Beyond Deaths per Person:
Three CoViD-19 Mortality Indicators for Temporal and International Comparisons

Patrick Heuveline and Michael Tzen
California Center for Population Research (CCPR)
University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA)

Updated Version, 5/11/2020

Original Manuscript Submitted 4/29/2020, Published 5/5/2020 at:
https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.29.20085506v1

Abstract
In response to the novel coronavirus disease 2019 (CoViD-19) pandemic, national and local institutions have issued public-health orders to slow the spread of the disease. Comparing CoViD-19 trends over time and place may thus provide important public health insights about the impact of different strategies. To aid these comparisons, we illustrate the properties of 3 comparative indicators of CoViD-19 mortality using estimates and projections for the world's most affected areas. We first demonstrate how a Crude CoViD-19 Death Rate (CCDR) incorporates the temporal dimension of CoViD-19 mortality. We also show how the advantage of the indirectly age-standardized Comparative CoViD-19 Mortality Ratio (CCMR). Finally, we calculate declines in life expectancy at birth that translate CoViD-19 mortality projections into an easily interpretable metric. Projections used to illustrate this yields a .5-year decline in life expectancy at birth for the U.S.A., for instance, which would exceed the .3-year decline in life expectancy at birth between 1992 and 1993 (AIDS mortality) and between 2014 and 2017 (opioid-overdose mortality). Data about the pandemic are changing too rapidly to draw any conclusion from the current values of the indicators, however, and there are multiple reasons to expect substantial revisions of these projections.

Acknowledgment
The authors benefited from facilities and resources provided by the California Center for Population Research at UCLA (CCPR), which receives core support (P2C-HD041022) from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD).

Beyond Deaths per Person

Background

As of April 26, 2020, close to 3 million cases of the novel coronavirus disease 2019 (CoViD-19) had been reported worldwide, with more than 200,000 deaths attributed to the disease according to Johns Hopkins University's Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE).[1] The most frequently cited of several online tools that have been developed to track the fast expanding pandemic, the CSSE interactive dashboard maps the location and number of confirmed CoViD-19 cases, deaths, and recoveries for all affected countries.

The CCSE numbers illustrate a public health emergency developing at a very fast pace. In response, national and local institutions have issued public-health orders to slow the spread of the disease and "flatten the curve" so that the number of infected individuals in need of intensive care peaks at a level lower than local hospital capacity. Comparing CoViD-19 trends over time and place may thus provide important public health insights about the strategies that have succeeded in reducing the need for emergency hospitalizations and, eventually, the CoViD-19 death toll. The number of reported cases seems to represent only a small, varying fraction of the actual number of cases,[2] depending in particular on variable testing capacities. Deaths attributed to CoViD-19 provide a more reliable basis for comparative assessments. As the HIV pandemic made clear,[3] a pandemic is more reliably tracked with mortality data. While the current CoViD-19 death toll is also undercounted due to cause-of-death mis-diagnostics and delays in reporting deaths at home and nursing homes, this death undercount is of a much smaller magnitude than the case undercount and can be expected to decline further over time.

The United States currently has the highest estimated number of CoViD-19 deaths, having surpassed Italy, which had earlier surpassed China. Obviously, comparing the number of deaths in countries home to 60 million (Italy), 330 million (U.S.A.) or 1.4 billion (China) people makes little sense. Dividing the number of CoVid-19 deaths by the population size, a comparative table on the CSSE website displays vastly different ratios: from .33 deaths per 100,000 people in China, to 16.43 in the United States and to 43.66 in Italy (as of April 26, 2020.)[1] Considering the countries with at least 1,000 deaths, the largest ratio appears to be in Belgium, with 6,917 deaths but a ratio of 60.56 deaths per 100,000 people at the time.

While comparing the number of deaths to the population size is a necessary first step in comparing CoVid-19 mortality across countries, this ratio does not possess several desirable properties. First, it does not integrate the time dimension, that is, it does not differentiate between a number of deaths recorded in periods of different durations. In particular, while the ratio may appear small in comparison to the Crude Death Rate (CDR, in the order of 850 deaths per person-year in the U.S.A.), the CDR includes deaths for one year whereas most of the CoViD-19 deaths registered to date occurred in the last 2 months. Second, the ratio does not control for the age distribution of the population, whereas strong variations in CoViD-19 mortality by age are already well established. Finally, national-level indicators mask important within-country differences. In China, the vast majority of deaths originated in one Province (Hubei), with a population size roughly equivalent to the national population of Italy. In the U.S.A., the epidemic might be better studied as several epidemics of variable timing and intensity than as one national epidemic. With about 6% of the U.S. population, the State of New York State had close to half of the CoViD-19 deaths reported in the country by the end of April.

