Spatial Variation in Excess Mortality Across Europe: A Cross-sectional Study of 561 Regions in 21 Countries

Florian Bonnet*[1], Pavel Grigoriev[2], Markus Sauerberg[2], Ina Alliger[2], Michael Mühlichen[2], Carlo-Giovanni Camarda[1]

Abstract

Objective
To measure the burden of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 at the subnational level by estimating excess mortality, defined as the increase in all-cause mortality relative to an expected baseline mortality level.

Design
Statistical and demographic analyses of regional all-cause mortality data.

Setting
The vital statistics systems of 21 European countries.

Participants
The entire population of 561 spatial units in 21 European countries.

Main Outcome Measures
Losses of life expectancy at ages 0 and 60 for males and females.

Results
Evidence was found of a loss in life expectancy in 391 regions, while only three regions exhibit notable gains in life expectancy in 2020. For 12 regions, losses of life expectancy amounted to more than 2 years, and three regions showed losses greater than 3 years. Geographic clusters of high mortality were found in Northern Italia, Spain and Poland, while clusters of low mortality were found in Western France, Germany/Denmark and Norway/Sweden.

Conclusions
Regional differences of loss of life expectancy are impressive, ranging from a loss of more than 4 years to a gain of 8 months. These findings provide a strong rationale for regional analysis, as national estimates hide significant regional disparities.

Keywords: COVID-19, excess mortality, Europe, spatial variation

[1] French Institute for Demographic Studies (INED), Aubervillers, France
[2] Federal Institute for Population Research (BiB), Wiesbaden, Germany
[*] Corresponding author: florian.bonnet@ined.fr, 9 cours des Humanités, 93300 Aubervilliers, France.

1. Introduction

The outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 triggered a strong reaction from public authorities, who responded in accordance with the threat that this new infectious disease entailed for the population. Despite having adopted social distancing measures that had never been seen in living memory in the 21st century, this pandemic led to most countries seeing significantly increased mortality, which the national surveillance authorities in Europe highlighted daily with their published reports [1-2]. Nowadays, the daily monitoring of the pandemic's evolution has been partially replaced by the quest to globally assess its mortality burden.

However, because these various national surveillance authorities were quickly established ad hoc to monitor the pandemic, use of the data they provide is broadly questioned for a wide range of reasons: different definitions of data among countries; time-varying collection methods; reporting delays; and diverse coverage by place of death [3-4]. In contrast, the standard official statistics systems provide all-cause deaths, which are essential for computing excess mortality, which is defined as “the difference between the number of deaths (from any cause) that occur during the pandemic and the number of deaths that would have occurred in the absence of the pandemic” [5]. Excess mortality is considered by scholars to be the gold standard for estimating the global impact of SARS-CoV-2 [6-7], which is why numerous studies have estimated excess mortality for a large number of countries [8-16].

While some of these studies evaluate the pandemic’s impact on mortality by estimating the absolute or relative numbers of excess deaths these figures are generally insufficient because they fail to consider changes in a population’s age structure. For this reason, scholars prefer looking at age-specific mortality rates instead, as they can be collapsed into a summary measure such as the age-standardized death rate or period life expectancy at birth (hereinafter, shortened to simply “life expectancy”). The latter measure might be more comprehensible because life expectancy readily expresses changes in mortality in terms of a longer or shorter average life span. Accordingly, the indicator is a popular tool for assessing the magnitude of mortality shocks, such as those incurred by the COVID-19 pandemic.

To date, most of these studies estimate excess mortality for countries as a whole, with the undeniable risk of hiding intranational differences and hindering effective health policies within a pandemic context. Hence, in recent months, many papers have estimated regional excess mortality for specific countries [17-25]. However, comparing these regional patterns is relatively problematic because these studies take different approaches to compute the mortality levels that would have occurred without the pandemic. Specifically, they either use pre-pandemic levels or employ forecasting techniques. Moreover, these papers rely on different indicators to assess excess mortality, namely life expectancy or death toll. To our knowledge, only one

study [26] allows for a simultaneous comparison of regional excess deaths in five European countries (Italy, Switzerland, Spain, Greece, England, and Wales) in 2020.

Our paper aims to fill this research gap by presenting life expectancy losses at birth in 2020 for 561 regions from 21 countries in Central and Western Europe. In dealing with small geographical areas, we focus on point-estimates as much as on uncertainty quantification. In order to obtain the mortality levels that would have been observed in 2020 in the absence of the pandemic, we took a robust forecasting approach that accounts for regional diversity and delivers analytic confidence intervals that account for all sources of uncertainty [27]. Furthermore, this study also identifies geographical clusters of high and low losses of life expectancy.

2. Data and Methods

2.1. Data Preparation

We collected regional death and population counts for 21 European countries by age and sex from the national statistical offices, Eurostat, and the Human Mortality Database [28]. Since these data show varying age classes, we harmonized them into single-age intervals up to 95+ for all spatial units [29]. To ensure consistency in size when selecting spatial units among the 21 countries, we thus relied on mostly NUTS 3 (Czechia, Denmark, France, Italy, Luxembourg Slovakia, Spain, Sweden) and NUTS 2 levels (Austria, Belgium, Hungary, Iceland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Switzerland, Slovenia, England, Wales). As exceptions, we used NUTS 1 for Ireland, Northern Ireland, and Scotland; and, for Germany, a national classification ("Raumordnungsregionen"). Minor adjustments were required due to territorial changes over time and data availability issues (see online supplementary Appendix A, Table 1 for details). In total, we analysed 561 harmonized spatial units containing populations ranging from 40,000 (Bornholm, Denmark) to 6,760,000 (Madrid, Spain).

