Estimating the Impact of COVID-19 on the Individual Lifespan: A Conceptual Detour and an Empirical Shortcut

Updated Version, 8/24/2020

Original Manuscript Submitted 8/9/2020, Published 8/13/2020 at:

https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.08.09.20171264v1

Patrick Heuveline, Ph.D.

California Center for Population Research (CCPR)

University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA)

Contact author: Patrick Heuveline <heuveline@soc.ucla.edu>

Abstract

Declines in life expectancies provide intuitive indicators of the impact of COVID-19 on the individual lifespan. Derived under the assumption that future mortality conditions will indefinitely repeat those observed during a reference period, however, life expectancies' intuitive interpretation becomes problematic when that reference period is only a temporary phase in the diffusion of an epidemic.

To avoid making any assumption about future mortality, I propose measuring instead the Mean Unfulfilled Lifespan (MUL), defined as the average difference between the actual and otherwise expected ages at death in a recent death cohort. For fine-grained tracking of the pandemic, I also provide an empirical shortcut to MUL estimation for small areas or short periods.

I estimate quarterly MUL values for the first half of 2020 in 142 national populations and 91 sub-national populations in Italy, Spain and the US. Across national populations, the highest quarterly values were reached in the second quarter in Peru (3.90 years) and in Ecuador (4.59 years). Higher quarterly values still were found in New York and New Jersey, where individuals died respectively 5.41 and 5.56 years younger on average than their expected age at death.

Using a shorter, seven-day rolling window, I estimate the MUL peaked at 7.32 years in Lombardy, 8.96 years in Madrid, and 8.93 years in New York, and even reached 12.86 years for the entire month of April in Guayas (Ecuador). These results illustrate how the MUL provides an intuitive metric to track the pandemic without requiring assumptions about future mortality.

Significance Statement

To convey the significance of COVID-19 in a relatable metric is important because public awareness is critical to the participation on which mitigating policies depend. Mortality indicators are among the most salient measures of the impact of COVID-19. While demographers favor age-standardized death rates to track the pandemic, those are expressed in underwhelming metrics: deaths per 1,000 or fraction thereof. Declines in life expectancies are intuitive indicators, but, derived under an assumption of unchanged future mortality, they are unsuitable for fine-grained tracking of a fast-moving epidemic. To avoid making any assumption about future mortality, I introduce a Mean Unfulfilled Lifespan (MUL), defined as the average difference between the actual and otherwise expected ages at death in a recent death cohort.

Estimating the Impact of COVID-19 on the Individual Lifespan:

A Conceptual Detour and an Empirical Shortcut

Introduction

In the past few months, the numbers of deaths from the novel coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) have become part of the daily news cycle the world over. Impressive though these numbers are, they may not convey a clear sense of the pace and scale of the pandemic. By contrast, declines in life expectancies induced by COVID-19 mortality provide a simple and intuitive metric.

An aggregate indicator of period mortality conditions over the lifespan, the period life expectancy at birth (PLEB) is relatively insensitive to mortality changes at older ages. In high-income countries, where mortality at young ages is already low, recent changes in PLEB have been in the order of +.2 years annually.[1] With the notable exception of periods of armed conflict,[2] declines in PLEB have become rare and similarly modest. In the US, for instance, the most recent reversals in the annual PLEB gains are the .3 of a year decline during the opioid-overdose crisis, from 78.9 to 78.6 years between 2014 and 2017, and the earlier .3 of a year decline, from 75.8 to 75.5 years between 1992 1993, at the peak of the HIV epidemic.[3]

The impact of COVID-19 mortality on the 2020-PLEB can be expected to be substantially larger than those, in the US as well as in a number of Latin American countries. The nearly 300,000 COVID-19 deaths in the US by December 1st that the University of Washington's Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME) currently projects would translate into a 2020-PLEB reduction of slightly more than one year. Based on this set of projections, 2020-PLEB reductions would exceed two years in Peru and three years in Ecuador.[4]

Moreover, estimates of PLEB reductions are sensitive to the scale of the population and to the length of the period they refer to. By averaging out COVID-19 mortality conditions in the least and most affected areas, national figures may conceal large within-country differences, especially in countries

spread on large territories like the US, Brazil or Mexico, not to mention China or India. The 2020-PLEB similarly averages out mortality conditions before the first COVID-19 death and during the most severe months of the pandemic.

