Exponential distribution of large excess death rates in Europe during the COVID–19 outbreak in the spring of 2020

José María Martín-Olalla[1, a)]
Universidad de Sevilla. Facultad de Física. Departamento de Física de la Materia Condensada. ES41012 Sevilla. Spain

(Dated: 20200923.1916+0200)

Excess death rates E during the spring of 2020 are computed in $N = 519$ level 3 European territorial units for statistics —NUTS3 in Netherlands (44), Belgium (40), France (96), Spain (50), Italy (110) and United Kingdom (179)— from 2020 provisional week deaths, the population numbers for 2020, and observations in previous years (reference or baseline), all of them obtained from Eurostat web page.

Excess death rates are classified in three tiers. Largest 27 excess death rates (tier 1, $E > 1740 \times 10^{-6}$) were distributed exponentially with empirical complementary cumulative distribution function (empirical survival function) S following $S \propto 10^{-E/\varepsilon}$ with $\varepsilon_1 = 3218(150) \times 10^{-6}$. Tier 2 (next 57 largest excess death rates, $E < 1140 \times 10^{-6}$ also distributed exponentially with $\varepsilon_2 = 1250(24) \times 10^{-6}$. Tier 3 (smallest 434 excess death rates) were distributed normally.

Tier 1 occurred mainly in specific regions of Spain and Italy, tier 2 in Spain, Italy and United Kingdom. While the European distribution of excess death rates during the spring of 2020 exhibited this kind of clustering, the exponential distribution suggests that the outcome may have been reached with little interaction between territorial units once communitary spread begun.

Keywords: disease; epidemiology; exponential distribution; power law; Gaussian distribution; Zipf law; rank plot; Kolmogorov-Smirnov; risk; survival function

[a)] Electronic mail: olalla@us.es; Twitter: @MartinOlalla_JM;

CC BY NC ND

1. INTRODUCTION

Excess death rates[1] relative to a consistent reference value based on historical records are a key quantity to understand the impact of a pandemic like the one associated to the illness designated COVID–19 which is caused by the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)[2]. The illness caught worldwide attention since its identification in late 2019 and impacted largely in several countries of Europe during the spring of the year 2020.[3] Mortality monitors like EuroMoMo recorded extremely large anomalies in Italy, Spain, and United Kingdom among others. Societal responses in the form of nationwide lock-downs were taken by governments at the spring of 2020.

Many empirical quantities shows a normal (Gaussian) distribution where the sample average value and sample standard deviation suffices to characterize the distribution. Many other societal quantities are characterized by the presence of abnormally large events to which average value means close to nothing.[4] A nice example of this is the distribution of population in municipalities from villages to mega cities. In this case the distribution opens wide relative to a Gaussian distribution due to the occurrence of mega cities. Likewise the heavy tail distribution for the risk of contagious diseases is also an issue of recent interest.[5,6]

This work will analyze the distribution of excess crude deaths in European level 3 territorial units for statistics in Italy, Spain, France, United Kingdom, Belgium and Netherlands. Helped by population numbers, excess death rates E will be computed for the spring of 2020. The work aims to understand the distribution of events along the 519 territorial units that entered in the analysis with focus in characterizing abnormally large excess deaths. Notice that abnormally low (negative) excess deaths are less likely to occur since mortality in modern societies comes mainly from natural causes. However societal response in the form of lock-downs may favor mild negative excess deaths.

2. DATA SET

Historical records of week deaths in Italy (ITA), France (FRA), Belgium (BEL), Netherlands (NED) and United Kingdom (GBR) were retrieved from Eurostat web page[1] in September 2020. Besides, Spanish (ESP) records of week deaths were retrieved form directly from the National Statistics Institute[2] although they were also available at Eurostat web page. Week deaths were disaggregated by level 3 of the nomenclature of territorial unit for statistics (NUTS3) which fits to the concept of province (Italy and Spain), arrondissement (Belgium), department (France), COROP region (Netherlands), and upper tier authorities, groups of unitary authorities, districts, principal areas or council areas (United Kingdom).

European territorial units are encoded by an alphanumeric bigendian string composed of the ISO-3166 alpha-2 country code and up to three characters signaling the level 1, level 2, and level 3 of territorial units. French overseas departments (FRY) and Canary Islands (ES7) did not enter in the collection.

