The remarkable ups and downs of birth rate in Switzerland 2020 to 2023 in a historical context

Short title: Births in Switzerland 2020 to 2023 in historical context

Mathilde Le Vu [1], Katarina L. Matthes [1], Kaspar Staub [1,3]

[1] Institute of Evolutionary Medicine, University of Zurich, Switzerland

[2] Swiss School of Public Health SSPH+, Zurich, Switzerland

ORCiDs

Mathilde Le Vu: 0000-0001-9495-4822

Katarina L. Matthes: 0000-0002-5263-3542

Kaspar Staub: 0000-0002-3951-1807

Correspondence: PD Dr. Kaspar Staub, Institute of Evolutionary Medicine, University of Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, CH-8057 Zurich, Switzerland, kaspar.staub@iem.uzh.ch, +41 44 635 05 13

Funding: This work was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation under Grant 197305.

Abstract

We follow population trends in the monthly birth rate in Switzerland almost up to the present and place the latest developments in a historical context. Birth rates in 2022 were the lowest since the 1870s, and the trend is continuing in 2023. The latest decline had already begun 1-2 years before Covid-19. Previous pandemics (1890, 1918, 1920, 1957) had led to a temporary decline in births ∽9 months after the epidemic peaks. With Covid-19, this appears more complex. During and shortly after the first two waves and shutdowns in 2020, there were more conceptions and thus excess birth rates in 2021, in all available subgroups except Italian-speaking Switzerland, and somewhat more pronounced among >30-year-old mothers and second parities. Possible reasons for the mini-boom include: The increased time at home during the shutdowns has – planned or not – led to more conceptions which has brought pregnancies forward; the corona virus was still circulating too infrequently in this 1st phase of the pandemic to have a negative impact on pregnancies or fertility; at the end of the waves and shutdowns, the perceived end of the pandemic threat could have led to an optimistic mood and thus also more conceptions. The subsequent decline from January 2022 was stronger than the increase before. The first part of the decline in 2022 is most likely due to a negative rebound from the advancement of births in 2020/2021 and deliberately postponed pregnancies due to the start of the vaccination program. The second part of the decline in 2022 is associated with conceptions during the large Omicron wave in the winter of 2021/2022, when many people in Switzerland fell ill. In addition, prices have been rising and real wages falling since 2021, the global political situation has become more unstable, and a general change in values regarding the willingness to have children may also be underway. Following these observations at population level (with limited depth of variables), more in-depth studies must now follow to better understand the dynamic ups and downs in the birth rate in Switzerland in recent years.

Keywords: Monitoring; Population level; Historical pandemics; Spanish flu; Russian flu; Asian flu; Covid-19

Introduction

At the end of 2023, birth rates are the focus of attention in many places (Danny, 2023). Were there more or fewer births during or after the COVID-19 pandemic crisis, a baby boom or a baby bust? A multinational study showed that in many European countries, the initial pandemic shock in early 2020 was associated with a decline in births nine months later (Sobotka et al., 2023). Subsequently, some European countries reported stable or slightly increasing birth rates in 2021, nine months after the first and second pandemic waves in 2020. From January 2022, many European countries show a marked decline in birth rates, continuing a negative trend that may have begun before Covid-19 (Sobotka et al., 2023). In the US, the pattern of birth rates was somewhat different, with an initial decline in 2020 to early 2021 (Bailey et al., 2023), and especially after the first and second waves of Covid-19 (Adelman et al., 2023), followed by a smaller than expected rebound in 2022.

Birth rates are known to respond to pandemics and other crises (Lee et al., 2023), including heatwaves and natural disasters such as tsunamis (Barreca et al., 2018; Nobles et al., 2015). In the case of pandemics and epidemics, it has been shown that birth rates appear to drop approximately 9 months after the peak of an outbreak (as was the case with SARS-CoV-1, Zika, and to a lesser extent Ebola), followed by a rebound in births (Pomar et al., 2020). The reasons for this pattern are multifactorial but are likely to be related to deliberate postponement of conception, as well as illness-related fertility restrictions and natural abortions early in pregnancy during the peak of the outbreak. Most of the evidence on historical pandemics comes from research on the 1918-1920 influenza pandemic ("Spanish flu"), when births declined 9 months after the pandemic peak in Scandinavia (Bloom-Feshbach et al., 2011; Svenn-Erik Mamelund, 2004; Pomar et al., 2020), Britain (Chandra et al., 2018; Chandra & Yu, 2015; Reid, 2005), Japan (Chandra & Yu, 2015), and the United States (Bloom-Feshbach et al., 2011; Chandra et al., 2018). However, some of these aspects are currently being debated in the literature, for example whether the 1918-1920 pandemic or the end of the First World War is more likely to be associated with these changes in birthrates (Gaddy & Ingholt, 2023; S.-E. Mamelund, 2012).

Following the sharp decline in the birth rate in Switzerland from the 1970s onwards with the introduction of the contraceptive pill, the birth rate has stabilized at a low level in recent decades. The birth rate slightly declined for two or three years before the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic. Switzerland was hit by the first wave of COVID-19 in the spring of 2020, leading to a partial shutdown from mid-March to early May 2020. The stronger second wave emerged from October 2020 and led to historic excess mortality (Staub et al., 2022), especially among the elderly, accompanied again by a partial shutdown from November 2020 to February 2021, and followed by a gradual easing of these measures. As elsewhere, the circulation of different SARS-CoV-2 strains led to several waves of various intensity from 2021. The large omicron wave, which occurred between November 2021 and April 2022, resulted in very high case numbers but a relatively low mortality. Switzerland was also directly or indirectly affected by other events that coincided with the pandemic, such as the outbreak of war in Ukraine in February 2022 and a severe heat wave in the summer of 2022. In addition, COVID-19 led to an economic downturn.

For Switzerland, the most recent trends in birth rates in the years 2020 to 2023 in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic and crisis have not yet been scientifically studied. The aim of the present study is to describe the

monthly dynamics in birth rates during the last two to three years of the COVID-19 pandemic, also for certain subgroups, and to place these population-level developments in a larger temporal context since the end of the 19th century.

Data and methods

For this study, we have chosen two different approaches to the official Swiss vital statistics BEVNAT of the Swiss Federal Statistical Office (FSO). BEVNAT is the annual statistics of all births, marriages, divorces, deaths, etc. in Switzerland. On the one hand, we worked with the officially published monthly aggregated numbers of all live births in Switzerland between January 1871 and September 2023. The numbers for January through September 2023 are preliminary (final numbers for the full year 2023 will not be available until later in 2024). On the other hand, we obtained from the FSO all currently available individual data on all births per month from BEVNAT, in fully anonymized form and after signing a data contract (according to the Human Research Act HRA, no ethical approval is required when working with fully anonymized government data). Here we cover the period from January 1989 to December 2022 and have other co-factors such as maternal age, maternal nationality (Swiss vs. non-Swiss), parity at birth (since 2005), sex and vital status of the newborns, and whether it was a multiple birth or not. We also know the language region (German-, French- or Italian-speaking Switzerland) in which the mother lived at the time of the birth. Language region can be considered a rough proxy for cultural, social and behavioral factors, including diet, smoking and alcohol consumption of the parents, as well as genetics (Novembre et al., 2008; Skrivankova et al., 2019). The timing and duration of the earlier pandemics of 1890, 1918-1920, 1957, 1969-1970 and 2009 were obtained from the weekly bulletin of the Federal Office of Public Health (Schweiz Bundesamt für Gesundheitswesen, n.d.).

