

## **Individual and spatial determinants of mortality during the Covid-19 pandemic: The case of Belgium in 2020**

Mélanie Bourguignon<sup>a</sup>, Aurélie Bertrand<sup>b</sup>, Joan Damiens<sup>a</sup>, Yoann Doignon<sup>c,a</sup>, Thierry Eggerickx<sup>a</sup>, Audrey Plavsic<sup>a</sup>, Jean-Paul Sanderson<sup>a</sup>

5

<sup>a</sup> Centre for Demographic Research, UCLouvain (Belgium)

<sup>b</sup> Statistical Methodology and Computing Service, UCLouvain (Belgium)

<sup>c</sup> CNRS, UMR 6266 IDEES (France)

10

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

## Abstract

**Context.** The year 2020 was marked by the Covid-19 pandemic. In Belgium, it led to a doubling in deaths, mainly grouped into two periods. This article aims to compare the relative importance of predictors and individual and spatial determinants of mortality during these two waves to an equivalent non-pandemic period and to identify whether and to what extent the pandemic has altered the sociodemographic patterns of conventional mortality.

**Methods.** The analyses relate to all-cause mortality during the two waves of Covid-19 and their equivalent in 2019. They are based on matching individual and exhaustive data from the Belgian National Register with tax and population census data. A multi-level approach was adopted combining individual and spatial determinants.

**Results.** Mortality patterns during the pandemic are very similar to those observed outside the pandemic. As in 2019, age, sex, and household composition significantly determine the individual risk of dying, with a higher risk of death among the oldest people, men, and residents of collective households. However, their risk of death increases during the Covid period, especially in the 65–79 age group. Spatial information is no more significant in 2020 than in 2019. However, a higher risk of death is observed when the local excess mortality index or the proportions of isolated or disadvantaged people increase.

**Conclusions.** While the Covid pandemic did not fundamentally alter conventional mortality patterns, it did amplify some of the pre-existing differences in mortality.


## Keywords

Mortality, pandemic, Covid-19, determinants, Belgium, multi-level analysis

## Introduction

The Covid-19 pandemic was the deadliest episode in the history of Belgium since the Second World War, incurring more than 33,000 deaths between 2020 and 2022. Regardless of the method used to count deaths<sup>1</sup>, which varies from one country to another, Belgium appears to be one of the countries where the mortality rate from Covid-19 in 2020 was particularly high (Bustos Sierra et al., 2020; Sánchez-Páez, 2022). Two main waves of excess mortality have been identified (Figure 1). The first ran from mid-March to the end of April 2020 and the second from mid-October to the end of December 2020. Both were characterised by a doubling in the number of deaths compared with a so-called ‘normal’ situation (the monthly average of deaths observed between 2016 and 2019). This translates into a loss of one year of life expectancy at birth in Belgium between 2019 and 2020 (Bourguignon et al., 2022), one of the most significant international losses (Aburto et al., 2021; Islam et al., 2021).

Figure 1. Trends in excess mortality linked to Covid-19 in Belgium. Source: Statbel, authors' calculations.



45

<sup>1</sup> In Belgium, both Covid-certified and -suspected deaths were considered as Covid deaths, whether they occurred in hospital, at home or in a nursing home.

In Belgium and worldwide, very few studies have looked at the spatial determinants of mortality during a pandemic. Moreover, their relative importance compared with individual determinants remains largely unknown. Is Covid-19-related mortality unique, or does it follow the usual trends? ‘Spatial determinants’ and ‘contextual determinants’ are used synonymously and refer to the characteristics of the environment in which individuals live (see section ‘Hypotheses, data and methods’).

### Individual determinants

Studies agree on the major role of age in the mortality caused by the pandemic: as age increases, so does the risk of mortality from Covid-19, particularly in high-income countries (Bauer et al., 2021; Guilmoto, 2020; Islam et al., 2021; Pifarré i Arolas et al., 2021; Williamson et al., 2020). In Belgium, the increase in excess mortality with age is highly conspicuous, particularly during the first wave of the pandemic, especially from the age of 65 onwards (Bourguignon et al., 2022). This can be explained in particular by health status: as age increases, health status deteriorates (Bambra et al., 2020), and the risk of contamination and death linked to Covid-19 is greater in people with co-morbidities such as cardiovascular disease, diabetes, cancer, and lung disease (Atkins et al., 2020; Burström & Tao, 2020). During the second wave, the gradient of excess mortality by age persists but is less clear-cut, with the situation for those over 85 years of age approaching that of the 75–84 age group (Bourguignon et al., 2022).

The high excess mortality among the elderly in 2020 also depends on where they live. In many countries, residential institutions for the elderly were places where Covid-19 mortality was particularly high (Brandén et al., 2020; Kemenesi et al., 2020). In Belgium, during the first wave, they accounted for 50% of deaths linked to Covid-19 related deaths (Sciensano, 2020). In Wallonia (the southern region of Belgium), 65% of deaths involved individuals staying in these institutions, whereas only 1.3% of the Walloon population resides in such establishments (Hardy et al., 2021). For the country as a whole, the standardised mortality rate for people living

in collective households in 2020 was 1.7 times higher than the same rate calculated for the 2015–2019 period in the first wave and 1.5 times higher in the second wave (Bourguignon et al., 2022). This excess mortality is due to the age and state of health of the residents but also to the proximity in these residences between individuals and with carers (Davidson & Szanton, 75 2020; Kemenesi et al., 2020). The health crisis highlighted structural weaknesses, including a lack of resources (e.g., face masks) and staff that these establishments were experiencing.

Even within the home, household composition may have had an impact on the risk of dying from Covid-19, given the importance of interpersonal contact in transmitting the virus. According to a study of people over 65 living at home in England (Nafilyan et al., 2021), living 80 in a multigenerational household is associated with a higher risk of death (compared with a two-adult household). Another study in Los Angeles in the United States showed a positive association between household size and the risk of dying from Covid-19 (Varshney et al., 2022). In the case of Stockholm, the risk of dying from Covid-19 was higher for elderly people living with adults in working age than for those living alone (Brandén et al., 2020).

85 Furthermore, the risk of dying from Covid-19 was higher in men than in women at any age in most countries (Aburto et al., 2021; Ahrenfeldt et al., 2021), including Belgium (Gadeyne et al., 2021). In general, the gender gap increases until the 60–69 age bracket, then gradually decreases to become very small after the age of 80 (Ahrenfeldt et al., 2021). This could be explained by a selection effect linked to the health of men and women at different ages.

90 The influence of nationality on the risk of death from Covid-19 is less definite. Some studies have shown that people of foreign nationality were affected by higher excess mortality during the pandemic period than natives, as was the case in Sweden, irrespective of age and socio-economic characteristics (Drefahl et al., 2020), and in the United States and the United Kingdom (Abedi et al., 2021; Andrasfay & Goldman, 2021; Williamson et al., 2020). In Italy,

95 on the other hand, mortality patterns for migrants and non-migrants in 2020 did not differ significantly from those observed in the preceding years (Canevelli et al., 2020).

Over and above age, gender, household type, and nationality, several studies have shown that Covid-19 hit the disadvantaged social classes harder (Abedi et al., 2021; Andrasfay & Goldman, 2021; Barhoumi et al., 2020; Chen & Krieger, 2021; Mayer, 2022; Williamson et al., 2020).

100 Firstly, this may be due to the increased presence of co-morbidities at an earlier age among the most disadvantaged populations, which already increases the risk of dying from Covid-19 (Bambra et al., 2020; Williamson et al., 2020). Disadvantaged populations are characterised by more widespread risk behaviours (smoking, poor dietary habits), less understanding of and adherence to health and hygiene measures to combat the disease, and limited access to and/or  
105 use of good quality healthcare. (Gadeyne et al., 2021). Secondly, socially disadvantaged populations are more frequently found in densely populated neighbourhoods and densely occupied housing, which are additional factors of exposure to the risk of infection and, by extension, mortality (Bambra et al., 2020; Barhoumi et al., 2020). Thirdly, disadvantaged populations are over-represented among ‘front-line’ occupations, which have not benefited as  
110 much from the protective effects of containment and teleworking (Bambra et al., 2020; Barhoumi et al., 2020).

In Belgium, the few studies considering the social dimension of Covid-19 present variable results depending on the methodologies and social-positioning indicators used. Decoster et al. (2021) showed the existence of a negative income gradient in terms of excess mortality among  
115 the elderly in Belgium in the first wave (Decoster et al., 2021). Conversely, Gadeyne et al. (2021), using income and level of education as indicators of social inequality, identified the highest levels of excess mortality among the highest-income men aged 25–64 and among middle- and high-income men and women aged 65–84. Bourguignon et al. (2022) found excess

mortality among all social groups<sup>2</sup> based on an excess mortality index<sup>3</sup> calculated for the two  
120 Covid-19 waves in 2020. However, the most disadvantaged social group shows the highest  
level of excess mortality, with a visible social gradient that is more marked for the population  
aged 40–79 than for those aged 80 and over, especially in the second wave. The significant fall  
in life expectancy in 2020 is more marked for the most disadvantaged social group  
(Bourguignon et al., 2022).