Estimating PLEB reductions for smaller areas and during shorter periods may thus achieve a double objective. First, tracking the pandemic at a finer-grained geographical and temporal scale should provide better insights on the pandemic than annual, national averages. Second, expected to be several times larger than these averages, estimates of PLEB reductions for the most affected areas during the most intense phase of the pandemic may receive more public attention. This is important because public awareness is critical to the participation on which mitigating policies depend.

Indeed, some estimates of PLEB reductions have impressively reached double-digit figures (in years).[5, 6, 7] A routinely acknowledged but easy to miss limitation of these estimates, however, is that the intuitive interpretation of the PLEB as a measure of the individual lifespan may no longer apply to them. The PLEB estimates the expected age at death of a newborn experiencing the mortality conditions of the reference period during her entire lifetime. The 2020-PLEB for instance assumes an annual re-occurrence of the 2020 swings in mortality induced by COVID-19 or another pandemic with a similar mortality impact. One may hope that such an annual occurrence will not become a "new normal," but this possibility cannot be entirely ruled out on principle either. PLEB estimates for shorter periods and smaller areas estimate the age at death of a newborn experiencing the conditions in that short period and small area for her entire lifetime. The highest PLEB reductions are thus estimated on the rather sinister assumption of a Groundhog-Day-like[8] time loop repeating the worst week of the COVID-19 crisis in some of the worst affected areas, with those born there unable to ever leave.

Mindful of the importance of a relatable, individual-level metric to assess the magnitude of COVID-19, I suggest an alternative indicator of the impact of a cause of death on the individual lifespan. This indicator measures an average loss in length of lives lived, and can be estimated for mortality changes in populations of any size and for periods of any length. This is illustrated here for COVID-19-induced changes in mortality in 142 national populations and 91 sub-national populations in Italy, Spain

and the US, for each sex and each of the first two quarters of 2020. Finally, I show that in a given population, its value remains nearly proportional to the ratio of COVID-19 deaths to total deaths, providing an easy short-cut for fine-grained tracking of the pandemic.

Conceptual Detour

The impact of COVID-19 on life expectancies is estimated by comparing two period life tables, one representing the prevailing mortality conditions and another one representing the counterfactual mortality conditions expected in the absence of COVID-19. One approach is to work with estimates of COVID-19 deaths by sex and age-group in the period and incorporate them, typically under the assumption that death *rates* from other causes are unaffected by COVID-19, into a previous projection of period mortality conditions that did not anticipate COVID-19 mortality.[9] An alternative is to work with estimates of all deaths in the period and to derive the counterfactual mortality conditions, in the absence of COVID-19, from a past benchmark period.[10] On the one hand, the second approach by-passes the estimation of COVID-19 deaths and readily includes any potential "indirect" effect of COVID-19 on other causes of death. On the other hand, this approach is much more sensitive than the first one to the choice of a benchmark period to represent past mortality conditions. In either case, assessing PLEB reductions involves a relatively copious amount of life table manipulations.

Considering the related issue of estimating the increase in PLEB brought by eliminating a cause of death, Nathan Keyfitz provided the useful insight that the increase "depends on the average time that elapses before the persons rescued will die of some other cause."[11] In the case at hands, the effect of an additional cause of death on the individual lifespan depends on the average time that would have elapsed before the persons who died from that cause would have died from other causes. Under the assumption, unlikely but without clear alternatives, that this average time is the same as observed for persons who did not die from that cause, that is, that the probabilities of dying from the different causes are independent, the PLEB-reduction can be summed up in life table notations as:

$$\frac{1}{l_0} \cdot \int_0^{\omega} (d^C(a).\, e_a^{o-C})\, da$$

where l_0 and $d^C(a)$ are the radix and the number of decrements from the new cause(s) of death at age a in the multi-decrement life table representing the prevailing mortality conditions, whereas $e_a^{o\text{-}C}$ is the life expectancy at age a in the single-decrement (or all decrements combined) period life table representing the counterfactual mortality conditions in the absence of that new cause.

