

As we discuss below there are a number of caveats concerning how far hospital COVID-19 deaths can be regarded as reflecting the trajectory of the epidemic above and beyond the delays in reporting to the NHS that we have already discussed. However, as a first approximation, one may work back from a posible peak on April 8 to when the rate of community transmission began to fall. If we assume a median time of around 23 days following infection (5 days median incubation period (9) and 18 days from symptom onset to death(10)) one can track back to a date of infection of of around March 16. This is a week prior to the hard lockdown announced on 23 March. However there is evidence of a decline in social contact and travel in the previous week (March 16-23) (11, 12).

From another perspective, this illustrates just how long the delay is between a fall in rate of infection and it becoming manifest in a fall in deaths. To the 23 days one would need to add an additional 5 or more to be confident that the mortality signal was not due to delays in reporting, resulting in a 28 day gap between a decline in infections becoming apparent in deaths by date of occurrence.

The dynamics of infection and subsequent mortality are importantly driven by changes in patterns of transmission in the community. However, it is important to note that community transmission is not the only source of infections that lead to death in hospital. There are also infections within care-homes, which will behave differently and will not be as influenced by broader lockdown once established in any particular institution. Although care homes will have introduced restrictions on visitors who may seed infection, they are not entirely closed communities, and once established in a particular institution, transmission may be particularly difficult to stop. Lockdown primarily affects inter-household and not intrahousehold transmission. This may lead to a more extended period of ongoing transmission and later mortality than seen in the general community. Finally there are the infections that occur within hospitals, that will affect both staff as well as others who have to be in hospital for other reasons other than COVID-19. Again, this focus of transmission will have its own dynamic.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.21.20073049; this version posted April 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

The most striking finding by age concerns those dying aged 40-59 years, who look as though they have a peak mortality on April 11 rather than April 8. Because they constitute less than 1 in 10 of total hospital COVID-19 deaths, the effect of this later peak is not very visible in the pattern seen for the population as a whole. One possible explanation for this later peak is that a larger proportion of these younger cases who die have been admitted to critical units than at older ages. Although they eventually succumb to the infection, their survival might have been extended by a few days as a result of the more invasive ventilation and organ support available in critical care units. This supposition is supported by a comparison of the age distributions of patients with COVID-19 admitted to critical units who subsequently die, compared to the age distribution of all hospital COVID-19 deaths. Data from a recent report of the Intensive Care National Audit & Research Centre on COVID-19 patients (13) shows that up to April 16 only 2% of the COVID-19 deaths in critical care units were to people aged 80+. In comparison 52% of all hospital COVID-19 deaths are among those aged 80+ up to the same date. Indeed only 3% of the COVID-19 cases admitted to critical care were aged over 80 years, while 46% were younger than 60 years.

The reasons why London shows a clearer pattern of decline after April 8 compared to the country as a whole or the Midlands are unclear. It is well accepted that the epidemic in London was more advanced and intense than in other regions. It is possible that the effect of the lockdown on transmission via the London underground and other features of the human density of the city may have been sharper than in other places. However, further work is required to understand this.

Our analyses are based on counts of people who die in hospital with a laboratory verified diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2. This definition of a COVID-19 death is similar to that used in a number of other countries including Italy (14). However not all of these deaths will be caused by COVID-19, although it seems likely a large number will have been precipitated by the infection. However, more importantly, there is the issue of deaths occurring outside of hospital. The weekly ONS COVID mortality report (published April 21) showed that to April 10 18% of deaths in which COVID-19 was mentioned on the death certificate occurred in private homes, care homes or hospices (15). It is, however, unclear what proportion of cases of people in care homes are admitted to hospital if they have COVID-19 symptoms. Crucially for the validity of our analyses it is not known whether the fraction of such cases admitted has changed during the course of the epidemic. On the one hand as the epidemic has progressed there may be a greater reluctance to send to hospital frail elderly people with presumed COVID-19. On the other hand the probable steep growth in the number of cases occurring in care homes in April, as evidenced by a doubling of deaths mentioning COVID-19 on the death certificate over the week 10 April (15), suggests that there might have been an increase in admissions from this source. These two forces may balance out as suggested by the fact that there is only weak evidence of a decline in hospital COVID-19 deaths at age 80+ years after the April 8 peak.

