Violent and Nonviolent Death Tolls for the Gaza War:

New Primary Evidence

By

Michael Spagat, Royal Holloway University of London

Jon Pedersen, independent researcher

Khalil Shikaki, Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research

Michael Robbins, Princeton University,

Eran Bendavid, Stanford University

Håvard Hegre, Peace Research Institute Oslo and

Debarati Guha-Sapir, Université Catholique de Louvain

Abstract

High-quality war mortality estimates, such as those that were produced for Kosovo, Iraq, and Darfur play a critical role in illuminating the human cost of war. During the tumult of war they are, however, challenging to obtain due to the conflicts themselves. The Gaza Ministry of Health (GMoH) has provided regular updates to their post-October-7 violent death tally for the Gaza Strip. However, GMoH reports have attracted both criticism and support. Here, we present results from a large-scale household survey, the Gaza Mortality Survey (GMS), which provides independent estimates of war-related deaths between October 7, 2023 and January 5, 2025. Our findings suggest that violent mortality has significantly exceeded official figures. Our central estimate for the extent of GMoH undercount closely matches a separate estimate made using capture-recapture methods. We also find that nonviolent excess deaths, often overlooked in conflict assessments, also represent a substantial burden. These results underscore the feasibility of mortality surveillance methodologies in some highly challenging war-affected settings and provide a crucial empirical foundation for assessing the true human cost of the war.

1. INTRODUCTION

High-quality war mortality estimates, such as those that were produced for Kosovo, Iraq, and Darfur (1-3) play a critical role in illuminating the human cost of war. During the tumult of war they are, however, challenging to obtain due to the conflicts themselves. The Gaza Ministry of Health (GMoH) has provided regular updates to their post-October-7 violent death tally for the Gaza Strip. However, GMoH reports have attracted both criticism (4-5) and support (6-8). Here, we present results from a large-scale household survey, the Gaza Mortality Survey (GMS), which provides independent estimates of war-related deaths between October 7, 2023 and January 5, 2025. Our findings suggest that violent mortality has significantly exceeded official figures. Our central estimate for the extent of GMoH undercount closely matches a separate estimate made using capture-recapture methods (7). We also find that nonviolent excess deaths, often overlooked in conflict assessments, also represent a substantial burden. These results underscore the feasibility of mortality surveillance methodologies in some highly challenging war-affected settings and provide a crucial empirical foundation for assessing the true human cost of the war.

A recent study triangulating 2 sources of GMoH data with social media obituaries (7) yielded a violent death toll estimate of 64,260 deaths (95% CI 55,298–78,525) from the beginning of the war through June 15, 2024. This work makes substantive contributions to generating independent estimates of the Gaza death toll, yet (7) has meaningful limitations. First, two of their three data sources, and a strong majority of the deaths, are components of the GMoH database itself. So (7) can offer only limited and partially circular assessment of GMoH overall numbers and their

demographic disaggregates. Second, their approach – a three-list capture recapture – admits multiple valid models that are all plausible given our current state of knowledge. As a group, the 95% confidence intervals for these models range from 47,457 to 88,332 deaths. So, even if we accept the broad thrust of the analysis in (7), considerable uncertainty remains (9), and fully independent assessment of the death toll – one not reliant on GMoH data – is needed to clarify the violent death toll of the war. Finally, major studies that estimate the death toll in Gaza based on GMoH data (7-8) fail to shed light on the number of nonviolent excess deaths caused indirectly by the war.

Indeed, information on the nonviolent excess death toll of the war is, to date, scant and unreliable. A report on this topic (10) estimated that it that the number of nonviolent deaths in the war could be 4 times as high as the number of violent deaths. Additionally, physicians who worked in the Gaza Strip (11) claimed tens of thousands of deaths due to starvation. However, these studies are not based on systematic data collection. To date, no empirically grounded estimates of nonviolent deaths for the Gaza war exist, a gap we aim to fill.

In this study, the Gaza Mortality Survey (GMS), we present newly and independently collected survey data from the Gaza Strip that enable fresh and more precise estimates of both the violent and nonviolent death toll of the war. In the GMS, we surveyed a representative sample of 2,000 Gazan households (representative of Gaza pre-Pre-October 7) and collected information on the vital status of 9,729 household members and their newborns, including whether they are alive or dead. Reported deaths are divided into violent or nonviolent ones.

Based on the GMS, we estimate 75,200 violent deaths (95% CI: 63,600–86,800) between October 7, 2023, and January 5, 2025. Among those, 56.2% (95% CI: 50.4%–61.9%) were women (18-64), children (< 18), or elderly (65+). We also estimate 8.540 (95% CI: 4,540–12,500) excess (i.e., above expectation) nonviolent deaths.