This difference clearly relates to the concept of "potential years of life lost,"[12] which as Years of Life Lost (YLL) has become a staple of burden-of-disease assessments:

$$YLL = \int_0^{\omega} (D^C(a).\, e_a^{o*})da$$

where $D^C(a)$ is the number of deaths from a certain cause at age a in the population during a certain period and e_a^{o*} is life expectancy at age a in a counterfactual period life table. This equation also makes the assumption that the probabilities of dying from the different causes are independent. Several assessments of the impact of COVID-19 using this approach already exist, measuring this impact in total number of years lost to the pandemic and allowing for comparisons with other causes of death.[13, 14, 15]

In global burden-of-disease assessments, a universal life table representing optimal survival conditions is typically used, allowing to add YLL across populations to derive global estimates, but potentially misrepresenting the actual gains from averting a death in a specific population. Combining these two traditions, I propose to use the cause-deleted life table values instead of a standard as in the equation derived from Keyfitz' insight. To avoid assuming that period conditions will become permanent, under which life table decrements are calculated, however, I suggest to replace the cause-specific decrements and the sum of all decrements (the life table radix) in that equation by their value in the population during the period. The resulting Mean Unfulfilled Lifespan (MUL) is defined as:

$$MUL = \frac{1}{D} \cdot \int_0^{\omega} (D^C(a).\, e_a^{o-C})da$$

where D is now the total number of deaths (from all causes at all ages) in the population during the reference period. As the PLEB, the MUL measures the impact of a cause of death on the individual lifespan in time units, typically years. If deaths from other causes are assumed to occur at the expected

age, they do not contribute to the sum and the MUL can be interpreted as the difference between the actual and expected ages at death, averaged over a death cohort, that is, members of the population dying in a certain period.

Empirical Shortcut

As discussed, tracking COVID-19 variations over time and across areas might be of interest, and, contrary to reductions in PLEB, calculating the MUL for small geographical areas and short periods is not conceptually problematic since it captures the actual length of lived lives, not future expectations thereof. The demand on data (including a separate counterfactual life table for each population of interest) is substantial, however, and the life table manipulations not particularly straightforward.

To derive an approximation circumventing the need for those, the MUL equation can be expanded as:

$$MUL = \frac{1}{D} \cdot \int_0^{\omega} (D^C(a).e_a^{o-C})da = \frac{D^C}{D} \cdot \int_0^{\omega} \left(\frac{D^C(a)}{D^C}.e_a^{o-C}\right)da$$

where D^C is the number of deaths from the specific cause at all ages in the population during the period. This last formula shows that the value of the MUL depends on three main factors: the all-age ratio of deaths from the specific cause to all deaths, the age distribution of deaths from that cause in the population, and a set of life expectancies in the absence of a specific cause.

In a given population, the counterfactual life expectancies are estimated from prior conditions and do not change over time. The age distribution of deaths from the COVID-19 can be expected to vary little within short periods depends because they depend on the population composition, $C(a)$ and the age pattern of COVID-19 death rates, $M^C(a)/M^C$, can be expected to vary little within short periods:

$$\frac{D^C(a)}{D^C} = \frac{M^C(a).N(a)}{M^C.N} = \frac{M^C(a)}{M^C}.C(a)$$

where M^C and $M^C(a)$ are the all-age death rate and the death rate at age a from a specific cause, and N and $N(a)$ are the total population size and number of individuals at age a in the population.

This suggests that the value of the integral sum in the expanded MUL equation can be treated as constant over time and relatively invariant across populations with similar pre-COVID-19 life expectancies and population compositions. That value represents the average unfulfilled lifespan per COVID-19 death, similar to the average YLL in burden-of-disease assessments, but again adjusted with population-specific, counterfactual life tables instead of a universal standard. MUL values for a given population during a given period can then be approximated as the product of that adjusted average YLL (AAYLL) for the population and the all-age ratio of COVID-19 deaths to all deaths in the population during that period, D^C/D.

Results

Figure 1 shows MUL values in the first quarter (length of the dark segment of the bar) and second quarter (total length of the bar) of 2020 for both sexes in national and sub-national populations with the largest MUL values and at least 1,000 COVID-19 deaths by July 1, 2020. As first-quarter MUL values illustrate, the individual lifespan was impacted first in parts of Italy and Spain, with limited impact elsewhere except in Ecuador. During the first quarter in Madrid, individuals died 3.16 years younger on average than their otherwise expected age at death (in the absence of COVID-19). The corresponding figure for Lombardy was 2.75 years. The average for Spain (.98 years) and Italy (.88 years) were lower than for Ecuador, however, the only country where the MUL exceeded one year during that quarter (1.29 years, Figure 1).

