medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Beyond Borders: Spatial Disparities in the Mortality Burden of the Covid-19 pandemic across 569 European Regions (2020-2021)

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

Abstract

This article presents a detailed analysis of the global mortality burden of the COVID-19 pandemic across 569 regions in 25 European countries. We produce sex-specific excess mortality and present our results using Age-Standardised Years of Life Lost (ASYLL) in 2020 and 2021, as well as the cumulative impact over the two pandemic years. Employing a robust forecasting approach that considers regional diversity and provides confidence intervals, we find notable losses in 362 regions in 2020 (440 regions in 2021). Conversely, only seven regions experienced gains in 2020 (four regions in 2021). Most importantly, we estimate that eight regions suffered losses exceeding 20 years of life per 1,000 population in 2020, whereas this number increased to 75 regions in 2021. The contiguity of the regions investigated in our study also reveals the changing geographical patterns of the pandemic. While the highest excess mortality values were concentrated in the early COVID-19 outbreak areas during the initial pandemic year, a clear East-West gradient appeared in 2021, with regions of Slovakia, Hungary, and Latvia experiencing the highest losses. This research underscores the importance of regional analyses for a nuanced comprehension of the pandemic's impact.

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

ORCID. Florian Bonnet (0000-0001-6125-3317) ; Pavel Grigoriev (0000-0003-1419-9885) ; Markus Sauerberg (0000-0001-9524-446X) ; Michael Mühlichen (0000-0002-7396-069X) ; Carlo-Giovanni Camarda (0000-0003-0191-4093)

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

In 2023, the number of deaths due to COVID-19 will be much lower than in the years 2020 to 2022. The WHO has therefore declared the end of the global health emergency on 6 May 2023. It is now time to evaluate the overall burden of the pandemic, particularly in the years 2020 and 2021, when it was at its peak.

To do this, scholars have first used reports of case fatalities published by national surveillance authorities [1, 2] but are now mainly calculating excess mortality, defined as “the difference between the number of deaths (from any cause) that occur during the pandemic and the number of deaths that would have occurred in the absence of the pandemic” [3]. This is considered to be the gold standard for estimating the overall impact of COVID-19 [4, 5], and especially more reliable than epidemiological surveillance data due to different definitions of data among countries, time-varying collection methods, reporting delays, and diverse coverage by place of death [6, 7].

Many studies have attempted to quantify the impact of the pandemic using this approach. However, most of them have done so at national level [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17]. A few other studies have attempted to quantify the impact of the pandemic at a finer geographical scale, but for one country at a time [18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27]. However, comparing these regional patterns is problematic because these studies take different approaches to compute the mortality levels that would have occurred without the pandemic. Specifically, they either use pre-pandemic levels or employ forecasting techniques. Moreover, these papers rely on different indicators to assess excess mortality, e.g. life expectancy or death toll. It is therefore impossible to use these results to compare the impact of the pandemic between regions in one country and those in another. To our knowledge, only two studies allow for a simultaneous comparison of regional excess mortality in several European countries for 2020 [28, 29]. Another study covers 200 NUTS 2 European regions for the years 2020 to 2022 but does not estimate excess mortality in regions of Germany, the UK, Ireland or Sweden [30]. Finally, most of these studies quantified the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 only, while the virus was still virulent in 2021.

However, it is important to produce these estimates at a fine geographical level, because the pandemic affected in different ways the regions of the same country: for example, the North of Italy was severely affected by the pandemic in 2020 while the South was mostly spared [18]. These differences can be explained in particular by the locations where the virus first arrived in Europe, and by the travel restrictions that were enforced to prevent the spread of the virus over space. It is quite likely that spatial differences would still be visible in 2021, due in particular to the spread of the virus strains or to the differences in cultural resistance to the vaccination campaign launched that year [31].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

From a methodological point of view, assessing the full impact of the pandemic in 2020 and 2021 is a challenge. The death toll, widely used in studies, fails to consider differences between population's age structures. For this reason, scholars prefer looking at age-specific mortality rates instead, as they can be aggregated into a summary measure such as the age-standardised death rate or period life expectancy. However, for assessing the total burden of the pandemic while differentiating 2020 from 2021, life expectancy and age-standardized death rates are not convenient candidates as they cannot be added up over time.

Our paper aims to fill these research gaps by presenting Age-Standardised Years of Life Lost (ASYLL) in 2020 and 2021 for 569 regions of comparable size from 25 countries in Central and Western Europe. To obtain the mortality levels that would have been observed in 2020 and 2021 in the absence of the pandemic, we took a robust forecasting approach that accounts for regional diversity and delivers confidence intervals surrounding our excess mortality measures. Calculating these confidence intervals is crucial for robust and reliable data interpretation: fine-grained analyses often involve small populations, making data susceptible to increased variability. At the end, we reveal to what extent the European regions suffered from the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 and 2021, and how the geographic patterns of excess mortality due to the pandemic have changed between these two years.