Population numbers for the territorial units were retrieved from Eurostat `demo_r_pjangr3`[3] table which lists values from 2019 to 2014. Population values for 2020 were obtained after rescaling NUTS3 2019 population numbers with nationwide 2020 population obtained from table `tps00001`[4]. For Spain numbers were taken from table `31304` at the National Statistics Institute[5] which includes numbers until 2020 disaggregated by level 3 territorial units. Population numbers always refer to January 1 values. Weekly population values were obtained for every ISO-8601 week by linear interpolation from January 1, 2020 backwards. Population in 2020 was set constant irrespective of week number. As of 2020 the total population is 268 419 149.

3. METHODS

3.1. Accumulated excess death rates

In this work the accumulated death rates from week 10 to week 21 (2020) were computed for Netherlands, Belgium, France, and Spain. For Italy the interval run from week 08 to week 20 and for United Kingdom from week 12 to week 22. In 2020 W10 started on March 2 and W21 ended on May 24. Loosely speaking the intervals are representative of the spring of 2020. They were suggested from visual inspection of the death rate anomaly in 2020 and from the $z-$score anomalies observed in maps produced by EuroMoMo[6].

---

[1] https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/cache/metadata/en/demomwk_esms.htm
[2] See https://www.ine.es/experimental/defunciones/experimental_defunciones.htm#tablas_resultados (accessed September 2020)
[3] See https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/product?code=demo_r_pjangrp3 (accessed September 2020)
[4] See https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/tgm/table.do?tab=table&plugin=1&language=en&pcode=tps00001 (accessed September 2020)
[5] See https://ine.es/jaxiT3/Tabla.htm?t=31304&L=1 (accessed September 2020)
[6] See https://www.euromomo.eu/graphs-and-maps#map-of-z-scores

A baseline or reference value can be obtained analyzing the accumulated death rate in the previous years. For that purpose a Poisson regression —`glm` function with option `family="poisson"` in `R`— with a rate linearly varying with calendar year[7] was performed to get a predicted, baseline, reference death rate for 2020. The accumulated excess death rate of the interval —excess death rate hereafter— was then computed as the difference from the observed value in 2020 to the predicted baseline. Figure 3 in Appendix A (Supplementary Material) shows the results of this procedure for the smallest and largest anomalies recorded in every country.

3.2. Statistics

The distribution of accumulated excess death rates $\{E_i\}$ in the spring of 2020 for territorial units will be described by its empirical survival function, the probability of finding an excess death rate larger or equal than a given value: $S = P(X \geqslant x)$.

An estimate for the survival function is obtained from a set of N observations $\{E_i\}$ by ranking them in descending order of E_i. The survival function is given by $S_k = k/N$, where k is the rank, which is a assigned to E_k the k-th largest observation. As an example the rank of the largest observation is $k = 1$, then $S_1 = 1/N$. For the smallest observation the rank is $k = N$ and therefore $S_N = 1$.

If the survival function S is to be compared to the survival function F of a prescribed continuous distribution then the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) statistic $\sqrt{N} \times |F - S|$ is the appropriate quantity to analyze. The KS distance $D = \sqrt{N}\max|F - S|$ assesses whether the null hypothesis "sample distribution originated from tested distribution or $S - F = 0$" is or is not rejected at a given level of significance. For the standard level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ the KS distance equals to $D_c = 1.36$, irrespective of N.

The impact of $\sqrt{N}$ in D_n implies that larger samples need smaller differences ($\propto 1/\sqrt{N}$) to overshot the critical threshold D_c and reject the null hypothesis. In other words, the smaller the sample the more difficult to reject a null hypothesis. To put a naive example a coin toss experiment sized $N = 3$ can produce uniform empirical scores —three tails or three heads— without rejecting the binomial distribution as a parent distribution. On the contrary uniform empirical scores would be signaling an unfair coin toss if $N = 10$. In this work the impact of N will be noted as the number of territorial units for statistics varies from country to country.

4. RESULTS

Table 1 lists descriptive values for the excess death rate statistics: number of territorial units N, 2020 population P, population to number of territorial units and total excess death toll followed by the median excess Q_2, the average excess $\langle E \rangle$, the standard deviation of excesses s, the ratio excess death toll to population or population weighted excess average E_w and the KS distance to the Gaussian distribution. The null hypothesis is rejected for the Italian distribution and the combined distribution only. British, Dutch and Belgian excess death rates find excellent agreement with the Gaussian distribution and extremely low KS distances. Excess death tolls were computed as $\sum_i E_i \times P_i$.