Finally, we verified the data quality by comparing our regional data (aggregated at the national level) with those available in the Human Mortality Database.

2.2 Methodology

When dealing with excess mortality, a central methodological issue concerns estimating the baseline mortality level, which is what would have been the expected level in the absence of the pandemic. Pre-pandemic mortality levels are often used as the baseline because they are easy to obtain and compute. However, because such a simplistic approach frequently ignores temporal trends, it is necessary to derive a more suitable expected mortality level in the absence of COVID-19 by forecasting pre-pandemic historical trends for the year affected by the pandemic (here, 2020). Among the numerous methodologies currently available (e.g., [30]), we

opted for a CP-spline approach [31], which combines two-dimensional P-splines with prior demographic information derived from population-specific historical patterns.

A significant advantage to taking a non-parametric approach like that of CP-splines lies in its great flexibility for describing various mortality scenarios, which becomes particularly relevant when dealing with 561 diverse subpopulations across 21 European countries. Furthermore, smooth, plausible age profiles and time trends are ensured while we gain the added advantage of robustness when analysing small populations at risk. Moreover, the relatively low computation costs of CP-splines allow us to optimize region-specific time windows for our 2020 forecast values.

It is essential to quantify uncertainty before drawing any conclusions on excess mortality levels, particularly when dealing with regional mortality data. The error associated with the forecasting procedure must be added to the uncertainty around the observed 2020 mortality levels. Whereas the variance-covariance structure from CP-splines allows us to compute confidence intervals for our forecast values, a fully analytic procedure is used to compute uncertainty around the observed 2020 mortality levels. These two sources of uncertainty are then combined without performing any simulation or bootstrap procedures, thereby considerably reducing computational costs and time.

It is noteworthy that the whole procedure can be performed for any given age and regardless of the mortality indicator selected for estimating excess mortality (e.g., life expectancy or age-standardized death rate). More details on this approach can be found in [27]. All calculations are performed in R [32].

To identify any spatial clustering of losses of life expectancy, we rely on the Getis-Ord Gi* statistic [33], which allows us to locate hot and cold spots, that is, neighbouring areas of high concentration spatial units with either large or small loss of life expectancy. In practice, Gi* is calculated for all estimated losses of life expectancy in our dataset, and the resultant z-scores and p-values are evaluated within a defined neighbourhood. Here, we used the contiguity edges corners definition of neighbourhood, which specifically considers neighbours to be units that share a boundary, share a node, or overlap. To be a statistically significant hot spot, a spatial unit should not only have a high value, but also be surrounded by other units with high values. The local sum for a given unit and its neighbours is evaluated against the sum of all spatial units. If the observed local sum is very different from the expected local sum, then this difference is not the result of random chance, and the corresponding z-score is statistically significant. The same logic is applied for identifying cold spots.

All spatial data analyses were performed using *ArcMap* software [34]. Shapefiles were collected from Eurostat [35] and were re-projected using the *Winkel tripel* projection.

3. Results

Figure 1 shows the spatial distribution of losses of life expectancy at birth across 561 territorial units in 21 European countries during 2020. Light blue represents gains in life expectancy compared to expected values, whereas the remaining colours indicate life expectancy losses. Among all the countries considered in our analysis, those most affected by the pandemic appear to be Italy, Spain, and Poland. In most Polish regions as well as in many Spanish and Italian regions, losses in both male and female life expectancy amounted to more than 1 year. This fall in life expectancy observed within just one calendar year is unprecedented in 21st century Europe [8]. Interestingly, although the Italian and Spanish regions experienced the most substantial losses of life expectancy, they are also notably among the areas with the highest longevity in Europe (see online supplementary Appendix A, Figures A1 and A2). In contrast, most regions in Denmark, Germany, Norway, and western France, as well as some rural areas in Sweden, showed only moderate declines or even slight increases in life expectancy in 2020 compared to their expected values.

Although previous works could only show national differences in excess mortality associated with the COVID-19 pandemic, our regional analysis is able to highlight substantial within-country variations at the subnational level. Italy represents a notable example, with the whole country showing a loss of life expectancy at birth of 1.16 years for both sexes combined. However, this national value conceals both a loss of 4.18 years in the Bergamo province in the north (CI: −3.95; −4.4) and a gain of 0.4 years (CI: −0.17; 0.92) in the Sicilian province of Caltanissetta. Moreover, we can see in Figure 3 that 95% confidence intervals are plotted along estimated excess mortality in life expectancy at birth. Other examples of remarkable subnational differences can be found in France and the United Kingdom. In the former case, higher excess mortality is visible in the north-east compared to the south-west regions. In the latter, Scotland shows a moderate gain, unlike the central parts of England that experience high losses. Spatial variation is also evident in Germany, a country with relatively better performance during the first pandemic wave in 2020. Specifically, its eastern and south-eastern regions bordering Poland, Czechia, and Austria show higher life expectancy losses than the rest of the country.

In contrast, although Poland shows life expectancy losses similar to Italy (1.32 year), there is considerably less subnational variation between the highest and lowest affected regions, with Jeleniogorski in the south showing a loss of 0.7 years (CI: −0.16; −1.09) and Przemyski in the east a loss of 2.17 years (CI: −1.7; −2.65).

The analysis of spatial distribution of losses of life expectancy at age 60 has revealed very similar results (online supplementary Appendix A, Figure A3).



Figure 1. Spatial distribution of losses of life expectancy at birth (years) across 21 European countries in 2020 Source: As shown in Table A1.