Between the two quarters, the MUL trended upward across Europe, including in countries where the impact had previously been limited, such as Belgium (2.81 years), and reaching 3.66 years in Madrid and 3.04 years in Lombardy (Figure 1). The most notable increases, however, were in the Western Hemisphere. During the second quarter in Ecuador, individuals died 4.59 years younger on average than their otherwise expected age at death. The corresponding figure was 3.90 years in Peru. In the US, the second-quarter MUL averaged 1.76 years for the nation as a whole, but reached 5.41 in New York and 5.56 years in New Jersey (Figure 1). The above values refer to both sexes combined, and MUL values for

men are even higher. During the second quarter in New Jersey, men died 6.05 years younger on average than their expected age at death before COVID-19.



Figure 1: Mean Unfulfilled Lifespan (MUL) for both sexes, by quarter and populations with 1,000 or more COVID-19 deaths by July 1st, 2020, in years.

To apply the suggested empirical short-cut, Appendix Table S1 provides quarterly AAYLL values using counterfactual life tables in different populations. These values range from a low of 9.62 years in Bulgaria to a high of 26.48 years in Qatar. These differences can be explained by different age compositions, with younger compositions giving more weight to remaining life expectancies at younger ages, which are obviously higher. Figure 2 shows MUL values derived from quarterly AAYLL values for

a rolling seven-day period from mid-March to mid-May peaking at 7.32 years in Lombardy, 8.96 years in Madrid and 8.93 years in New York.



Figure 2: Mean Unfulfilled Lifespan (MUL) for both sexes, seven-day averages, in years.

The same approximation but for sub-populations is illustrated by focusing on the province of Guayas in Ecuador. Data on the monthly number of deaths by province show the marked increase in March, April and May from a baseline of 1,700-2,000 per month in January, February and again in June.[16] In April, the number of deaths reached 12,004, of which the January-February-June average suggests only 15.5% might be estimated to be from causes other than COVID-19 (without adjustment for competing causes). No specific life table is available to estimate MUL values for the province directly, but based on the second-quarter AAYLL derived for Ecuador, individuals appeared to have died 12.86 years younger, on average, that their expected age at death in April in the province of Guayas. This probably represents the largest impact of COVID-19 on the individual lifespan to date.

Discussion

Taking stock of COVID-19 mortality during the first half of 2020, MUL values were estimated for a total of 233 populations for each sex and each quarter. To estimate this large number of values, the simplifying assumption of a common age-and-sex pattern of COVID-19 mortality was used (i.e., the same age-and-sex-specific death rates relative to all-age, both-sex death rate in all populations). The distribution of COVID-19 deaths by sex and age-group derived so can obviously be replaced with the actual distribution in populations for which that distribution is available.

An approximation *is* required to estimate the difference between the actual and expected ages at death for individuals dying on an age interval (ages x to $x+n$). Using the average age at death on that age interval and life expectancy prior to COVID-19 at beginning of that age interval (exact age x), this difference was estimated here when individuals were at exact age x rather than at their age at death. This entails some underestimation of the difference on each age interval, which was preferred to compensate for the fact that individuals dying of COVID-19 should have a lower life expectancy at their age of death than same-age individuals, due to a higher likelihood of underlying long-term conditions (e.g., obesity). In the United Kingdom, one study found that the average YLL per COVID-19 death was reduced from 13 to 12 years (average for both sex) when controlling for these conditions.[17] These average YLL compare to AAYLL values for the United Kingdom estimated here to be 11.85 years during the first quarter and 11.94 years during the second one (Appendix Table S1). Our AAYLL values for the USA, 12.64 years in the first quarter and 12.71 years in the second, are also consistent with an earlier estimate that the country would lose 12.3 million years of remaining life if the COVID-19 death toll was to reach one million.[18]

The AAYLL was introduced to approximate MUL values for smaller-area populations for which a separate life table might not be available or for short-duration periods. As the product of the AAYLL and the ratio of COVID-19 to total deaths in the population during the period, the MUL can easily be approximated from a fixed, population-specific value of the AAYLL as long as that value remains near constant. AAYLL values were estimated in each of the first two quarters and found indeed to have changed little from one quarter to the next. This approximation can also be used for sub-populations for

which the necessary data are only provided of the entire population, but only when the age compositions of the sub-populations can be held as relatively similar.