The empirical survival function of the excess death rate in the spring of 2020 for $N = 519$ territorial units for statistics is plotted against the excess death rate (top axis) and its normal score (bottom axis) in Figure 1. The empirical survival function is scaled by $\sqrt{N}$ and it is presented in logarithmic scale. Quartile whiskers are shown in the top of plot area. The location of the KS distance is also noted by a vertical broken line.

Three regimes can be identified. First, a rounding region in the highest ranked region ($k > 85$, 84 % of the distribution) not much different from what is expected for a standard Gaussian distribution. Second, in the middle of the distribution an exponential distribution of events $\log_{10} S = a + b_1 E$ or $S \propto 10^{-E/\varepsilon_2}$ is noted (tier 2). The characteristic excess death rate is $\varepsilon_2 = 1265(25) \times 10^{-6}$. While exponentially distributed this tier does not deviate too much from the Gaussian behaviour.

Finally the largest (tier 1) events ($k < 27$) find also an exponential distribution but the characteristic excess death rate is $\varepsilon_1 = 3218(150) \times 10^{-6}$. The crossover of the last two regions marks the onset of a heavy tail and of large events occurring with abnormally large frequencies. Tier 1 is noted by a dark gray background in the figure; tier 2, by a light gray background.

The distribution of the $m = 85$ largest events and of the $N - m$ smallest events is shown in Table 2 and Table 3 (Supplementary Material). The largest events occurred mostly in Great Britain (36), Italy (25) and Spain (16) although it must be noted that 32 % of Spanish territorial units and 38.2 % of Spanish population entered in this category, while in Great Britain that made 20.1 % and 23.3 %. Likewise 79.1 % (ESP) and 70.9 % (ITA) of the excess death toll occurred in this category but only a 33.0 % in United Kingdom. On the contrary the overwhelming majority of population and excess death toll in Netherlands, Belgium and France are found in territorial units belonging to the lowest tier of the distribution. Table 4 in Supplementary Material lists the 50 largest and the 50 smallest events.

	Netherlands	Belgium	France	Spain	Italy	United Kindom	All six
Number of NUTS3	40 7.7 %	44 8.5 %	96 18.5 %	50 9.6 %	110 21.2 %	179 34.5 %	519
Population (2020)	17 407 585 6.5 %	11 549 888 4.3 %	67 098 824 25.0 %	45 092 671 16.8 %	60 244 639 22.4 %	67 025 542 25.0 %	268 419 149
Pop per NUTS3	435 190	262 497	698 946	901 853	547 679	374 444	517 185
Excess death toll	8104 4.0 %	8436 4.2 %	21 780 10.8 %	48 938 24.4 %	49 184 24.5 %	64 444 32.1 %	200 886
Median excess Q_2 ($\times 10^6$)	353	637	136	632	382	924	615
Average excess $\langle E \rangle$ ($\times 10^6$)	407	667	228	1059	791	904	712
Standard deviation s ($\times 10^6$)	387	364	377	1149	1140	354	753
Excess death to population ($\times 10^6$)	466	730	325	1085	816	961	748
KS distance to Gaussian distribution	0.52	0.39	1.08	1.12	2.05	0.83	2.73

TABLE 1. Descriptive statistic values level 3 of territorial units per country and all six combined. First, the number of territorial units, population numbers for 2020 and the ratio population to number of territorial units; then, excess death toll in the spring of 2020; followed by median excess death rate, averages excess death rate and standard deviation; the ratio excess death toll to population —population weighted average excess death rate— and the KS distance to the Gaussian distribution. Values in blue ink highlight the rejection of the null hypothesis at the standard level of significance ($p < 0.05$). French overseas departments (FRY) and Canary Islands (ES7) did not enter in the analysis.

Figure 2 displays the same plot as in Figure 1 but on a country basis. As noted by the KS distance (see Table 1), Dutch, Belgian, French and British distributions accommodate very well to the standard Gaussian distribution. On the contrary Spanish and Italian data looks like exponentially distributed, with little curvature.

5. DISCUSSION

The discussion of the previous results is conditioned by the distribution of level 3 territorial units within countries. While the main goal of territorial units for statistics is to provide homogeneous territorial units the outcome is far from being optimum. The average population per territorial unit ranges from 200×10^3 (Belgium) to 900×10^3 (Spain) (see Table 1).