Birth rates were calculated using the total annual population (source: FSO STATPOP). In a sensitivity analysis, we also calculated all models using the population of women aged 15-49 as the denominator. The monthly expected birth rate was estimated by using a Bayesian hierarchical model in which the last 5 years of the respective birth year are used for the calculation. A negative binomial model was used to model the number of births while the population was considered as an offset. Time and seasonality effects were added in the model as random effect using random walk model of order 1 and birth month as fixed effect. Following the model fitting process, we draw 1000 samples from the posterior distribution (the expected number of births). Subsequently, we computed the median and 95% credible intervals (CrI). The over-birth and under-birth rates were then determined by subtracting the expected values from the observed ones and expressing the results as percentages. These estimates are calculated for all subgroups mentioned above. In addition, using the same Bayesian hierarchical model, we predicted the birthrate from 2021-2023 using the years 2016-2020 (the pre-pandemic period) as reference birth numbers. All statistical analyses were performed using R Version 4.2.2 (R Core Team, 2022) and all models were fitted using INLA (Integrated Nested Laplace Approximation) (www.r-inla.org).

Results

The long-term trend in the monthly birth rate is shown in Figure 1. From the end of the 19th century at the latest, rates fell sharply to below 25 live births per 10 000 population. There was a temporary dip during the First World War. From the Second World War until the mid-1960s there was a marked increase in births due to the so-called baby boom generations. With the introduction of the contraceptive pill, the birth rate fell sharply from the 1970s and has remained below the fertility replacement level of 2.1 children per woman. In recent decades, the birth rate has more or less stabilized at a low level. After a slight increase in the birth rate around 2016, the birth rate declined slightly thereafter and until 2019 (Figure 2). In 2021, the second year of the pandemic, there was a temporary excess of births before the birth rate reached an all-time low of 9.3 live births per 10 000 population in 2022 (Supplementary Table S1). Preliminary monthly data up to September 2023 suggest that the downward trend is continuing (Figure 2).

If we look at the impact of previous pandemics on the birth rate, we find different patterns. The so-called "Russian flu", which peaked in January 1890 and affected more than two thirds of the population, led to a decline in births of -21.8% (95% CrI -23.9 to -19.0%) about nine months later, in October 1890 (Supplementary Figure S1). About 9 months after the outbreak of World War I and the general mobilisation of troops in Switzerland in 1914, fertility rates began to fall and remained low for the duration of the war (Supplementary Figure S2). The first two waves of the "Spanish flu" occurred in 1918, at the end of the war, when birth rates had already fallen markedly. We see the lowest birth rates of the entire war period in mid-1919 (a decrease of -17.1% (95% CrI -34.9 to 6.2%)), about 9 months after the strongest wave of "Spanish flu". About 9 months after the end of the war and the end of the second "Spanish flu" wave, there was a marked increase in births, which was temporarily interrupted again (by a decrease of -18.3%) towards the end of 1920, i.e. about 9 months after the strong later pandemic wave, which peaked in February 1920. The next influenza pandemic hit Switzerland in the autumn of 1957. Again, about 9 months after the peak of the "Asian flu", we see a decrease in the birth rate of -12.1% (95% CrI -16.44 to -8.43%) (Supplementary Figure S3). The next influenza pandemic was the "Hong Kong flu", which also hit Switzerland in the winters of 1968/69 and 1969/70, albeit to a lesser extent. This time we see no effect on the birth rate 9 months later (Supplementary Figure S4). The Great Recession of 2008/2009 and the "Swine Flu" pandemic at the end of 2009 also did not lead to a reduction in births 9 months later, but in the case of the "Swine Flu" an increase in births can be seen around 9 months after the end of the pandemic wave (Supplementary Figure S5).

If we look at the trend in recent years (Figure 2 and Table 1), there is no change at the population level in Switzerland around 9 months after the declaration of the COVID-19 pandemic and the first immediate pandemic shock at the beginning of 2020 compared to the expected values. On the other hand, we find a +4.5% to +9.4% increase in the monthly birth rate in two periods in 2021, associated with conceptions during and shortly after each of the two pandemic waves and the associated partial shutdowns in 2020. From January 2022, the relative differences in the birth rate compared to the expected monthly values are negative (-7.3% to -11.5%). The first months of this decline are associated with conceptions in the first quarter of 2021, when the vaccination campaign officially started in Switzerland. However, young adults without pre-existing conditions

were not eligible for vaccination until May 2021, and among 20–40-year-olds, the proportion of double vaccinated people did not exceed 33% until July 2021 and 50% until September 2021 (this would correspond to births in April and June 2022). The second half of the decline in 2022 is associated with conceptions in the winter of 2021/2022, when the first major Omicron wave raged in Switzerland. The negative trend also continues in the provisional monthly data for 2023. A sensitivity analysis with the 15–49-year-old women as the denominator instead of the total population reaches very similar results. The monthly trend in the sex ratio at birth has been stable for many years and has not changed noticeably in recent years (Supplementary Figure S6).

If the increase in births in the year 2021 is not considered when estimating expected birth rates for 2022 and 2023, it becomes clear that the declining births in 2022 and 2023 follow the general trend of declining births that already began in the years before the pandemic (Figure 3). The observed births 2022 to 2023 are slightly lower than the expected births, but still follow the negative trend of birth rates predicted from the years 2016 to 2020.

Based on the fully anonymized individual data, we can also track the trends up to the end of 2022 for certain subgroups of the population (Table 1). The overall pattern (first more births in 2021 and then fewer births in 2022) is also seen in most of the subgroups. The increase in births in 2021 appears to have been slightly stronger in second parities, and slightly weaker in mothers aged <30 years. In Italian-speaking Switzerland and in the case of third and more parities, the increase in 2021 hardly seems to have taken place. The decline in births in 2022 appears to be slightly more pronounced and/or longer in German-speaking Switzerland than in Latin Switzerland, and slightly more pronounced among Swiss mothers, mothers >30 years old, and among non-primiparous women.