MUL values are not sex- or age-standardized and do not substitute for sex-and-age-standardized COVID-19-specific death rates for comparisons of COVID-19 mortality across populations that differ markedly in age composition. MUL comparisons across such populations will be biased as, all else equal, a younger population composition yields a younger distribution of deaths and a higher MUL value. Age-standardized death rates remain useful when population compositions differ to account for the known variations of COVID-19 mortality with age,[19] but expressed in deaths per thousand, ten thousand or a hundred thousand of person-years, the significance of differences expressed with those rates may seem underwhelming. Like the PLEB, the MUL is a measure based much more intuitively on an average length of lives lived per person rather than on deaths per thousand person-years lived. The PLEB is the inverse of a "stationary" death rate: a weighted average of the period age-specific death rates with weights derived from these death rates through life table construction. Using these internally-derived weights rather than an external, standard age distribution,[20] the stationary death rate still achieves the main goal of age-standardization, namely, to yield a mortality measure independent of the actual age composition of the population. Unfortunately, this internal derivation assumes current mortality conditions will become permanent, an inconvenient assumption for short periods of time in relatively small populations.

For fine-grained tracking, the Mean Unfulfilled Lifespan provides an alternative to the reduction in PLEB to express the impact of COVID-19 on the individual lifespan in an easily interpretable metric. Its interpretation pertains to an actual death cohort, that is, individuals who died in a certain area during a certain period. The MUL indicates how much younger than expected, based on mortality conditions before the onset of COVID-19, members of this death cohort died on average, and its measurement requires no assumption about future mortality trends.

Materials and Methods

The equations defining YLL or MUL look deceivingly simple. To implement them, one has to match numbers of deaths or decrements that are available or can be estimated on age intervals, with life

expectancies that refer to exact ages. The changing value of life expectancy on a closed age interval can be approximated by linear interpolation, and the contribution of the interval to the total sum then equals the number of deaths or decrements in the interval times the interpolated value of life expectancy at the average age at death on the interval.[21] The linear approximation is more problematic for age intervals on which mortality changes rapidly with age, and for the open-ended interval, it requires setting an arbitrary upper age limit. Unfortunately, this may concern a large share of COVID-19 deaths: in the US for instance, about 60% are above age 75 years and reported in just one closed (75 to 84 years) and one open age interval (over 85 years).

As for reductions in PLEB, an alternative can be derived working directly with estimates of all deaths by age and sex in a period rather than with estimates of COVID-19 deaths by age and sex, distinguishing between deaths that were expected to occur in that period and those that were not ("excess" deaths), based on benchmark mortality conditions. Individuals dying in the age interval in which they were expected to die, which includes all individuals dying in the open-ended age interval, D_{N+}, do so a little earlier on average with the additional cause of death, as reflected by the difference between the average number of years lived after age x for individuals dying between ages x and $x+n$, ${}_na_x$ and ${}_na_x^{-C}$ in the period life tables with and without COVID-19,[22] and for the open-ended interval, between life expectancies at age N in the period life tables with and without COVID-19 while e^o_N and $e^o_N{}^{-C}$. Their contribution to the total decline in length of lives lived is:

$$\left(\sum_{x=0,n}^{N-n}\left({}_nD_x^{-C}.\left({}_na_x^{-C}-{}_na_x\right)\right)+\left(D_{N+}.\left(e_N^{o-C}-e_N^{o}\right)\right)\right)$$

where ${}_nD_x^{-C}$ is the number of deaths between ages x and $x+n$ that would have been expected during the same period without COVID-19. This approach has the advantage of not having to arbitrarily interpolate the value of life expectancies on the open-ended age interval.

For "excess" deaths that were not expected on the age interval, interpolating life expectancies on the age interval remains an option. A simpler alternative is to estimate the difference between the

expected and actual length of life at age x, that is, as the difference between life expectancy at that age in the absence of COVID-19, e_x^{o-C}, and the average number of years lived after that age for those dying in the age interval, ${}_na_x$. Estimating the difference back when individuals were age x rather than at their age at death entails a small underestimation. One reason to prefer a simpler alternative that might underestimate the actual value of the difference is that using life expectancies from the life table ignores the higher prevalence of underlying long-term conditions such as obesity among individuals who die of COVID-19. The average life expectancy at the time of death for an individual dying from COVID-19 should thus be lower than for an average individual of the same age.