Data and methods

Data preparation

We collected subnational death and population counts for 25 European countries by age classes and sex from Eurostat, the Human Mortality Database [32] and national statistical offices. To ensure comparability of the selected spatial units in size and structure, we relied mostly on the Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS), using NUTS-3 levels for Czechia, Denmark, France, Italy, Luxembourg, Poland, Slovakia, Spain and Sweden, NUTS-2 for Austria, Belgium, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Switzerland, England and Wales, as well as NUTS-1 for Ireland, Northern Ireland and Scotland. For Germany, we applied a national spatial classification ("Raumordnungsregionen") [33]. Minor adjustments had to be made due to territorial changes over time and data availability issues (see online supplementary Appendix A, Table 1 for details). To verify the data quality, we compared our data obtained at regional level with data from the Human Mortality Database when available; differences are negligible.

Because of varying age classes in these data, we harmonised them into single-year age intervals up to 95+ for all spatial units [34]. The lowest number of age groups in our input data is eighteen (for Germany) and the largest age group that we ungrouped into single years of age is fourteen (for Germany, deaths at age 1 to 14).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

In total, we analysed 569 harmonised spatial units containing populations ranging from 40,000 (Bornholm, Denmark) to 6,750,000 (Madrid, Spain).

Methodology

When addressing the issue of excess mortality, a central methodological challenge involves estimating the baseline mortality level, which represents what would have been expected in the absence of the pandemic. Often, pre-pandemic mortality levels are used as the baseline due to their ease of acquisition and computation. However, this simplistic approach often overlooks temporal trends. To establish a more appropriate expected mortality level in the absence of COVID-19, it is necessary to use pre-pandemic historical trends for forecasting the pandemic-affected year, such as 2020 or 2021.

Among the various methodologies available (e.g. [35]), we chose to use a *CP*-spline approach [36], combining two-dimensional P-splines with prior demographic insights derived from historical patterns specific to each population. One significant advantage of employing a non-parametric approach like *CP*-splines is its remarkable flexibility in describing diverse mortality scenarios, which is especially valuable when dealing with 569 distinct subpopulations across 25 European countries. Additionally, it ensures the generation of smooth and plausible age profiles and time trends, while enhancing robustness when analysing smaller populations at risk. Moreover, the relatively low computational costs associated with *CP*-splines allow us to optimise region-specific timeframes for forecasting 2020 and 2021 values. This method also offers the advantage of acquiring the variance-covariance matrix, thereby enhancing the capacity for quantifying model uncertainty. More information about this approach can be found in [37].

Quantifying uncertainty before drawing conclusions regarding excess mortality levels is imperative, particularly when working with regional mortality data. In particular, the uncertainty regarding the forecasting procedure needs to be combined with the uncertainty surrounding the observed mortality levels in 2020 and 2021. We employ bootstrap procedures to compute uncertainty surrounding the excess mortality measures and in the following we present 95% Confidence Intervals (CI).

It is worth noting that this entire procedure can be applied to any age group and is applicable regardless of the mortality indicator chosen for estimating excess mortality, such as life expectancy or age-standardised death rates. However, these indicators are not good candidates to estimate the total burden of the pandemic while differentiating 2020 from 2021, as they cannot be added up over time. Therefore, we chose to use Age-Standardised Years of Life Lost (ASYLL) to do so.

ASYLL is a measure used in public health and epidemiology [38] to assess the impact of premature mortality on a population: it quantifies the cumulative years of life lost attributable to a particular cause of death and can be adjusted to quantify the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

total years of life lost in the context of a specific crisis. Moreover, this metric allows for meaningful comparisons between different populations, as it accounts for variations in age structures. In few words, computing ASYLL involves (1) to identify the number of excess deaths within each age group, (2) to calculate for each deceased the number of years they would have been expected to live if they had not experienced premature death, (3) to sum the years of life lost for all individuals in each age group, and (4) to implement age-standardisation by adjusting the years of life lost in each age group considering a standard population's age distribution. This standard population is chosen to represent a hypothetical population with a fixed age structure, facilitating more meaningful comparisons between different populations; we used the 2013 European Standard Population (ESP). As an example, an ASYLL value of 20 indicates a standard population of 1000 inhabitants have experienced a loss of 20 years of life.

Additional details on the analytical procedure can be found online in supplementary appendix B. All calculations were carried out using R version 4.3.1 [39]. Supplementary appendix C contains a data visualisation tool and detailed values of our estimates for ASYLL and life expectancy at birth.