The countries here analyzed displayed the largest records of excess death rate in Europe during the spring 2020. Therefore the exponential distribution of large events in the tier 1 ($k \leqslant 27$; $E > 1730 \times 10^{-6}$; dark gray background in Figure 1) with characteristic death rate ε_1 3218×10^{-6} is a robust result. It is populated almost exclusively by Italian and Spanish territorial units (Figure 1 and Table 4 in Supplementary Material). No other level 3 territorial unit in Europe is likely to have shown excess death rate that large during the spring of 2020. Adding more countries to the analysis would only vertically shift S for these events as they would move from k/N to $k/(N+n)$, where n is the number of new territorial units. The same can be said about tier 2 ($27 < k \leqslant 85$; $1730 \times 10^{-6} > E \geqslant 1140 \times 10^{-6}$; light gray background in figure 1) although they could be altered by some few new territorial units that may have got excess death rates larger than 1140×10^{-6}.

This process is observed in a reverse way in Figure 2. Removing countries and analyzing the distribution of events in Spain or Italy does not alter the evidence that the largest events distribute exponentially. However, by removing countries the distribution of middle and smallest events changes as noticed by the curvature of tier 2 data in United Kingdom.

The exponential distribution appears in the distribution of interevents time of statistically independent phenomena, including mortality. Excess death rates is nothing but a cumulative sum of deaths during a prescribed time interval.

It is common-knowledge that the spring outbreak of COVID–19 was extremely heterogeneous in Europe with the highest impact in Italy, Spain and United Kingdom. Even within these countries the outbreak was still highly



FIG. 1. The empirical distribution of excess death rates in the $N = 519$ level 3 territorial units of Netherlands, Belgium, France, Spain, Italy and United Kingdom against the normal of the excess death rate score $(E - \langle E \rangle)/s$. Different color and symbol according to country are used. The Gaussian survival function is noted by an orange line. Gray backgrounds display the first tier (dark, $k < 27$) and the second tier, $k < 85$). Bivariate analysis results for $S \propto 10^{-E/\varepsilon}$ are annotated in the plot. The vertical broken line shows the position of the KS distance to the Gaussian distribution $D = 2.73$ ($p < 10^{-6}$) which is computed as the vertical largest difference from the data point to the Gaussian line.

heterogeneous and distributed in clusters. This is noted in Table 4 (Supplementary Material) by the occurrences of level 2 numbers (third and second right most character in the NUTS3 code) within a country. All this suggests a strong close social interaction.

The exponential distribution of large events suggests that despite this well known clustering, excess death rate could have been developed in isolated conditions: once the disease sets in a territorial unit, once community spread begins and, perhaps, once a superspread event occurs or once an infection threshold is reached, and once lock-downs are enforced, the fate of the outbreak depends on a myriad of societal issues but, to some extend and empirically, it could be independent from what happens in other territorial units.

6. CONCLUSION

Excess death rates in Europe during the 2020 spring outbreak of the illness COVID–19 were distributed exponentially above $E_c \sim 1750 \times 10^{-6}$ with with empirical survival function decreasing by 1/10 every $\varepsilon_1 = 3218(150) \times 10^{-6}$.

A second tier exponentially distributed tier of excess death rates is found for $1140 \times 10^{-6} \leqslant E < 1730 \times 10^{-6}$ with a characteristic one-tenth excess death rate $E_m = 1250(24) \times 10^{-6}$. On the contrary smaller events were distributed normally.



FIG. 2. Distribution of excess death rates E during the spring of 2020 along level 3 of European territorial units. From top to bottom and left to right Netherlands, Belgium, France, Spain, Italy and United Kingdom. Every panel shows $\sqrt{N} \times S$, where S is the empirical survival function $S_i = k_i/N$, with k_i the rank position (right axis) from largest to smallest and N is the sample size against the normal values of excess death rate (bottom axis) and excess death rates (top axis). Light and dark backgrounds are those of Figure 1. Descriptive statistic values are listed in Table 1. Canary Islands (ES7) and French overseas departments (FRY) were not included in the analysis.

REFERENCES

[1]J. Aaron, J. Mullbauer, C. Giattino, and H. Ritchie, "A pandemic primer on excess mortality statistics and their comparability across countries," (2020).

[2]N. Zhu, D. Zhang, W. Wang, X. Li, B. Yang, J. Song, X. Zhao, B. Huang, W. Shi, R. Lu, P. Niu, F. Zhan, X. Ma, D. Wang, W. Xu, G. Wu, G. F. Gao, and W. Tan, "A novel coronavirus from patients with pneumonia in China, 2019," New England Journal of Medicine **382**, 727–733 (2020).