A final caveat is important. Not all of the hospital COVID-19 deaths we have analysed will have been caused by COVID-19. A subset will really be people admitted to hospital and critical care units with other life threatening conditions including terminal cancer and trauma (16). It is quite conceivable that a fraction of these will be infected with COVID-19 in the hospital itself. These deaths will however be still classed as COVID-19 using the pragmatic definition used to assemble these data. Many of these deaths are however unlikely to be coded as having COVID-19 as the underlying cause of death.

What are the implications of our findings? For analytic purposes, the sorts of analyses we have undertaken (Figure 3) where counts are examined within defined single-day periods of delay provide a more sensitive and transparent approach to the empirical analysis of the trends. This will be particularly important to consider when making international comparisons, where other patterns

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.21.20073049; this version posted April 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

of delay may have occurred. With respect to public communication of trends we suggest that emphasis is placed upon trends in deaths by date of occurrence that are evident with 4 or 5 days delay.

Establishing when the peak of COVID-19 mortality occurred will help anchor modelling of the so far hidden extent of the epidemic infection in England, and will also help with health service planning. The fact that a peak may have been reached on April 8 is not an argument for saying that restrictions on social contact and so on should now be relaxed. Communicating to the public that there has been one peak a week ago might provide in fact motivation for people to persevere with the lockdown strategy – as even deaths are responding to its imposition.

References

1. Ipsos MORI. Coronavirus - Confidence and Concern (Accessed 19 April 2020) 2020 [Available from: https://www.ipsos.com/ipsos-mori/en-uk/coronavirus-confidence-and-concern.
2. ECDC. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in the EU/EEA and the UK – eighth update (8 April 2020). European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control; 2020.
3. Pollock AM, Roderick P, Cheng K, Pankhania B. Covid-19: why is the UK government ignoring WHO's advice? BMJ. 2020;368:m1284.
4. Iacobucci G. Covid-19: What is the UK's testing strategy? BMJ. 2020;368:m1222.
5. Centres for Disease Control and Prevention. Evaluating and Testing Persons for Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) (Accessed 19 April 2020): U.S. Department of Health & Human Services; 2020 [Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/clinical-criteria.html.
6. COBR UK Government. Slides and datasets to accompany coronavirus press conferences (Accessed 19 April 2020) 2020 [Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/slides-and-datasets-to-accompany-coronavirus-press-conferences.
7. NHS England. COVID-19 Daily Deaths (Accessed 18 April 2020) [Available from: https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/statistical-work-areas/covid-19-daily-deaths/.
8. Bird S, Nielsen B. Now-casting of COVID-19 deaths in English hospitals (Accessed 21 April 2020) 2020 [Available from: http://users.ox.ac.uk/~nuff0078/Covid/index.htm.
9. Zhang J, Litvinova M, Wang W, Wang Y, Deng X, Chen X, et al. Evolving epidemiology and transmission dynamics of coronavirus disease 2019 outside Hubei province, China: a descriptive and modelling study. The Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2020.
10. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, Fan G, Liu Y, Liu Z, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. The Lancet. 2020;395(10229):1054-62.
11. Hunter DJ. Covid-19 and the Stiff Upper Lip - The Pandemic Response in the United Kingdom. N Engl J Med. 2020;382(16):e31.
12. COBR UK Government. Slides to accompany coronavirus press conference: 20 April 2020 (Accessed 20 April 2020): Prime Minister's Office, 10 Downing Street; 2020 [Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/880261/COVID-19_Press_Conference_Slides_-_20_04_2020.pdf.
13. Intensive Care National Audit & Research Centre. ICNARC report on COVID-19 in critical care 17 April 2020 (Accessed 20 April 2020): ICNRAC; 2020 [Available from: https://www.icnarc.org/DataServices/Attachments/Download/c9b491af-ea80-ea11-9124-00505601089b.
14. Onder G, Rezza G, Brusaferro S. Case-Fatality Rate and Characteristics of Patients Dying in Relation to COVID-19 in Italy. JAMA. 2020.
15. Office for National Statistics. Deaths registered weekly in England and Wales, provisional: week ending 10 April 2020 (Accessed 21 April 2020): ONS; 2020 [Available from: https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deaths/bulletins/deathsregisteredweeklyinenglandandwalesprovisional/weekending10april2020).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.21.20073049; this version posted April 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

16. Vincent J-L, Taccone FS. Understanding pathways to death in patients with COVID-19. The Lancet Respiratory Medicine. 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.21.20073049; this version posted April 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Figure 1 : Distribution of hospital COVID-19 deaths by date of death announced by NHS England on selected dates