Our next step was to analyse the hot and cold spots for losses of life expectancy at birth (Figure 2) and at age 60 (online supplementary Appendix A, Figure A4). This analysis statistically confirms our previous visual inspection: Hot spots of life expectancy losses were indeed located in northern Italy and covered most of the Polish and Spanish territory; whereas cold spots were located in Denmark, Germany, western France, and Norway. Furthermore, our analysis identifies several small clusters of elevated excess mortality expanding across national borders. One example can be seen in an area covering parts of northern Italy and southern Switzerland, and – at least among women – spreading into eastern France. Another cross-national hot spot expands from southern Poland into eastern Czechia and – again, among women – into northern Slovakia. These observations may well indicate possible spill-over effects of the pandemic burden across European countries.

Figure 3 ranks the life expectancy losses and shows the associated 95% confidence intervals (CI) for all 561 spatial units. This figure also allows us to visually assess the magnitude of uncertainty around point estimates. The Panel A colours correspond to the colours and cut points presented in Figure 1. Panels B and C depict the top and bottom 30 regions, respectively. Figures A5 and A6 in the online supplementary Appendix A separately show the same distributions for men and women.

Figure 3 also reveals the large regional variability in excess mortality across Europe. The aforementioned Italian Bergamo province experienced the highest loss of life expectancy, amounting to 4.18 years (CI: −3.95; −4.4); whereas the Ariège department in France benefited from the highest gain of 0.65 years (CI: −0.13; 1.45). Only a few regions experienced life expectancy gains for which the 95% confidence intervals do not include 0: Devon, Cornwall, and Scilly Island in the UK; and Nordjylland in Denmark. Overall, 391 out of 561 regions suffered consequential life expectancy losses, meaning that the associated 95% confidence intervals do not contain 0. The tail of the distribution (Panel C) is dominated by northern Italian and central Spanish regions. Among those harshly hit by the pandemic, 12 regions experienced losses of life expectancy greater than 2 years, with the Italian provinces of Piacenza, Cremona, and Bergamo experiencing more than 3 years of losses. As expected, the group of regions least affected by the pandemic (Panel B) is dominated by German, French, and Danish spatial units. However, this successful group also includes some Italian and UK regions. The numerical values of losses of life expectancy at birth and at age 60 for each spatial unit and for both females and males are provided in the online supplementary Appendix B.



Figure 2. Hot and cold spots of losses of life expectancy at birth across 21 European countries in 2020 Source: As shown in Table A1.



Figure 3. Excess mortality associated with COVID-19 pandemic across 561 spatial units in 21 European countries, 2020, both sexes combined Source: As shown in Table A1. Notes: 1) Excess mortality is estimated as the difference between observed and expected life expectancy at birth 2) Vertical bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

In addition to revealing intranational heterogeneity and cross-national patterns, using subnational data has the advantage of enabling a deeper analysis of excess mortality. Moreover, the uncommonly large number of spatial units also increases statistical power in these supplementary analyses. For instance, we can easily assess sex differences in life expectancy loss and examine their association. Figure 4 presents the outcomes from this closer examination, with losses in female life expectancy plotted against the corresponding male values.

The diagonal line in Figure 4 represents the situation of perfect equality, that is, losses of life expectancy are equal for both males and females. Points located in the upper triangle (above the diagonal) depict regions with greater losses among males, whereas the points in the lower triangle (below the diagonal) refer to regions in which females experienced greater losses than males. Despite a strong statistical association between male and female losses (Pearson correlation coefficient $r = 0.768$), most of the points are located above the diagonal, thus suggesting a general tendency for greater losses among males.

Our diagnosis of the outliers is particularly interesting. Here, we identify outliers from a model that assumes greater losses among males, which remains invariant throughout the harsh course of the pandemic. Notably, nearly all outliers among regions with greater losses of males belong to areas identified as hot spots (Italy, Poland, Spain). Nevertheless, some outliers also show greater female losses, and these are located predominantly in France.



Figure 4. Association between male and female losses of life expectancy at birth across 561 spatial units in 21 European countries, 2020 Source: As shown in Table A1.

4. Discussion

Statement of principal findings

This large study of 561 territorial units in 21 countries uses loss of life expectancy to measure the burden of COVID-19 in 2020 throughout Western and Central Europe. Our findings show evidence of losses in 391 regions, while only three regions exhibit notable gains in life expectancy during the first year of pandemic. Overall, those most affected were central Spain, northern Italy, and eastern Poland, while Denmark, western France, Germany, and Norway were somewhat spared from the COVID-19 burden. Regional differences in life expectancy changes were impressive, ranging from a loss of more than 4 years to a gain of 8 months. For 12 regions, losses of life expectancy amounted to more than 2 years, and three regions showed losses greater than 3 years.

This study further reveals that regional differences in excess mortality were also highly substantial within some countries. In Italy, for example, we estimated a 4-year life expectancy loss in the Bergamo province but no loss in the Caltanissetta province. However, the regional differences in one country can differ greatly from those in another. For example, although Italy and Poland both have similar losses of life expectancy at birth at the national level, the gap between the highest and lowest afflicted regions is three times larger in Italy than in Poland.

Geographic clusters identify where life expectancy was much lower than expected (hot spot), and others where life expectancy was in line with expectations (cold spot). Notwithstanding, these analyses pinpoint clusters where excess mortality expanded beyond national borders in certain European areas: The hot spots observed in northern Italy spilled over into southern Switzerland and eastern France, and other hot spots observed in Poland spilled over into northern Slovakia and eastern Czechia. Meanwhile, this study singles out a cold spot located in two nearby countries (Germany and Denmark).

We observe differences between women and men in their life expectancy losses in 2020. In most analysed regions, reduced life expectancy was greater among men. For example, in the worst hit regions in northern Italy and central Spain, men's losses were more than 1 year higher as compared to their female counterparts. Yet, our results also reveal more pronounced life expectancy losses for women in many European regions where drops in life expectancy were more moderate. This is often overlooked when studying excess mortality at the national level, and it constitutes an important new finding, as it suggests that the degree of mortality deterioration is not necessarily linked to biological sex.

