

14 **Authorship**

15 CW, CB and FM designed the study. CW completed all analyses with input from FM and CB. CW, VA,
16 FM and CB all contributed to drafting the manuscript. The corresponding author attests that all listed
17 authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted. CW is
18 guarantor of the analysis.

19 The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of
20 all authors, a worldwide licence to the Publishers and its licensees in perpetuity, in all forms, formats
21 and media (whether known now or created in the future), to i) publish, reproduce, distribute, display
22 and store the Contribution, ii) translate the Contribution into other languages, create adaptations,
23 reprints, include within collections and create summaries, extracts and/or, abstracts of the
24 Contribution, iii) create any other derivative work(s) based on the Contribution, iv) to exploit all
25 subsidiary rights in the Contribution, v) the inclusion of electronic links from the Contribution to
26 third party material where-ever it may be located; and, vi) licence any third party to do any or all of
27 the above.

28 **Conflicts of Interest Statement**

29 All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf
30 and declare: no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the
31 submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could appear to
32 have influenced the submitted work.

33 **Data Sharing Statement**

34 All data used are publicly freely available through the GOV.UK and the ONS. Code used in the
35 analyses is available upon request.

36 **Ethical Approval**

37 This study was approved by the Newcastle University Ethics Committee (Ref: 7543/2020).

38 **Transparency declaration**

39 The lead author* affirms that this manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the
40 study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any
41 discrepancies from the study as planned (and, if relevant, registered) have been explained.

42

43 *The manuscript's guarantor.

44

45 **Funding**

46 This work was supported by a grant from The Health Foundation (Ref: 2211473), who took no part in
47 the design, analysis or writing of this study.

48

49 **Summary Box**

50 **Section 1: What is already known on this subject**

51 Geographical inequalities in COVID-19 case rates have been noted worldwide, and in England.
52 However, how these inequalities were affected by policy responses – such as national lockdowns -
53 has yet to be investigated.

54 **Section 2: What this study adds**

55 We examined geographical inequalities in COVID-19 case rates by deprivation during the first English
56 lock down (March – July, 2020). We find that cases were first reported in the less deprived areas of
57 England, but this pattern quickly reversed and large excesses of cases occurred in the most deprived
58 areas during the first national lockdown. Case rates in more deprived areas also rose more sharply,
59 peaked higher, and then dropped faster than in less deprived areas. Inequality in cumulative case
60 rates grew over the lockdown, increasing inequalities in disease burden.

61

62 **Abstract**

63 **Background**

64 Socio-economic inequalities in COVID-19 case rates have been noted worldwide. Previous studies
65 have compared case rates over set phases. There has been no analysis of how inequalities in cases
66 changed overtime and were shaped by national mitigation strategies (e.g. lock downs). This paper
67 provides the first analysis of the evolution of area-level inequalities in COVID-19 cases by deprivation
68 levels in the first wave of the pandemic (January to July 2020) in England – with a focus on the
69 effects of the first national lockdown (March – July 2020).

70 **Methods**

71 Weekly case rates per Middle Super Output Area (MSOA, n=4412) in England from 2020-03-15 to
72 2020-07-04 were obtained, and characteristics of local epidemics were calculated, e.g. the highest
73 case rate per area. Simple linear and logistic regression analyses were employed to assess the
74 association of these metrics with index of multiple deprivation (IMD). Local authority-level (n=309)
75 cases were used similarly in a sensitivity analysis, as these data were available daily and extended
76 further back in time. The impact of lockdown was assessed by comparing the cumulative case rate
77 in the most deprived 20% of MSOAs to the least deprived 20%, for the periods before the lockdown,
78 and by the end of lockdown.

79 **Findings**

80 Less deprived areas began recording COVID-19 cases earlier than more deprived areas and were
81 more likely to have peaked by March 2020. More deprived areas' case rates grew faster and peaked
82 higher than less deprived areas. During the first national lockdown in the UK, the relative excess in
83 case rates in the most deprived areas increased to 130% of that of the least deprived ones.

84 **Interpretation**

85 The pattern of disease spread in England confirm the hypothesis that initial cases of a novel
86 infectious disease are likely to occur in more affluent communities, but more deprived areas will
87 overtake them once national mitigation strategies begin, and bear the brunt of the total case load.
88 The strict first national lockdown served to increase case rate inequalities in England.