[3]A. Campbell and E. Morgan, "Comparisons of all-cause mortality between European countries and regions : January to June 2020," Office for National Statistics , 1–27 (2020).

[4]A. Clauset, C. R. Shalizi, and M. E. J. Newman, "Power-law distributions in empirical data," SIAM Review **51**, 661–703 (2009).

[5]P. Cirillo and N. N. Taleb, "Tail risk of contagious diseases," Nature Physics **16**, 606–613 (2020), arXiv:2004.08658.

[6]A. Corral, "Scientific comment on "Tail risk of contagious diseases"," (2020), arXiv:2007.06876.

[7]J. M. Martin-Olalla, "Age and sex disaggregation of crude excess deaths during the 2020 spring COVID-19 outbreak in Spain," medRxiv , 2020.08.06.20169326 (2020).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to thank Eurostat and the National Statistics Institutes in Europe for releasing week crude deaths.

This work benefited from `GNU octave-4.2.2` (https://www.gnu.org/software/octave/); `R-3.4.4` (https://www.r-project.org/); `gnuplot-5.2.2` (http://www.gnuplot.info/); `GNU emacs-25.2.2` (https://www.gnu.org/software/emacs/) and AUCTEX(`https://www.gnu.org/software/auctex/`).

This project started on September 12, 2020.

Appendix A: Supplementary Material

1. Figures

Figure 3 shows as an example the records of accumulated death rates for the smallest (right) and largest (left) anomalies recorded during the spring of 2020 in level 3 territorial units for every country. Circles display normal scores of the observed accumulated death rates. They are obtained after the observations O_i prior to 2020 are standardized to zero sample average and one sample standard deviation by the normal (linear) transform $(O_i - \langle O \rangle)/s$, $\langle O \rangle$ is the sample average and s is the sample standard deviation. The standard deviation s is listed on every picture. The line is the result of the Poisson regression. It is extended until 2020 to show the predicted baseline obtained from the preceding observed accumulated death rates. The vertical distance from the 2020 observed value to the 2020 predicted baseline is the accumulated excess death rate E. Its value is listed on every picture and the excess death toll in 2020 T. Every panel also lists the sample standard deviation of the observations until 2019 —which scales the vertical axis— and the sample standard deviation of the residual excesses until 2019: the ratio E to r is the $z-$score of the excess death rate.

Finally, on every picture T displays the accumulated excess death toll in 2020 for the territorial unit.



FIG. 3. Smallest (left) and largest (right) accumulated excess death rate recorded in Netherlands, Belgium, France, Spain, Italy and United Kingdom (top to bottom) during the spring of 2020. Every picture identifies the territorial unit by its code and name with 2020 population numbers in parenthesis. Circles represent observed values, the line is the predicted values by a Poisson regression with rate linearly varying with calendar year. Vertical axes display the normal scores of death rates: average is removed and the distribution is scaled by the sample standard deviation. The same vertical scale is preserved on every picture. Every panel lists the excess death rate —vertical distance from 2020 observation to reference— the corresponding excess death toll T; the sample standard deviation of the observations until 2019 s and the sample standard deviation of the residual excesses until 2019 r.

2. Tables

Table 2 list descriptive values for the $m = 85$ largest excess death rate that populate tier 1 and tier 2 (gray backgrounds in Figure 1).

Table 3 list descriptive values for the $m = 85$ largest excess death rate that populate tier 1 and tier 2 (gray backgrounds in Figure 1).

Table 4 lists the 50 largest events and the 50 smallest events. Rank, code and name are shown with excess death rate, excess death toll T and the $z-$score: the ratio of the excess to the standard deviation of the excesses prior to 2020. It is the normal value of the excess death rate relative to its historical distribution.