Strengths and limitations of the study

This study is the first to use a large set of small territorial units to provide estimates of loss of life expectancy during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. The contiguity of the regions investigated has allowed us to accurately identify geographic clusters of elevated mortality. This approach is novel because most previous studies have focused primarily on single-country regions or on regions in various countries with no common borders.

Contrary to many other studies on COVID-19-related deaths, we estimated losses of life expectancy using official mortality data routinely collected by vital registration systems, which are less sensitive to reporting delays and misclassification. To verify that each country's sums of its regional data were consistent for all ages, we verified them with data from the Human Mortality Database. This is especially crucial, not only for calculating outcomes at older ages, which require statistical techniques to obtain single-year-of-age data, but also considering how COVID-19 was particularly dangerous for older individuals. Finally, we computed baseline mortality using an up-to-date statistical methodology that optimizes the time windows in our models for forecasting regional-specific trends in 2020. We compared our country-specific estimates with results from previous studies in order to evaluate our findings in terms of reliability. Our estimates losses in life expectancy are consistent with results from Aburto et al. [8] and Islam et al. [14] (see table A2).

Our study also has several limitations. It covers 21 Central and Western European countries and still cannot be extended to Eastern European countries. However, comparisons with these countries would have been interesting insofar as this global health crisis triggered different political responses. Furthermore, this study covers only the year 2020. Given the experience gained by policymakers during the first waves of the pandemic and the emergence of new variants, the results for 2021 and 2022 should be different. As soon as more up-to-date data become available, the analyses we performed can be easily extended along both the spatial and temporal dimensions.

While our adopted forecast approach is robust and flexible enough to be adapted to different demographic scenarios and relatively small populations, we model each spatial unit independently and without considering spatial autocorrelation. By including a spatial structure in modelling and forecasting mortality, this may eventually reduce uncertainty around excess mortality estimates and thus lead to more explicit outcomes. In order to avoid underestimating excess mortality, it is paramount to account for temporal trends when estimating baseline mortality. However, other approaches in computing baseline mortality level have been proposed [36-38], and these could be adopted in order to obtain alternative perspectives.

Policy implications and future research

Our study extends the existing literature on excess mortality during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 by reporting results at the regional level for many European countries, which has not been done so far. The findings provide a strong rationale for this regional analysis, as we show that national estimates would have hidden significant regional disparities. Policymakers should be made aware of this intranational heterogeneity in order to fully assess the burden of the pandemic in their own countries and adopt differentiated health policy responses.

While our study quantifies regional differences in excess mortality, it cannot provide avenues for explaining them. The first step toward doing so would be to link these estimates to regional contextual variables (such as income level or occupational structure) as well as to public policies of social distancing and international isolation, which were implemented at both regional and national levels. Eventually, ecological analyses should be complemented with carefully designed epidemiological studies. In this way, one will be able to highlight the decisive factors explaining these regional differences and ultimately gain a better understanding of how to deal with the spread of a new infectious disease. For example, the exceptional mortality observed in northern Italy might be due to the early onset of the pandemic, which triggered a strong public response from the Italian government that limited the spread of the pandemic to the southern parts of the country [39].

It should be emphasized that this study estimates the burden of the pandemic by calculating excess mortality, which is the overall net assessment of the pandemic's impact on society and must be distinguished from the mortality count due to COVID-19. More specifically, the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME) considers excess mortality to be influenced by six drivers related to the pandemic and the response to it, which are namely: (i) deaths directly related to SARS-CoV-2 infection; (ii) increased mortality due to cancelling or postponing care; (iii) increased mortality due to mental health problems, including depression, increased alcohol use, and increased opiate use; (iv) reduced mortality from decreases in accidents because of reduced mobility; (v) reduced mortality due to reduced transmission of other viruses, including influenza; and (vi) reduced mortality from many chronic diseases such as cardiovascular and respiratory diseases that would have killed frail individuals had COVID-19 not killed them instead. When detailed cause-of-death statistics become available, an accurate assessment must be made of COVID-19 mortality, as well as the distinction between direct and indirect COVID-19 mortality.

Finally, this study critically depends on reliable data being made available from the national statistical institutes of the different European countries analysed here. The magnitude of our presented results should encourage policymakers to promptly provide regional data in order to better measure the burden of future epidemics in a timely fashion. In order to produce accurate analyses in times of demographic ageing, it is of utmost importance to harmonize the European populations and

mortality data with standardized age groups and an oldest age-class above at least 100 years.

Acknowledgments

We are very grateful to Markéta Majerová, Rok Hrzic, Magdalena Muszyńska-Spielauer, and Mathias Lerch for providing, respectively, Czech, Slovenian, Austrian, and Swiss data.

References

[1] A. Caporali, J. Garcia, É. Couppié, S. Poniakina, M. Barbieri, F. Bonnet, C. G. Camarda, E. Cambois, I. Hourani, D. Korotkova et others, “The demography of COVID-19 deaths database, a gateway to well-documented international data,” *Scientific Data,* vol. 9, pp. 1–9, 2022.

[2] T. Riffe, E. Acosta et COVerAGE-DB team, “Data Resource Profile: COVerAGE-DB: a global demographic database of COVID-19 cases and deaths,” *International Journal of Epidemiology,* vol. 50, pp. 390–390f, 2021.

[3] J. Garcia, C. Torres, M. Barbieri, E. Cambois, C. G. Camarda, A. Caporali, F. Meslé, S. Poniakina et J.-M. Robine, “Differences in COVID-19 Mortality: the implications of imperfect and diverse data collection systems,” *Population,* vol. 76, pp. 35–72, 2021.