Discussion

We follow population trends in the birth rate in Switzerland almost up to the present and place the latest developments during the COVID-19 pandemic in a historical context. The birth rate in 2022 was the lowest it has been since the 1870s, and it seems the trend is continuing in 2023. The latest decline had already begun 1-2 years before COVID-19. Previous pandemics (1890, 1918, 1920, 1957) had each led to a temporary decline in the birth rate around 9 months after the peak of these outbreaks. With Covid-19, this appears more complex. The immediate shock of the global outbreak has not left a negative mark on births in Switzerland. However, during and shortly after the first two pandemic waves and partial shutdowns in 2020, there were more conceptions and thus excess births in 2021, in all available subgroups except Italian-speaking Switzerland, and somewhat more pronounced among >30-year-old mothers and second parities. Possible reasons for the mini-boom include: The increased time at home during the shutdowns has – planned or not – led to more conceptions which has brought pregnancies forward; the corona virus was still circulating too infrequently in this 1st phase of the pandemic to have a negative impact on pregnancies or fertility; at the end of the waves and shutdowns, the perceived end of the pandemic threat could have led to an optimistic mood and thus also more conceptions. The subsequent decline in births from January 2022 was stronger than the increase in

births in 2021. The first part of the decline in 2022 is most likely due to a negative rebound from the advancement of births in 2020/2021 and deliberately postponed pregnancies due to the start of the vaccination program. The second part of the decline in 2022 is associated with conceptions during the big Omicron wave in the winter of 2021/2022, when many people in Switzerland fell ill. In addition, prices have been rising and real wages falling since 2021, the global political situation has become more unstable, and a general change in values regarding the willingness to have children may also be underway.

The short-term shifts in the Swiss birth rate described above are remarkable and show both similarities and differences to other countries. In contrast to other countries (Sobotka et al., 2023), the initial pandemic shock in Switzerland at the beginning of 2020 did not lead to marked drop in the birth rate 9 months later at the end of 2020. The subsequent double-peak increase in 2021, nine months after each of the two pandemic waves and shutdown phases in 2020, also occurred with varying magnitude in other countries. However, the short-term boom was less pronounced or even absent in neighboring countries (Germany, Austria and Italy) (Sobotka et al., 2023). Only France recorded similar increases in 2021 than those reported here. The sharp decline during 2022 is also observed in many other countries, including France, Germany, and Austria (DESTATIS, 2023; Insee, 2023; StatistikAustria, 2023). However, the extent of the short-term ups and downs appears to have been particularly pronounced in Switzerland compared with other countries (Sobotka et al., 2023). The reasons for these country-specific differences still need to be investigated.

Looking back at past pandemics, we can also confirm the temporary decline in births in Switzerland in mid-1919, around nine months after the most severe phase of the "Spanish flu" in Fall and Winter 1918, as in other countries (Bloom-Feshbach et al., 2011; Pomar et al., 2020). This was followed by an increase in births in 1920, although the effects of the end of the war and the end of the pandemic can hardly be separated, even in countries not directly involved in the war (Gaddy & Ingholt, 2023; S.-E. Mamelund, 2012). We also add to the literature by showing that in Switzerland the “Russian flu” in 1890, the strong “Spanish flu” later wave in 1920 and the “Asian flu” in 1957 also led to a short-term drop in births around nine months after the pandemic peaks. In the case of the 1890 Russian flu, the authorities at the time were already aware of the phenomenon (Schmid, 1895), and explained the lack of births around 9 months after the pandemic peak with postponed conceptions as well as infection-related abortions early in pregnancy, which would escape statistics (Schmid, 1895). As far as we know, there are not many comparative studies on birth rates and fertility during these other historical pandemics, but in Switzerland the 1890, 1918-1920, and 1957 pandemics were the strongest before COVID-19 (Staub et al., 2022), and the respective authorities at the time estimated that at least two thirds of the population fell ill during each of these pandemics. This was not the case with the later and weaker pandemics of 1968-70 (“Hong Kong flu”) or 2009 (“Swine flu”), which were not associated with a decline in birth rates in Switzerland.

Usually, crises and pandemics tend to have a negative effect on the birth rate (Lee et al., 2023). The temporary baby boom in 2021 around 9 months after the first two waves of the Covid-19 pandemic and the associated shutdowns in 2020 is therefore rather surprising. There are certainly several reasons for this. On the one hand, thanks to the strong public health interventions (including two partial shutdowns), the number of

infections among the population was still relatively low in 2020. This assumption is supported by seroprevalence studies carried out at the time, which showed that after the first wave in spring, around 12% of the population had antibodies in their blood, and this level only increased to around 25% during the second wave in autumn/winter 2020 (West et al., 2020). This means that the risk of infection-related reduced fertility or abortions in Switzerland was probably still rather low in 2020. During the shutdowns, people obviously spent more time at home, which could have improved the work-personal life balance and increased the frequency of intercourse. This could explain the increase in both planned and unplanned (Lewis et al., 2021) pregnancies, perhaps also in the sense of bringing planned pregnancies forward. We also see that the two increases in the number of conceptions in 2021 lasted for a short time after the measures were lifted. The end of the partial shutdowns and the perceived threat of a pandemic may have led to a mood of optimism when it comes to family planning. However, the societal and health impacts of the first two COVID-19 waves and the associated shutdowns in 2020 were certainly not the same for everyone in Switzerland, and this heterogeneity would need to be investigated in more in-depth studies.

The start of the decline in births from January 2022 is associated with conceptions from March 2021. Again, there are various possible reasons, which are not necessarily exclusive. If there was a forward-bringing of pregnancies in 2020 as described above, this could have resulted in a negative rebound from Spring 2021. In addition, the vaccination campaign officially started at the beginning of 2021, but young people without pre-existing conditions were not officially eligible for the vaccination until May 2021 (and the vaccination rate among young people increased only slowly thereafter). This could have led to pregnancies being deliberately postponed until after vaccination, as has been suggested for other countries. At present, the evidence is rapidly growing that the coronavirus vaccination cannot be directly and biologically linked to the decline in births and fertility (Wang et al., 2023; Zaçe et al., 2022). This unanimous opinion is supported by a growing number of studies with different designs on male/female fertility (Aharon et al., 2022; Ba et al., 2023; Barda et al., 2022; Gonzalez et al., 2021; Morris, 2021; Reschini et al., 2022; Yang et al., 2023; Yildiz et al., 2023) and miscarriage (Yland et al., 2023; Zauche et al., 2021), including already some review articles (Rimmer et al., 2023; Wesselink et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2023; Zhu et al., 2023). Several studies report changes in the duration of menstrual cycle length following COVID-19 vaccination (Alvergne et al., 2023), but these changes are small (+/-1 day) and resume in the next cycle, thus not threatening fertility (Alvergne, 2023). In the case of Switzerland, the timing also speaks against such a direct effect of vaccination on birth rates: The decline in births at the beginning of 2022 and thus in conceptions from spring 2021 was already ongoing for several months before young people in Switzerland were able to be vaccinated, and before >30% of the 20-40 age group were double vaccinated in July 2021.