Methods and Data

To address these shortcomings, this article illustrates the properties of 3 comparative indicators of CoViD-19 mortality. The first one is simply a death *rate*, structured like the CDR, that is, expressed in deaths per person-*year*. This indicator only requires an estimated or projected number of CoViD-19 deaths in a given area, the length of the timeframe in which the deaths occurred, and the population size of the area.

The second indicator is an indirectly age-standardized measure, structured like the Comparative Mortality Ratio (CMR).[4] This indicator was selected because the calculation of (directly) age-standardized CoViD-19 mortality rates requires a breakdown of CoViD-19 deaths by age, which to date remains unavailable for many areas. In mid-April, the Center for Disease Control (CDC) has begun publishing a weekly breakdown of CoViD-19 deaths by age in the U.S.A., albeit on a relatively small number of registered deaths.[5] This allows for the calculation of a CMR-equivalent measure for CoViD-19 mortality in all areas for which the population can be estimated for the same age groups as in the CDC data.

The third indicator translates a number of deaths due to CoViD-19 into an estimated decline in life expectancy at birth for the calendar year 2020. In addition to the data required for the previous indicator, this last calculation requires prior period life table estimates for that year (i.e., not including CoViD-19 mortality). Details on the calculation of these three indicators are described in the online supplementary materials of this article.

To illustrate the properties of these indicators, we calculate their values for a recent set of CoViD-19 mortality estimates, from Johns Hopkins University's CSSE,[1] and projections, from the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME).[6] Specifically, we calculate the "First-Death-To-Date" (FDTD) Crude CoViD-19 Death Rate (CCDR) and Comparative CoVidD-19 Mortality Ratio (CCMR) for the period starting on the date of the first CoViD-19 deaths reported in the area[7] and ending on the date of the estimates or the end date of the projections. We calculate FDTD CCDR values corresponding to the CSSE estimates for Hubei Province (China), 14 Countries and 9 States in the U.S.A.—all Countries and States with over 1,000 estimated deaths due to CoViD-19 as of April 20th, 2020. Hubei Province and these 14 countries jointly accounted for 85% of the global CoViD-19 deaths reported on the CSSE dashboard at the time. We also calculate projected FDTD CCDR values for 11 of the 14 Countries (9 European Countries, Canada, the U.S.A.) for which IHME projections were available and for the U.S. States. We then calculate CCMR values for the same areas. Finally, as period life tables are typically available only for single or multiple calendar-year periods, we calculate the difference in life expectancy at birth in each of the 11 Countries for calendar year 2020.

As discussed in the concluding section, CoViD-19 data are changing rapidly and we expect the indicators to need frequent updating. Our current geographical focus will likely need to be expanded as well to reflect the spread of the pandemic. In order to update our indicators regularly, we developed a weekly web-scraping tool to update the CDC breakdown of CoViD-19 deaths, and both estimated and projected number of CoViD-19 deaths. To allow for customized calculations derived for different periods and populations or from different data sources, we are making both our web-scraping script and spreadsheet for deriving the indicators available on a Github repository.[8] Our own weekly results updates and occasional methodological updates will be added to the repository as well.

Results

We now briefly describe the properties of the 3 indicators using calculations from the most recent weekly dataset (May 11, Table 1). We first point out a few additional insights from calculating the CCDR at the level of a Province (China) or State (U.S.A.) rather than merely at the Country level. For instance, whereas the ratio of estimated number of CoViD-19 deaths/population size in China is far smaller than in most other countries, the current value of FDTD CCDR for Hubei Province remains smaller but somewhat comparable to those in some of the other areas considered here. The CCDR values for U.S. States also confirm stark differences in their CoViD-19 mortality so far, with the value in the State of New York nearly 50% higher than the second-highest value for a U.S. State (New Jersey) and nearly twice the highest value for a Country (Belgium). With a combined population size of 52.3 million, thus comparable to the size of a large European Country, the 5 Northeastern U.S. States (Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York & Pennsylvania) also exhibit a higher FDTD CCDR than any European Country.