[4] E. B. Pathak, R. B. Garcia, J. M. Menard et J. L. Salemi, “Out-of-hospital COVID-19 deaths: consequences for quality of medical care and accuracy of cause of death coding,” *American Journal of Public Health,* vol. 111, pp. S101–S106, 2021.

[5] S. Helleringer et B. L. Queiroz, “Commentary: Measuring excess mortality due to the COVID-19 pandemic: progress and persistent challenges,” *International Journal of Epidemiology,* vol. 51, pp. 85–87, 2022.

[6] T. Beaney, J. M. Clarke, V. Jain, A. K. Golestaneh, G. Lyons, D. Salman et A. Majeed, “Excess mortality: the gold standard in measuring the impact of COVID-19 worldwide?,” *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine,* vol. 113, pp. 329–334, 2020.

[7] A. Karlinsky et D. Kobak, “Tracking excess mortality across countries during the COVID-19 pandemic with the World Mortality Dataset,” *eLife,* vol. 10, p. e69336, 2021.

[8] J. M. Aburto, J. Schöley, I. Kashnitsky, L. Zhang, C. Rahal, T. I. Missov, M. C. Mills, J. B. Dowd et R. Kashyap, “Quantifying impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic through life-expectancy losses: a population-level study of 29 countries,” *International Journal of Epidemiology,* vol. 51, pp. 63–74, 2022.

[9] S. Mazzuco et S. Campostrini, “Life expectancy drop in 2020. Estimates based on Human Mortality Database,” *PLoS ONE,* vol. 17, p. e0262846, 2022.

[10] J. Aburto, J. Schöley, I. Kashnitsky et R. Kashyap, “Life expectancy declines in Russia during the Covid-19 pandemic in 2020,” *International Journal of Epidemiology,* vol. 51, pp. 1695–1697, 2022.

[11] J. M. Aburto, R. Kashyap, J. Schöley, C. Angus, J. Ermisch, M. C. Mills et J. B. Dowd, “Estimating the burden of the Covid-19 pandemic on mortality, life expectancy and lifespan inequality in England and Wales: a population-level analysis,” *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health,* vol. 75, pp. 735–740, 2021.

[12] C. Peretz, N. Rotem, L. Keinan-Boker, A. Furshpan, M. Green, M. Bitan et D. M. Steinberg, “Excess mortality in Israel associated with COVID-19 in 2020–2021 by age group and with estimates based on daily mortality patterns in 2000–2019,” *International Journal of Epidemiology,* vol. 51, pp. 727–736, 2022.

[13] E. Kontopantelis, M. A. Mamas, J. Deanfield, M. Asaria et T. Doran, “Excess mortality in England and Wales during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic,” *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health,* vol. 75, pp. 213–223, 2021.

[14] N. Islam, D. A. Jdanov, V. M. Shkolnikov, K. Khunti, I. Kawachi, M. White, S. Lewington

et B. Lacey, “Effects of Covid-19 pandemic on life expectancy and premature mortality in 2020: time series analysis in 37 countries,” *BMJ,* vol. 375, p. e066768, 2021.

[15] B. Kowall, F. Standl, F. Oesterling, B. Brune, M. Brinkmann, M. Dudda, P. Pflaumer, K.-H. Jöckel et A. Stang, “Excess mortality due to Covid-19? A comparison of total mortality in 2020 with total mortality in 2016 to 2019 in Germany, Sweden and Spain,” *Plos one,* vol. 16, p. e0255540, 2021.

[16] W. Msemburi, A. Karlinsky, V. Knutson, S. Aleshin-Guendel, S. Chatterji et J. Wakefield, “The WHO estimates of excess mortality associated with the COVID-19 pandemic,” *Nature,* pp. 1–8, 2022.

[17] E. A. L. Gianicolo, A. Russo, B. Büchler, K. Taylor, A. Stang et M. Blettner, “Gender specific excess mortality in Italy during the COVID-19 pandemic accounting for age,” *European Journal of Epidemiology,* vol. 36, pp. 213–218, 2021.

[18] M. Blangiardo, M. Cameletti, M. Pirani, G. Corsetti, M. Battaglini et G. Baio, “Estimating weekly excess mortality at sub-national level in Italy during the COVID-19 pandemic,” *PLoS ONE,* vol. 15, p. e0240286, 2020.

[19] S. Trias-Llimós, T. Riffe et U. Bilal, “Monitoring life expectancy levels during the COVID-19 pandemic: Example of the unequal impact of the first wave on Spanish regions,” *PLoS ONE,* vol. 15, p. e0241952, 2020.

[20] I. Locatelli et V. Rousson, “A first analysis of excess mortality in Switzerland in 2020,” *PLoS One,* vol. 16, p. e0253505, 2021.

[21] D. M. Weinberger, J. Chen, T. Cohen, W. Crawford, F. Mostashari, D. Olson, V. E. Pitzer, N. G. Reich, M. Russi, L. Simonsen, A. Watkins et C. Viboud, “Estimation of excess deaths associated with the COVID-19 pandemic in the United States, March to May 2020,” *JAMA Internal Medicine,* vol. 180, pp. 1336–1344, 2020.

[22] L. Cuéllar, I. Torres, E. Romero-Severson, R. Mahesh, N. Ortega, S. Pungitore, N. Hengartner et R. Ke, “Excess deaths reveal the true spatial, temporal and demographic impact of COVID-19 on mortality in Ecuador,” *International Journal of Epidemiology,* vol. 51, pp. 54–62, 2022.