## 125 [Spatial and contextual determinants](#)

Like other epidemics, Covid-19 has a particular spatial structure (Amdaoud et al., 2021). In  
addition to individual determinants, certain characteristics of the place of residence can impact  
the individual risk of dying from Covid-19. Population density and mobility play a major role  
in the spread of the virus (Fonseca-Rodríguez et al., 2021). In the United States, among the  
130 seven states most affected, the most densely populated counties were the ones with the highest  
rates of contamination (Abedi et al., 2021). In France, the departments with the highest  
urbanisation rates experienced the highest excess mortality during the first wave of Covid-19  
(Pilkington et al., 2021). The contagious nature of Covid-19 means that the closer an area is to  
a source of contamination, the greater the probability that it will be affected by the epidemic  
135 (Amdaoud et al., 2021). Spread by contagion has been observed in France’s departments  
(Levratto et al., 2020) and in China’s provinces (Kang et al., 2020). Containment has proved to  
be an effective solution to limit this contagion, as demonstrated in France (Gaudart et al., 2021).  
In New York and Chicago, the ‘cold spots’ identified based on diagnosed cases were  
distinguished by their ability to maintain physical distancing (Maroko et al., 2020).

---

<sup>2</sup> The study used a multidimensional index incorporating four indicators: level of education, income, employment category, and housing characteristics. For more details, see the methodology section of this article.

<sup>3</sup> This is the ratio between the age-standardised mortality rate calculated for the two 2020 waves and the standardised mortality rate calculated for the same months over the 2016–2019 observation period.

140 At the same time, there are inequalities between regions in terms of access to healthcare. If an  
area has a smaller and more dispersed healthcare system, this implies a lower or slower response  
capacity in critical situations. At the French departmental level, a strong association was found  
between high levels of excess mortality and poor primary care provision during the first wave  
of the epidemic (Pilkington et al., 2021). The social and residential environment also has an  
145 influence on exposure to the virus and the probability of dying. High population densities  
(Andersen et al., 2021; Fonseca-Rodríguez et al., 2021) and neighbourhoods with a high  
proportion of overcrowded housing (Maroko et al., 2020), immigrant or ethnic minority  
populations (Andersen et al., 2021; Fonseca-Rodríguez et al., 2021), and disadvantaged  
populations (Riou et al., 2021; Vandentorren et al., 2022) are frequently cited as contextual  
150 factors in infection and excess mortality. The association between these factors makes it  
difficult to understand the geography of Covid-19-related mortality. In Belgium, a significant  
association has been detected at the municipal level between the number of *infections* and social  
precariousness (Meurisse et al., 2022). Still, nothing of the kind has yet been shown concerning  
*excess mortality* from Covid-19.

155 Mortality linked to Covid-19 was not uniform across Belgium. Some areas were affected earlier  
and/or more severely than others, revealing the presence of outbreaks, as in other countries  
(Figure 2). During the first wave, the main outbreaks were in the Mons region (south-west), the  
province of Limburg and eastern Flemish Brabant (north-east), a large part of the province of  
Liège and the north-east of the province of Luxembourg (centre-east) and the Brussels  
160 conurbation (centre). But the geography of the excess mortality in the first wave differs greatly  
from that of the second wave, with outbreaks mainly located along international borders.  
Furthermore, to date, no clear link has been detected between the excess mortality linked to  
Covid-19 and other factors such as population density, the country's social geography or  
'normal' mortality, particularly during the second wave (Bourguignon et al., 2021).




165

Figure 2. Excess mortality in the first wave (18 March–17 June 2020) and the second wave (28 September 2020–31 January 2021)<sup>4</sup>. Source: Statbel; authors' calculations.

### First wave

### Second wave



## Hypotheses, data and methods

### 170 Research questions and hypotheses

This article has two objectives. Firstly, we measure – and are the first to do so, to our knowledge – the relative importance of the various individual and spatial determinants by ranking their weight in terms of the risk of dying during the two Covid-19 waves in 2020. Are the factors most correlated with mortality during the Covid-19 period the same as those outside the period?

175 Secondly, we measure the differences in mortality between the different population groups defined by these determinants during the periods of excess mortality linked to Covid-19. Which characteristics are the most associated with excess mortality during the pandemic period?

These two objectives are part of a comparative perspective. Firstly, the analyses compare two types of mortality patterns, ‘classic’ (2019) and ‘pandemic’ (2020), aiming to identify potential

---

<sup>4</sup> We chose the method of smoothing by potential, i.e., Stewart’s method (Grasland, Mathian, and Vincent 2000; Stewart and Warntz 1958), which we performed using the online interface Magrit (<http://magrit.cnrs.fr>). The following parameters were used: exponential function, span = 10 km, beta = 2.

180 differences between the two. The analyses are carried out separately for each Covid wave in 2020, systematically compared with the two equivalent periods in 2019. Finally, the analyses cover the whole population and three major age groups (40–64, 65–79, 80+), which may have been affected differently by the pandemic.

Our analyses and reflections are based on three hypotheses.

185 Firstly, the relative importance of individual and contextual determinants would change in a pandemic context. The **weight of contextual variables** would be greater than that observed in conventional mortality, given the contagious nature of the pandemic and exposure factors more closely linked to population density or nearby outbreaks.

Secondly, certain population groups would see their risk of death changed during a pandemic:  
190 the association between some **characteristics** and mortality would increase or decrease compared to a ‘classic’ mortality pattern. The vulnerability of people who are already fragile in a context of traditional mortality would be amplified during a pandemic, and this would particularly affect the elderly, men, disadvantaged social groups and residents of collective households. Conversely, isolated households would be less vulnerable in a pandemic due to  
195 their isolated lifestyle.

Thirdly, individual and contextual determinants during the pandemic would have a different effect depending on **the individual’s age**. Among older and very old adults, poor health status would increase the individual risk of dying during one of the 2020 Covid-19 waves. This would be reflected in a risk of death that increases with age or a higher risk of death for residents of  
200 collective households (of the MR(S)<sup>5</sup> type). Among working-age adults, social class would play a decisive role, with an increased risk of death during the two 2020 pandemic waves among the

---

<sup>5</sup> MR(S) stands for ‘Maisons de repos et de soins’, the appellation for Belgian nursing and care homes.

most disadvantaged groups due to poorer health status, more frequent risk behaviours, less use of healthcare and socially discriminatory measures during periods of confinement<sup>6</sup>.

## Data

205 Several types of data were used in this article. As the analysis was conducted at the individual level, we used an anonymised individual database (Demobel) that exhaustively covers Belgium's entire legally domiciled population, i.e., over 11 million individuals. This database, developed by the Belgian statistical office (Statbel), is the result of linking the individual-level censuses (2001 and 2011), the National Register (in which every legal resident in Belgium is  
210 entered), and the tax register for the period 1992–2022. The censuses and the tax register provide information on the socio-economic characteristics of individuals (education, occupation, housing conditions, tax income). The National Register provides information on their socio-demographic characteristics (age, gender, type of household, place of residence, etc.). This database can also identify people who died during the period covered by the data,  
215 with the date of death indicated where appropriate. This information makes it possible to identify individuals who died during the two periods of Covid-related excess mortality covered by our article.

Our approach is based on an analysis of all-cause mortality. Our analyses focus on the months marked by excess mortality associated with Covid-19. The first wave of deaths associated with  
220 the pandemic runs from March to May 2020 and the second wave from October to December 2020. Particular care has been taken to define the population at risk and its characteristics (household composition, commune of residence) at the time of each wave. For the first wave, the population at risk of dying is the population that survived at least until March. It was assigned the characteristics declared on 1 January 2020. The population observed in the second

---

<sup>6</sup> The most precarious social groups more often carry out front-line jobs, and strict compliance with health measures depends on living conditions (e.g., high household density).

225 wave includes residents of Belgium who were still alive in October. To be more precise, we  
have associated the characteristics on 1 January 2021 with survivors only to take account of  
changes made during 2020 regarding household composition or place of residence, for example.  
For people who died in 2020, we have no choice but to use the characteristics observed on 1  
January 2020. The same procedure was followed to define the populations at risk of dying in  
230 2019.

## Methods

Our questions and hypotheses were tested using a two-pronged approach: firstly, to identify the  
individual and contextual determinants of mortality during the Covid-19 pandemic, and  
secondly, to measure the relative importance of these determinants. To do this, we model the  
235 individual probability of dying during each of the two waves<sup>7</sup> of excess mortality during Covid-  
19. As we wish to distinguish the effect of individual variables from that of contextual variables,  
we estimate a multilevel random-effects logistic model:

$$\log(p_{ij} / 1-p_{ij}) = \beta_0 + \beta \Xi_{1ij} + \beta \Xi_{2j} + u_{0j} \quad \text{where } u_{0j} \sim N(0, \sigma_{u0}^2) \quad (1)$$

where  $p_{ij}$  denotes the probability of an individual  $i$  residing in a commune  $j$  dying during a  
240 Covid-19 wave;  $X_{ij}$  a vector of individual explanatory variables;  $X_j$  a vector of contextual  
explanatory variables;  $u_{0j}$  a random residual term at the level of the groups defined by the  
communes (this term groups together the unobservable random effects at the commune level).

Several variables are included in the multilevel models to explain the probability of dying  
during a wave of excess Covid-19 mortality. These variables are either individual or contextual.  
245 **Individual variables** include (1) the age of individuals, (2) their sex, (3) the composition of  
their household, (4) their nationality, and (5) their social background.

---

<sup>7</sup> The first wave runs from 15 March to 30 April 2020 and the second wave from 15 October to 31 December 2020.