Results

We begin with the assessment of the spatial disparities in ASYLL observed across 569 spatial units in 25 European countries during the first (2020) and the second (2021) year of the COVID-19 pandemic among males (Figure 1) and females (Figure 2). The regions highlighted in light blue colour are those that experienced gains in years of life compared to the expected values, whereas the remaining colours of the legend imply the age-adjusted years of life losses per 1,000 population. Figure A1 in supplementary appendix A reveals ASYLL variations between 2020 and 2021.

FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE

During the first pandemic year, high ASYLL were mostly located in northern Italy, southern Switzerland, central Spain, and Poland. The highest ASYLL (above 30 years of life lost per 1,000 population) were observed in those places where the outbreak of the COVID-19 was first reported in Europe (Italy and Spain). By contrast, the majority of French and German regions, the south of the UK as well as Finland, Iceland, Northern Ireland, Estonia, Latvia, and Hungary experienced modest losses. Negative values of ASYLL (i.e. reduction of mortality compared to the baseline), and, thus, gains in years of life were concentrated in western and southwestern France as well as Denmark, Norway, and Sweden.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

The spatial patterns of excess mortality in Europe changed drastically during the second pandemic year. In 2021, the highest losses were observed exclusively in the Eastern European countries, and particularly among men. As far as male mortality is concerned, the highest losses were observed in Slovakia, Hungary, and Latvia (more than 35 years of life lost per 1,000 population). Unlike the spatial patterns of excess mortality in 2020, those observed in 2021 followed closely the known East-West mortality gradient [40]. The East-West differences are particularly pronounced in female excess mortality. Almost all regions located in western Europe experienced rather moderate losses or even gains in years of life. It is interesting to note that the German-Polish and German-Czech borders do not clearly demarcate the zones of high and modest excess mortality: they present intermediate losses between neighbouring Czechia and Poland and the western part of Germany.

Finally, and using values for both sexes combined, we found evidence of gains in only seven regions in 2020, and four regions in 2021. On the contrary, 362 regions experienced notable losses during the first year of the pandemic, and 440 regions in the second year. Importantly, only eight regions suffered from ASYLL higher than 20 per 1,000 population in 2020, while 75 regions suffered such a loss in 2021.

Figure 3 depicts the combined effects of the two pandemic years, which were particularly pronounced among men. Most of the regions with the highest male excess mortality were predominantly located in Poland, Slovakia, and Lithuania. The ASYLL values in the other countries of Eastern Europe were also high but comparable to those observed in northern Italy and central Spain. Among the Baltic States, Estonia experienced the lowest male excess mortality over the two pandemic years. This excess mortality was comparable in magnitude to the one observed in the regions of eastern Germany, northern Austria, Slovenia, central and northern Italy, Switzerland, the Netherlands as well as to several French regions close to the Belgian and German borders. Among 25 countries considered here, the majority of regions located in Scandinavian countries, western and northern Germany, and France experienced either relatively small losses or even gains during 2020–2021. The favourable trend in these regions is more pronounced among women.

Using values for both sexes combined, we estimate that only two regions experienced a significant gain during the two years of our study, while 458 regions exhibit a notable loss; among them, 136 suffered from ASYLL higher than 20 per 1,000 population. Our results also show that more than twice as many regions (151) experienced high excess mortality among men as among women (73) during the two years of the pandemic.

FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE

The analysis of the combined effects of the two pandemic years indicates that excess mortality was generally higher in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) having lower life expectancy. However, we also notice that in 2020, the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

highest excess mortality was observed in European regions with the highest pre-pandemic life expectancy at birth, such as central Spain and northern Italy. In what follows, we examine the ecological associations between the magnitude of excess mortality due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the initial mortality level across 569 spatial units. We stratify the analysis by year (2020 and 2021) and broader geographical regions (CEE and West) to account for the substantial differences between the two pandemic years as well as the differences in mortality levels between the CEE countries and remaining Europe (Figure 4).

FIGURE 4 ABOUT HERE

The panels of Figure 4 provide a clear illustration of the so-called Simpsons' paradox [41]. If the association is examined across all spatial units without stratifying them into CEE and West, it appears to be negative as highlighted by the fitted regression line in black. That is, the higher initial level of life expectancy observed in 2015–2019, the lower ASYLL is. In 2020, this association was rather weak, but it became strong in 2021. However, once East and West are analysed separately, it becomes apparent that there is no clear relationship between the two outcomes. In 2020, we can observe a positive association between initial life expectancy and ASYLL for both men and women in the West as well as women in the CEE (but not men). The results for 2021 are even more inconclusive. In the CEE stratum, there is a modest negative association among females, while there is hardly any among males. The same can be said about women in the West. Contrary to the other strata, we observe a positive association between the level of life expectancy at the baseline and the years of life lost in 2021 among men living in the West.