Where there is a relatively large body of evidence, however, is how single and multiple COVID-19 infections can harm male and female fertility (Aksak et al., 2022; Chen et al., 2021; Harb et al., 2022; Hosseini et al., 2023; Martinez et al., 2023; Patel et al., 2021; Saadedine et al., 2023; Wesselink et al., 2022). And this could be one of the reasons for the decline in births in the second half of 2022. The conception of these pregnancies goes back to the fall/winter of 2021/2022 when the long and massive first Omicron wave hit the Swiss population, and this time a large proportion of the population fell ill. The fact that the birth rate continues to fall in

2023 may also be related to the increasingly uncertain economic situation in Switzerland. Although unemployment never increased massively during the Covid-19 crisis, the consumer price index has been rising steadily since 2021, which is currently leading to a noticeable loss of real wages (Supplementary Figures S7 & S8). The increasingly frequent heatwaves could also have a certain influence, as studies have already linked such extreme climatic events to reduced fertility (Barreca et al., 2018). The increasingly uncertain political situation in the world, for example with the start of the war in Ukraine in February 2022, could also have an impact on family planning.

Finally, life planning decisions are central (Tasneem et al., 2023). Birth rates had already been falling slightly for a few years before the Covid-19 pandemic in Switzerland. In 2018, around 9% of young people said in a nationwide survey that they did not want to have children (Schweiz. Bundesamt für Statistik BFS, 2018). Vasectomies are also on the increase. And it is possible that a change in values is taking place at a societal level, and that some young people simply want to have fewer or no children now, or in general (Guzzo & Hayford, 2023). A possible explanation for the decision to not have children is also concerns about climate change, but also economic or general insecurity could be further reasons (Danny, 2023; Dillarstone et al., 2023)

The present study has several limitations. Firstly, it operates at the population level, which means that there is a lack of in-depth variables in the individual data. For example, at the individual level, nothing can be said about the socio-economic background or other relevant subgroups of the population. Secondly, the natural time lag between conception and birth makes it difficult to interpret the birth rate. The life decisions that are made now are not reflected in the birth rate only about 9 months later. In addition, this temporal lag must be approximated on an ecological level by means of a 9-month distance, as the exact date of birth of the children is not accessible for data protection reasons, which would allow the time of conception to be narrowed down more precisely by means of the gestational age. Thirdly, most official statistics are based on live births only. While stillbirths are fortunately rather rare in Switzerland today (<4.5/1000 yearly between 2020 and 2022), this was not the case a few decades ago, let alone at the end of the 19th century. Unfortunately, there are no monthly stillbirth figures for Switzerland for the time 1871 to 1987 that would allow these cases to be considered in our analyses. Fourth, there is no central database in Switzerland in which new pregnancies are registered. This means that the number of births cannot be verified with reliable statistics on new pregnancies or abortions. Finally, the possible reasons given for the ups and downs in the birth rate are based on temporal associations, and a causal relationship between these is not necessarily the case and has not been investigated. In addition, the reasons are certainly multifactorial and other as yet unknown factors may also play a role. It must be left to more in-depth studies to shed more light on this.

Societies and even specific subgroups such as young people are by no means a homogeneous group. That diversity potentially explains in different ways the ups and downs in births. The present study described the rather surprising and short-term shifts in the birth rate in Switzerland in the last two to three years at the population level. More in-depth studies of different designs and at different levels must now follow to better understand these more or less active fertility decisions.

Author statements

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank the Swiss Federal Statistical Office for providing the fully anonymized data 1987-2022 and further information, as well as Marcel Zwahlen and Svenn-Erik Mamelund for their helpful comments.

Funding: This work was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation under Grant 197305.

Competing interests: The authors declare no competing interests.

Ethics committee approval: Ethics approval was not required for the reuse of these publicly available and fully anonymized Federal authority data.

Data availability statement

The aggregated datasets presented in this study and the codes can be found in online repositories:

Github: https://github.com/KaMatthes/birth_trend_Switzerland

Zenodo: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10277091

Bibliography

Adelman, S., Charifson, M., Seok, E., Mehta-Lee, S. S., Brubaker, S. G., Liu, M., & Kahn, L. G. (2023). State-specific fertility rate changes across the USA following the first two waves of COVID-19. *Human Reproduction*, *38*(6), 1202–1212. https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/dead055

Aharon, D., Lederman, M., Ghofranian, A., Hernandez-Nieto, C., Canon, C., Hanley, W., Gounko, D., Lee, J. A., Stein, D., Buyuk, E., & Copperman, A. B. (2022). In Vitro Fertilization and Early Pregnancy Outcomes After Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Vaccination. *Obstetrics & Gynecology*, *139*(4), 490–497. https://doi.org/10.1097/AOG.0000000000004713

Aksak, T., Satar, D. A., Bağci, R., Gültekin, E. O., Coşkun, A., & Demirdelen, U. (2022). Investigation of the effect of COVID-19 on sperm count, motility, and morphology. *Journal of Medical Virology*, *94*(11), 5201–5205. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.27971

Alvergne, A. (2023). Why we must fight ignorance about COVID-19 vaccines and menstrual cycles. *Trends in Molecular Medicine*, *29*(9), 678–680. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molmed.2023.06.005

Alvergne, A., Kountourides, G., Argentieri, M. A., Agyen, L., Rogers, N., Knight, D., Sharp, G. C., Maybin, J. A., & Olszewska, Z. (2023). A retrospective case-control study on menstrual cycle changes following COVID-19 vaccination and disease. *IScience*, *26*(4), 106401. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2023.106401

Ba, Z., Yang, A., Zhu, S., Li, Y., Ma, J., Zhang, Y., Li, Z., & Chen, F. (2023). Comprehensive evaluation of the effect of inactivated SARS-CoV-2 vaccination on female fertility: A retrospective cohort study. *Journal of Medical Virology*, *95*(10). https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.29161

Bailey, M. J., Currie, J., & Schwandt, H. (2023). The COVID-19 baby bump in the United States. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *120*(34). https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2222075120

Barda, S., Laskov, I., Grisaru, D., Lehavi, O., Kleiman, S., Wenkert, A., Azem, F., Hauser, R., & Michaan, N. (2022). The impact of <scp>COVID</scp> -19 vaccine on sperm quality. *International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics*, *158*(1), 116–120. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijgo.14135

Barreca, A., Deschenes, O., & Guldi, M. (2018). Maybe Next Month? Temperature Shocks and Dynamic Adjustments in Birth Rates. *Demography*, *55*(4), 1269–1293. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-018-0690-7

Bloom-Feshbach, K., Simonsen, L., Viboud, C., Mølbak, K., Miller, M. A., Gottfredsson, M., & Andreasen, V. (2011). Natality Decline and Miscarriages Associated With the 1918 Influenza Pandemic: The Scandinavian and United States Experiences. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases*, *204*(8), 1157–1164. https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jir510

Chandra, S., Christensen, J., Mamelund, S.-E., & Paneth, N. (2018). Short-Term Birth Sequelae of the 1918–1920 Influenza Pandemic in the United States: State-Level Analysis. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, *187*(12), 2585–2595. https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwy153