A multidimensional indicator of social precariousness captures the socioeconomic category of individuals based on four dimensions that traditionally enable individuals to be positioned socially (Cambois & Jusot, 2007; Kunst & Mackenbach, 1994): education, employment  
250 category, and housing conditions from the 2011 census, and household income from the 2017 tax returns. While the correlation between these dimensions is high, they each play a different role in health status and mortality. Level of education measures cultural capital. It will determine attitudes toward preventative behaviours, use of healthcare, and access to healthcare. Income, employment category, and housing conditions refer more to material resources and  
255 standard of living (Cambois & Jusot, 2007). This multidimensional index considers each individual's overall situation and has been divided into score quartiles: disadvantaged, low intermediate, high intermediate, and advantaged (Eggerickx et al., 2020). A fifth group was observed: the 'undetermined', for whom no information is available for at least two of the dimensions considered, either because they did not answer the questions or were not present at  
260 the time of the census (e.g. children born or immigrants arrived in after 2011).

At the same time, **contextual variables** relating to the characteristics of individuals' place of residence are included: (1) the proportion of disadvantaged people in the commune of residence, (2) the commune's population density, (3) the proportion of isolated people, (4) the level of excess mortality in all communes within 20 kilometres of the commune of residence (incl.),  
265 calculated by comparing the mortality observed in the two 2020 waves with the average for the years 2016–2019 at the same time, (5) the distance to the nearest hospital<sup>8</sup>, and (6) the position of the commune of residence in the country's urban hierarchy<sup>9</sup>.


---

<sup>8</sup> The distance between the commune and the nearest hospital is calculated from the centroid of the individual communes of residence. It therefore does not include information on travel time which, in specific rural contexts in the south of Belgium, for example, can also indicate other inequalities in healthcare access.

<sup>9</sup> Urban hierarchy is based on the typology of urban residential complexes developed by Vanderstraeten and Van Hecke (2019). It distinguishes five types of place: the conurbation, suburbs (urbanised belt of around urban centre), ZMAs (*zones des migrants alternants*, areas outside cities with a substantial commuter population, small towns, and the rural environment (areas not classified within the urban hierarchy).

In total, 16 models are produced for the total population and three main age groups (40–64, 65–79, 80+) <sup>10</sup>. The use of these population subgroups will enable us to compare the relationships of each predictor with the risk of death, and to see whether or not the directions and intensity of these relationships are identical. Nevertheless, the comparison of estimates must be made with caution, due to the existence of unobserved heterogeneity: the variation in mortality from one age group to another may depend on unobserved variables, and this unobservable variation may be different (Mood, 2010). Each of the four main models is reproduced for each of the two waves in 2020 and for the two equivalent periods in 2019 (base year) (Figure 3)

Figure 3: Estimated multilevel models



Analysis of the regression models makes it possible to identify the individual and contextual determinants of the individual risk of death. Measuring the relative importance of the different explanatory variables involves analysing the marginal contributions of the predictors in reducing the unexplained variability of mortality, all other things being equal (for a fixed value

<sup>10</sup> The under-40s were not considered, as no excess mortality in this population was observed in 2020 in the descriptive analyses (Bourguignon et al., 2022).

of the other variables introduced into the model). For each explanatory variable, we calculated a partial pseudo-correlation ( $R$ ) adapted to the logistic model (Bhatti et al., 2006):

$$R = \sqrt{\frac{\text{Wald statistic} - 2K}{-2LL_0}} \quad (2)$$

285 Where  $K$  is the number of degrees of freedom of the explanatory variable and  $LL$  is the log-likelihood of the empty model without independent variables. Partial pseudo-correlation is interpreted similarly as a correlation coefficient (between  $-1$  and  $1$ ). In our case, the absolute value of the indicator will be used, as we are interested in the intensity of partial pseudo-correlations independently of their direction.

#### 290 [Analysis of an exhaustive population](#)

The data we used were drawn from the National Register and population censuses. The population studied is not a representative sample of Belgium's resident population but rather is the total population residing in Belgium and included in the National Register. Registration in these databases is compulsory, and in theory, only illegal migrants, asylum seekers, and  
295 diplomatic personnel are not covered by this data source. Given the exhaustiveness of the data, this research does not fall within the inferential statistics framework. We do not consider that there is a 'super-population' from which our study population is drawn or that the latter is one possible reality among others. By definition, inferential statistical tools should be used when the data constitute a sample and the results are expected to be generalised to a larger population  
300 (White & Gorard, 2017), which is not the case here.

Thus, the  $b$  parameters derived from the regression models are not an estimate of the sample parameter to which a confidence level is assigned. These parameters are real and represent the effect of an explanatory variable on the variable of interest in the population studied. In this way, we do not interpret using the tools of inferential statistics ( $p$ -value, confidence intervals).

305 Instead, we systematically use the number of individuals and the proportion of deaths for each modality of each categorical variable used. This sometimes means we can temper our comments, for example, if the analyses involve too small a group of individuals.

## Analysis

### Relative importance of variables

310 In 2020, during the two waves of the Covid-19 pandemic, the individual probability of dying was mainly influenced by age, household type, sex, and local excess mortality. In comparison, the weight of contextual variables is very low overall, except for excess local mortality during the pandemic period. Age is the factor with the greatest relative importance for the probability of dying during the two Covid waves in 2020. In the first wave, it was 2.5 times more important  
315 than the household composition variable and 5 times more important than the sex variable (Figure 4). This finding is unsurprising and is also observed for mortality outside any pandemic episode. More surprising is the low weight of certain individual variables, such as social group and nationality, both during and outside the pandemic.

### Relative importance of variables by age group

320 There are nonetheless slight differences between the main age groups. Among 40–64-year-olds, age and gender retain their high relative weight, while that of household composition declines. Conversely, contextual determinants – the proportion of disadvantaged or isolated households in the municipality, population density, and local excess mortality – are better positioned in the ranking than for older age groups, even if their relative weight remains low. For older people  
325 (aged 65–79 or 80 and over), the variables that have a decisive influence on individual mortality are relatively different. During the first wave of the Covid-19 pandemic, household composition had the highest weight, followed closely by age and sex. The dominance of household composition underlines, in particular, the devastating effect of the epidemic in nursing homes.




In contrast, for ‘usual’ mortality (2019), the decisive role is attributed to the age of individuals.

330 In the second wave, the situation ‘normalises’, with the return of age as the leading variable in terms of partial pseudo-correlations.

Finally, it should be noted that, except for the 40–64 age group in the first wave, excess local mortality was among the five variables with the highest relative importance. This means that in the context of age-related frailty (and therefore health-related frailty), excess mortality in the


335 surrounding area is a determining (or aggravating) factor in mortality during the Covid period.

Figure 4: Partial pseudo-correlations from multilevel models estimating the probability of dying during the first or second wave (2020) of the Covid-19 pandemic and the equivalent of these periods for 2019. Graphs produced based on ‘all ages’ models and by major age groups; prioritisation of variables according to their respective weight in the models for the year 2020. Source: Statbel; authors’ calculations.





340

### 40-60 years old



### 65-79 years old





### Characteristics related to mortality

345 The all-ages models (Table 1) show that men, older people, disadvantaged social categories, and certain types of households, such as collective households and single people, have a higher mortality rate than other categories, both during the Covid period and outside the pandemic. In 2020, in both waves, women were half as likely as men to die (in wave 1, Odds-Ratio (OR) = 0.523, and in wave 2, OR = 0.553). This factor is just as strong outside the pandemic (in wave 350 1, OR 2019 = 0.547, and in wave 2, OR = 0.592). Men’s vulnerability was therefore not a distinctive feature of mortality during Covid-19.

At the same time, a one-year increase in age leads to an additional risk of death of around 10%. But here again, this is not a characteristic of the pandemic period: the frailty of the elderly appears to be equivalent in 2019 and 2020.

355 In addition, a social gradient is observed: the more socially disadvantaged individuals are, the greater their risk of death. In 2020, compared with the most disadvantaged social group, the

privileged class had an odds ratio at least 40% lower (in wave 1, OR = 0.599; in wave 2, OR = 0.563). However, the social gradient observed does not differ from that observed in conventional mortality either, where the most disadvantaged social groups are those which, all other things being equal, are characterised by a higher odd of death. In other words, the pandemic period neither partially erased nor significantly increased social differences in mortality, with the result that the social effect of Covid-19-related mortality was not neutral.

Note the case of people for whom the social group cannot be determined (unknown social group): in terms of mortality, they behave more or less identically to the most disadvantaged social group, in times of pandemic or not. This ‘all other things being equal’ finding is interesting insofar as, in the context of descriptive analyses, we had already mentioned the excess mortality of the ‘undetermined’ social group during the Covid waves of 2020 (Bourguignon et al., 2021). This can be explained in part by the fact that, from a socio-economic point of view, this group is also *a priori* in a precarious situation, characterised in particular by an overrepresentation of people of immigrant origin and people living in the Brussels Region (Bourguignon et al., 2021). However, overall, nationality does not lead to substantial differences in mortality.

Finally, the household composition of individuals generates differences in mortality. According to the regression models, individuals living in a couple with or without children would be the least exposed to mortality during the two Covid waves in 2020. On the other hand, the differences are more marked for other types of households. For example, the excess mortality of single individuals or single-parent households is confirmed in 2020, in the same way as that observed for usual mortality (2019). The differences between 2019 and 2020 relate more to collective households, for which mortality was amplified in 2020. In the first wave, residents of collective households had a risk of death around six times higher than that observed for couples with (a) child(ren) (OR in 2019 – equivalent to wave 1 – is around 4 times higher). In

the second Covid wave, excess mortality still characterised these collective households but was roughly equivalent (OR = 2.7) to that observed in 2019 during the similar period (OR = 2.4).