Figure 5 highlights the vanguard and laggard regions of Europe in terms of overall losses over the two pandemic years. The 'First 30' label refers to the spatial units having the highest losses, while the 'Last 30' label designates the European regions with no losses or gains in ASYLL during 2020–2021. In total, the 60 highlighted units constitute roughly 10 percent of the total number of the analysed regions.

The group of the most affected regions of Europe (panels A and C for women and men, respectively) is dominated by districts located in Eastern Europe, particularly in Poland and Slovakia. Among men, however, there are two Italian provinces with very high ASYLL values, Cremona (57.1 years per 1,000 population, with CI ranging from 49 to 65.2) and Bergamo (51.7 years, CI 46.7 to 56.7). Unlike the laggard group of European regions, the vanguard group (panels B and D of Figure 5) is quite heterogeneous. It consists of areas located in different parts of Europe (except CEE countries). Nevertheless, the majority of best-performing regions belong to the Scandinavian countries, Germany, and France. In contrast to years of life losses, which were more pronounced among men, there are no notable differences between the sexes in years of life gains during the two pandemic years.

FIGURE 5 ABOUT HERE

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 1. Spatial distribution of age-standardized years of life lost (ASYLL) across 25 European countries in 2020 and 2021, males (per 1,000 population)

Source: Copy from Table A1.



Figure 2. Spatial distribution of age-standardized years of life lost (ASYLL) across 25 European countries in 2020 and 2021, females (per 1,000 population)

Source: As for Figure 1

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 3. Spatial distribution of age-standardized years of life lost (ASYLL) across 25 European countries during 2020-2021 (per 1,000 population)

Source: As for Figure 1

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 4. Age-standardized years of life lost (ASYLL) against life expectancy at birth in 2015-2019 across 25 European countries

Source: As for Figure 1

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 5. Highest and lowest values of age-standardized years of life lost (ASYLL) during 2020-2021 (per 1,000 population).
Source: As for Figure 1. Note: Vertical bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Discussion

Main findings

This study is the first to use a large set of 569 small territorial units in 25 European countries to provide estimates of the total burden of the COVID-19 pandemic in both years, 2020 and 2021. Computing excess mortality at a fine geographical level, as opposed to a national level, is of paramount importance in understanding the pandemic's true impact. Fine-grained spatial analysis allows for a more accurate and nuanced assessment of the disparities in excess mortality, which are often masked when considering national aggregates.

Our findings using Age-Standardised Years of Life Lost (ASYLL) as the main indicator to measure excess mortality show evidence of gains in only seven regions in 2020, and four regions in 2021, for both sexes combined. On the contrary, 362 regions experienced notable losses during the first year of the pandemic, and 440 regions in the second year. Importantly, only eight regions suffered from ASYLL higher than 20 per 1,000 population in 2020, while 75 regions suffered such a loss in 2021.

Our research additionally highlights significant regional variations in excess mortality within certain countries in both years. For instance, in Italy in 2020, our calculations did not show any excess mortality for both sexes combined in the Caltanissetta, Trapani and Potenza provinces, whereas our indicator reaches over 38 per 1,000 population in Bergamo and Cremona. Similarly, in 2021 in Germany, our calculations showed an almost significant gain in East Schleswig-Holstein for males, while our indicator reached over 16.5 per 1,000 population in South Saxony and North Thuringia. Finally, during the two years studied, in Poland, our study shows a maximum excess mortality of 32 per 1,000 population in the Poznan region (West) for both sexes combined, while this value is at least 60 per 1,000 population in the Pulawski region (East).

Beyond these country-specific case studies, the contiguity of the regions investigated in our study enables us to explore a vast part of Europe and to reveal the geographical patterns of the pandemic during 2020 and 2021, which are quite different. This approach is novel because most previous studies have focused primarily on single-country regions or on regions in various countries with no common borders. During the initial pandemic year, high values for excess mortality were concentrated in northern Italy, southern Switzerland, central Spain, and Poland, aligning with the early COVID-19 outbreak areas. Notably, most of the French and German regions as well as Finland, Iceland, Northern Ireland, southern Great Britain, Estonia, Latvia, and Hungary experienced comparatively lower losses. The spatial

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

dynamics of excess mortality in Europe underwent a significant shift in the second pandemic year.