89

90 **Funding**

91 This work was supported by a grant from The Health Foundation (Ref: 2211473), who took no part in
92 the design, analysis or writing of this study.

93

94

95 **Research in Context**

96 **Evidence before this study**

97 The magnitude and distribution of deprivation-related inequalities in COVID-19 cases have been
98 reported for England and many other countries, however, none have yet investigated the initial
99 evolution of these inequalities, nor the effects of the first national lockdown.

100 **Added value of this study**

101 We leverage the benefits of two separate datasets of COVID-19 case counts to investigate the
102 initiation and evolution in inequalities in disease burden by deprivation. We found that cases were
103 first recorded in less deprived areas before rising faster in more deprived areas. The first national
104 lockdown led to an increase in these geographical inequalities.

105 **Implications of all the available evidence**

106 National lockdowns are an important tool in the armoury of pandemic control, but their timing and
107 duration must be carefully decided and be locally specific. Because case rate inequalities were
108 already present before lockdown in England, movement restrictions served to further increase them.

109

110

111 Introduction

112 Inequalities in the burden of COVID-19 have been demonstrated globally¹. These inequalities exist
113 by age, sex, ethnicity, socio-economic status and community deprivation (1–9). Most of this work
114 has been descriptive and focused on comparing total case rates over set time phases¹. There has
115 been no analysis to date of how these inequalities in cases arose, changed overtime and were
116 shaped by national mitigation strategies (lock downs). Understanding how these inequalities first
117 emerged at the start of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 – and the impact of national policy
118 responses (lock downs) - could help uncover important modifiable drivers which could be leveraged
119 to prevent worsening of inequalities in future waves, or future pandemics. The first stage of such
120 work is identifying the inequalities and how they arose. Deprivation has been linked to COVID-19
121 case rates in England previously¹¹, but this paper provides the first analysis of the evolution of area-
122 level inequalities in COVID-19 by deprivation levels in the first wave of the pandemic (January to July
123 2020) in England – with a focus on the effects of the first national lockdown (March – July 2020).

124 Many countries employed national ‘lockdown’ orders in the early stages of the pandemic, in an
125 attempt to curtail viral transmission and avoid health system collapse¹. In the UK, the first such
126 lockdown was announced on the 23rd March 2020, and began to be released on the 1st June 2020. In
127 keeping with many other European countries, this was characterised by a 12 week ‘stay at home’
128 order (SI 350) - whereby people could go outside only for certain "very limited purposes". Face-to-
129 face education was suspended and many workplaces closed, with employees ordered to ‘work from
130 home’ where possible. Most office based workers were able to work from home, but key workers in
131 factories, transport, food retail and health care continued to work as usual. Many other staff were
132 furloughed as businesses ceased trading- particularly in the hospitality, travel and retail sectors¹². As
133 national cases, hospitalisations and deaths started to fall the lockdown was gradually released over
134 several months - culminating in the so-called ‘Super Saturday’ on 4th July 2020 when many
135 businesses (including hospitality) reopened – albeit with strict social distancing rules¹³. Such
136 lockdowns are an important and useful tactic in the national response, but the rationale for their
137 timings are rarely transparent, and their impacts may not be experienced equally by different areas
138 given geographical inequalities in the progression of the pandemic. We therefore explore the
139 impact of the first English national lock down on inequalities in COVID-19 cases.

140 Clouston *et al.* (2021) leveraged the theories of Fundamental Cause Theory (FCT, ¹⁴) and Stages of
141 Disease (SOD, ¹⁵) to test the hypotheses that COVID-19 cases would initially occur in less deprived
142 areas, would then spread to more deprived communities, and the greater overall burden of disease
143 would be experienced by the most deprived². Their hypotheses were supported by the evolution of
144 the US COVID-19 epidemic². England also exhibits strong area-level socio-economic inequalities;
145 thus we would expect similar case patterning to occur in England¹⁶.

146 It has been noted previously that when national epidemic dynamics are used for local decisions, they
147 can mask important sub-national variation in disease spread, thus mitigation strategies that rely
148 solely on the national data could inadvertently worsen inequalities¹⁷. Previous descriptive studies of
149 inequalities in COVID-19 cases have tended to focus on cumulative measures over set timespans,
150 without documenting the disparities in evolution of case rates^{5,8,18}. An understanding of how
151 national mitigation strategies affect geographical inequalities in COVID-19 cases would help inform
152 policies targeted at minimising viral spread whilst preventing the widening (or even actively
153 decreasing) health inequalities.