385 Among the contextual variables, the intensity of excess local mortality affects the individual odd of dying in 2020. During the two waves of Covid-19, a one-unit increase in the local excess mortality indicator – i.e., a massive increase in mortality, which is not observed in reality<sup>11</sup> – is associated with an individual risk of dying 2.5 times and 3.5 times higher in the first and second waves respectively. At the same time, a 1 percentage point increase in the proportions of isolated or disadvantaged people results in a 1% increase (OR = 1.01) in the individual risk of  
390 death. The effect of these variables may seem smaller than that of excess local mortality. Still, the amplitude of the values observed for the variables can have a significant effect on the individual risk of dying<sup>12</sup>. The other contextual variables (population density, distance from the nearest hospital) result in minor differences in mortality, both in a pandemic context and in a ‘classic’ mortality context.

### 395 [Characteristics related to mortality by large age group](#)

The results distinguished by large age group remain approximately the same, as the individual characteristics associated with mortality remain very close from one group to the other. Estimates suggest that the probability of dying during the Covid-19 period is related to factors similar to those observed in usual mortality (2019). Whatever the age group, therefore, gender,  
400 age, and social affiliation generate similar mortality differentials, whether during a pandemic or not. There are, however, several specificities for certain age groups that merit highlighting.

---

<sup>11</sup> At the local level, the excess mortality indices do not exceed 1.7 in wave 1 and 1.4 in wave 2. A local excess mortality of 2 would mean that mortality in 2020 would have doubled compared with 2019.

<sup>12</sup> The difference between the lowest and highest proportion of isolated people at the municipal level is 28 percentage points (minimum value = 7.79%; maximum value = 36.04%). Regarding the proportions of disadvantaged people, the difference between the minimum and maximum proportions is 56 percentage points (minimum value = 6.54%; maximum value = 62.87%), with potentially significant differences in the risk of death between individuals belonging to different municipalities.

Firstly, the effect of belonging to a collective household may vary between different age groups. The risk of mortality remains higher for individuals living in collective households, but more so for those aged 65–79 (OR = 10.3 (wave 1) or 4.4 (wave 2)) than for those aged 80 and over (OR = 3.7 (wave 1) or 1.9 (wave 2))<sup>15</sup>. This situation according to age (65–79 vs. 80+) and according to period (wave 1 vs. wave 2) is probably explained by a double selection effect: on the one hand, those who survive the first wave would be more robust than those who have died; on the other hand, those who survive the very old ages (80 and over) would also be potentially selected, because of a better state of health which would have enabled them to survive to that point. Nevertheless, such a difference in coefficients between two logistic models can be explained by the unobserved heterogeneity of mortality between different age groups (Mood, 2010).

Secondly, the effect of excess local mortality increases among the oldest populations. This is particularly true for the second wave of Covid-19, with the effect of excess local mortality on the individual odd of dying increasing with age. This could be partly explained by the fact that, even if the transmission mechanisms of the virus that generated the pandemic were a little better understood during the second wave, the relaxation of some health measures (or of compliance with them) could have led to significant outbreaks of excess mortality, with fatal consequences for the oldest age groups.

---

<sup>15</sup> We are not commenting here on the odds ratios for residents of collective households before the age of 65, who are inevitably less affected by factors related to old age and proportionally very few (on 1 Jan. 2020, 0.5% of 40–64-year-olds were living in collective households, compared with 1.5% of 65–79-year-olds and 12.7% of those aged 80 and over).

Table 1. Multivariate results estimating the individual probability of dying (expressed in odds ratios) during one of the two Covid-19 waves (2020), compared with the results obtained during the same periods in 2019, models all ages combined. Source: Statbel; authors' calculations.

	MODEL 1: All – V1 2020			MODEL 9: All – V1 2019			MODEL 5: All – V2 2020			MODEL 13: All – V2 2019		
	OR	Population	Number of deaths per 100,000	OR	Population	Number of deaths per 100,000	OR	Population	Number of deaths per 100,000	OR	Population	Number of deaths per 100,000
<b>Sex (ref. Male)</b>		<b>5,660,064</b>	<b>187.4</b>		<b>5,628,228</b>	<b>122.9</b>		<b>5,649,456</b>	<b>225.5</b>		<b>5,621,309</b>	<b>160.5</b>
Female	0.523	5,832,577	195.9	0.547	5,803,178	121.0	0.553	5,821,152	224.0	0.592	5,796,156	163.4
<b>Age</b>	1.100			1.093			1.104			1.098		
<b>SES quartile (ref. Disadvantaged)</b>		<b>2,105,793</b>	<b>484.9</b>		<b>2,161,269</b>	<b>299.1</b>		<b>2,095,583</b>	<b>555.8</b>		<b>2,154,805</b>	<b>398.1</b>
Int. low	0.870	2,391,690	233.2	0.865	2,425,540	148.3	0.888	2,386,113	290.2	0.818	2,421,942	192.9
Int. high	0.777	2,548,680	152.2	0.724	2,574,867	91.9	0.739	2,544,800	175.1	0.739	2,572,501	128.0
Advantaged	0.599	2,462,251	69.2	0.590	2,475,318	45.4	0.563	2,460,547	82.9	0.567	2,474,195	60.9
Unknown	0.989	107,021	342.9	0.962	108,345	192.0	1.072	106,654	339.4	0.931	108,137	210.8
Missing	0.795	1,877,206	15.7	0.835	1,686,067	10.8	0.849	1,876,911	18.7	0.799	1,685,885	12.8
<b>Household composition (ref. Couples with children)</b>		<b>5,503,935</b>	<b>26.5</b>		<b>5,508,626</b>	<b>19.0</b>		<b>5,377,863</b>	<b>37.8</b>		<b>5,387,650</b>	<b>27.1</b>
Isolated	1.477	1,744,620	355.9	1.524	1,718,738	242.6	1.176	1,798,045	442.1	1.315	1,764,714	335.0
Couples without children	1.112	2,559,680	243.7	1.198	2,538,616	179.2	0.971	2,592,041	319.7	1.051	2,579,179	237.7
Single-parent households	1.557	1,317,053	74.6	1.764	1,307,845	57.0	1.266	1,321,359	94.2	1.500	1,306,669	77.1
Others	1.679	230,430	198.3	1.820	220,880	147.1	1.160	231,527	215.1	1.460	223,545	188.3
Collectives	6.034	136,923	4,884.5	4.185	136,701	2,272.8	2.725	149,773	3,849.8	2.392	155,708	2287.0
<b>Nationality (ref. Belgians)</b>		<b>10,065,990</b>	<b>203.9</b>		<b>10,039,981</b>	<b>130.1</b>		<b>10,078,773</b>	<b>238.8</b>		<b>10,066,532</b>	<b>172.3</b>
French	1.048	170,324	152.1	0.988	167,508	90.7	1.026	169,500	184.7	0.884	166,682	105.6
Italians	0.994	155,696	328.2	0.915	155,866	177.1	0.927	154,152	371.1	0.979	154,220	260.0
Other Europeans	0.887	669,172	76.7	0.871	649,429	50.2	0.794	659,945	81.8	0.809	637,559	63.4
Africans	0.945	191,037	64.9	0.844	188,137	37.2	0.951	180,414	85.9	0.794	175,380	51.9
Asians	1.061	177,072	46.3	0.863	170,389	27.0	1.055	169,159	62.1	0.873	162,161	38.9
Other nationalities	0.688	63,350	26.8	0.833	60,096	21.6	0.952	58,665	44.3	0.734	54,931	27.3
Excess mortality at 20 km	2.531						3.578					
Proportion of isolated people	1.016			0.999			1.001			1.005		
Distance to hospital	1.001			1.000			1.004			1.002		
Community density	1.000			1.000			1.000			1.000		
Proportion of disadvantaged	1.012			1.011			1.009			1.008		
<b>Urban hierarchy (ref. Conurbation)</b>		<b>1,539,081</b>	<b>189.3</b>		<b>1,526,309</b>	<b>94.7</b>		<b>1,521,928</b>	<b>176.9</b>		<b>1,511,842</b>	<b>129.3</b>
Suburb	0.954	1,907,456	190.6	1.055	1,899,616	126.8	1.056	1,895,448	238.7	0.987	1,889,904	165.2
ZMA	0.878	1,658,605	211.9	0.989	1,650,103	128.2	1.047	1,653,922	235.3	0.970	1,647,242	174.8
Small town	0.903	2,708,417	204.0	1.029	2,694,209	130.4	1.043	2,710,111	240.0	0.976	2,698,282	172.8
Rural (or other)	0.891	3,679,082	175.1	1.046	3,661,169	121.8	1.050	3,689,199	221.3	0.972	3,670,195	160.0
AIC	235,269.7			169,539.1			277,578.9			216,392.5		
BIC	235,683.1			169,938.2			277,992.3			216,791.5		

Table 2. Multivariate results estimating the individual probability of dying (expressed in odds ratios) during one of the two Covid-19 waves (2020), compared with the results obtained during the same periods in 2019, models for people aged 40 to 64. Source: Statbel; authors' calculations.