In 2021, Eastern European countries, particularly Slovakia, Hungary, and Latvia, showed the highest losses, following a discernible East-West mortality gradient. Using our regional values, we reveal that there is no relation between excess mortality in 2021 and pre-pandemic level of mortality when disentangling values between Western Europe and CEE countries This outcome is in line with the results of a recent study [40], who concluded that the East-West differences in excess mortality are related to structural and psychosocial traits that have their roots in the communist era. On the one hand, this includes differences in the connectivity of populations, driving the later onset of the pandemic in the East (from October 2020 onwards), while the West was hit more in the first wave (March to May 2020). On the other hand, this likely includes profound disparities in levels of vulnerability to the disadvantage of the East, e.g. in terms of pre-existing diseases, intensified by lagging economic development and selective migration due to their impact on risk-relevant behaviour. Lower levels of compliance with policy interventions (e.g. social distancing and vaccination) and a generally lower level of trust in authorities might also stem from the communist past of CEE countries.

Finally, the two pandemic years highly impacted male mortality in Eastern European countries (Poland, Slovakia, and Lithuania), which experienced high ASYLL values comparable to northern Italy and central Spain. Estonia exhibited the lowest male excess mortality among the Baltic States. Regions in Scandinavia, western and northern Germany, and southern France experienced relatively modest losses or gains, particularly among women.

Strengths and limitations

In contrast to other investigations regarding COVID-19-related mortality, we calculated excess mortality for the 569 European regions of our panel utilising official mortality data regularly gathered by vital registration systems, which are less susceptible to reporting delays and misclassification. We ensured the consistency of the sum of regional data for all age groups within each country by cross-referencing it with information from the Human Mortality Database. This validation is particularly essential not only for computing outcomes in the context of older age groups, for which single-year-of-age data necessitates statistical techniques, but also due to the heightened vulnerability of older individuals to COVID-19.

Furthermore, we determined the baseline mortality using an up-to-date statistical approach that optimises the time frames in our models for projecting regional trends in 2020 in 2021. By aggregating our outcomes at national level, we conducted a comparative analysis with a previous study to validate the reliability of our findings: our estimations concerning declines in life expectancy generally align with the results of Schöley et al. [17]. In cases where disparities exist (Switzerland, Spain, Estonia,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Lithuania), they are primarily associated with the year 2021 and the observed life expectancies (see table A2 for specifics).

Finally, we use ASYLL to estimate the comprehensive burden of COVID-19 in 2020 and 2021 instead of common measures such as life expectancy and age-standardised death rates since they cannot be added up over time. ASYLL is a measure used in public health and epidemiology to assess the impact of premature mortality on a population: it measures the cumulative years of life lost attributed to a specific cause of death, and in this context, to a particular crisis. ASYLL facilitates meaningful comparisons across diverse populations by accommodating variations in age structures.

Our study focuses exclusively on the years 2020 and 2021 due to data availability. However, it is widely accepted that excess mortality in 2020 and 2021 were driven by the COVID-19 pandemic, which was not true for 2022 anymore. European countries and the global community have gained a better understanding of the virus, its variants, and effective measures to control its spread. Moreover, a substantial proportion of the population in European countries has been vaccinated by 2022, likely reducing the severity of illness and the case fatality related to COVID-19. Finally, there were severe influenza waves in late 2022 that probably contributed significantly to the regional levels and variation of mortality. Therefore, it would be inappropriate to attribute excess mortality in 2022 fully to the impact of COVID-19 and mix it with 2020 and 2021.

Although our chosen forecasting approach is robust and adaptable to various demographic scenarios and smaller populations, we model each geographical unit independently and do not account for spatial autocorrelation. Incorporating spatial structure into mortality modelling and forecasting may eventually reduce uncertainties surrounding excess mortality estimates. However, as far as we are aware, there are currently no readily available methods for forecasting regional mortality while accounting for spatial dependence. It is essential to reiterate the importance of accounting for temporal trends when estimating mortality levels outside of a pandemic context and, consequently, to calculate excess mortality more accurately. Sensitivity analyses and comparisons of various alternative approaches for determining baseline mortality levels have been proposed across diverse data structures [42, 43, 44]. Exploring these alternatives could provide additional insights.

Conclusion and future research

Our research contributes to the prevailing body of literature concerning excess mortality in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic in both 2020 and 2021. We distinguish our study by presenting findings at the regional level for numerous European countries, a dimension that has hitherto not well been explored. The results underscore the significance of conducting a regional analysis, as we demonstrate that national-level estimates would obscure notable regional variations

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

at least for 2020. It is imperative for policymakers to recognize this intranational heterogeneity to comprehensively evaluate the pandemic's impact within their respective countries and formulate health policy responses that are tailored to specific regional needs.

This research paves the way for two promising avenues. First, while our study effectively quantifies regional variations in excess mortality, it does not offer insights into their underlying causes. This would involve associating these estimates with both regional contextual factors and public policies related to social distancing and international isolation, which were implemented at both regional and national levels. Then, ecological analyses could be conducted in parallel to well-designed epidemiological studies. This approach would enable the identification of key factors that account for the regional differences we have identified, leading to a deeper understanding of how to manage the transmission of a new infectious disease. For instance, the notably high mortality observed near Bergamo and Cremona in Italy could be attributed to the early onset of the pandemic, which prompted a robust public response from the Italian government which spared the southern regions of the country.