As opposed to a simple ratio of CoViD-19 deaths over population size, the FDTD CCDR controls for the duration of the period to which deaths pertain. This is illustrated by the fact that FDTD CCDR values are typically higher for estimated than for projected mortality, whereas the simple ratio can only increase over time. The CCDR thus provides a better picture of the temporal distribution of deaths. At this time, the IHME projections only yields higher FDTD CCDR values for the period ending on August 4, 2020 than the current CSSE estimates in Sweden, where IHME predicts a substantial future increase in mortality. The FDTD CCDR also makes it easier to compare with mortality indicators available for calendar years: its value for the State of New York (8.8 deaths per 1,000 person-year), for instance, exceeds the State's most recent annual CDR estimate available for all causes combined (782.7 for 2017).[9]

Relative to the CCDR, the CCMR has the additional advantage of controlling for the age distribution of the different populations. As European countries have "older" age distributions, their CCMR values relative to the U.S.A. (by design equal to 1 for the estimation period) are thus lower than the ratio of their CCDR to the U.S. CCDR. The highest year-to-date CCDR for a Country (Belgium) is about 4 times its value for the U.S.A., but Belgium's CCMR for the same period is 3.22. The opposite happens for Hubei Province and other Countries in Asia (Iran and Turkey) and South America (Brazil), whose population is "younger" than the U.S. population. The CCMR for Hubei Province is .29, close to the values for Germany or California (.33). For the same reason, Iran—whose CCDR value is less than a third of the U.S.A.—has a CCMR of .74 relative to the U.S.A., close to the CCMR values for Sweden and Canada.

According to IHME projections, the Country with the highest CCMR would eventually be Sweden (1.27), substantially lower than the highest value for a U.S. State (3.18, New Jersey). This would translate into a 1.14-year decline in life expectancy at birth for Sweden, -.88 in Belgium, -.67 in Spain and the United Kingdom, -.52 in France, Italy, and the U.S.A., -.44 in the Netherlands, -.32 in Switzerland, and smaller in Canada and Germany.

Discussion

The results above are used to illustrate the properties of the 3 proposed indicators and the limitations of considering CoViD-19 mortality differences across Countries only. To summarize, in order of increasing data requirements, the FDTD CCDR incorporates the temporal dimension of CoViD-19 mortality. The CCMR (indirectly) standardizes for differences in population age distribution. Relative to the U.S.A., age standardization lowers the CoViD-19 mortality assessment in European Countries and raises it in Asian and South American countries. An age-standardized indicator as well, the decline in life expectancy at birth translates CoViD-19 mortality projections into an easily interpretable metric. A decline of .3 of a year in life expectancy at birth, currently projected in 9 countries, would be comparable to the decline in life expectancy at birth during the last two public health crises in the U.S.A.: a decline from 75.8 in 1992 to 75.5 years in 1993 (AIDS mortality) and from 78.9 years in 2014 and 78.6 years in 2017 (opioid-overdose mortality).[10] However, the decline would be induced by mortality changes over a more condensed time scale in the case of the CoViD outbreak.

More importantly, data about the pandemic are changing too rapidly to draw any conclusion from the current values of the indicators. Based on a single set of estimates and projections, this set of results fails to express the uncertainty surrounding future projections and even current estimates. We plan to attend to this uncertainty in future updates, especially as regards projections. To take a single example, on April 29, 2020, the Global Epidemic and Mobility Model (GLEAM) used by researchers at Northeastern University projected between 60,000 and 121,000 CoViD-19 deaths in the U.S.A. by May 12, 2020 under the "mitigated" scenario with stay-at-home policy.[11] Other models suggested even higher numbers for the same period, whereas the IHME projected 68,000 deaths by August 4, 2020. Moreover, at the moment none of these models can predict the likelihood of a second wave of infections later in the year. Finally, the eventual decline in life expectancy will depend on the "downstream" effects of the pandemic and mitigating policies, which may affect mortality from other causes. While mortality rates from some causes may well decline (e.g., motor-vehicle injuries), mortality rates from other causes are likely to increase, especially in places where hospitals' intensive-care capacities became saturated by the surge in CoViD-19 emergency hospitalizations. Current CDC estimates on excess deaths seem to indicate the latter.[12]

The standardized indicators could be further refined by also considering sex differences in CoViD-19 mortality. At the time the derivation of the indicators was developed, the CDC reported deaths by age and deaths by sex separately.[13] Because population sex ratios tend to vary less than their age distributions, we prioritized accounting for age differences. The CDC now tabulates CoViD-deaths by both sex and age-group become, which allows for CCMR and differences in life expectancy estimation that jointly standardize on both dimensions.