	MODEL 2: 40-64 - V1 2020			MODEL 10: 40-64 - V1 2019			MODEL 6: 40-64 - V2 2020			MODEL 14: 40-64 - V2 2019		
	OR	Population	Number of deaths per 100,000	OR	Population	Number of deaths per 100,000	OR	Population	Number of deaths per 100,000	OR	Population	Number of deaths per 100,000
<b>Sex (ref. Male)</b>		<b>1,917,228</b>	<b>70.7</b>		<b>1,912,404</b>	<b>59.2</b>		<b>1,933,261</b>	<b>97.8</b>		<b>1,921,458</b>	<b>77.6</b>
Female	0.599	1,901,678	42.7	0.579	1,898,207	35.4	0.552	1,912,239	55.0	0.614	1,903,642	49.4
<b>Age</b>	1.099			1.088			1.106			1.094		
<b>SES quartile (ref. Disadvantaged)</b>		<b>651,106</b>	<b>112.0</b>		<b>665,246</b>	<b>90.9</b>		<b>636,415</b>	<b>158.2</b>		<b>657,023</b>	<b>132.1</b>
Int. low	0.699	868,833	65.7	0.676	882,002	55.3	0.672	853,489	92.0	0.606	874,280	71.8
Int. high	0.500	1,073,050	42.7	0.461	1,076,859	34.7	0.490	1,072,864	59.7	0.469	1,078,567	50.4
Advantaged	0.403	976,702	29.4	0.405	964,329	26.3	0.346	1,001,314	35.9	0.335	979,526	31.0
Unknown	0.900	43,913	113.9	0.823	42,652	72.7	0.801	46,996	117.0	0.677	44,122	79.3
Missing	0.586	205,302	<b>35.6</b>	0.600	179,523	29.0	0.576	234,422	<b>41.0</b>	0.446	191,582	28.2
<b>Household composition (ref. Couples with children)</b>		<b>1,737,614</b>	<b>26.8</b>		<b>1,733,305</b>	<b>22.8</b>		<b>1,819,318</b>	<b>41.1</b>		<b>1,737,230</b>	<b>32.3</b>
Isolated	2.580	662,213	112.5	2.566	654,828	91.0	1.774	663,795	139.7	2.199	666,102	122.4
Couples without children	1.286	952,450	61.3	1.377	961,105	54.4	0.953	880,224	91.8	1.091	955,116	71.9
Single-parent households	1.746	379,366	50.6	1.963	376,188	46.8	1.442	394,762	65.9	1.705	380,423	60.5
Others	1.646	69,451	<b>63.4</b>	2.078	67,280	65.4	1.242	70,018	<b>82.8</b>	1.460	68,023	70.6
Collectives	12.224	17,812	774.8	7.384	17,905	391.0	6.573	17,383	822.6	5.835	18,206	505.3
<b>Nationality (ref. Belgians)</b>		<b>3,342,696</b>	<b>58.1</b>		<b>3,347,984</b>	<b>49.3</b>		<b>3,347,628</b>	<b>79.1</b>		<b>3,357,785</b>	<b>66.1</b>
French	0.854	57,486	53.9	0.924	56,393	47.9	0.821	60,563	69.3	0.598	57,658	39.9
Italians	0.622	69,987	58.6	0.521	71,442	36.4	0.625	67,241	81.8	0.753	69,788	74.5
Other Europeans	0.814	235,195	42.1	0.664	226,492	30.0	0.707	246,203	50.0	0.706	230,132	38.7
Africans	0.887	55,281	<b>56.1</b>	0.760	52,906	39.7	0.838	60,356	<b>67.9</b>	0.674	53,588	42.9
Asians	0.899	44,228	45.2	0.427	41,955	19.1	0.817	48,461	53.7	0.972	42,719	51.5
Other nationalities	0.444	14,033	21.4	0.929	13,439	37.2	0.779	15,048	46.5	0.626	13,430	29.8
Excess mortality at 20 km	2.333						2.773					
Proportion of isolated people	1.017			1.006			1.002			1.003		
Distance to hospital	1.003			1.006			1.008			1.008		
Community density	1.000			1.000			1.000			1.000		
Proportion of disadvantaged	1.014			1.011			1.017			1.014		
<b>Urban hierarchy (ref. Conurbation)</b>		<b>480,329</b>	<b>56.6</b>		<b>474,733</b>	<b>40.9</b>		<b>493,219</b>	<b>76.6</b>		<b>479,801</b>	<b>54.2</b>
Suburb	0.977	598,804	68.3	1.162	598,604	54.1	0.949	603,611	85.0	0.907	599,397	70.1
ZMA	0.865	539,376	62.9	1.197	539,527	52.8	1.067	540,552	83.8	0.961	540,007	71.7
Small town	0.907	915,525	60.8	1.191	914,379	51.4	0.998	918,099	78.0	0.943	917,714	69.5
Rural (or other)	0.829	1,284,872	46.0	1.099	1,283,368	41.4	1.027	1,290,019	68.4	0.879	1,288,181	56.5
AIC	34,460.73			29,712.98			45,284.76			38,577.97		
BIC	34,842.24			30,068.12			45,666.26			38,946.25		



Table 3. Multivariate results estimating the individual probability of dying (expressed in odds ratios) during one of the two Covid-19 waves (2020), compared with the results obtained during the same periods in 2019, models for people aged 65 to 79. Source: Statbel; authors' calculations.

	MODEL 3: 65–79 – V1 2020			MODEL 11: 65–79 – V1 2019			MODEL 7: 65–79 – V2 2020			MODEL 15: 65–79 – V2 2019		
	OR	Population	Number of deaths per 100,000	OR	Population	Number of deaths per 100,000	OR	Population	Number of deaths per 100,000	OR	Population	Number of deaths per 100,000
<b>Sex (ref. Male)</b>												
Female	0.507	729,352 818,339	465.6 281.9	0.503	713,718 804,594	319.3 188.8	0.502	804,468 884,093	790.6 1,027.0	0.523	745,450 829,384	410.4 252.7
<b>Age</b>	1.099			1.080			1.100			1.088		
<b>SES quartile (ref. Disadvantaged)</b>		<b>449,161</b>	<b>527.0</b>		<b>461,983</b>	<b>334.6</b>		<b>455,559</b>	<b>628.9</b>		<b>460,592</b>	<b>471.8</b>
Int. low	0.828	457,358	344.2	0.851	450,784	239.1	0.833	492,049	416.0	0.784	465,191	309.8
Int. high	0.698	358,016	288.0	0.716	339,642	203.2	0.698	412,986	318.4	0.661	363,511	252.3
Advantaged	0.536	254,008	212.6	0.607	239,240	166.8	0.502	294,234	225.7	0.532	256,959	199.3
Unknown	0.910	10,379	1,156.2	0.773	10,373	510.9	1.095	11,316	1,069.3	0.849	10,786	602.6
Missing	0.759	18,769	378.3	0.620	16,290	196.4	0.864	22,417	432.7	0.684	17,795	264.1
<b>Household composition (ref. Couples with children)</b>		<b>133,805</b>	<b>325.1</b>		<b>131,119</b>	<b>193.7</b>		<b>155,393</b>	<b>400.3</b>		<b>135,792</b>	<b>284.3</b>
Isolated	1.249	397,344	394.6	1.526	387,555	280.0	0.985	431,540	452.8	1.214	405,289	366.2
Couples without children	0.848	916,546	265.8	1.054	901,190	201.6	0.783	991,376	344.1	0.912	929,813	272.1
Single-parent households	1.287	50,693	382.7	1.642	49,790	283.2	1.054	57,185	426.7	1.253	51,687	346.3
Others	1.256	25,625	405.9	1.773	24,994	332.1	0.959	28,267	431.6	1.278	26,111	383.0
Collectives	10.312	23,678	4,079.7	7.823	23,664	1,766.4	4.428	24,800	3,048.4	4.306	26,142	1,820.8
<b>Nationality (ref. Belgians)</b>		<b>1,442,626</b>	<b>366.7</b>		<b>1,414,889</b>	<b>250.1</b>		<b>1,572,033</b>	<b>417.4</b>		<b>1,467,569</b>	<b>325.4</b>
French	0.797	16,656	372.2	0.968	16,421	274.0	1.081	18,363	582.7	1.141	17,084	415.6
Italians	0.891	31,259	451.1	0.825	30,725	257.1	0.899	34,103	539.5	1.083	31,879	448.6
Other Europeans	0.877	42,491	346.0	0.951	41,666	242.4	0.745	47,922	321.4	0.840	43,499	280.5
Africans	0.884	7,566	462.6	0.759	7,645	222.4	1.110	8,001	674.9	0.727	7,646	300.8
Asians	1.045	5,584	411.9	1.165	5,482	291.9	1.360	6,395	625.5	0.867	5,616	302.7
Other nationalities	0.664	1,509	331.3	0.528	1,484	134.8	1.000	1,744	458.7	0.585	1,541	194.7
Excess mortality at 20 km	2.647						3.383					
Proportion of isolated people	1.020			0.992			1.007			1.004		
Distance to hospital	1.003			0.996			1.007			1.007		
Community density	1.000			1.000			1.000			1.000		
Proportion of disadvantaged	1.011			1.014			1.013			1.009		
<b>Urban hierarchy (ref. Conurbation)</b>		<b>150,733</b>	<b>500.2</b>		<b>149,127</b>	<b>274.9</b>		<b>163,862</b>	<b>431.5</b>		<b>153,870</b>	<b>338.6</b>
Suburb	0.876	242,365	385.0	0.992	238,860	278.4	1.176	263,017	489.7	0.994	246,979	373.7
ZMA	0.889	232,685	390.7	0.855	228,340	236.5	1.158	253,452	434.0	0.930	236,705	330.8
Small town	0.898	392,236	375.3	0.942	384,331	249.8	1.147	427,822	427.3	0.918	399,176	328.4
Rural (or other)	0.843	529,672	308.7	0.966	517,654	236.3	1.122	580,408	376.6	0.884	538,104	300.5
AIC	70,200.6			51,150.4			86,629.3			66,644.5		
BIC	70,555.9			51,493.0			86,984.5			66,987.0		

Table 4. Multivariate results estimating the individual probability of dying (expressed in odds ratios) during one of the two Covid-19 waves (2020), compared with the results obtained during the same periods in 2019, models for people aged 80 and over. Source: Statbel; authors' calculations.