Second, comparing excess mortality due to COVID-19 with other historical mortality crises could be a valuable analytical tool for placing this pandemic in a broader historical and public health context. Such comparisons offer insights into the uniqueness and severity of the impact of COVID-19 by drawing parallels or distinctions with past crises such as influenza pandemics, major wars, or other epidemics. This comparative approach should help researchers and policymakers better understand the relative gravity of the pandemic, assess the efficacy of response measures, and identify patterns that might inform future preparedness efforts.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Acknowledgments

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

Funding

IA, PG, MM, and MS were supported by funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 851485).

Authors' contributions

Conceptualization: FB, MS, PG, CGC, MM

Methodology: CGC, FB, PG.

Data collection and curation: MS, FB, IA, MM, PG, CGC.

Formal analysis: FB, PG.

Writing - Original draft: PG, FB, CGC.

Writing - Review & Editing: PG, FB, CGC, MS, MM, IA.

Visualisation: MS, FB, PG.

Availability of data and materials

Detailed values of our estimates are available at:
https://osf.io/fwtsa/?view_only=ba00308358dc4fbaa23de72f9c82d1db.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

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

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

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

[17] J. Schöley, J. M. Aburto, I. Kashnitsky, M. S. Kniffka, L. Zhang, H. Jaadla, J. B. Dowd et R. Kashyap, «Life expectancy changes since COVID-19,» *Nature Human Behaviour,* vol. 6, p. 1649–1659, October 2022.

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

[19] M. Mühlichen, M. Sauerberg et P. Grigoriev, «Evaluating Spatial, Cause-Specific and Seasonal Effects of Excess Mortality Associated with the COVID-19 Pandemic: The Case of Germany, 2020,» *Journal of Epidemiology and Global Health,* p. 1–12, 2023.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[27] T. Adair, B. Houle et V. Canudas-Romo, «Effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on life expectancy in Australia, 2020-22,» *International Journal of Epidemiology,* p. dyad121,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

2023.

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

[29] F. Bonnet, P. Grigoriev, M. Sauerberg, I. Alliger, M. Mühlichen et C.-G. Camarda, «Spatial variation in excess mortality across Europe: a cross-sectional study of 561 regions in 21 countries,» *medRxiv,* p. 2023–04, 2023.

[30] T. Hajdu, J. Krekó et G. C. Tóth, *Inequalities in regional excess mortality and life expectancy during the COVID-19 pandemic in Europe,* Institute of Economics, Centre for Economic and Regional Studies Eötvös …, 2023, p. 1–37.

[31] A. D. Popa, A. I. Enache, I. V. Popa, S. A. Antoniu, R. A. Dragomir et A. Burlacu, «Determinants of the hesitancy toward COVID-19 vaccination in Eastern European countries and the relationship with health and vaccine literacy: a literature review,» *Vaccines,* vol. 10, p. 672, 2022.

[32] M. Barbieri, J. R. Wilmoth, V. M. Shkolnikov, D. Glei, D. Jasilionis, D. Jdanov, C. Boe, T. Riffe, P. Grigoriev et C. Winant, «Data resource profile: the human mortality database (HMD),» *International journal of epidemiology,* vol. 44, p. 1549–1556, 2015.

[33] M. Mühlichen, M. Lerch, M. Sauerberg et P. Grigoriev, «Different health systems–Different mortality outcomes? Regional disparities in avoidable mortality across German-speaking Europe, 1992–2019,» *Social Science & Medicine,* vol. 329, p. 115976, 2023.

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

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

[36] C. G. Camarda, «Smooth Constrained Mortality Forecasting,» *Demographic Research,* vol. 41, p. 1091–1130, 2019.

[37] F. Bonnet et C. G. Camarda, «Estimating Subnational Excess Mortality in Times of Pandemic. An application to French Departements in 2020.,» *Forthcoming in PLOS One,* 2023.

[38] R. Martinez, P. Soliz, R. Caixeta et P. Ordunez, «Reflection on modern methods: years of life lost due to premature mortality—a versatile and comprehensive measure for monitoring non-communicable disease mortality,» *International journal of epidemiology,* vol. 48, p. 1367–1376, 2019.

[39] R Development Core Team, «R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing,» Vienna, 2022.

[40] V. M. Shkolnikov, S. Timonin, D. Jdanov, N. Islam et D. A. Leon, «East-West mortality disparities during the COVID-19 pandemic widen the historical longevity divide in Europe.,» *medRxiv,* p. 2023–11, 2023.