154 In this paper, we interrogate COVID-19 cases data from the first wave of the pandemic in England to
155 identify geographical inequalities in the evolution of local epidemics, and to describe the effects of
156 the first national lockdown on these inequalities.

157

158 **Role of the Funding Source**

159 The funders took no part in the study design, collection, analysis or interpretation of the data used in
160 this study, nor in the writing of the report or the decision to submit for publication.

161

162 **Methods**

163 Weekly counts of COVID-19 cases for the period 2020-03-15 to 2020-07-04 per Middle Super Output
164 Area (MSOA) for England were downloaded from GOV.UK and converted to rates per 100,000
165 persons using Office for National Statistics (ONS) mid-2019 population estimates. MSOAs are small-
166 area geographies used in Census data¹⁹. They are comprised of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs).
167 MSOAs represent a minimum population of 5000 and the mean population per MSOA is 7200
168 persons. There are 6,791 MSOAs and 32,844 LSOAs in England. MSOAs¹⁹ with no data preceding
169 'Super Saturday' (2020-07-04) or with fewer than four weeks of data were excluded (n=2377). The
170 Isles of Scilly (E02006781) and City of London (E02006781) were excluded due to systematic
171 differences in case reporting, leaving 4412 MSOAs for analysis.

172 Rank of Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) for all LSOAs in England was obtained from the ONS, and
173 the mean rank was calculated for each MSOA. The mean IMD ranks were divided into deciles, where
174 decile 1 contained the most deprived 10% of MSOAs in England. IMD is the standard measure of
175 area-level deprivation in England. It produces a ranking of areas in England based on relative local
176 scores for: income, employment, health, education, crime, access to services and living
177 environment²⁰.

178 Case rates per MSOA were converted to 3-week rolling means, and metrics characterising each
179 MSOA's first wave of epidemic (up to 2020-07-04) were calculated, including; peak case rate, speed
180 of increase from 25% of peak rate to peak, speed of descent from peak to 50% of peak rate, total
181 cumulative case rate over the first wave, and cumulative case rate up until the announcement of the
182 first UK national lockdown (2020-03-23). Metrics were associated with IMD using simple linear or
183 logistic regression models where appropriate. Similarly, cases for all MSOAs within each decile of
184 IMD were summed, and comparative metrics of each decile's first wave were compared.

185 A sensitivity analysis was conducted on daily cases data at Local Authority (LA) level (n=309). These
186 data were acquired from GOV.UK and extended further back in time than the MSOA-level data, thus
187 capturing more of the earliest COVID-19 case information. Results from analyses of LA data were
188 similar to those of MSOA data.

189 All analyses were conducted in R statistical software version 3.6.2.

190

191 **Patient and Public Involvement**


192 Our public involvement panel inputted into project design and considered the research topic to be of
193 contemporary importance and value. The data used do not require patient permissions for use and
194 are publicly available.

195


196 **Results**

197 Of the 4412 MSOAs studied, in 1773 (40%) their earliest recorded case rate was their highest, i.e. the
198 case rate peaked earlier than these data started being recorded. A simple logistic regression using
199 an 'early peak' as the dependent binary variable showed that those MSOAs that peaked early were
200 more likely to have a higher mean average rank of IMD (i.e. to be less deprived. IMD coefficient
201 1.001e-05, *p*-value 0.008).

202 Excluding the aforementioned MSOAs that peaked before data recording began, the peak case rate
203 was higher in areas with low IMD (Figure 1). Each unit increase in average rank of IMD was
204 associated with a very small (0.001 cases per 100,000 people) but statistically significant reduction in
205 the peak case rate (Figure 2). There was no significant difference in the speed of increase or
206 decrease in case rates across IMD at MSOA level.



207
208 **Figure 1.** Mean daily case rates per 100,000 persons for MSOAs (n=4412) in each decile of rank of
209 IMD (Index of Multiple Deprivation) across the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic in England.
210 Decile 1 is the most deprived group.