Chandra, S., & Yu, Y.-L. (2015). The 1918 influenza pandemic and subsequent birth deficit in Japan. *Demographic Research*, *33*, 313–326. https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2015.33.11

Chen, F., Zhu, S., Dai, Z., Hao, L., Luan, C., Guo, Q., Meng, C., & Zhang, Y. (2021). Effects of COVID-19 and mRNA vaccines on human fertility. *Human Reproduction*, *37*(1), 5–13. https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/deab238

Danny, D. (2023). World population projections: Just little bits of history repeating? *Significance*, *20*(4), 22–27. https://doi.org/10.1093/jrssig/qmad062

DESTATIS. (2023). *Geburten: Veränderung der Zahl der Lebendgeborenen zum jeweiligen Vorjahr*. https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Gesellschaft-Umwelt/Bevoelkerung/Geburten/Tabellen/lebendgeborene-differenz.html

Dillarstone, H., Brown, L. J., & Flores, E. C. (2023). Climate change, mental health, and reproductive decision-making: A systematic review. *PLOS Climate*, *2*(11), e0000236. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pclm.0000236

Gaddy, H., & Ingholt, M. M. (2023). Did the 1918 influenza pandemic cause a 1920 baby boom? Demographic evidence from neutral Europe. *Population Studies*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/00324728.2023.2192041

Gonzalez, D. C., Nassau, D. E., Khodamoradi, K., Ibrahim, E., Blachman-Braun, R., Ory, J., & Ramasamy, R. (2021). Sperm Parameters Before and After COVID-19 mRNA Vaccination. *JAMA*, *326*(3), 273. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2021.9976

Guzzo, K. B., & Hayford, S. R. (2023). Evolving Fertility Goals and Behaviors in Current U.S. Childbearing Cohorts. *Population and Development Review*, *49*(1), 7–42. https://doi.org/10.1111/padr.12535

Harb, J., Debs, N., Rima, M., Wu, Y., Cao, Z., Kovacic, H., Fajloun, Z., & Sabatier, J.-M. (2022). SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, and Reproduction: Effects on Fertility, Pregnancy, and Neonatal Life. *Biomedicines*, *10*(8), 1775. https://doi.org/10.3390/biomedicines10081775

Hosseini, E., Kohan-Ghadr, H.-R., Bazrafkan, M., Amorim, C. A., Askari, M., Zakeri, A., Mousavi, S. N., Kafaeinezhad, R., Afradiasbagharani, P., Esfandyari, S., & Nazari, M. (2023). Rescuing fertility during COVID-19 infection: exploring potential pharmacological and natural therapeutic approaches for comorbidity, by focusing on NLRP3 inflammasome mechanism. *Journal of Assisted Reproduction and Genetics*, *40*(5), 1173–1185. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10815-023-02768-1

Insee. (2023). *Bilan démographique 2022*. Insee Première.

Lee, D. S., Batyra, E., Castro, A., & Wilde, J. (2023). Human fertility after a disaster: a systematic literature review. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *290*(1998). https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2023.0211

Lewis, R., Blake, C., Shimonovich, M., Coia, N., Duffy, J., Kerr, Y., Wilson, J., Graham, C. A., & Mitchell,

K. R. (2021). Disrupted prevention: condom and contraception access and use among young adults during the initial months of the COVID-19 pandemic. An online survey. *BMJ Sexual & Reproductive Health*, *47*(4), 269–276. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjsrh-2020-200975

Mamelund, S.-E. (2012). Fertility Fluctuations in Times of War and Pandemic Influenza. *Journal of Infectious Diseases*, *206*(1), 140–141. https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jis315

Mamelund, Svenn-Erik. (2004). Can the Spanish Influenza Pandemic of 1918 Explain the Baby Boom of 1920 in Neutral Norway? *Population (English Edition, 2002-)*, *59*(2), 229. https://doi.org/10.2307/3654904

Martinez, M. S., Ferreyra, F. N., Paira, D. A., Rivero, V. E., Olmedo, J. J., Tissera, A. D., Molina, R. I., & Motrich, R. D. (2023). COVID-19 associates with semen inflammation and sperm quality impairment that reverses in the short term after disease recovery. *Frontiers in Physiology*, *14*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2023.1220048

Morris, R. S. (2021). SARS-CoV-2 spike protein seropositivity from vaccination or infection does not cause sterility. *F&S Reports*, *2*(3), 253–255. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xfre.2021.05.010

Nobles, J., Frankenberg, E., & Thomas, D. (2015). The Effects of Mortality on Fertility: Population Dynamics After a Natural Disaster. *Demography*, *52*(1), 15–38. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-014-0362-1

Novembre, J., Johnson, T., Bryc, K., Kutalik, Z., Boyko, A. R., Auton, A., Indap, A., King, K. S., Bergmann, S., Nelson, M. R., Stephens, M., & Bustamante, C. D. (2008). Genes mirror geography within Europe. *Nature*, *456*(7218), 98–101. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature07331

Patel, D. P., Punjani, N., Guo, J., Alukal, J. P., Li, P. S., & Hotaling, J. M. (2021). The impact of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19 on male reproduction and men's health. *Fertility and Sterility*, *115*(4), 813–823. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fertnstert.2020.12.033

Pomar, L., Contier, A., Harris, J. E., Favre, G., Nielsen-Saines, K., & Baud, D. (2020). Potential Consequences of Sars-Cov-2 Pandemic on Birth Rates and Subsequent Demographics. *Investigations in Gynecology Research & Womens Health (IGRWH)*, *3*(5). https://doi.org/10.31031/IGRWH.2020.03.000574

R Core Team. (2022). R core team (2022). In *R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL http://www. R-project. org*.

Reid, A. (2005). The Effects of the 1918–1919 Influenza Pandemic on Infant and Child Health in Derbyshire. *Medical History*, *49*(1), 29–54. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025727300008279

Reschini, M., Pagliardini, L., Boeri, L., Piazzini, F., Bandini, V., Fornelli, G., Dolci, C., Cermisoni, G. C., Viganò, P., Somigliana, E., Coccia, M. E., & Papaleo, E. (2022). COVID-19 Vaccination Does Not Affect Reproductive Health Parameters in Men. *Frontiers in Public Health*, *10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.839967

Rimmer, M. P., Teh, J. J., Mackenzie, S. C., & Al Wattar, B. H. (2023). The risk of miscarriage following COVID-19 vaccination: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Human Reproduction*, *38*(5), 840–852. https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/dead036

Saadedine, M., El Sabeh, M., Borahay, M. A., & Daoud, G. (2023). The influence of COVID-19 infection-associated immune response on the female reproductive system. *Biology of Reproduction*, *108*(2), 172–182. https://doi.org/10.1093/biolre/ioac187

Schmid, F. (1895). *Die Influenza in Der Schweiz in den Jahren 1889-1894* (Francke (ed.)).