Figure 2 : Numbers of published hospital COVID-19 daily deaths* according to date of announcement by NHS England and actual date of death (up to April 17)



* Note : the deaths included in this Figure are only those included in the daily reports announced between April 2 and April 20. The report for April 2 only included those deaths occurring at an earlier date that had been notified to NHS England from 5pm 31 March to 5Pm 1 April

Figure 3 : Numbers of hospital COVID-19 deaths by date of death (up to April 20) according to length of delay (in days) between this date and date of announcement by NHS England (up to April 21). Shown for all ages combined and selected adult age groups separately.



Note : vertical dashed red line indicates deaths occurring on 8 April 2020

Figure 4 : Numbers of hospital COVID-19 deaths by date of death (up to April 20) according to length of delay (in days) between this date and date of announcement by NHS England (up to April 21). Shown for London and the Midlands separately.



Note : vertical dashed red line indicates deaths occurring on 8 April 2020

Table 1 : Cumulated numbers of hospital COVID-19 deaths by date of death (up to April 20) according to length of delay (in days) between this date and date of announcement by NHS England (up to April 21), by age at death

(a) All ages

Date of death	Days delay										
	1-11	1-10	1-9	1-8	1-7	1-6	1-5	1-4	1-3	1-2	1
03-Apr	599	590	584	581	564	534	503	440	350	280	99
04-Apr	699	694	681	675	671	643	604	557	464	285	97
05-Apr	660	657	655	645	640	635	603	560	503	341	69
06-Apr	647	643	638	631	625	616	606	557	487	387	81
07-Apr	729	726	704	699	692	673	660	634	573	419	135
08-Apr	801	799	792	782	771	750	737	709	657	496	140
09-Apr	706	706	703	687	674	653	636	611	562	442	117
10-Apr	677	666	660	656	641	624	606	579	516	423	115
11-Apr		712	700	697	693	671	660	637	575	443	121
12-Apr			651	642	634	630	610	589	540	437	118
13-Apr				622	609	602	597	566	521	399	122
14-Apr					590	582	580	573	536	427	113
15-Apr						619	600	594	572	471	151
16-Apr							579	548	520	458	138
17-Apr								516	446	393	150
18-Apr									449	328	118
19-Apr										320	85
20-Apr											136

Cells highlighted in yellow are the maximum value seen within each column (period of delay)

(b) 40-59 years

Date of death	Days delay										
	1-11	1-10	1-9	1-8	1-7	1-6	1-5	1-4	1-3	1-2	1
03-Apr	43	43	43	42	40	37	37	34	27	23	5
04-Apr	52	51	49	49	49	44	43	38	32	17	6
05-Apr	46	46	46	46	46	45	41	38	35	25	4
06-Apr	49	49	49	47	47	46	45	39	36	31	3
07-Apr	55	55	52	52	52	49	47	42	39	26	10
08-Apr	57	57	57	55	54	54	53	51	48	37	18
09-Apr	63	63	62	61	58	56	56	52	46	35	9
10-Apr	64	64	64	63	62	59	55	53	44	31	10
11-Apr		67	65	65	64	61	60	56	47	35	5
12-Apr			53	53	53	53	51	47	44	38	9
13-Apr				53	52	51	51	47	46	31	9
14-Apr					57	56	56	55	54	43	14
15-Apr						50	50	50	48	33	7
16-Apr							40	36	33	23	6
17-Apr								42	37	32	8
18-Apr									41	28	6
19-Apr										24	7
20-Apr											9

Cells highlighted in yellow are the maximum value seen within each column (period of delay)

(c) 60-79 years

Date of death	Days delay										
	1-11	1-10	1-9	1-8	1-7	1-6	1-5	1-4	1-3	1-2	1
03-Apr	256	253	249	248	243	230	213	185	141	112	41
04-Apr	300	298	294	291	288	278	262	243	207	134	42
05-Apr	251	250	250	248	248	246	232	217	196	133	26
06-Apr	260	259	257	255	251	248	244	224	177	139	31
07-Apr	312	311	303	300	297	290	283	269	241	168	56
08-Apr	316	314	312	307	302	290	285	271	251	189	42
09-Apr	296	296	295	289	283	275	266	256	231	188	46
10-Apr	270	262	258	257	252	244	241	233	206	168	49
11-Apr		292	287	286	286	275	269	264	241	186	53
12-Apr			247	242	239	237	226	219	197	156	43
13-Apr				241	233	229	225	214	192	141	42
14-Apr					216	213	212	208	197	155	46
15-Apr						233	227	225	212	174	48
16-Apr							230	220	207	178	52
17-Apr								206	178	153	53
18-Apr									148	106	38
19-Apr										113	26
20-Apr											54