[41] C. H. Wagner, «Simpson's paradox in real life,» *The American Statistician,* vol. 36, p. 46–48, 1982.

[42] M. R. Nepomuceno, I. Klimkin, D. A. Jdanov, A. Alustiza-Galarza et V. M. Shkolnikov,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

«Sensitivity analysis of excess mortality due to the COVID-19 pandemic,» *Population and Development Review,* 2022.

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

[44] M. Levitt, F. Zonta et J. P. A. Ioannidis, «Comparison of pandemic excess mortality in 2020–2021 across different empirical calculations,» *Environmental Research,* vol. 213, p. 113754, 2022.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Online supplementary appendix A

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

Country	Spatial units	Source	Period	Upper age limit	Adjustments/comments
Austria	9 NUTS 2 units ('Länder')	Statistics Austria, Eurostat	1990–2021	Deaths: 115 Pop.: 95 (after 2001:100)	–
Belgium	11 NUTS 2 units ('provincies')	Belgian Statistical Office	1993–2021	Deaths: 100 Pop.: 100	–
Czechia	14 NUTS 3 units ('kraje')	Czech Statistical Office	1996–2021	Deaths: 95 Pop.: 95	–
Denmark	11 NUTS 3 units ('landsdele')	Statistics Denmark	2008–2020	Deaths: 90 Pop.: 90	–
Estonia	1 NUTS 2 unit	Statistics Estonia	1989–2021	Deaths:100 Pop.: 85	–
Finland	4 NUTS 2 units ('Storområden')	Statistics Finland	1972–2021	Deaths: 95 Pop.: 95	We merged Åland Islands to South Finland
France	95 NUTS 3 units ('départements')	INSEE	1970–2021	Deaths: 105 Pop.: 105 (after 2016: 95)	Non-European areas excluded; north and south of Corse merged to maintain consistent time series
Germany	96 ROR ('Raumordnungs-regionen')	Statistical Offices of the	1992–2021	Deaths: 90 Pop.: 90	Harmonized to apply current territorial administrative division (as of Dec 2022) to the whole study period and to eliminate the Census

		German Länder			2011 break; 400 NUTS 3 units ('Kreise') aggregated to 96 ROR units according to classification of BBSR (2017) [36]
Hungary	8 NUTS 2 units ('tervezési-statisztikai régiók')	Hungarian Central Statistical Office, Eurostat	2001–2021	Deaths: 90 Pop.: 90	–
Iceland	1 NUTS 2 unit	Human Mortality Database, Eurostat	1970–2021	Deaths: 110 (2021:100) Pop.: 110 (2021:100)	–
Ireland	1 NUTS 1 unit	Human Mortality Database, Eurostat	1990–2021	Deaths: 110 (2021:100) Pop.: 110 (2021:100)	No subnational division due to data availability issues
Italy	92 NUTS 3 units ('province')	ISTAT	1995–2021	Deaths: 100 Pop.: 100	We merged the following regions to maintain a consistent time series: 1) Biella + Vercelli, 2) Novara + Verbano, 3) Como + Lecco, 4) Milano + Lodi + Monza + Brianza, 5) Rimini + Forli-Cesena, 5) Firenze + Prato, 6) Cagliari + Medio Campidano + Carbonia-Iglesias + Ogliastra + Oristano + Nuoro, 7) Sassari + Olbia-Tempio, 8) Foggia + Bari + Barletta, 9) Fermo + Ascoli-Piceno, 10) Crotone + Vibo Valentia + Cantanzaro.
Latvia	1 NUTS 2 unit	Official Statistics Portal Latvia	1990–2021	Deaths: 100 Pop.: 100	–

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Lithuania	2 NUTS 2 units	Statistical Office, Eurostat	2001–2021	Deaths: 85 Pop.: 100	–
Luxembourg	1 NUTS 3 unit	Human Mortality Database	1996–2021	Deaths: 110 Pop.: 110	–
Netherlands	12 NUTS 2 units (‘provincies’)	Statistics Netherlands	1990–2021	Deaths: 100 Pop.: 90 (after 2001: 100)	–
Norway	7 NUTS 2 units (‘landsdeler’)	Statistics Norway	2000–2021	Deaths: 100 Pop.: 105	Harmonized to apply current territorial administrative divisions; we excluded remote islands Svalbard and Jan Mayen
Poland	73 NUTS 3 units (‘podregiony’)	Statistics Poland	2006–2021	Deaths: 90 Pop.: 100	–
Portugal	5 NUTS 2 units (‘regiões’)	National Institute of Statistics, Eurostat	1992–2021	Deaths: 100 Pop.: 100	For visibility reasons, we excluded the remote islands Azores and Madeira.
Slovakia	8 NUTS 3 units (‘kraje’)	Slovakian Statistical Office	1996–2022	Deaths: 100 Pop.: 100	–
Slovenia	2 NUTS 2 units (‘kohezijske regije’)	Slovenian Statistical Office	2002–2021	Deaths: 100 Pop.: 100	–