211

212 **Figure 2.** Mean peak case rate per decile of rank of IMD (Index of Multiple Deprivation) during the
213 first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic in 4412 MSOAs (Middle Super Output Areas) in England.

214


215 Total cumulative case rates across the first wave were significantly lower in less deprived MSOAs
216 compared to more deprived MSOAs (Figure 3).



217

218 **Figure 3.** Boxplot of total cumulative case rates for all MSOAs (Middle Super Output Areas, n=4412)
219 in each decile of rank of IMD (Index of Multiple Deprivation) over the first wave of COVID-19
220 pandemic in England.

221 When comparing the most deprived 20% of MSOAs in England (IMD deciles 1 and 2) with the least
222 deprived 20% (IMD deciles 9 and 10), the ratio of cumulative case rates in most versus least deprived
223 increased steadily across the first wave, showing that inequality in case rates grew over this period
224 (Figure 4).



225
226

227 **Figure 4.** Ratio of least deprived/most deprived 20% of MSOAs (Middle Super Output Areas)
228 cumulative case rates over the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic in England.

229 In each MSOA, the weekly case rate up until the first UK national lockdown was announced (2020-
230 03-23) was summed. The mean summed rate per IMD decile was then calculated, and the most and
231 least deprived 20% of MSOAs were compared. Up until lockdown, the most deprived 20% of MSOAs
232 recorded, on average, 42.4 cases per 100,000 persons, whereas the least deprived 20% (IMD deciles
233 9 and 10) recorded an average of 48.2 cases per 100,000 persons, thus the less deprived areas had
234 accrued 14% more cases before lockdown began. At the end of the lockdown period, the most
235 deprived 20% had recorded on average 504.5 cases per 100,000, compared to the least deprived
236 20% which recorded 382.5 cases per 100,000 persons, i.e. cases were over 30% higher in the most
237 deprived 20% of areas than in the least deprived 20%, thus inequality in case rates grew under the
238 lockdown.

239

240 **Sensitivity Analysis: Local Authority level**

241 The above metrics were calculated using similar methods for 309 (of 311 for which daily COVID-19
242 case numbers were available from GOV.UK for the period in question, and additionally excluding
243 London and the Isles of Scilly) local authorities (LAs) across England. This sensitivity analysis was
244 conducted to assess whether limitations of MSOA-level data (only available weekly and starting from

245 a later date) were important. All comparable MSOA-level results were similar to those from LA-level
246 analyses. In LA-level analyses, more deprived areas saw faster increases and decreases in case rates
247 compared to less deprived areas. As local authority data were recorded earlier than MSOA-level
248 data, we used these to determine whether a relationship existed between IMD and the timing of the
249 first recorded COVID-19 cases per LA. We found that more deprived LAs began recording cases
250 earlier than less deprived LAs (see Supplement).

251

252 Discussion

253 In keeping with previous work, our study has found high inequalities in COVID-19 case rates by
254 deprivation across England^{1,20}. We have also found new evidence that the significant inequalities in
255 the evolution of local COVID-19 epidemics have led to large differences in cumulative case numbers
256 across England. Further, we have shown that these inequalities arose due to systematic differences
257 in when the first cases were recorded, how quickly they grew, and to what peak level. The effect of
258 the first UK national lockdown was to increase the relative excess of cases in deprived areas, likely
259 due to a combination of factors – discussed below. We used data from two levels of geography to
260 assess our hypotheses, one of which covered a large number of small areas, but suffered from a
261 restricted time window and reduced regularity of data reporting, and another with a smaller number
262 of larger areas which began earlier and was available as daily counts. We thereby leveraged the
263 benefits of both datasets and provide sensitivity analyses.

264 Seeding of the COVID-19 virus into England probably occurred due to more affluent holidaymakers
265 returning from Northern Italy²¹. From there, it spread within less deprived communities first, before
266 viral spread in those areas was inhibited by lockdown. During the lockdown, residents of more
267 deprived areas suffered from higher exposure levels and higher rates of transmission⁶. For example,
268 were less able to fully isolate, due in part to more overcrowded housing, low/no sickness payments,
269 lack of access to outdoor space, greater proportions of key-workers and people in public-facing
270 roles⁶. Therefore, under movement restrictions, the virus was better able to spread within deprived
271 communities. Throughout the lockdown, the case rate inequality grew. Our findings align with the
272 fundamental causes theory proposed by Clouston *et al.* (2021) on stages of disease transmission and
273 the generation of health inequalities². However, our recent analyses of geographical inequalities in
274 mortality found that whilst death rates were higher across the first wave in more deprived areas, the
275 lock down did reduce them²².