Schweiz. Bundesamt für Statistik BFS. (2018). *Kinderwunsch, Elternschaft*. https://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/de/home/statistiken/bevoelkerung/familien/kinderwunsch-elternschaft.html

Schweiz Bundesamt für Gesundheitswesen. (n.d.). *Bulletin des Eidgenössischen Gesundheitsamtes, 1920-1979*. Hallwag.

Skrivankova, V., Zwahlen, M., Adams, M., Low, N., Kuehni, C., & Egger, M. (2019). Spatial epidemiology of gestational age and birth weight in Switzerland: census-based linkage study. *BMJ Open*, *9*(10), e027834. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-027834

Sobotka, T., Zeman, K., Jasilioniene, A., Winkler-Dworak, M., Brzozowska, Z., Alustiza-Galarza, A., Németh, L., & Jdanov, D. (2023). Pandemic Roller-Coaster? Birth Trends in Higher-Income Countries During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Population and Development Review*. https://doi.org/10.1111/padr.12544

StatistikAustria. (2023). *Demographische Merkmale von Geborenen*.

Staub, K., Panczak, R., Matthes, K. L., Floris, J., Berlin, C., Junker, C., Weitkunat, R., Mamelund, S.-E., Zwahlen, M., & Riou, J. (2022). Historically High Excess Mortality During the COVID-19 Pandemic in Switzerland, Sweden, and Spain. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, *175*(4), 523–532. https://doi.org/10.7326/M21-3824

Tasneem, N., Atiqul Haq, S. M., Ahmed, M. N. Q., & Ahmed, K. J. (2023). Fertility decisions in the wake of COVID-19: a comprehensive review of influencing determinants and trends. *SN Social Sciences*, *3*(8), 135. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-023-00729-0

Wang, C., Wang, M., Li, G., Song, B., Xing, Q., & Cao, Y. (2023). Effects of COVID-19 vaccination on human fertility: a post-pandemic literature review. *Annals of Medicine*, *55*(2). https://doi.org/10.1080/07853890.2023.2261964

Wesselink, A. K., Hatch, E. E., Rothman, K. J., Wang, T. R., Willis, M. D., Yland, J., Crowe, H. M., Geller, R. J., Willis, S. K., Perkins, R. B., Regan, A. K., Levinson, J., Mikkelsen, E. M., & Wise, L. A. (2022). A Prospective Cohort Study of COVID-19 Vaccination, SARS-CoV-2 Infection, and Fertility. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, *191*(8), 1383–1395. https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwac011

West, E. A., Anker, D., Amati, R., Richard, A., Wisniak, A., Butty, A., Albanese, E., Bochud, M., Chiolero, A., Crivelli, L., Cullati, S., D'Acremont, V., Epure, A. M., Fehr, J., Flahault, A., Fornerod, L., Frank, I., Frei, A., Michel, G., … Puhan, M. A. (2020). Corona Immunitas: study protocol of a nationwide program of SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and seroepidemiologic studies in Switzerland. *International Journal of Public Health*, *65*(9), 1529–1548. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00038-020-01494-0

Yang, L., Neal, S., Lee, T., Chou, A., Schutt, A. K., & Gibbons, W. (2023). Comparison of Female Ovarian Reserve Before vs After COVID-19 Vaccination. *JAMA Network Open*, *6*(6), e2318804. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.18804

Yildiz, E., Timur, B., Guney, G., & Timur, H. (2023). Does the SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccine damage the ovarian reserve? *Medicine*, *102*(20), e33824. https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.0000000000033824

Yland, J. J., Wesselink, A. K., Regan, A. K., Hatch, E. E., Rothman, K. J., Savitz, D. A., Wang, T. R., Huybrechts, K. F., Hernández-Díaz, S., Eisenberg, M. L., & Wise, L. A. (2023). A prospective cohort study of preconception COVID-19 vaccination and miscarriage. *Human Reproduction*. https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/dead211

Zaçe, D., La Gatta, E., Petrella, L., & Di Pietro, M. L. (2022). The impact of COVID-19 vaccines on fertility-A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Vaccine*, *40*(42), 6023–6034. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2022.09.019

Zauche, L. H., Wallace, B., Smoots, A. N., Olson, C. K., Oduyebo, T., Kim, S. Y., Petersen, E. E., Ju, J., Beauregard, J., Wilcox, A. J., Rose, C. E., Meaney-Delman, D. M., & Ellington, S. R. (2021). Receipt of mRNA Covid-19 Vaccines and Risk of Spontaneous Abortion. *New England Journal of Medicine*, *385*(16), 1533–1535. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2113891

Zhang, L., Sun, X., Wang, R., & Ma, F. (2023). Effect of COVID-19 vaccination on the outcome of in vitro fertilization: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Public Health*, *11*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1151999

Zhu, S., Luan, C., Zhang, S., Wang, X., Long, F., Zhang, Q., & Yan, J. (2023). Effect of SARS-CoV-2 infection and vaccine on ovarian reserve: a systematic review. *European Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology and Reproductive Biology*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejogrb.2023.10.029

Figures and tables

Figure 1: The long-term trend in the monthly live birth rate in Switzerland from 1871 to 2023. The annual data, also in relation to women aged 15-49 and the number of stillbirths, can be found in Supplementary Table S1. The monthly data for January to September 2023 are still provisional. (+9m. = 9 months after…)



Figure 2: The monthly live birth rate in Switzerland from 2016 to 2023. Top: The observed values (red) compared with the expected values (grey, with interval). Below: The same numbers converted into relative differences, expressed in per cent (red=excess and lower birth rates). A: The time period 9 months after the first COVID-19 wave in Spring 2020 and the associated partial shutdown; B: The time period 9 months after the second COVID-19 wave in Fall and Winter 2020/2021 and the associated partial shutdown; C: The time period 9 months after the share of double-vaccinated young persons aged 20-40 years surpassed 30% to 50%; D: The time period 9 months after the large Omicron wave in Winter 2021/2022; E: The time period 9 months after the heat wave in Summer 2022.



Figure 3: The monthly live birth rate in Switzerland from 2016 to 2023 (red line) and the predicted births (grey line and area) considering 2016 to only 2020 (=pre-pandemic time) as reference births rate. A: The time period 9 months after the first COVID-19 wave in Spring 2020 and the associated partial shutdown; B: The time period 9 months after the second COVID-19 wave in Fall and Winter 2020/2021 and the associated partial shutdown; C: The time period 9 months after the share of double-vaccinated young persons aged 20-40 years surpassed 30% to 50%; D: The time period 9 months after the large Omicron wave in Winter 2021/2022; E: The time period 9 months after the heat wave in Summer 2022.



Table 1: The monthly live birth rate in Switzerland from 2018 to 2022, shown as relative differences (expressed in percent) between observed vs. expected values for the overall trend and for available subgroups based on individual data. Excess and lower births s are color-coded in red or green.