	MODEL 4: 80+ – V1 2020			MODEL 12: 80+ – V1 2019			MODEL 8: 80+ – V2 2020			MODEL 16: 80+ – V2 2019		
	OR	Population	Number of deaths per 100,000	OR	Population	Number of deaths per 100,000	OR	Population	Number of deaths per 100,000	OR	Population	Number of deaths per 100,000
<b>Sex (ref. Male)</b>		<b>238,795</b>	<b>2,386.1</b>		<b>235,465</b>	<b>1,414.2</b>		<b>265,965</b>	<b>2,391.3</b>		<b>261,690</b>	<b>1,633.6</b>
Female	0.570	408,193	2,014.2	0.616	403,443	1,177.4	0.637	444,913	2,040.8	0.694	438,568	1,446.8
<b>Age</b>	1.090			1.108			1.101			1.108		
<b>SES quartile (ref. Disadvantaged)</b>		<b>299,155</b>	<b>2,358.3</b>		<b>297,740</b>	<b>1,425.1</b>		<b>342,182</b>	<b>2,243.8</b>		<b>321,679</b>	<b>1,698.6</b>
Int. low	0.932	176,168	1,911.8	0.937	168,748	1,168.6	0.984	208,652	1,929.5	0.896	186,809	1,360.7
Int. jigh	0.925	115,595	2,026.9	0.852	111,768	1,128.2	0.869	136,167	1,794.1	0.898	122,764	1,440.2
Advantaged	0.786	56,412	1,519.2	0.710	51,416	846.0	0.779	71,310	1,377.1	0.773	59,046	1,102.5
Unknown	0.874	5,347	3,572.1	0.959	5,671	2,098.4	0.974	5,997	3,034.9	0.904	6,037	2,037.4
Missing	0.893	4,110	2,579.1	0.917	3,565	1,402.5	1.136	5,014	2,572.8	1.151	3,923	1,835.3
<b>Household composition (ref. Couples with children)</b>		<b>26,996</b>	<b>1,622.5</b>		<b>26,962</b>	<b>1,031.1</b>		<b>31,968</b>	<b>1,701.7</b>		<b>28,590</b>	<b>1,360.6</b>
Isolated	0.939	261,338	1,471.7	0.892	255,515	952.6	0.858	300,685	1,663.2	0.842	274,944	1,291.2
Couples without children	0.862	239,618	1,333.8	0.937	231,354	944.0	0.859	287,353	1,405.2	0.878	251,033	1,150.4
Single-parent households	1.128	31,091	1,797.9	1.144	30,826	1,239.2	0.958	35,727	1,914.5	1.039	33,141	1,629.4
Others	1.292	14,165	2,132.0	1.173	14,149	1,321.6	0.930	16,152	1,931.6	1.062	15,196	1,730.7
Collectives	3.710	83,579	6,675.1	2.313	80,102	3,264.6	1.876	97,437	4,988.9	1.434	97,354	3,071.3
<b>Nationality (ref. Belgians)</b>		<b>621,478</b>	<b>2,105.9</b>		<b>605,038</b>	<b>1,265.0</b>		<b>726,349</b>	<b>2,010.5</b>		<b>662,669</b>	<b>1,523.8</b>
French	1.272	5,224	3,101.1	1.030	4,973	1,508.1	1.051	6,071	2,684.9	0.804	5,473	1,425.2
Italians	1.192	11,942	2,755.0	1.164	11,520	1,484.4	1.103	14,392	2,306.8	1.039	12,771	1,589.5
Other Europeans	0.957	12,896	1,961.8	0.932	12,295	1,098.0	0.860	16,048	1,545.4	0.899	13,727	1,311.3
Africans	0.832	3,213	1,556.2	0.824	3,116	866.5	0.724	3,978	1,282.1	0.731	3,429	1,049.9
Asians	1.079	1,669	1,917.3	0.888	1,603	935.7	0.957	2,055	1,654.5	0.786	1,800	1,111.1
Other nationalities	0.656	365	1,643.8	0.614	363	826.4	0.960	429	2,097.9	0.718	389	1,285.3
Excess mortality at 20 km	2.546						3.860					
Proportion of isolated people	1.008			0.996			0.992			1.002		
Distance to hospital	0.997			1.000			1.001			0.998		
Community density	1.000			1.000			1.000			1.000		
Proportion of disadvantaged	1.011			1.009			1.006			1.004		
<b>Urban hierarchy (ref. Conurbation)</b>		<b>68,399</b>	<b>2,704.7</b>		<b>67,590</b>	<b>1,195.4</b>		<b>78,888</b>	<b>1,990.2</b>		<b>73,189</b>	<b>1,557.6</b>
Suburb	1.001	107,313	2,092.9	1.057	105,337	1,304.4	1.078	124,926	2,130.1	1.027	114,799	1,507.0
ZMA	0.885	102,236	2,181.2	1.023	99,698	1,243.8	1.050	119,193	1,921.3	1.034	108,919	1,525.9
Small town	0.930	165,523	2,084.9	1.072	160,191	1,266.6	1.071	194,082	2,010.0	1.069	176,133	1,500.0
Rural (or other)	0.942	213,316	1,942.2	1.103	206,092	1,275.6	1.101	252,233	1,989.4	1.106	227,218	1,516.6
AIC	124,432.3			82,695.1			138,800.3			104,439.5		
BIC	124,762.8			83,013.7			139,130.1			104,757.8		

## 420 Discussion

The main objectives of this article are (1) to measure the relative importance of individual and spatial determinants of mortality during and outside the Covid-19 pandemic, and (2) to measure differences in mortality according to individual and spatial characteristics. The combination of these two approaches has provided an original viewpoint for analysing the determinants of mortality during a pandemic while offering a comparison of mortality patterns over time (2019 vs. 2020), according to the evolution of the pandemic (wave 1 vs. wave 2) and according to the age of individuals (40–64 years, 65–79 years and 80 years and over).

The data for this purpose come from the National Register, the 2017 tax register, and the 2011 census. There are many advantages to using these data. In particular, the exhaustive nature of these sources allows an analysis of what mortality was like in 2019 and 2020, without the bias associated with inferring and generalising results from population samples.

As a reminder, three research hypotheses were mooted based on abundant international literature. The results obtained allow us to respond to them and qualify them based on the case of Belgium.

### 435 First hypothesis: The relative weight of the variables

Firstly, we postulated that the relative importance of individual and spatial determinants of mortality would be modified in a pandemic context, with an increase in the weight of contextual variables and a change in the hierarchy of predominant variables, given the highly contagious nature of the virus associated with the Covid-19 pandemic. At this stage, the hypothesis has not been confirmed: the probability of dying during the Covid-in 2020 period is mainly influenced by the same individual variables as during similar periods in 2019, i.e., age, sex, and household composition. Nevertheless, some spatial variables played a decisive role in mortality in 2020, such as the local excess mortality index and the proportions of disadvantaged or isolated people

in the municipality of residence. The extent of excess local mortality is in line with what has  
445 been observed in France (Levratto et al., 2020) and China (Kang et al., 2021). On the other  
hand, the results obtained contradict those of other studies that show a greater vulnerability  
during a pandemic period of individuals living in densely populated regions of France  
(Pilkington et al., 2021) and in the United States (Abedi et al., 2021).

The other individual variables (nationality, social group) and spatial variables (population  
450 density, distance to the nearest hospital) have a minimal influence on mortality, even in a  
pandemic. Compared with 2019, there is no real change in the hierarchy of variables according  
to their respective weight on mortality. Furthermore, the weight of contextual variables does  
not override that of individual variables, whether in the Covid-19 period or not.

### Second hypothesis: The characteristics associated with mortality

455 The second hypothesis involved identifying mortality-related characteristics during the Covid-  
19 pandemic. The vulnerability of some population groups that were already fragile in a context  
of traditional mortality would have been amplified during the pandemic, for example, men,  
older people, collective households, and disadvantaged social groups.

Overall, and with a few exceptions, our hypothesis has not been confirmed. Age and sex relate  
460 to multiple, well-studied phenomena, combining biology, metabolic state, health behaviours,  
and lifestyles. The year 2020 is no exception to the rule of a significant increase in the risk of  
death after the first year of life, as it is no exception to the excess male mortality rate up to the  
oldest ages. Social inequalities in mortality neither increased nor decreased during the Covid-  
19 crisis, which means that the social effect of Covid-19-related mortality is not neutral. It is  
465 apparent at the individual level in the excess mortality of the disadvantaged social group and in  
the existence of a social gradient in mortality. It is also apparent at the municipal level, with a  
non-negligible effect from variables such as the proportions of disadvantaged people. The  
pandemic would thus have perpetuated existing and significant disparities to the detriment of

disadvantaged populations, as observed elsewhere in the world (Barhoumi et al., 2020; Chen &  
470 Krieger, 2021; Mayer, 2022).

However, there is one point on which the hypothesis is confirmed: the vulnerability of collective  
households during a pandemic. The excess mortality in collective households also reflects, to  
some extent, the determining effect of biological factors on mortality via age and/or state of  
health. It is also accepted that other factors may have contributed to the ‘vulnerable state’  
475 characteristic of residents of collective households (proximity between residents and with  
carers, a particularly contagious virus (Davidson & Szanton, 2020; Kemenesi et al., 2020), and  
the lack of resources, particularly masks and hydroalcoholic gels).