Cells highlighted in yellow are the maximum value seen within each column (period of delay)

(d) 80+ years

Date of Death	Days delay										
	1-11	1-10	1-9	1-8	1-7	1-6	1-5	1-4	1-3	1-2	1
03-Apr	295	289	287	286	276	263	249	218	179	142	51
04-Apr	347	345	338	335	334	321	299	276	225	134	49
05-Apr	356	354	352	344	339	337	325	301	268	180	38
06-Apr	335	332	329	326	324	319	314	291	272	215	46
07-Apr	356	354	343	341	337	328	324	318	288	221	69
08-Apr	418	418	414	411	406	397	390	378	350	266	80
09-Apr	342	342	341	332	328	318	310	299	281	215	61
10-Apr	340	337	335	333	324	318	307	290	263	221	56
11-Apr		343	338	336	333	325	321	307	278	216	62
12-Apr			343	339	334	332	326	316	294	239	64
13-Apr				327	323	321	320	304	282	226	71
14-Apr					314	310	309	307	282	227	52
15-Apr						334	321	317	310	262	96
16-Apr							307	290	278	255	80
17-Apr								266	230	207	89
18-Apr									257	192	72
19-Apr										181	52
20-Apr											71

Cells highlighted in yellow are the maximum value seen within each column (period of delay)

Table 2 : Cumulated numbers of hospital COVID-19 deaths by date of death (up to April 20) according to length of delay (in days) between this date and date of announcement by NHS England (up to April 21) for London and the Midlands

(a) London

Date of death	Days delay										
	1-11	1-10	1-9	1-8	1-7	1-6	1-5	1-4	1-3	1-2	1
03-Apr	165	159	156	155	149	139	124	112	84	62	15
04-Apr	200	198	191	189	189	178	165	149	127	79	19
05-Apr	163	161	161	157	154	154	140	128	116	84	12
06-Apr	164	164	161	159	159	155	150	137	123	98	15
07-Apr	189	187	176	173	171	167	163	153	140	90	29
08-Apr	199	199	197	193	190	182	180	170	156	125	29
09-Apr	173	173	172	160	159	153	151	144	134	110	31
10-Apr	149	149	149	146	144	141	134	126	101	87	29
11-Apr		156	156	156	156	148	147	140	124	87	13
12-Apr			132	132	132	132	130	127	114	100	22
13-Apr				142	142	142	141	128	120	88	24
14-Apr					117	116	115	114	103	78	28
15-Apr						117	114	112	108	76	20
16-Apr							121	119	108	92	25
17-Apr								80	73	61	27
18-Apr									77	56	21
19-Apr										67	12
20-Apr											20

Cells highlighted in yellow are the maximum value seen within each column (period of delay)

(b) Midlands

Date of death	Days delay										
	1-11	1-10	1-9	1-8	1-7	1-6	1-5	1-4	1-3	1-2	1
03-Apr	117	117	117	116	114	101	96	85	68	39	15
04-Apr	135	135	135	131	128	127	114	107	88	35	3
05-Apr	148	147	146	146	145	144	137	120	107	49	0
06-Apr	132	132	132	132	132	128	125	111	87	65	7
07-Apr	116	116	116	116	116	116	112	111	103	55	14
08-Apr	173	173	173	173	173	171	169	163	148	92	17
09-Apr	130	130	130	128	127	124	119	117	102	72	12
10-Apr	124	124	124	124	118	115	115	110	106	71	14
11-Apr		136	136	136	136	132	130	127	113	92	13
12-Apr			132	131	129	128	124	119	110	87	19
13-Apr				110	110	110	109	98	88	70	12
14-Apr					113	113	113	112	106	80	19
15-Apr						143	143	143	141	116	30
16-Apr							85	83	81	73	8
17-Apr								103	94	79	22
18-Apr									95	61	20
19-Apr										60	6
20-Apr											21

Cells highlighted in yellow are the maximum value seen within each column (period of delay)