[23] U. Basellini, D. Alburez-Gutierrez, E. Del Fava, D. Perrotta, M. Bonetti, C. G. Camarda et E. Zagheni, “Linking excess mortality to mobility data during the first wave of COVID-19 in England and Wales,” *Social Science & Medicine - Population Health,* vol. 14, p. 100799, 2021.

[24] M. Scortichini, R. Schneider dos Santos, F. De’Donato, M. De Sario, P. Michelozzi, M. Davoli, P. Masselot, F. Sera et A. Gasparrini, “Excess mortality during the COVID-19 outbreak in Italy: a two-stage interrupted time-series analysis,” *International Journal of Epidemiology,* vol. 49, pp. 1909–1917, 2021.

[25] A. D. Iuliano, H. H. Chang, N. N. Patel, R. Threlkel, K. Kniss, J. Reich, M. Steele, A. J. Hall, A. M. Fry et C. Reed, “Estimating under-recognized COVID-19 deaths, United States, march 2020 - may 2021 using an excess mortality modelling approach,” *The Lancet Regional Health-Americas,* vol. 1, p. 100019, 2021.

[26] G. Konstantinoudis, M. Cameletti, V. Gómez-Rubio, I. L. Gómez, M. Pirani, G. Baio, A. Larrauri, J. Riou, M. Egger, P. Vineis et others, “Regional excess mortality during the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic in five European countries,” *Nature communications,* vol. 13, pp. 1–11, 2022.

[27] F. Bonnet et C. G. Camarda, “Estimating Subnation Excess Mortality in Times of

Pandemic. An application to French Departements in 2020.," *medRxiv,* 2022.

[28] M. Barbieri, J. R. Wilmoth, V. M. Shkolnikov, D. Glei, D. Jasilionis, D. Jdanov, C. Boe, T. Riffe, P. Grigoriev et C. Winant, "Data resource profile: the human mortality database (HMD)," *International journal of epidemiology,* vol. 44, pp. 1549–1561, 2015.

[29] M. D. Pascariu, M. J. Dańko, J. Schöley et S. Rizzi, "Ungroup: An R package for efficient estimation of smooth distributions from coarsely binned data," *Journal of Open Source Software,* vol. 3, p. 937, 2018.

[30] R. D. Lee et L. R. Carter, "Modeling and forecasting US mortality," *Journal of the American statistical association,* vol. 87, pp. 659–671, 1992.

[31] C. G. Camarda, "Smooth Constrained Mortality Forecasting," *Demographic Research,* vol. 41, pp. 1091–1130, 2019.

[32] R. D. C. Team, "R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing," Vienna, 2022.

[33] J. K. Ord et A. Getis, "Local spatial autocorrelation statistics: distributional issues and an application," *Geographical analysis,* vol. 27, pp. 286–306, 1995.

[34] C. E. S. R. I. Redlands, *ArcGIS Desktop: Release 10,* 2011.

[35] *Eurostat, "NUTS geographical information". The Geographic Information System of the Commission, 2021.*

[36] M. R. Nepomuceno, I. Klimkin, D. A. Jdanov, A. Alustiza-Galarza et V. M. Shkolnikov, "Sensitivity analysis of excess mortality due to the COVID-19 pandemic," *Population and Development Review,* 2022.

[37] V. M. Shkolnikov, I. Klimkin, M. McKee, D. A. Jdanov, A. Alustiza-Galarza, L. Németh, S. A. Timonin, M. R. Nepomuceno, E. M. Andreev et D. A. Leon, "What should be the baseline when calculating excess mortality? New approaches suggest that we have underestimated the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and previous winter peaks," *SSM-population health,* vol. 18, p. 101118, 2022.

[38] J. Schöley, "Robustness and bias of European excess death estimates in 2020 under varying model specifications," *MedRxiv,* 2021.

[39] U. Basellini et C. G. Camarda, "Explaining regional differences in mortality during the first wave of Covid-19 in Italy," *Population Studies,* vol. 76, pp. 99–118, 2022.

Online Supplementary Appendix A

Table A1: Regional division, sources, data information and adjustments by country

Country	Spatial units	Source	Period	Upper age limit	Adjustments/comments
Austria	9 NUTS 2 units (‘Länder’)	Statistics Austria	1990–2020	Deaths: 90 Pop.: 100	–
Belgium	11 NUTS 2 units (‘provincies’)	Belgian Statistical Office	1992–2020	Deaths: 100 Pop.: 100	–
Czechia	14 NUTS 3 units (‘kraje’)	Czech Statistical Office	1996–2020	Deaths: 95 Pop.: 95	–
Denmark	11 NUTS 3 units (‘landsdele’)	Statistics Denmark	2008–2020	Deaths: 100 Pop.: 100	–
France	95 NUTS 3 units (‘départements’)	INSEE	1970–2020	Deaths: 105 Pop.: 105 (after 2016: 95)	Non-European areas excluded; north and south of Corse merged to maintain consistent time series
Germany	96 ROR (‘Raumordnungs-regionen’)	Statistical Offices of the German Länder	1992–2020	Deaths: 90 Pop.: 90	Harmonized to apply current territorial administrative division (as of Dec 2022) to the whole study period and to eliminate the Census 2011 break; 400 NUTS 3 units (‘Kreise’) aggregated to 96 ROR units according to classification of BBSR (2017)
Hungary	8 NUTS 2 units (‘tervezési-statisztikai régiók’)	Hungarian Central Statistical Office, Eurostat	2001–2020	Deaths: 90 Pop.: 90	–
Iceland	1 NUTS 2 unit	Human Mortality Database	1970–2020	Deaths: 110 Pop.: 110	–