The comparable, i.e., for the same period, GMoH estimate of about 45,650 (12) is roughly 39% below our central estimate and 28% below the lower bound of our 95% confidence interval for violent deaths, suggesting that the GMoH has not exaggerated the death toll in the war. Our estimated percentage of women, children, and elderly among the dead is consistent with GMoH reporting that put this number at 57.2% in October 2024 and 53.9% in March 2025 (GMoH data). We also provide grounded estimates for the number of excess nonviolent deaths, an original contribution.

These results demonstrate the feasibility of data collection, even in environments as challenging as the Gaza Strip during the present war and highlight the need for improved mortality surveillance in conflict zones.

2. COLLECTION AND DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

2.1 Sampling and Fieldwork

The Materials and Methods file of the supplementary materials section provides more details on GMS sampling and fieldwork than this brief overview does and still more details are in Supplementary Information (SI).

The survey was preregistered, ethically approved by Royal Holloway University of London and obtained informed consent from each respondent. The Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research (PCPSR) collected the data from 2,000 households spread across 200 Primary Sampling Units (PSUs). Challenges to drawing a representative sample included widespread displacement and the inaccessibility of Northern Gaza, Gaza City, and Rafah due to ongoing fighting and Israeli evacuation orders. PCPSR, which has tracked population movements throughout the war, randomly selected 70, 41 and 89 PSUs in, respectively, census enumeration areas, built-up shelters, and tent gatherings - mirroring the population proportions by dwelling type when the survey was conducted. We strived to ensure representativeness by governorate of origin by earmarking some shelter and tent PSUs to cover the populations of the three inaccessible governorates. Figure 1 shows PSU locations and the governorate of origin that each PSU represents. We describe the selection procedures within PSUs in the SI section.

FIGURE 1 HERE

We wrote the questionnaire in English and PCPSR translated and then tested it in Arabic. The interview documents household members as of October 6, 2023, plus newborns added to these households during the war, and their post-October-7 vital status. Interviewers were trained to ensure accurate mortality reporting, focusing only on household members. Data were collected between December 30, 2024, and January 5, 2025, by ten two-person teams supported by four supervisors and other PCPSR staff. GPS tracking and real-time monitoring were among the quality control

measures. Face-to-face interviews were conducted using tablets and mobile phones, with data instantly uploaded to a secure central server.

2.2. Sample Description

Table 1 shows the status, by gender and age, of all people recorded by the survey as household members as of October 6, 2023. Between the ages of 5 and 39, deaths among men greatly outnumber deaths among women. There are more men than women reported missing in all age categories, including children, especially for ages 18-39. Women make up just 1 out of 52 people reported imprisoned. The primary group in the sample who left Gaza are young adults.

TABLE 1 HERE

Table 2 subdivides reported deaths into categories, by gender and age. Violent deaths greatly outnumber nonviolent deaths. Among violent deaths, there are many more males than females, especially between the ages of 18-39.

TABLE 2 HERE

Table 3 gives the within-sample number of violent deaths along with the percentage dying violently within each governorate. Readers should interpret this table with caution because many people, after being displaced, will have died outside their governorate of origin, and we did not collect information on where people were killed.

TABLE 3 HERE

The survey recorded post-October-6 births of 179 boys and 178 girls, of whom it was reported that two boys and two girls had died.

3. ESTIMATES

To adjust for the sample not corresponding exactly to expected distributions of the population by ages, gender, regions in the Gaza Strip (governorates), and household sizes, we raked (13-14) the sample with marginal distributions derived from the US Census Bureau population projections for ages and genders (15), the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics for their projections of population by governorate in the Gaza Strip (16), and the Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2019-20 (17) for the distribution of household sizes. We trimmed high weights down to twice the median weight for the whole sample, performing all the work with the survey.design and trimWeights procedure of the R package Survey 4.4.2 (18). Table S6 in supplementary materials shows the impact of raking and trimming on the estimates. We also used the linearization method in Survey to estimate standard errors.

Table 4 displays our main estimates. We stress ranges over central estimates and caution readers that, as with any survey, we cannot quantify all the uncertainty affecting the estimates.

The range of our violent death estimate, 63,600–86,800, is between 3.0-4.1% of the population of the Gaza Strip. The GMoH figure of 45,650 is 53% of the top of our 95% confidence interval for violent deaths and 72% of the bottom of this interval.

We estimate that women, children (<18) and elderly (65+) make up 56.2% (95% CI: 40.4%–61.9%) of the violent deaths during the study period. Our central estimate is sandwiched between comparable and available GMoH numbers of 57.2% in October 2024 and 53.9% in March 2025. In absolute terms, the bottom of our 95% confidence intervals for this group (33,100) exceeds the March tally from GMoH (26,658), although the GMoH number includes more than 2 additional months of conflict.