Supplementary Material

Supplementary Figure S1: The monthly live birth rate in Switzerland from 1885 to 1895. Top: The observed values (red) compared with the expected values (grey, with interval). Below: The same numbers converted into relative differences, expressed in per cent (red=excess and lower birth rates). Cyan bar: Time period 9 months after the peak of the "Russian flu" in January 1890.



Supplementary Figure S2: The monthly live birth rate in Switzerland from 1912 to 1922. Top: The observed values (red) compared with the expected values (grey, with interval). Below: The same numbers converted into relative differences, expressed in per cent (red=excess and lower birth rates). Cyan bars: Time period 9 months after the start of World War 1 and mobilization of troops in August 1914; Time period 9 months after the strong Fall/Winter wave of the "Spanish flu" 1918 and the worsening nutritional situation towards the end of the war; Time period 9 months after the strong later pandemic wave in February 1920.



Supplementary Figure S3: The monthly live birth rate in Switzerland from 1952 to 1962. Top: The observed values (red) compared with the expected values (grey, with interval). Below: The same numbers converted into relative differences, expressed in per cent (red=excess and lower birth rates). Cyan bar: Time period 9 months after the "Asian flu" in Fall 1957.



Supplementary Figure S4: The monthly live birth rate in Switzerland from 1964 to 1974 Top: The observed values (red) compared with the expected values (grey, with interval). Below: The same numbers converted into relative differences, expressed in per cent (red=excess and lower birth rates). Cyan bars: The time periods 9 months after the two waves of the "Hong Kong flu" in Winter 1968/1969 and in Winter 1969/1970.



Supplementary Figure S5: The monthly live birth rate in Switzerland from 2004 to 2014. Top: The observed values (red) compared with the expected values (grey, with interval). Below: The same numbers converted into relative differences, expressed in per cent (red=excess and lower birth rates). Cyan bar: The time period 9 months after the wave of the Swine flu in Fall and Winter 2009. Green bar: The time period 9 months after the Great Recession economic crises at the end of 2008 and the beginning of 2009.



Supplementary Figure S6: The stable monthly trend in the sex ratio of all live births in Switzerland 2016 to 2023.



Supplementary Figure S7: To illustrate the context: A) The different waves of the COVID-19 pandemic in Switzerland, shown here using monthly hospitalisations; B) The monthly trend in the consumer price index in Switzerland; C) The monthly trend in the unemployment rate in Switzerland; D) The vaccination rate among 20–40-year-olds in Switzerland as of 2021 (grey=vaccinated once, black=vaccinated twice). a) The WHO declares the COVID-19 pandemic (dashed line); b) the first wave in spring 2020 (blue bar); c) the second wave in autumn/winter 2020 (blue bar); d) the official start of the vaccination campaign in Switzerland; e) around 10% of 20-40-year-olds have been vaccinated once (dashed line); f) the first wave of the Omicron coronavirus (blue bar); g) the start of the war in Ukraine (dashed line); h) the heatwave in summer 2022 (yellow bar); i) the WHO declares the end of the pandemic (dashed line).



Supplementary Figure S8: To illustrate the economic context: A) Monthly consumer price index (CPI) and unemployment rate in Switzerland 2011 to 2023; B) Annual CPI, nominal and real wages in Switzerland 2011 to 2022. (Grey bar=time period of the COVID-19 pandemic)



Supplementary Table S1: The annual data on births in Switzerland since 1871.