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Spain	50 NUTS 3 units (‘provincias’)	National Statistics Institute	1990–2021	Deaths: 100 Pop.: 85 (after 2001:100)	For visibility reasons, we excluded the Canary Islands.
Sweden	21 NUTS 3 units (‘län’)	Statistics Sweden, Eurostat	1969–2021	Deaths: 100 Pop.: 100	–
Switzerland	7 NUTS 2 units (‘Grossregionen’)	Federal Statistical Office	1991–2020	Deaths: 95 Pop.: 100	–
United Kingdom	37 NUTS 2 regions	Office for National Statistics (for England & Wales); Human Mortality Database (for Northern Ireland & Scotland)	2002–2021 2002–2021 1990–2021	England & Wales Deaths: 90 Pop.: 90 Northern Ireland Deaths: 110 Pop.: 110 Scotland Deaths: 113 Pop: 90	– NUTS 1 level data for Northern Ireland and Scotland due to data quality issues

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table A2: Comparison of changes in life expectancy at birth with Schöley et al. (2022)

	Women				Men			
	Schöley et al. 2022		This paper		Schöley et al. 2022		This paper	
Country	**2020**	**2021**	**2020**	**2021**	**2020**	**2021**	**2020**	**2021**
Austria	-0,70	-0,70	-0,49	-0,59	-0,99	-1,26	-0,81	-1,12
Belgium	-1,15	-0,33	-0,91	-0,22	-1,29	-0,78	-1,15	-0,70
Switzerland	-0,64	-0,23	-0,90	-0,55	-1,14	-0,74	-1,57	-1,17
Czech Republic	-0,94	-1,76	-0,94	-1,94	-1,25	-2,41	-1,20	-2,60
Germany	-0,32	-0,67	-0,10	-0,52	-0,49	-1,03	-0,30	-0,84
Denmark	-0,03	-0,33	0,00	-0,32	-0,04	-0,17	-0,03	-0,20
Estonia	-0,32	-1,94	-0,07	-1,51	-0,40	-2,65	-0,23	-2,12
Spain	-1,41	-0,93	-1,14	0,02	-1,52	-1,22	-1,38	-0,44
Finland	-0,01	-0,23	-0,02	-0,24	-0,30	-0,32	-0,37	-0,47
France	-0,52	-0,18	-0,43	-0,46	-0,75	-0,53	-0,71	-0,85
North. Ireland	-0,84	-0,95	-0,81	-0,83	-0,79	-0,97	-0,85	-1,05
Scotland	-0,45	-0,69	-0,44	-0,73	-1,07	-1,00	-0,91	-0,83
Hungary	-0,83	-2,20	-0,73	-2,15	-0,93	-2,55	-0,84	-2,68
Iceland	-0,41	-0,39	0,01	0,01	-0,30	-0,11	-0,22	0,04
Italy	-1,07	-0,97	-0,86	-0,76	-1,46	-1,25	-1,33	-1,12
Lithuania	-1,57	-2,97	-1,08	-2,43	-2,25	-2,98	-1,69	-2,58
Netherlands	-0,58	-0,74	-0,52	-0,76	-0,95	-0,94	-0,90	-1,10
Norway	0,04	-0,21	-0,05	-0,19	-0,05	-0,17	-0,26	-0,26
Poland	-1,02	-2,26	-1,02	-2,08	-1,60	-2,64	-1,55	-2,55
Portugal	-0,66	-0,65	-0,59	-0,64	-0,91	-1,02	-0,77	-0,78
Sweden	-0,62	-0,21	-0,30	0,02	-1,01	-0,56	-0,72	-0,31
Slovenia	-1,02	-0,64	-0,87	-0,77	-0,93	-0,88	-1,00	-1,38
Slovakia	-0,94	-2,97	-0,85	-3,09	-1,10	-3,38	-1,07	-3,58



Figure A1. Spatial distribution of the change in age-standardized years of life lost (ASYLL) between 2020 and 2021 across 25 European countries

Source: As shown in Table A1

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Online supplementary appendix B

A detailed description of the analytic procedure to compute excess mortality is available at:
https://osf.io/fwtsa/?view_only=ba00308358dc4fbaa23de72f9c82d1db

Online supplementary appendix C

Detailed values of our estimates and data visualisation tool are available at:
https://osf.io/fwtsa/?view_only=ba00308358dc4fbaa23de72f9c82d1db

Please read “Online Appendix C.pdf” first.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300149; this version posted December 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .