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)

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 .3 of a year decline in life expectancy at birth for the U.S.A., for instance, which would be comparable to the 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 upward 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).

Three CoViD-19 Mortality Indicators for Temporal and International Comparisons

Patrick Heuveline and Michael Tzen

Background

As of April 26, 2020, close to 3 million cases of the novel coronavirus disease 2019 (CoViD-19) have been reported worldwide and more than 200,000 deaths have been 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. While their number is also likely under-reported at the moment,[3] the death undercount due to delays in registering deaths at home and in nursing homes 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.[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.

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 duration. 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 has close to half of the estimated CoViD-19 deaths in the country.

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. The Center for Disease Control (CDC) has begun to publish weekly such a breakdown for CoViD-19 deaths in the U.S.A., albeit on a relatively small number of registered death.[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 translate a number of deaths due to CoViD-19 into an estimated decline in life expectancy at birth. In addition to the data required for the previous indicator, this last calculation requires prior period life table estimates (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 year-to-date Crude CoViD-19 Death Rate (CCDR) and Comparative CoVidD-19 Mortality Ratio (CCMR) for the period starting on January 1st, 2020 and ending on the date of the estimates or the end date of the projections. We calculate year-to-date 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 year-to-date 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 Hubei Province and the same Countries. 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.[7] 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 first weekly dataset (April 20, 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 value of the current year-to-date CCDR for Hubei Province is higher than in 5 of the 14 countries considered here: Brazil, Turkey, Canada, Germany and Iran. 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 twice as high as the second-highest value for a U.S. State (New Jersey) or 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 year-to-date CCDR than any European Country. Finally, the year-to-date CCDR value is currently higher in the combined population of the first 9 U.S. States to reach 1,000 CoViD-19 deaths than in the combined population of the first 9 European Countries to reach that grim milestone.

As opposed to a simple ratio of CoViD-19 deaths over population size, the CCDR controls for the duration of the period to which deaths pertain. This is illustrated by the fact that year-to-date CCDR values can be 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 yield higher CCDR values for the period ending on August 4, 2020 than the current CSSE estimates in 2 of the 14 countries (the Netherlands and Sweden) and 3 of the 9 U.S. States (Connecticut, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania) included herein.

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 3.24. 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 .85, whereas the Province’s CCDR is less than .6 of the U.S. value. For the same reason, Iran—whose CCDR value is comparable to the lowest value for a European Country (Germany) and about half the value for the U.S.A.—has a CCMR of 1.14 relative to the U.S.A., also exceeding the CCMR values for Sweden and Switzerland.

According to IHME projections, the Country with the highest CCMR would eventually be Sweden (3.24), where IHME predicts a substantial future increase in mortality. This would translate into a 1.2-year decline in life expectancy at birth. In Belgium, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain and the United Kingdom, the decline would range from .5 to .8 of a year. The decline would be about .3 of a year in Switzerland and the U.S.A., and lesser 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 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, for instance, 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).[8] 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 first 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, the Global Epidemic and Mobility Model (GLEAM) used by researchers at Northeastern University projects 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.[9] Other models suggest even higher numbers for the same period, whereas the IHME projects 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.

This first set of results have not included the specific age distribution of the different U.S. States, and values of State-level CCMR and decline in life expectancy at birth were not calculated. This can be added in future revisions as well, but to the extent that the difference between a State's age distribution and the national average is relatively modest though,[10] the value of the CCMR for a State can be approximated by the ratio of the State's CCDR to the U.S. CCDR. This ratio would again suggest than standardizing for age, the State of New York would have a higher CCMR than any other State, Province or Country, both for the estimation and the projection periods.

Finally, the standardized indicators could be further refined by also considering sex differences in CoViD-19 mortality. The CDC online report also suggests that CoViD-19 death rates are higher for males than for females (Table 3).[5] At the present, however, death rates are not provided for age-and-sex groups. We prioritized accounting for age differences because population sex ratios tend to vary less than their age distributions, but should CoViD-deaths tabulated by gender and age-group become available, the CCMR and differences in life expectancy would be improved by jointly standardizing on both dimensions.

Table 1: Comparative CoViD-19 Mortality Indicators by Country, Province & State

Subregion or Country	Country, Province or State	CCDR (Deaths per 100,000 person-year)		CCMR		Diff. in 2020 Life Expect. at Birth, e(0)
		YTD Est.	6-m. Proj.	YTD Est.	6-m. Proj.	
Eastern Asia	Hubei Province (China)	24.4	--	0.85	--	--
Southern Asia	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	20.4	--	1.14	--	--
Western Asia	Turkey	8.4	--	0.36	--	--
Northern Europe	Sweden	51.6	176.8	1.01	3.46	-1.198
	United Kingdom	80.4	79.3	1.66	1.64	-0.547
Southern Europe	Italy	131.5	74.9	2.09	1.19	-0.452
	Spain	147.1	90.6	2.61	1.61	-0.622
Western Europe	Belgium	165.8	118.3	3.24	2.31	-0.779
	France	102.5	60.2	1.87	1.10	-0.429
	Germany	19.1	12.3	0.33	0.21	-0.072
	Netherlands	72.4	76.6	1.47	1.55	-0.531
	Switzerland	54.4	35.4	1.07	0.70	-0.273
Above-9 European Countries		88.1	64.3	1.59	1.16	--
South America	Brazil	4.0	---	0.16	---	---
North America	Canada	15.1	20.3	0.33	0.44	-0.167
	United States of America	41.9	34.5	1.00	0.82	-0.268
United States of America	California	10.1	7.2	--	--	--
	Connecticut	121.4	140.3	--	--	--
	Illinois	34.5	28.0	--	--	--
	Louisiana	92.9	63.7	--	--	--
	Massachusetts	80.6	102.5	--	--	--
	Michigan	80.5	56.4	--	--	--
	New Jersey	164.5	132.1	--	--	--
	New York	310.4	198.2	--	--	--
	Pennsylvania	34.3	36.1	--	--	--
	Above-9 U.S. States	93.0	47.6	--	--	--
	Above-5 NE U.S. States	173.2	88.6	--	--	--

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] "40,000 Missing Deaths: Tracking the True Toll of the Coronavirus Outbreak," *The New York Times,* April 27, 2000. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/04/21/world/coronavirus-missing-deaths.html

[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] "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

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

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

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

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

[10] United States Census Bureau. "Geography Profile." https://data.census.gov/cedsci/profile?g=0100000US&tid=ACSDP1Y2018.DP05&hidePreview=true