	Netherlands	**Belgium**	**France**	**Spain**	**Italy**	**United Kindom**	**All six**
NUTS3 occurrences	2	5	1	16	25	36	85
(to country)	5.0 %	11.4 %	1.0 %	32.0 %	22.7 %	20.1 %	16.4 %
(to all combined)	2.4 %	5.9 %	1.2 %	18.8 %	29.4 %	42.4 %	
Population (2020)	1 265 099	2 757 616	790 602	17 204 516	14 065 315	15 606 175	51 689 323
(to country)	7.3 %	23.9 %	1.2 %	38.2 %	23.3 %	23.3 %	19.3 %
(to all combined)	2.4 %	5.3 %	1.5 %	33.3 %	27.2 %	30.2 %	
Excess death toll	1682	3395	1305	38 707	34 858	21 264	101 210
(to country)	20.8 %	40.3 %	6.0 %	79.1 %	70.9 %	33.0 %	50.4 %
(to all combined)	1.7 %	3.4 %	1.3 %	38.2 %	34.4 %	21.0 %	
Excess death rate ($\times 10^6$)	1329	1231	1650	2250	2478	1363	1958

TABLE 2. Descriptive values for the $m = 85$ largest excess death rates recorded in the 519 level 3 territorial units: the number of occurrences; population; excess death toll; and excess death rate. Percentages are taken first relative to country and second relative to the set of 85 largest excess death rates.

	Netherlands	**Belgium**	**France**	**Spain**	**Italy**	**United Kindom**	**All six**
NUTS3 occurrences	38	39	95	34	85	143	434
(to country)	95.0 %	88.6 %	99.0 %	68.0 %	77.3 %	79.9 %	83.6 %
(to all combined)	8.8 %	9.0 %	21.9 %	7.8 %	19.6 %	32.9 %	
Population (2020)	16 142 486	8 792 272	66 308 222	27 888 155	46 179 324	51 419 367	216 729 826
(to country)	92.7 %	76.1 %	98.8 %	61.8 %	76.7 %	76.7 %	80.7 %
(to all combined)	7.4 %	4.1 %	30.6 %	12.9 %	21.3 %	23.7 %	
Excess death toll	6423	5040	20 475	10 232	14 326	43 180	99 675
(to country)	79.2 %	59.7 %	94.0 %	20.9 %	29.1 %	67.0 %	49.6 %
(to all combined)	6.4 %	5.1 %	20.5 %	10.3 %	14.4 %	43.3 %	
Excess death rate ($\times 10^6$)	398	573	309	367	310	840	460

TABLE 3. Descriptive values for the $N - m = 434$ smallest excess death rates recorded in the 519 level 3 territorial units: the number of occurrences; population; excess death toll; and excess death rate. Percentages are taken first relative to country and second relative to the set of 434 smallest excess death rates.