With the simpler approximation, the contribution to the sum of differences between the actual and expected ages at death from excess deaths between ages x and $x+n$ in a given period can be estimated as:

$$\left({}_nD_x - {}_nD_x^{-C}\right).\left(e_x^{o-C} - {}_na_x\right)$$

where ${}_nD_x$ is the number of deaths from all causes between ages x and $x+n$ in the population during the period. Adding the contributions of expected and excess deaths, and averaging across all age-groups, the MUL value can be estimated as:

$$MUL = \frac{1}{D}\left(\sum_{x=0,n}^{N-n}\left({}_nD_x.\left(e_x^{o-C} - {}_na_x\right) - {}_nD_x^{-C}.\left(e_x^{o-C} - {}_na_x^{-C}\right)\right) + \left(D_{N+}.\left(e_N^{o-C} - e_N^{o}\right)\right)\right)$$

Using this approximation to estimate the impact of COVID-19 on the individual lifespan in each of the first two quarters of 2020 first requires a life table representing survival conditions in the first half of 2020 in the absence of COVID-19 whose values of e_x^{o-C} and ${}_na_x^{-C}$ can be used. Combined with the number of individuals by sex and age-group, the life table values of ${}_nm_x^{-C}$ then provide the expected numbers of deaths ${}_nD_x^{-C}$ in the absence of COVID-19. Population data and life table functions for countries were obtained from the UN Population Division.[23] Corresponding data for sub-populations in Italy, Spain, and the US were obtained from national statistical agencies.[24, 25, 26, 27]

New life tables representing actual mortality conditions (with COVID-19) in each quarter must then be derived to calculate the corresponding values of ${}_na_x$. The construction of these life tables requires

the quarterly numbers of deaths by sex and age-group. In countries where vital statistics are unavailable or incomplete, but estimates of COVID-19 deaths are available, the total number of deaths, ${}_nD_x$, can be obtained by adding these estimates (through a multi-decrement life table to adjust for competing risks of deaths) to the expected numbers of deaths in the absence of Covid-19 (${}_nD_x^{-C}$). When COVID-19 estimates are not broken down by sex and age-group, an alternative is to use a reference set of age-and-sex death rates from COVID-19 from another population for which these rates are deemed reliable.[28] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) data provided the reference set of age-and-sex death rates from COVID-19.[29] Estimates of COVID-19 deaths by April 1, and July 1, 2020 were taken from the IHME.[30] All of these data were downloaded from institutional websites.

Acknowledgments

The author 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). The author thanks Michel Guillot, Philippe Bocquier, Tim Riffe and Sam Preston for comments on an earlier draft of this manuscript.

References

[1] Ho JY & Hendi AS. 2018. Recent Trends in Life Expectancy across High Income Countries: Retrospective Observational Study. *BMJ* 362: 2562. https://www.bmj.com/content/362/bmj.k2562

[2] Obermeyer, Z., Murray CJL & Gakidou E. 2008. Fifty Years of Violent War Deaths from Vietnam to Bosnia: Analysis of Data from the World Health Survey Programme. *BMJ* 336(7659): 1482. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.a137

[3] Arias E, & Xu JQ. 2019. United States life tables, 2017. *NVSR* 2019,68(7). Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Vital Statistics.

[4] Heuveline P & Tzen M. 2020. Beyond Deaths per Capita: Comparative CoViD-19 Mortality Indicators. *MedRxiv* https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.29.20085506v8

[5] Ghislandi S et al. 2020. News from the Front: Estimation of excess mortality and life expectancy in the major epicenters of the COVID-19 pandemic in Italy. *MedRxiv* https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.29.20084335v3

[6] Trias-Llimos S, Riffe T & Bilal U. 2020. Monitoring Life Expectancy Levels During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Example of the Unequal Impact in Spanish Regions. *MedRxiv* https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.03.20120972v2

[7] Aburto JM et al. 2020. Estimating the burden of COVID-19 on mortality, life expectancy and lifespan inequality in England and Wales: A population-level study. *MedRxiv* https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.16.20155077v1

[8] Ramis H & Rubin D. 1993. *Groundhog Day*. Washington, D.C., United States: National Film Registry.