276 Reduced viral load across the country is an important aim that benefits all inhabitants, through a
277 reduction in selection pressure on the virus, and reduced demand on healthcare. Lockdowns are an
278 effective means of achieving this aim quickly, however their potential harms need to be carefully
279 weighed, and their timings carefully considered – and to reflect both local and national need. Based
280 on our analyses, extended lockdowns may drastically increase health inequalities in case rates, for a
281 population whose risk of adverse outcomes upon infection are already greater than others²³. The
282 duration of lockdown needs to consider the prevailing case rates at the time of initiation. The higher
283 case rates are, the longer a lockdown will need to be to bring them under ‘control’. Given that
284 lockdowns increase case rate inequalities, minimising this disparity relies upon their timely initiation
285 in local areas before rates increase too much.

286 Using two different data sources to examine case rates, one at a higher geographical level but with
287 earlier, more frequent, recording, and another at a lower level but with more a restricted timespan,
288 we are able to identify patterns in local epidemics that would be hidden from one or other dataset.
289 We found significant relationships between the speed of increase and decrease of case rates with
290 IMD in LA-level data, which were not apparent in MSOA-level data. This discrepancy is likely due to
291 the differences in data structure and reporting frequency in each, where daily data allow for a larger
292 set of timepoints to examine trends compared to weekly data.

293 **Strengths and Limitations**

294 In this study we leveraged the benefits of two separate datasets of case counts to avoid issues of
295 small sample size, infrequent data recording and restricted time windows. MSOA-level data allowed
296 for a sample size of 4412 small areas, with populations likely to be more homogeneous than at larger
297 geographies. However, these data were only captured weekly beginning in March, when cases had
298 already begun to be recorded in England. We excluded many MSOAs from some analyses whose
299 cases were already declining at the earliest dates captured. To better understand the earliest phase
300 of wave 1 in England, we therefore used LA-level data, which dated back further. These data had a
301 more restrictive sample size (n=309) and covered a much larger population per area, but benefitted
302 from being recorded daily. Significant differences in speeds of growth and decline in case rates were
303 not found in MSOA-level data, despite being apparent at LA-level, likely because of restricted
304 numbers of data points per area (weekly data). In general, the analyses of each dataset were
305 similar, and combining both we were able to mitigate some of the limitations of each. The ideal data
306 for this work would be at LSOA level, daily, extending back to 2020-01-01, however such data are not
307 available for research and would suffer heavily from censoring due to low numbers.

308 Case rates in the early pandemic were likely heavily influenced by the availability of testing, which
309 was initially only available in hospitals. This will have led to underreporting of the true community
310 case rate, however such underreporting was likely similar across all areas and would therefore not
311 have meaningfully affected comparative analyses.

312

313 **Contributors**

314 FM, CB and CW designed the study. CW completed all analyses with input from FM and CB. CW, VA,
315 FM and CB all contributed to drafting the manuscript. The corresponding author attests that all listed
316 authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted. CW is
317 guarantor of the analysis.

318 **Declaration of interests**

319 All authors declare no conflicts of interest

320

321 **Data sharing statement**

322 All data used are publicly available at no cost.

323

324 **References**

- 325 1 Bambra C, Lynch J, Smith KE. Unequal Pandemic: COVID-19 and Health Inequalities. Bristol:
326 Policy Press, 2021 <https://policy.bristoluniversitypress.co.uk/the-unequal-pandemic>.
- 327 2 Clouston SAP, Natale G, Link BG. Socioeconomic inequalities in the spread of coronavirus-19
328 in the United States: A examination of the emergence of social inequalities. *Social Science
329 and Medicine* 2021; **268**: 113554.
- 330 3 Plümper T, Neumayer E. The pandemic predominantly hits poor neighbourhoods? SARS-CoV-
331 2 infections and COVID-19 fatalities in German districts. *European journal of public health*
332 2020; **30**: 1176–80.
- 333 4 NHS. COVID-19 and the Northern Powerhouse: Tackling inequalities for UK health and
334 productivity. 2020.
- 335 5 Baena-Diéz JM, Barroso M, Cordeiro-Coelho SI, Diáz JL, Grau M. Impact of COVID-19 outbreak
336 by income: Hitting hardest the most deprived. *Journal of Public Health (United Kingdom)*
337 2020; **42**: 698–703.