Ireland	1 NUTS 1 unit	Human Mortality Database	1990–2020	Deaths: 110 Pop.: 110	No subnational division due to data availability issues
Italy	92 NUTS 3 units (‘province’)	ISTAT	1995–2020	Deaths: 100 Pop.: 100	We merged the following regions to maintain a consistent time series: 1) Biella + Vercelli, 2) Novara + Verbano, 3) Como + Lecco, 4) Milano + Lodi + Monza + Brianza, 5) Rimini + Forli-Cesena, 5) Firenze + Prato, 6) Cagliari + Medio Campidano + Carbonia-Iglesias + Ogliastra + Oristano + Nuoro, 7) Sassari + Olbia-Tempio, 8) Foggia + Bari + Barletta, 9) Fermo + Ascoli-Piceno, 10) Crotone + Vibo Valentia + Cantanzaro.
Luxembourg	1 NUTS 3 unit	Human Mortality Database	1996–2020	Deaths: 110 Pop.: 110	–
Netherlands	11 NUTS 2 units (‘provincies’)	Statistics Netherlands	2001–2020	Deaths: 100 Pop.: 100	–
Norway	7 NUTS 2 units (‘landsdeler’)	Statistics Norway	2000–2020	Deaths: 100 Pop.: 105	Harmonized to apply current territorial administrative divisions; we excluded remote islands Svalbard and Jan Mayen
Poland	73 NUTS 3 units (‘podregiony’)	Statistics Poland	2006–2020	Deaths: 85 Pop.: 85 (until 2005: 65)	–
Portugal	5 NUTS 2 units (‘regiões’)	National Institute of Statistics, Eurostat	1992–2020	Deaths: 85 Pop.: 95	For visibility reasons, we excluded the remote islands Azores and Madeira.
Slovakia	8 NUTS 3 units (‘kraje’)	Slovakian Statistical Office	1996–2020	Deaths: 85 Pop.: 110	–
Slovenia	2 NUTS 2 units (‘kohezijske	Slovenian Statistical Office	2002–2020	Deaths: 100 Pop.: 100	–

	regije')				
Spain	50 NUTS 3 units ('provincias')	National Statistics Institute	1990–2020	Deaths: 100 Pop.: 100 (until 2001:85)	For visibility reasons, we excluded the Canary Islands.
Sweden	21 NUTS 3 units ('län')	Statistics Sweden	1969–2020	Deaths: 100 Pop.: 100	–
Switzerland	7 NUTS 2 units ('Grossregionen')	Federal Statistical Office	1991–2020	Deaths: 95 Pop.: 100	–
United Kingdom	37 NUTS 2 regions	Office for National Statistics (for England & Wales); Human Mortality Database (for Northern Ireland & Scotland)	2002–2020	England & Wales Deaths: 90 Pop.: 90 Northern Ireland & Scotland Deaths: 110 Pop.: 110	NUTS 1 level data for Northern Ireland and Scotland due to data quality issues