[9] Andrasfay T & Goldman N. 2020. Impact of COVID-19 on 2020 US Life Expectancy for the Black and Latino Populations. *MedRxiv* https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.12.20148387v1

[10] Weinberger DW, Chen J, Cohen, T et al. 2020. Estimation of Excess Deaths Associated With the COVID-[19] Pandemic in the United States, March to May 2020. *JAMA Intern Med*. Published online July 1, 2020. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.3391

[11] Keyfitz N. 1977. What Difference Would It Make if Cancer Were Eradicated? An Examination of the Taeuber Paradox *Demography* 14(4): 411. https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.2307/2060587.pdf

[12] Dempsey M. 1947. Decline in Tuberculosis - The Death Rate Fails to Tell the Entire Story. *Am Rev Tuberc.* 56(2): 157.

[13] Mohanty SK et al. 2020. Impact of COVID-19 Attributable Deaths on Longevity, Premature Mortality and DALY: Estimates of USA, Italy, Sweden and Germany *MedRxiv* https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.06.20147009

[14] Wetzler HP, Wetzler EA & Cobb HW. 2020. COVID-19: How Many Years of Life Lost? *MedRxiv* https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.08.20050559

[15] Arolas H et al. 2020. Global Years of Life Lost to COVID-19. *MedRxiv* https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.19.20136069

[16] Dirección General de Registro Civil, Identificación y Cedulación. 2020. Defunciones, Enero-Junio 2020. https://www.registrocivil.gob.ec/cifras/ Last used July 28, 2020.

[17] Hanlon P et al. 2020. COVID-19 – Exploring the Implications of Long-Term Condition Type and Extent of Multimorbidity on Years of Life Lost: A Modelling Study. *Welcome Open Res* 5: 75. https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15849.1

[18] Goldstein JR & Lee RD. 2020. Demographic Perspectives on Mortality of Covid-19 and Other Epidemics. *NBER Working Papers* 27043. https://www.nber.org/papers/w27043

[19] Dowd JB, Andriano L, Brazel DM, et al. 2020. Demographic science aids in understanding the spread and fatality rates of COVID-19. *PNAS* 117: 9696-8. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2004911117

[20] Modig K, Rau R & Ahlbom A. 2020. Life Expectancy: What Does it Measure? *BMJ Open* 10(7) https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/10/7/e035932

[21] Aragon T et al. 2020. Calculating Expected Years of Life Lost for Assessing Local Ethnic Disparities in Causes of Premature Death. BMC Public Health 8: 116. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-8-116

[22] Preston SH, Heuveline P & Guillot M. 2001. *Demography: Measuring and Modeling Population Processes*. Malden, MA, Oxford, England & Carlton, Australia: Blackwell.

[23] United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. *World Population Prospects 2019,* Online Edition. Rev. https://population.un.org/wpp/Download/Standard/CSV/. Last used June 2, 2020.

[24] Istituto Nazionale di Statistica (Istat). *Life Tables*. http://dati.istat.it/Index.aspx?QueryId=19053& lang=en. Last used June 28, 2020.

[25] Instituto Nacional Estadistica (INE). *Mortality Tables*. https://www.ine.es/dyngs/INEbase/en/ categoria.htm?c=Estadistica_P&cid=1254734710984. Last used June 28, 2020.

[26] United States Census Bureau. *Explore Census Data*. https://data.census.gov. Last used May 11, 2020.

[27] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). *CDC Wonder*. https://wonder.cdc.gov/cmf-icd10.html. Last used June 28, 2020.

[28] Guilmoto CZZ. 2020. COVID-19 Death Rates by Age and Sex and the Resulting Mortality Vulnerability of Countries and Regions in the World. *MedRxiv* https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.17.20097410v1

[29] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Provisional COVID-19 death counts by sex, age and state*. https://data.cdc.gov/NCHS/Provisional-COVID-19-Death-Counts-by-Sex-Age-and-S/9bhg-hcku. Last used July 12, 2020.

[30] University of Washington, Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. *COVID-19 projections*. https://covid19.healthdata.org/. Last used July 12,2020.