Table 1: Comparative CoViD-19 Mortality Indicators by Country, Province & State (ranked by FDTD CCMR estimate)

		CCDR (deaths per 100,000 p-y)		CCMR		Diff. in Proj. 2020 e(0)
Country, Province or State	Region or Country	FDTD Est.	6-m. Proj.	FDTD Est.	6-m. Proj.	
New York	United States of America	879.6	364.8	7.13	2.96	--
New Jersey	United States of America	606.5	390.3	4.95	3.18	--
5 Most-Affected NE States	United States of America	601.9	198.9	4.76	1.57	--
Connecticut	United States of America	566.5	259.4	4.32	1.98	--
Massachusetts	United States of America	486.8	256.9	3.95	2.08	--
Belgium	Western Europe	458.2	180.0	3.22	1.26	-0.881
Louisiana	United States of America	311.7	134.4	2.88	1.24	--
9 Most-Affected States	United States of America	311.4	107.4	2.66	0.91	--
Michigan	United States of America	314.5	162.2	2.54	1.31	--
Spain	Southern Europe	314.0	125.5	1.99	0.80	-0.671
United Kingdom	Northern Europe	258.5	127.1	1.93	0.95	-0.676
Pennsylvania	United States of America	202.6	153.8	1.50	1.14	--
Illinois	United States of America	169.9	112.8	1.46	0.97	--
France	Western Europe	214.3	91.9	1.40	0.60	-0.518
Italy	Southern Europe	245.1	104.6	1.40	0.60	-0.517
9 Most-Affected Countries	EUROPE	206.2	93.6	1.33	0.61	--
Netherlands	Western Europe	179.9	82.1	1.31	0.60	-0.442
United States of America	NORTHERN AMERICA	116.2	82.6	1.00	0.71	-0.518
Switzerland	Western Europe	119.6	52.8	0.85	0.37	-0.316
Sweden	Northern Europe	112.4	179.4	0.79	1.27	-1.137
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Southern Asia	36.2	--	0.74	--	--
Canada	NORTHERN AMERICA	89.9	40.9	0.71	0.32	-0.238
Turkey	Western Asia	31.6	--	0.49	--	--
Brazil	South America	31.6	---	0.46	---	---
California	United States of America	35.7	24.7	0.33	0.23	--
Germany	Western Europe	53.8	22.2	0.33	0.14	-0.099
Hubei Province (China)	Eastern Asia	22.9	--	0.29	--	--

Notes: FDTD indicators refer to the period from the time of the First Death from CoViD-19 reported in an area To the Date of the estimates/projections. CCDR & CCMR refer to the Crude CoViD-19 Death Rate and the Comparative CoViD-19 Mortality Ratios (see text for details)

References

[1] Dong, E., H. Du & L. Gardner. Forthcoming. "An Interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real time," *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. Published online first, February 19, 2000, at: https://www.thelancet.com/journals/laninf/article/PIIS1473-3099(20)30120-1/fulltext

[2] "Early antibody testing suggests COVID-19 infections in L.A. County greatly exceed documented cases," *USC News* April 20, 2000. https://news.usc.edu/168987/antibody-testing-results-covid-19-infections-los-angeles-county/ USC study

[3] Brookmeyer, R. & M. H. Gail. 1994. *AIDS Epidemiology: A Quantitative Approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[4] Preston, S. H., P. Heuveline & M. Guillot. 2001. *Demography: Measuring and Modeling Population Processes*. Blackwell: Malden, MA, USA; Oxford, UK; Carlton, Victoria, Australia.

[5] https://data.cdc.gov/NCHS/Provisional-COVID-19-Death-Counts-by-Sex-Age-and-S/9bhg-hcku

[6] Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. https://covid19.healthdata.org/

[7] Dates for most Countries and States were retrieved from the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation at https://covid19.healthdata.org. For other Countries, dates were obtained from the World Health Organization's daily situation reports at https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports/

[8] https://github.com/statsccpr/ind-cov-mort

[9] Kochanek, K. D., S. L. Murphy, J. Q. Xu & E. Arias. 2019. "Deaths: Final data for 2017," *National Vital Statistics Reports* 68(9). Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics

[10] Arias, E. & J. Xu. 2019. "United States Life Tables, 2017," *National Vital Statistics Reports* 68(7). Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Vital Statistics.

[11] "Modeling Covid-19 in the United States." http://covid19.gleamproject.org

[12] https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/vsrr/covid19/excess_deaths.htm

[13] "Table 2. Deaths involving coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), pneumonia, and influenza reported to NCHS by age group, United States." https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/vsrr/COVID19/index.htm