Top death rate excesses					**Bottom death rate excesses**				
Rank	Level 3 territorial unit	$E(\times 10^6)$	T	$z-$score	Rank	Level 3 territorial unit	$E(\times 10^6)$	T	$z-$score
1	ITC4A–Cremona	5851	2096	83.8	519	ES613–Córdoba	−438	−343	−4.8
2	ITC46–Bergamo	5634	6268	84.0	518	FRK12–Cantal	−352	−52	−2.1
3	ES416–Segovia	4761	734	34.1	517	FRI11–Dordogne	−326	−138	−5.9
4	ITH51–Piacenza	4616	1323	27.2	516	FRJ27–Tarn	−285	−115	−2.5
5	ITC49–Lodi	4213	968	26.4	515	ITG29–Olbia-Tempio	−282	−45	−1.2
6	ES417–Soria	3777	340	14.5	514	NL111–Oost-Groningen	−260	−39	−4.4
7	ITC47–Brescia	3595	4542	73.3	513	FRI23–Haute-Vienne	−252	−97	−2.5
8	ES422–Ciudad Real	3591	1775	36.0	512	FRI31–Charente	−239	−87	−2.8
9	ITH52–Parma	3139	1415	22.9	511	FRL06–Vaucluse	−228	−133	−2.8
10	ES415–Salamanca	3131	1037	29.2	510	ITG14–Agrigento	−226	−98	−2.8
11	ITC48–Pavia	3077	1677	39.2	509	FRJ28–Tarn-et-Garonne	−217	−59	−2.5
12	ES421–Albacete	2873	1120	28.8	508	FRK13–Haute-Loire	−206	−48	−1.4
13	ES424–Guadalajara	2738	718	18.1	507	ITG2A–Ogliastra	−201	−11	−0.7
14	ITC43–Lecco	2633	886	20.7	506	FRI21–Corrèze	−193	−48	−1.2
15	ITC18–Alessandria	2567	1079	30.3	505	FRI13–Landes	−192	−82	−1.6
16	ES423–Cuenca	2456	491	15.5	504	FRL02–Hautes-Alpes	−191	−28	−2.1
17	ES300–Madrid	2421	16 338	43.1	503	FRH01–Côtes-d'Armor	−187	−116	−1.1
18	ITC13–Biella	2258	396	13.0	502	UKN10–Derry City and Strabane	−161	−24	−2.2
19	ITC4B–Mantova	2211	910	16.1	501	ITI41–Viterbo	−157	−50	−1.1
20	ES411–Ávila	2162	344	13.1	500	ITF11–L'Aquila	−155	−46	−2.3
21	ES511–Barcelona	2023	11 400	30.8	499	FRI15–Pyrénées-Atlantiques	−135	−95	−1.2
22	ES425–Toledo	2005	1402	15.0	498	FRI12–Gironde	−134	−224	−3.1
23	ITI31–Pesaro e Urbino	1990	713	13.1	497	FRD11–Calvados	−132	−95	−1.1
24	BE323–Arr. Mons	1868	488	20.8	496	FRJ21–Ariège	−131	−21	−1.6
25	UKJ26–East Surrey	1758	715	26.4	495	FRI34–Vienne	−109	−49	−0.9
26	UKG39–Wolverhampton	1744	460	20.5	494	NL124–Noord-Friesland	−105	−34	−0.8
27	ITC33–Genova	1737	1458	17.5	493	FRK11–Allier	−97	−34	−0.6
28	ITC12–Vercelli	1735	296	15.3	492	FRC12–Nièvre	−88	−18	−0.5
29	UKG32–Solihull	1721	372	31.9	491	ITG15–Caltanissetta	−85	−22	−0.8
30	ITC4C–Milano	1718	5573	31.4	490	NL125–Zuidwest-Friesland	−85	−12	−0.3
31	UKI72–Brent	1661	554	137.8	489	FRK14–Puy-de-Dôme	−83	−57	−1.6
32	FRF12–Haut-Rhin	1650	1305	21.9	488	ITF32–Benevento	−78	−22	−0.7
33	UKD74–Wirral	1645	535	20.2	487	ITI15–Prato	−78	−20	−0.9
34	ES413–León	1627	747	12.0	486	ES640–Melilla	−78	−7	−0.5
35	UKM83–Inverclyde East Renfrewshire and Renfrewshire	1607	568	33.1	485	ES114–Pontevedra	−65	−61	−0.9
36	UKG38–Walsall	1583	451	17.3	484	ITG12–Palermo	−65	−81	−0.8
37	ITC44–Sondrio	1579	285	16.8	483	NL113–Overig Groningen	−55	−22	−9.1
38	ES432–Cáceres	1577	617	11.5	482	ITF35–Salerno	−53	−58	−0.5
39	UKI71–Barnet	1554	618	37.7	481	ITI44–Latina	−51	−29	−0.5
40	ITC20–Valle d'Aosta/Vallée d'Aoste	1529	192	10.2	480	ITG11–Trapani	−47	−20	−0.3
41	UKD12–East Cumbria	1519	406	33.6	479	FRJ23–Haute-Garonne	−46	−66	−0.8
42	UKC14–Durham CC	1516	804	16.2	478	ITG2C–Carbonia-Iglesias	−45	−6	−0.6
43	ITC4D–Monza e della Brianza	1498	1307	14.4	477	FRD13–Orne	−40	−12	−0.3
44	ES418–Valladolid	1480	771	22.6	476	ITG18–Ragusa	−39	−12	−0.2
45	UKI54–Enfield	1478	503	71.1	475	FRG05–Vendée	−35	−25	−0.5
46	UKD73–Sefton	1470	407	10.5	474	ITF64–Vibo Valentia	−30	−5	−0.3
47	UKI74–Harrow Hillingdon	1465	825	18.2	473	FRH04–Morbihan	−29	−23	−0.3
48	UKD72–Liverpool	1460	729	31.6	472	FRH03–Ille-et-Vilaine	−28	−31	−0.3
49	ITC17–Asti	1439	308	29.3	471	ITI43–Roma	−27	−115	−0.5
50	UKD62–Cheshire East	1430	548	17.0	470	ES112–Lugo	−25	−8	−0.2

TABLE 4. The 50 largest excess death rates and the 50 smallest excess death rates recorded in the 340 level 3 territorial units. The table lists the rank position, NUTS3 code and name, excess death rate and the $z-$score: ratio of the excess death rate to the standard deviation of the residuals of the Poisson regression (see Figure 3