We estimate a further 16,300 (95% CI 12,300-20,200) nonviolent deaths, the first such estimate for the Gaza Strip during the war. To estimate excess nonviolent deaths, we subtract 7,716 deaths predicted (19) to occur without war, a number that combines projections of 6,348 deaths for 2023 and 6,188 deaths for 2024 and 6,043 deaths for 2025, prorated for the number of war days within each year. This procedure produces an excess nonviolent death estimate of 8,540 (95% CI: 4,540–12,500), in line with an early projection for a scenario under which violence escalates but epidemics are avoided of 5,780 covering February through August 2024 (20).

TABLE 4 HERE

4. DISCUSSION

4.1 Interpretations and Conclusion

In this survey-based study of mortality in the Gaza war through January 5 2025, we conclude that: (a) the violent death toll of the war resulted in the deaths of around 3.6% of Gaza's population, exceeding the official GMoH total; (b) around 56% of the violent deaths were among women, children, and the elderly, a percentage similar to that endorsed by the GMoH; and (c) violent deaths far outnumber nonviolent deaths, though there have still been at least several thousand nonviolent excess deaths. There is striking alignment between our finding, that the comparable GMoH violent-death number is 39% below our central estimate, and the finding of (7), using completely different capture-recapture methods, that the GMoH tally is 41% below their central estimate. The proportion of deaths made up by women, children, and elderly supports the general perception in which non-combatants are frequent victims of the conflict.

Our findings are also incompatible with claims that: (a) the GMoH has "inflated the death toll" (5, 21); (b) indirect deaths could exceed violent deaths by at least a factor of four (10, 22); and (c) "it is likely that 62,413 people have died of starvation" (appendix to 11). Follow-up surveys might provide central estimates or distributions that differ substantially from the GMS. Nevertheless, this is the first population survey of mortality in Gaza which gives independent and grounded estimates that will anchor future discussions.

Our findings suggests that a high ratio of indirect to direct deaths is not inevitable in warfare, as some analysts seem to assume (10). This should not be

surprising as, for example, the Kosovo Memory Book project classified just 281 out of 13,517 deaths in the Kosovo war (1998-1999) as indirect (23). Indeed, indirect deaths are usually only estimated (24) in settings with extremely poor conditions such as Darfur (3) or Tigray (25) and direct deaths have substantially outnumbered indirect ones even in the extremely impoverished environment of Yemen (26).

Despite a claim to the contrary (7), the GMS demonstrates that a ground survey in the Gaza Strip was feasible despite the challenging conditions. This success highlights the need for improved mortality surveillance in conflict zones.

The GMoH work has value that extends far beyond the insight it provides into the total number of violent deaths in the war and the number's demographic composition. By naming individual victims one by one, the GMoH endows each person with a measure of human dignity (27). This project of memorialization has only begun and must continue for many years after the war ends. Estimates of numbers killed, the focus of the present paper, can help guide this casualty recording work. But we cannot provide each human being due recognition in death simply by estimating the number of deaths.

4.2 Sources of bias and uncertainty

Here we list and evaluate potential sources of both upward and downward bias in our estimates, beginning with upward bias.

Respondents may have overreported deaths, perhaps with the objective of collecting compensation for dead relatives or otherwise inflating the conflict's mortality counts. Interviewers were clear, however, that respondents could not gain materially from their participation. Moreover, interviews began with a household

roster before ascertaining the fate of each person listed on the roster. This procedure was intended to limit inflating death counts by forcing respondents to report deaths only of previously enumerated individuals, without *post hoc* addition of deaths.

Respondents may have reported deaths that are real but of relatives who were not household members, as seems to have happened in a survey of Iraq (28). We anticipated this possibility. Interviewer training stressed this and emphasized that relatives who are not household members must not be included in the household roster. Indeed, the mean household size in the sample (4.9) was below the population figure (5.5), arguing against inflation of households with non-member relatives.

We could not sample some populations. For example, we could not reach households that had left the Gaza Strip entirely (i.e., all members left). Although some people have left to receive medical treatment, or because of deaths of household members, it is plausible that leaving Gaza Strip is correlated with lower mortality, both because of better conditions in the destination place of residence, as well as because of selection (families with more means may have been more likely to leave). We note, however, that the number of leavers identified in our sample was relatively small (Table S4).

Finally, survey interview teams may have preferentially selected relatively high-mortality households. The survey protocol they were instructed to follow is designed to prevent this from happening, since we recognize that inadvertent factors may drive sympathetic human interviewers towards more affected families. The extent to which this may have happened is hard to ascertain and we have no positive evidence that it did happen. However, we address the possibility through a scenario

in our sensitivity analysis (Table S6) that removes the data collected by the survey team that captured the most violent deaths.