### Third hypothesis: The specific characteristics of the large age groups

Finally, the third hypothesis addressed possible differences in mortality patterns by large age  
480 groups before and during the Covid-19 pandemic. Overall, this hypothesis was not confirmed,  
with relatively limited differences between the major age groups, both in terms of the weight  
of the variables and the disparities between population subgroups. With a few nuances between  
age groups, age and sex are consistently among the main determinants of mortality patterns,  
whatever the age group; in other words, the classic biological factors of age and sex act  
485 identically across the age groups.

In particular, the hypothesis predicted that the social background of individuals would have a  
more visible impact on mortality before the age of 65, given that mortality before this age is  
considered ‘avoidable’ or ‘premature’, with, *a priori*, the biological effects of age and sex being  
less significant than at older ages. However, even during a pandemic, there was no reduction or  
490 increase in the mortality gap.

At older ages, on the other hand, we hypothesised that a biological effect would supplant the  
social effect, with a return of age, sex, and state of health (via household composition) as

determining variables. In reality, the only notable difference that emerges is in the variable of household composition. Its weight increases steadily with the age of individuals until it becomes  
495 the variable with the highest weight at age 65 and over in the first Covid wave of 2020. Analyses of the parameters for each modality show a remarkable risk of death for residents of collective households, and more so for those aged 65–79 than for those aged 80 and over. This is probably a selection effect. According to Pujol et al. (2021), compared with the population living in private households, the risk of death in a nursing home is much higher among relatively young  
500 residents (65–74) than among those aged 75 and over. For people aged 65–79, institutionalisation likely results from health problems that prevent them from remaining at home<sup>14</sup>. Among those aged 80 and over, nursing home residents have survived to a ripe old age and, in addition to medical care, for some of them, residence in an institution is a response not only to health issues but to a need for social interaction and contact (Hanratty et al., 2018), even  
505 if this need is not systematically met (Gardiner et al., 2020). The age, sex, and household situation of individuals would thus have been major determinants of mortality during the Covid period of 2020. Alongside these variables, living close to areas of excess mortality would determine the risk of death, particularly at older ages. As this is an indicator of the virulence of the virus in the area, this implies that the individual risk of dying during the Covid period is  
510 increased in elderly people living in an area of high mortality, thus pointing to high circulation of the virus. The spatial context of mortality would therefore have repercussions on the individual risk of mortality, and this is all the more justified in the case of the elderly as their resistance and immune capacity diminish. However, comparing the coefficients of logistic regressions carried out on different population groups is not easy, since the difference in

---

<sup>14</sup> In Brussels, the risk of death in a nursing home is strongly associated with age and pathologies, such as chronic illnesses (Houttekier et al., 2009).

515 coefficients can be explained by unobservable phenomena, which have different impacts on mortality depending on the age group (Mood, 2010).

### General conclusion

In general, and in conclusion, the results show that, with a few nuances, non-pandemic mortality patterns do not differ from those observed during the Covid pandemic. This can be explained  
520 by the fact that vulnerability to the Covid-19 virus mainly affected population groups that were already the most vulnerable under normal circumstances (elderly people, men, nursing home residents). In addition to the almost identical mortality pattern, it is essential to emphasise that during a pandemic, there is an almost systematic increase in partial pseudo-correlations. The combination of these two factors allows us to emphasise that the pandemic amplified  
525 inequalities in mortality in certain groups, which, even before the pandemic, were already paying a heavy price in terms of mortality.

### Limitations and methodological aspects

Several limitations may affect our analyses over and above the results and the conclusions we can draw from them. Firstly, it should be remembered that the analyses relate to all-cause  
530 mortality during the two Covid waves in 2020. Currently, data by cause of death are unavailable in Belgium, making it impossible to identify deaths that resulted directly from the pandemic. If Covid-19 doubled the number of deaths during the first wave of 2020, a certain number of ‘all-cause’ deaths were due to causes other than Covid-19.

There are also inherent limitations in the indicators used. For example, we have tried to explain  
535 the probability of dying in 2019 or 2020 by characteristics observed much earlier. This is the case for the social positioning of individuals, which is based on data from 2011 and 2017. However, individual situations may have changed between 2011 or 2017 and the most recent period, even if this problem probably affects the oldest individuals much less. At older ages, for whom mortality was highest, education levels, income, and access to housing are more or

540 less stable (Eggerickx et al., 2020). There is no alternative for addressing this concern, as the next update is expected to take place in 2021, i.e., at a later date than that relating to the events studied, and with no possible adjustment for people who died between 2011 and 2021.

The possibilities for research into Covid-19 are far from exhausted. The availability of data by cause of death will offer other possibilities for analysis, with questions that could be even more  
545 precise since we will be able to work solely with data on the victims of the pandemic. Still, analyses on all-cause excess mortality will remain solid on the consequences of the pandemic, in terms of death directly related to Covid, as well as other causes of death.

## References

- Abedi, V., Olulana, O., Avula, V., Chaudhary, D., Khan, A., Shahjouei, S., Li, J., & Zand, R. (2021).  
550 Racial, economic, and health inequality and COVID-19 infection in the United States. *Journal of Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities*, 8(3), 732-742.
- Aburto, J. M., Schöley, J., Kashnitsky, I., Zhang, L., Rahal, C., Missov, T. I., Mills, M. C., Dowd, J. B., & Kashyap, R. (2021). Quantifying impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic through life-expectancy losses: A population-level study of 29 countries. *International Journal of*  
555 *Epidemiology*, 51(1), 63-74.
- Ahrenfeldt, L. J., Otavova, M., Christensen, K., & Lindahl-Jacobsen, R. (2021). Sex and age differences in COVID-19 mortality in Europe. *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift*, 133, 393-398.
- Amdaoud, M., Arcuri, G., & Levratto, N. (2021). Are regions equal in adversity? A spatial analysis of spread and dynamics of COVID-19 in Europe. *The European Journal of Health Economics*,  
560 22(4), 629-642.
- Andersen, L. M., Harden, S. R., Sugg, M. M., Runkle, J. D., & Lundquist, T. E. (2021). Analyzing the spatial determinants of local Covid-19 transmission in the United States. *Science of the Total Environment*, 754, 142396.



- Andrasfay, T., & Goldman, N. (2021). Reductions in 2020 US life expectancy due to COVID-19  
565 and the disproportionate impact on the Black and Latino populations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(5), e2014746118.
- Atkins, J. L., Masoli, J. A., Delgado, J., Pilling, L. C., Kuo, C.-L., Kuchel, G. A., & Melzer, D. (2020). Preexisting comorbidities predicting COVID-19 and mortality in the UK Biobank community cohort. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series A*, 75(11), 2224-2230.
- 570 Bamba, C., Riordan, R., Ford, J., & Matthews, F. (2020). The COVID-19 pandemic and health inequalities. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 74(11), 964-968.
- Barhoumi, M., Jonchery, A., Lombardo, P., Le Minez, S., Mainaud, T., Raynaud, É., Pailhé, A., Solaz, A., & Pollak, C. (2020). *Les inégalités sociales à l'épreuve de la crise sanitaire : Un bilan du premier confinement*. Institut national de la statistique et des études économiques (INSEE).
- 575 Bauer, P., Brugger, J., König, F., & Posch, M. (2021). An international comparison of age and sex dependency of COVID-19 deaths in 2020 : A descriptive analysis. *Scientific Reports*, 11(1), 19143.
- Bhatti, I., Lohano, H., Pirzado, Z., & Jafri, I. (2006). A logistic regression analysis of the Ischemic Heart Disease Risk. *Journal of Applied Science*, 6(4), 785-788.
- 580 Bourguignon, M., Damiens, J., Doignon, Y., Eggerickx, T., Fontaine, S., Plavsic, A., Rees, A., Rizzi, E., Sanderson, J.-P., & Schlüter, B.-S. (2022). Un an après. Analyse de la variation sociodémographique de la surmortalité de 2020 liée à la Covid-19 en Belgique. *Cahiers québécois de démographie*.
- Bourguignon, M., Damiens, J., Doignon, Y., Eggerickx, T., Lusyne, P., Plavsic, A., Rees, A., Rizzi, E., Sanderson, J.-P., & Schlüter, B.-S. (2021). *Variations spatiales et sociodémographiques de mortalité de 2020-2021 en Belgique. L'effet de la pandémie Covid-19*. <https://hal.science/hal-03430468>.
- 585 Brandén, M., Aradhya, S., Kolk, M., Harkonen, J., Drefahl, S., Malmberg, B., Rostila, M., Cederström, A., Andersson, G., & Mussino, E. (2020). *Residential context and COVID-19*

- 590 *mortality among the elderly in Stockholm: A population-based, observational study* (Stockholm  
Research Reports in Demography 31). Stockholm University. <https://hal.science/hal-03430468>
- Burström, B., & Tao, W. (2020). Social determinants of health and inequalities in COVID-19. *European Journal of Public Health, 30*(4), 617-618.
- 595 Bustos Sierra, N., Bossuyt, N., Braeye, T., Leroy, M., Moyersoen, I., Peeters, I., Scohy, A., Van der Heyden, J., Van Oyen, H., & Renard, F. (2020). All-cause mortality supports the COVID-19 mortality in Belgium and comparison with major fatal events of the last century. *Archives of Public Health, 78*, 1-8.
- Cambois, E., & Jusot, F. (2007). Ampleur, tendance et causes des inégalités sociales de santé et de  
600 mortalité en Europe: Une revue des études comparatives. *Bulletin épidémiologique hebdomadaire, 2*(3), 10-14.
- Canevelli, M., Palmieri, L., Raparelli, V., Punzo, O., Donfrancesco, C., Lo Noce, C., Vanacore, N., Brusaferrero, S., Onder, G., & Italian National Institute of Health COVID-19 Mortality Group. (2020). COVID-19 mortality among migrants living in Italy. *Annali dell'Istituto Superiore di Sanità, 56*(3), 373-377.
- 605
- Chen, J. T., & Krieger, N. (2021). Revealing the unequal burden of COVID-19 by income, race/ethnicity, and household crowding: US county versus zip code analyses. *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice, 27*(1), S43-S56.
- Davidson, P. M., & Szanton, S. L. (2020). Nursing homes and COVID-19: We can and should do  
610 better. *Journal of Clinical Nursing, 29*, 2758-2759.
- Decoster, A., Minten, T., & Spinnewijn, J. (2021). The income gradient in mortality during the COVID-19 crisis: Evidence from Belgium. *Journal of Economic Inequality, 19*(3), 551-570.