Table A2: Comparison of estimated life expectancy changes with previous studies

	Difference in e0, females			Difference in e0, males		
Country	**Aburto et al. 2022**	**Islam et al. 2021**	**This paper**	**Aburto et al. 2022**	**Islam et al. 2021**	**This paper**
Austria	-0.67 (-0.83,-0.53)	-0.62 (-0.75,-0.51)	-0.55 (-0.71,-0.39)	-0.81 (-0.98,-0.65)	-0.84 (-0.96,-0.72)	-0.80 (-0.98,-0.63)
Belgium	-1.14 (-1.29,-1.01)	-1.11 (-1.26,-0.96)	-0.92 (-1.03,-0.80)	-1.19 (-1.33,-1.05)	-1.31 (-1.42,-1.20)	-1.14 (-1.27,-1.02)
Bulgaria	-1.29 (-1.45,-1.10)	-1.37 (-1.74,-1.01)	NA	-1.60 (-1.81,-1.41)	-1.96 (-2.11,-1.81)	NA
Switzerland	-0.65 (-0.80,-0.47)	-0.57 (-0.71,-0.43)	-0.53 (-0.69,-0.38)	-0.97 (-1.14,-0.81)	-1.05 (-1.28,-0.83)	-1.03 (-1.20,-0.86)
Chile	-0.85 (-1.01,-0.68)	-0.88 (-1.28,-0.50)	NA	-1.27 (-1.42,-1.14)	-1.64 (-1.97,-1.32)	NA
Czech Rep.	-0.90 (-1.05,-0.75)	-0.94 (-1.09,-0.79)	-0.94 (-1.06,-0.82)	-1.10 (-1.24,-0.95)	-1.26 (-1.36,-1.15)	-1.20 (-1.36,-1.03)
Germany	-0.23 (-0.28,-0.18)	-0.17 (-0.46,+0.12)	-0.16 (-0.23,-0.09)	-0.38 (-0.44,-0.32)	-0.46 (-0.67,-0.25)	-0.31 (-0.39,-0.24)
Denmark	+0.07 (-0.14,+0.28)	-0.09 (-0.2,+0.03)	+0.02 (-0.15,+0.18)	+0.05 (-0.14,+0.27)	-0.09 (-0.19,+0.00)	-0.01 (-0.18,+0.17)
Estonia	-0.43 (-0.87,-0.02)	-0.52 (-0.61,-0.43)	NA	-0.41 (-0.90,+0.05)	-0.75 (-1.00,-0.50)	NA
Spain	-1.50 (-1.58,-1.43)	-1.13 (-1.37,-0.90)	-1.13 (-1.21,-1.05)	-1.44 (-1.51,-1.36)	-1.35 (-1.53,-1.18)	-1.36 (-1.45,-1.26)
Finland	+0.01 (-0.19,+0.21)	-0.03 (-0.13,+0.06)	NA	-0.14 (-0.39,+0.07)	-0.34 (-0.42,-0.25)	NA
France	-0.60 (-0.66,-0.54)	-0.67 (-0.84,-0.51)	-0.49 (-0.57,-0.41)	-0.67 (-0.74,-0.61)	-0.53 (-0.66,-0.40)	-0.76 (-0.86,-0.68)
Eng. and W.	-0.91 (-0.98,-0.85)	-0.80 (-0.99,-0.62)	NA	-1.14 (-1.21,-1.08)	-1.20 (-1.35,-1.04)	NA
N. Ireland	-0.81 (-1.14,-0.43)	-0.62 (-0.85,-0.40)	-0.80 (-1.09,-0.52)	-0.76 (-1.14,-0.36)	-1.07 (-1.39,-0.76)	-0.92 (-1.23,-0.61)
Scotland	-0.51 (-0.73,-0.28)	-0.54 (-0.71,-0.36)	-0.45 (-0.63,-0.27.)	-1.06 (-1.28,-0.85)	-1.24 (-1.45,-1.03)	-0.98 (-1.19,-0.77)
Greece	-0.23 (-0.37,-0.08)	-0.34 (-0.55,-0.15)	NA	-0.36 (-0.52,-0.19)	-0.46 (-0.61,-0.30)	NA
Croatia	-0.83 (-1.10,-0.61)	-0.72 (-0.92,-0.51)	NA	-0.83 (-1.07,-0.58)	-0.92 (-1.09,-0.75)	NA
Hungary	-0.65 (-0.78,-0.51)	-0.79 (-0.94,-0.64)	-0.73 (-0.88,-0.58)	-0.71 (-0.87,-0.55)	-0.97 (-1.07,-0.87)	-0.88 (-1.05,-0.70)
Iceland	-0.07 (-0.95,+0.90)	+0.05 (-0.34,+0.44)	+0.00 (-0.59,+0.58)	-0.20 (-1.18,+0.84)	-0.26 (-0.74,+0.19)	-0.22 (-0.90,+0.46)
Italy	-1.01 (-1.07,-0.95)	-1.05 (-1.33,-0.77)	-0.85 (-0.93,-0.78)	-1.25 (-1.31,-1.18)	-1.56 (-1.80,-1.34)	-1.36 (-1.45,-1.28)
Lithuania	-1.26 (-1.54,-0.97)	-1.21 (-1.36,-1.05)	NA	-1.69 (-2.00,-1.36)	-1.83 (-2.07,-1.59)	NA
Netherlands	-0.57 (-0.68,-0.46)	-0.66 (-0.76,-0.56)	-0.46 (-0.56,-0.36)	-0.80 (-0.92,-0.68)	-1.03 (-1.14,-0.92)	-0.89 (-1.00,-0.78)
Norway	+0.18 (-0.04,+0.40)	+0.07 (-0.01,+0.14)	-0.05 (-0.20,+0.10)	+0.18 (-0.04,+0.42)	+0.06 (+0.00,+0.13)	-0.26 (-0.44,-0.09)
Poland	-1.07 (-1.15,-1.00)	-1.02 (-1.16,-0.89)	-1.04 (-1.13,-0.95)	-1.50 (-1.58,-1.41)	-1.54 (-1.67,-1.41)	-1.57 (-1.68,-1.46)
Portugal	-0.69 (-0.84,-0.54)	-0.78 (-0.94,-0.61)	-0.60 (-0.72,-0.48)	-0.83 (-1.02,-0.67)	-0.93 (-1.03,-0.84)	-0.76 (-0.92,-0.60)
Sweden	-0.59 (-0.76,-0.46)	-0.54 (-0.63,-0.45)	-0.30 (-0.41,-0.20)	-0.87 (-1.02,-0.72)	-0.90 (-0.99,-0.81)	-0.72 (-0.83,-0.60)
Slovenia	-1.06 (-1.35,-0.71)	-1.02 (-1.18,-0.86)	-0.91 (-1.15,-0.68)	-0.94 (-1.29,-0.57)	-1.04 (-1.21,-0.88)	-1.08 (-1.35,-0.82)

Slovakia	-0.79 (-0.99,-0.58)	-0.85 (-1.00,-0.70)	-0.75 (-0.95,-0.54)	-0.83 (-1.07,-0.59)	-1.00 (-1.12,-0.88)	-0.91 (-1.14,-0.68)
USA	-1.65 (-1.68,-1.62)	-1.61 (-1.70,-1.51)	NA	-2.23 (-2.26,-2.20)	-2.27 (-2.39,-2.15)	NA
Luxembourg	NA	-0.55 (-0.84,-0.28)	-0.55 (-1.01,-0.08)	NA	-0.35 (-0.64,-0.07)	-0.69 (-1.21,-0.17)
Ireland	NA	NA	-0.36 (-0.54,-0.19)	NA	NA	-0.27 (-0.46,-0.08)



Figure A1. Life expectancy at birth across 561 spatial units in 21 European countries, 2015–2019



Figure A2. Life expectancy at age 60 across 561 spatial units in 21 European countries, 2015–2019



Figure A3. Spatial distribution of losses of life expectancy at age 60 across 21 European countries in 2020



Figure A4. Hot and cold spots of losses of life expectancy at age 60 across 21 European countries in 2020



Figure A5. Excess mortality associated with COVID-19 pandemic across 561 spatial units in 21 European countries, 2020, males



Figure A6. Excess mortality associated with COVID-19 pandemic across 561 spatial units in 21 European countries, 2020, female

Online Supplementary Appendix B

Detailed values of our estimates and data visualisation tool are available at:

https://osf.io/h68wz/?view_only=47353f6f4b2e41cab3c761246e59d615

Please read first “Online Appendix B.pdf”.