- 338 6 Bambra C, Riordan R, Ford J, Matthews F. The COVID-19 pandemic and health inequalities.
339 *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 2020; **74**: 964–8.
- 340 7 Public Health England. Disparities in the risk and outcomes of COVID-19. 2020; : 89.
- 341 8 Chen JT, Krieger N. Revealing the unequal burden of COVID-19 by income, race/ethnicity, and
342 household crowding: US county versus zip code analyses. *Journal of Public Health*
343 *Management and Practice* 2021; **27**: S46–56.
- 344 9 Nicodemo C, Barzin S, Cavalli N, *et al.* Measuring geographical disparities in England at the
345 time of COVID-19: results using a composite indicator of population vulnerability. *BMJ open*
346 2020; **10**: e039749.
- 347 10 Sun Y, Hu X, Xie J. Spatial inequalities of COVID-19 mortality rate in relation to socioeconomic
348 and environmental factors across England. *Science of the Total Environment* 2021; **758**.
349 DOI:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.143595.
- 350 11 Morrissey K, Spooner F, Salter J, Shaddick G. Area level deprivation and monthly COVID-19
351 cases: The impact of government policy in England. *Social Science & Medicine* 2021; **289**:
352 114413.
- 353 12 HM Government. The Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (England) Regulations
354 2020. SI 350. 2020. <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2020/350/contents/made> (accessed
355 Feb 23, 2021).
- 356 13 HM Government. The Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (No. 2) (England)
357 Regulations 2020. SI2020/684. 2020.
358 <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2020/684/contents/made> (accessed Feb 23, 2021).
- 359 14 Phelan JC, Link BG, Tehranifar P. Social Conditions as Fundamental Causes of Health
360 Inequalities: Theory, Evidence, and Policy Implications. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*
361 2010; **51**: S28–40.
- 362 15 Clouston SAP, Rubin MS, Phelan JC, Link BG. A Social History of Disease: Contextualizing the
363 Rise and Fall of Social Inequalities in Cause-Specific Mortality. *Demography* 2016; **53**: 1631–
364 56.
- 365 16 Bambra C, Barr B, Milne E. North and South: Addressing the English health divide. *Journal of*
366 *Public Health (United Kingdom)* 2014; **36**: 183–6.
- 367 17 Salvatore M, Basu D, Ray D, *et al.* Comprehensive public health evaluation of lockdown as a
368 non-pharmaceutical intervention on COVID-19 spread in India: National trends masking state-
369 level variations. *BMJ Open* 2020; **10**. DOI:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-041778.
- 370 18 Niedzwiedz CL, O'Donnell CA, Jani BD, *et al.* Ethnic and socioeconomic differences in SARS-
371 CoV2 infection in the UK Biobank cohort study. *medRxiv* 2020; : 2020.04.22.20075663.
- 372 19 Office for National Statistics. Census Geography. 2012.
373 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/geography/ukgeographies/censusgeography#output-](https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/geography/ukgeographies/censusgeography#output-area-oa)
374 [area-oa](https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/geography/ukgeographies/censusgeography#output-area-oa).
- 375 20 Ministry of Housing C& LG. English indices of deprivation. 2020.
376 <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2019>.

- 377 21 Correa-Martínez CL, Kampmeier S, Kümpers P, *et al.* A pandemic in times of global tourism:
378 Superspreading and exportation of COVID-19 cases from a ski area in Austria. *Journal of*
379 *Clinical Microbiology* 2020; **58**: 19–21.
- 380 22 Welsh CE, Albani V, Matthews FE, Bamba C. Geographical inequalities in the evolution of the
381 COVID-19 pandemic: An ecological study of inequalities in mortality in the first wave and the
382 effects of the first national lockdown in England. *medRxiv* 2021.
383 DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.23.21265415>.
- 384 23 Tian W, Jiang W, Yao J, *et al.* Predictors of mortality in hospitalized COVID-19 patients: A
385 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Medical Virology* 2020; : 1–9.
- 386
- 387