- Drefahl, S., Wallace, M., Mussino, E., Aradhya, S., Kolk, M., Brandén, M., Malmberg, B., & Andersson, G. (2020). A population-based cohort study of socio-demographic risk factors  
615 for COVID-19 deaths in Sweden. *Nature Communications*, 11(1), 5097.
- Eggerickx, T., Sanderson, J.-P., & Vandeschrick, C. (2020). Mortality in Belgium from nineteenth century to today. Variations according to age, sex, and social and spatial contexts. *Quetelet Journal*, 8(2), 7-59.
- Fonseca-Rodríguez, O., Gustafsson, P. E., San Sebastián, M., & Connolly, A.-M. F. (2021). Spatial  
620 clustering and contextual factors associated with hospitalisation and deaths due to COVID-19 in Sweden : A geospatial nationwide ecological study. *BMJ Global Health*, 6(7), e006247.
- Gadeyne, S., Rodriguez-Loureiro, L., Surkyn, J., Van Hemelrijck, W., Nusselder, W., Lusyne, P., & Vanthomme, K. (2021). Are we really all in this together ? The social patterning of mortality during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic in Belgium. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, 20(1), 1-17.  
625
- Gardiner, C., Laud, P., Heaton, T., & Gott, M. (2020). What is the prevalence of loneliness amongst older people living in residential and nursing care homes ? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Age and Ageing*, 49(5), 748-757.
- Gaudart, J., Landier, J., Huiart, L., Legendre, E., Lehot, L., Bendiane, M. K., Chiche, L., Petitjean, A., Mosnier, E., & Kirakoya-Samadoulougou, F. (2021). Factors associated with the spatial  
630 heterogeneity of the first wave of COVID-19 in France : A nationwide geo-epidemiological study. *The Lancet Public Health*, 6(4), e222-e231.
- Guilmoto, C. Z. (2020). COVID-19 death rates by age and sex and the resulting mortality vulnerability of countries and regions in the world. *MedRxiv*.  
635 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.17.20097410>
- Hanratty, B., Stow, D., Collingridge Moore, D., Valtorta, N. K., & Matthews, F. (2018). Loneliness as a risk factor for care home admission in the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing. *Age and Ageing*, 47(6), 896-900.

- Hardy, O. J., Dubourg, D., Bourguignon, M., Dellicour, S., Eggerickx, T., Gilbert, M., Sanderson,  
640 J.-P., Scohy, A., Vandael, E., & Decroly, J.-M. (2021). A world apart : Levels and factors of  
excess mortality due to COVID-19 in care homes. The case of Wallonia-Belgium.  
*Demographic Research*, *45*, 1011-1040.
- Houttekier, D., Cohen, J., Bilsen, J., Deboosere, P., Verduyck, P., & Deliens, L. (2009).  
Determinants of the place of death in the Brussels metropolitan region. *Journal of Pain and*  
645 *Symptom Management*, *37*(6), 996-1005.
- Islam, N., Shkolnikov, V. M., Acosta, R. J., Klimkin, I., Kawachi, I., Irizarry, R. A., Alicandro, G.,  
Khunti, K., Yates, T., Jdanov, D. A., White, M., Lewingston, S., & Lacey, B. (2021). Excess  
deaths associated with covid-19 pandemic in 2020 : Age and sex disaggregated time series  
analysis in 29 high income countries. *BMJ*, *373*, 1137.
- 650 Kang, D., Choi, H., Kim, J.-H., & Choi, J. (2020). Spatial epidemic dynamics of the COVID-19  
outbreak in China. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*, *94*, 96-102.
- Kemenesi, G., Kornya, L., Tóth, G. E., Kurucz, K., Zeghib, S., Somogyi, B. A., Zöldi, V., Urbán,  
P., Herczeg, R., & Jakab, F. (2020). Nursing homes and the elderly regarding the COVID-  
19 pandemic : Situation report from Hungary. *GeroScience*, *42*, 1093-1099.
- 655 Kunst, A. E., & Mackenbach, J. P. (1994). International variation in the size of mortality differences  
associated with occupational status. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, *23*(4), 742-750.
- Levratto, N., Amdaoud, M., & Arcuri, G. (2020). *Covid-19 : Analyse spatiale de l'influence des facteurs  
socio-économiques sur la prévalence et les conséquences de l'épidémie dans les départements français*.  
University of Paris Nanterre, EconomiX.
- 660 Maroko, A. R., Nash, D., & Pavilonis, B. T. (2020). Covid-19 and Inequity : A comparative spatial  
analysis of New York City and Chicago hot spots. *Journal of Urban Health*, *97*(4), 461-470.
- Mayer, K. U. (2022). Aspects of a sociology of the pandemic : Inequalities and the life course.  
*Vienna Yearbook of Population Research*, *20*, 15-37.

- Meurisse, M., Lajot, A., Devleeschauwer, B., Van Cauteren, D., Van Oyen, H., Vand den Borre,  
665 L., & Brondeel, R. (2022). The association between area deprivation and COVID-19  
incidence : A municipality-level spatio-temporal study in Belgium, 2020-2021. *Archives of  
Public Health, 80*, 1-10.
- Mood, C. (2010). Logistic regression: Why we cannot do what we think we can do, and what we  
can do about it. *European sociological review, 26*(1), 67-82.
- 670 Nafilyan, V., Islam, N., Ayoubkhani, D., Gilles, C., Katikireddi, S. V., Mathur, R., Summerfield, A.,  
Tingay, K., Asaria, M., & John, A. (2021). Ethnicity, household composition and COVID-  
19 mortality : A national linked data study. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine, 114*(4),  
182-211.
- Pifarré i Arolas, H., Acosta, E., López-Casasnovas, G., Lo, A., Nicodemo, C., Riffe, T., & Myrskylä,  
675 M. (2021). Years of life lost to COVID-19 in 81 countries. *Scientific Reports, 11*(1), 1-6.
- Pilkington, H., Feuillet, T., Rican, S., Goupil de Bouillé, J., Bouchaud, O., Caihol, J., Bihan, H.,  
Lombrail, P., & Julia, C. (2021). Spatial determinants of excess all-cause mortality during  
the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic in France. *BMC Public Health, 21*(1), 2157.
- Pujol, F. E., Hancock, R., & Morciano, M. (2021). Trends in survival of older care home residents  
680 in England : A 10-year multi-cohort study. *Social Science & Medicine, 282*, 113883.
- Riou, J., Panczak, R., Althaus, C. L., Junker, C., Perisa, D., Schneider, K., Criscuolo, N. G., Low,  
N., & Egger, M. (2021). Socioeconomic position and the COVID-19 care cascade from  
testing to mortality in Switzerland : A population-based analysis. *The Lancet Public Health,*  
*6*(9), e683-e691.
- 685 Sánchez-Páez, D. (2022). Effect of income inequality on the COVID-19 pandemic : Evidence from  
European countries. *Vienna Yearbook of Population Research, 20*, 85-106.
- Sciensano. (2020). *Surveillance de la Covid-19. Questions fréquemment posées.* [https://covid-  
19.sciensano.be/sites/default/files/Covid19/COVID-19\\_FAQ\\_FR\\_final.pdf](https://covid-19.sciensano.be/sites/default/files/Covid19/COVID-19_FAQ_FR_final.pdf)

- Vandentorren, S., Smaili, S., Chatignoux, E., Maurel, M., Alleaume, C., Neufcourt, L., Kelly-Irving,  
690 M., & Delpierre, C. (2022). The effect of social deprivation on the dynamic of SARS-CoV-  
2 infection in France : A population-based analysis. *The Lancet Public Health*, 7(3), e240-e249.
- Vanderstraeten, L., & Van Hecke, E. (2019). Les régions urbaines en Belgique. *Belgeo. Revue belge de  
géographie*, 1.
- Varshney, K., Glodjo, T., & Adalbert, J. (2022). Overcrowded housing increases risk for COVID-  
695 19 mortality : An ecological study. *BMC Research Notes*, 15(1), 1-4.
- White, P., & Gorard, S. (2017). Against inferential statistics : How and why current statistics  
teaching gets it wrong. *Statistics Education Research Journal*, 16(1), 55-65.
- Williamson, E. J., Walker, A. J., Bhaskaran, K., Bacon, S., Bates, C., Morton, C. E., Curtis, H. J.,  
Mehrkar, A., Evans, D., Inglesby, P., Cockburn, J., McDonald, H. I., MacKenna, B.,  
700 Tomlinson, L., Douglas, I. J., Rentsh, C. T., Mathur, R., Wong, A. Y. S., Grieve, R., ...  
Goldacre, B. (2020). Factors associated with COVID-19-related death using  
OpenSAFELY. *Nature*, 584(7821), 430-436.

705