Year	Live births	Live births Jan-Aug	Still births	Total Pop.	Pop. women 15-49y	Birth rate	Birth rate women 15-49y
1871	77633	52939	3996	2686618	699779	28.9	110.9
1872	80329	54039	3984	2701982	701435	29.7	114.5
1873	80572	54350	3923	2718108	703390	29.6	114.5
1874	83051	55171	3867	2733487	705706	30.4	117.7
1875	87579	59129	4216	2749393	708375	31.9	123.6
1876	90786	61591	3809	2767666	711397	32.8	127.6
1877	89244	59724	3617	2785514	714775	32.0	124.9
1878	87833	59096	3593	2802222	718498	31.3	122.2
1879	86180	57632	3512	2817307	722360	30.6	119.3
1880	84165	57124	3248	2840501	726305	29.6	115.9
1881	85142	57108	3361	2851255	728421	29.9	116.9
1882	82689	55565	3298	2860234	730330	28.9	113.2
1883	81974	55280	3223	2871264	732599	28.5	111.9
1884	81571	54962	3223	2883670	734732	28.3	111.0
1885	80349	54102	3230	2892184	736406	27.8	109.1
1886	80763	54493	3379	2901605	738257	27.8	109.4
1887	81287	54783	3374	2911233	741022	27.9	109.7
1888	81098	55084	3346	2922897	744249	27.7	109.0
1889	81176	54905	3103	2949577	751164	27.5	108.1
1890	78548	54107	3072	2972024	759226	26.4	103.5
1891	83596	57387	3125	3000632	768483	27.9	108.8
1892	83125	56254	3140	3032945	777955	27.4	106.9
1893	84897	56944	3203	3063218	787064	27.7	107.9
1894	84142	57542	3175	3091585	796309	27.2	105.7
1895	84973	58075	3211	3122589	804824	27.2	105.6
1896	88428	59651	3246	3161271	815791	28.0	108.4
1897	90078	60446	3291	3201298	826159	28.1	109.0
1898	91793	61995	3391	3240943	836443	28.3	109.7
1899	94472	63523	3422	3282407	847418	28.8	111.5
1900	94316	64472	3379	3318985	857306	28.4	110.0
1901	97028	65679	3607	3364073	868078	28.8	111.8
1902	96481	65323	3512	3411135	879304	28.3	109.7
1903	93824	63437	3295	3453716	890605	27.2	105.3
1904	94867	64636	3433	3496188	901564	27.1	105.2
1905	94653	64270	3404	3536835	911383	26.8	103.9
1906	95595	64988	3376	3582151	924513	26.7	103.4
1907	94508	64610	3188	3625456	937289	26.1	100.8
1908	96245	65965	3223	3671165	950683	26.2	101.2
1909	94112	64531	3184	3711868	963905	25.4	97.6
1910	93514	63725	3155	3756842	977514	24.9	95.7
1911	91320	62731	2865	3778312	986204	24.2	92.6
1912	92196	62418	2975	3805595	995664	24.2	92.6
1913	89757	61555	2846	3828431	1005835	23.4	89.2
1914	87330	60248	2798	3849766	1016846	22.7	85.9
1915	75545	51399	2386	3860635	1027817	19.6	73.5
1916	73660	50375	2225	3871760	1040770	19.0	70.8
1917	72065	49646	2060	3878896	1052738	18.6	68.5
1918	72658	49248	2226	3864844	1056881	18.8	68.7
1919	72125	45661	2080	3869481	1066991	18.6	67.6
1920	81190	57209	2433	3883360	1076815	20.9	75.4
1921	80808	55769	2365	3908521	1086023	20.7	74.4
1922	76290	53192	2246	3928566	1094451	19.4	69.7
1923	75551	51970	2143	3952134	1103946	19.1	68.4
1924	73508	50847	2056	3970682	1112334	18.5	66.1
1925	72570	50124	1940	3989227	1119557	18.2	64.8
1926	72118	49438	1845	4009537	1124734	18.0	64.1
1927	69533	48534	1750	4024345	1130773	17.3	61.5
1928	69594	48102	1738	4040177	1136691	17.2	61.2
1929	69006	47468	1709	4052557	1142311	17.0	60.4
1930	69855	47944	1695	4070042	1144749	17.2	61.0
1931	68249	47370	1602	4091602	1146637	16.7	59.5
1932	68650	47765	1610	4110388	1148129	16.7	59.8
1933	67509	46579	1595	4136343	1151970	16.3	58.6
1934	67277	45936	1480	4159698	1155226	16.2	58.2
1935	66378	46425	1483	4178640	1162199	15.9	57.1
1936	64966	44992	1435	4198782	1168958	15.5	55.6
1937	62480	42851	1304	4217126	1173901	14.8	53.2
1938	63790	44159	1364	4235430	1178925	15.1	54.1
1939	63837	44284	1416	4252902	1183394	15.0	53.9
1940	64115	43557	1342	4268964	1188476	15.0	53.9
1941	71926	48648	1356	4296693	1189831	16.7	60.5
1942	78875	53327	1327	4326774	1189705	18.2	66.3
1943	83049	56373	1395	4360681	1190256	19.0	69.8
1944	85627	59104	1430	4392319	1190938	19.5	71.9
1945	88522	60581	1447	4428117	1191699	20.0	74.3
1946	89126	62028	1411	4490000	1200900	19.8	74.2
1947	87724	60865	1425	4549100	1210700	19.3	72.5
1948	87763	60816	1519	4611200	1220100	19.0	71.9
1949	85308	59250	1443	4668000	1228100	18.3	69.5
1950	84776	58405	1448	4717200	1229700	18.0	68.9
1951	81903	56615	1313	4778900	1235700	17.1	66.3
1952	83549	57326	1281	4844100	1241000	17.2	67.3
1953	83029	57522	1270	4907000	1247600	16.9	66.6
1954	83741	57927	1306	4970300	1253000	16.8	66.8
1955	85331	58885	1240	5033700	1258700	17.0	67.8
1956	87912	60983	1202	5097400	1266600	17.2	69.4
1957	90823	62020	1297	5162800	1278300	17.6	71.0
1958	91421	62041	1148	5230000	1290700	17.5	70.8
1959	92973	64272	1115	5295500	1304400	17.6	71.3
1960	94372	65226	1089	5360153	1319443	17.6	71.5
1961	99238	67817	1186	5508435	1353114	18.0	73.3
1962	104322	70942	1269	5639195	1384997	18.5	75.3
1963	109993	75485	1257	5749299	1414155	19.1	77.8
1964	112890	76853	1277	5829156	1430541	19.4	78.9
1965	111835	76913	1181	5883788	1441233	19.0	77.6
1966	109738	75852	1101	5952216	1457841	18.4	75.3
1967	107417	73982	1070	6031353	1482459	17.8	72.5
1968	105130	72663	1068	6104074	1506123	17.2	69.8
1969	102520	71242	962	6168700	1527638	16.6	67.1
1970	99216	68669	886	6193064	1521410	16.0	65.2
1971	96261	66802	830	6233744	1530837	15.4	62.9
1972	91342	63870	792	6288168	1549971	14.5	58.9
1973	87518	60641	665	6326525	1565055	13.8	55.9
1974	84507	58393	603	6356285	1576177	13.3	53.6
1975	78464	55070	566	6320978	1566605	12.4	50.1
1976	74199	51524	536	6284029	1558137	11.8	47.6
1977	72829	50343	423	6278319	1562546	11.6	46.6
1978	71375	49227	435	6285156	1572318	11.4	45.4
1979	71986	49608	412	6303573	1586631	11.4	45.4
1980	73661	50196	361	6335243	1603053	11.6	46.0
1981	73747	50188	373	6372904	1622133	11.6	45.5
1982	74916	51052	366	6409713	1638738	11.7	45.7
1983	73659	50355	361	6427833	1648836	11.5	44.7
1984	74710	50596	352	6455896	1659518	11.6	45.0
1985	74684	50832	345	6484834	1669224	11.5	44.7
1986	76320	51941	334	6523413	1681779	11.7	45.4
1987	76505	51419	337	6566799	1694892	11.7	45.1
1988	80345	53926	311	6619973	1707624	12.1	47.1
1989	81180	54661	332	6673850	1718463	12.2	47.2
1990	83939	56337	390	6750693	1733956	12.4	48.4
1991	86200	57609	357	6842768	1761319	12.6	48.9
1992	86910	58788	337	6907959	1769104	12.6	49.1
1993	83762	56880	348	6968570	1774405	12.0	47.2
1994	82980	56137	286	7019019	1777392	11.8	46.7
1995	82203	55132	336	7062354	1780500	11.6	46.2
1996	83007	55980	309	7081346	1773412	11.7	46.8
1997	80584	54617	336	7096465	1767049	11.4	45.6
1998	78949	53232	308	7123537	1763162	11.1	44.8
1999	78408	52808	277	7164444	1765419	10.9	44.4
2000	78458	52886	283	7204055	1770087	10.9	44.3
2001	72295	48982	279	7255653	1787328	10.0	40.4
2002	72372	48381	255	7313853	1799812	9.9	40.2
2003	71848	48140	306	7364148	1811563	9.8	39.7
2004	73082	48762	276	7415102	1820971	9.9	40.1
2005	72903	48491	307	7459128	1827831	9.8	39.9
2006	73371	48759	342	7508739	1834861	9.8	40.0
2007	74494	49523	297	7593494	1852450	9.8	40.2
2008	76691	51614	341	7701856	1874738	10.0	40.9
2009	78286	52283	345	7785806	1888007	10.1	41.5
2010	80290	53037	346	7870134	1899060	10.2	42.3
2011	80808	54065	349	7954662	1907498	10.2	42.4
2012	82164	54764	350	8039060	1912919	10.2	43.0
2013	82731	55105	402	8139631	1920838	10.2	43.1
2014	85287	56661	368	8237666	1925347	10.4	44.3
2015	86559	57604	357	8327126	1929910	10.4	44.9
2016	87883	58884	371	8419550	1929590	10.4	45.5
2017	87381	58365	362	8484130	1925827	10.3	45.4
2018	87851	59089	381	8544527	1921024	10.3	45.7
2019	86172	57957	344	8606033	1919301	10.0	44.9
2020	85914	57855	319	8670300	1922117	9.9	44.7
2021	89644	59785	395	8738791	1924694	10.3	46.6
2022	82371	55372	359	8815385	1936043	9.3	42.5
2023		51816					