A source of downward bias is our non-sampling of households with zero remaining live members, or no live members above the age of 15, whom we could interview. While the number of such households is unclear, this phenomenon has been documented by others (29).

We used shelter interviews exclusively to capture households from Northern Gaza, Gaza City and Rafah. Therefore, households from Deir al-Balah or Khan Younis that were displaced into shelters were outside our sampling frame. Thus, the estimates assume, implicitly, that mortality rates for displaced and nondisplaced households from these governorates were equal, although it seems likely that the former group suffered higher mortality than the latter group.

We were unable to reach households that remained entirely in Northern Gaza, Gaza City, or Rafah due to the extreme danger in these areas (30). This gap could contribute to underestimation. However, many displaced households experienced violence during departure, transit, or in their new locations. While we lack direct evidence on how these dynamics offset each other, the scale of displacement suggests that excluding those who remained is likely a minor source of bias.

It is unclear to what extent individuals classified as missing may be dead. This has implications not only for the overall mortality numbers, but also for the portion of the violent deaths made up by women, children, and elderly. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that, even if we make the extreme and implausible assumption that all missing

persons are dead, then the central estimate for the percentage of women, children, and elderly among the dead decreases only to 52.2% (Table S5).

The above discussion of biases shows that, as is the case with all surveys, confidence intervals cannot capture all the important uncertainty surrounding the estimates. Moreover, we did not attempt to model uncertainty over the number of projected deaths in the absence of war, instead using a single number for baseline deaths in our excess death calculation while acknowledging that this is a further source of uncertainty. Readers should, therefore, view our confidence intervals as minimum ranges.

4.3 The Future

A fragile ceasefire began roughly 10 days after our data collection ended but collapsed with renewed Israeli airstrikes on March 18. The humanitarian situation has further deteriorated since then. Widespread destruction across the Gaza Strip continues to cripple institutions essential to human development, particularly the health care system. Undercounting of violent deaths by the GMoH is likely to persist. On April 7, six senior UN officials warned of a looming humanitarian catastrophe (31), and subsequent reports through May and early June indicate worsening conditions. The ratio of nonviolent to violent deaths may well have grown since the GMS data collection period. Past scholarship suggests that the long-term toll of conflict will probably accumulate over the coming years even if the acute conflict ends (32-34). This underscores the importance of continued GMoH surveillance, as

well as independent surveys, to properly understand the unfolding dynamics of death. We hope that resources will be available to tackle this task.

Bibliography

1. Spiegel, P. B. & Salama, P. War and mortality in Kosovo, 1998–99: an epidemiological testimony. *The Lancet* **355**, 2204–2209 (2000).
2. Iraq Family Health Survey Study Group. Violence-Related Mortality in Iraq from 2002 to 2006. *New England Journal of Medicine* **358**, 484–493 (2008).
3. Degomme, O. & Guha-Sapir, D. Patterns of mortality rates in Darfur conflict. *The Lancet* **375**, 294–300 (2010).
4. Samuels, B. Biden: 'No confidence' in Palestinian death toll from Gaza Health Ministry. *The Hill* https://thehill.com/homenews/administration/4275738-biden-no-confidence-in-palestinian-death-toll-from-gaza-health-ministry/ (2023).
5. Fox, A. Questionable Counting: Analysing the Death Toll from the Hamas-Run Ministry of Health in Gaza. *Henry Jackson Society* https://henryjacksonsociety.org/publications/questionable-counting/ (2024).
6. Huynh, B. Q., Chin, E. T. & Spiegel, P. B. No evidence of inflated mortality reporting from the Gaza Ministry of Health. *The Lancet* **403**, 23–24 (2024).
7. Jamaluddine, Z., Abukmail, H., Aly, S., Campbell, O. M. R. & Checchi, F. Traumatic injury mortality in the Gaza Strip from Oct 7, 2023, to June 30, 2024: a capture–recapture analysis. *The Lancet* **0**, (2025).
8. Guillot, M., Draidi, M., Cetorelli, V., Silva, J. H. C. M. D. & Lubbad, I. Life expectancy losses in the Gaza Strip during the period October, 2023, to September, 2024. *The Lancet* **0**, (2025).
9. Nolen, S. Estimated Gaza Toll May Have Missed 25,000 Deaths, Study Says. *The New York Times* (2025).

10. Khatib, R., McKee, M. & Yusuf, S. Counting the dead in Gaza: difficult but essential. *The Lancet* **404**, 237–238 (2024).
11. Sidhwa, F., Haj-Hassan, T., Perlmutter, M., Subeh, M. & Ahmed, N. USA Letter | October 2. *Gaza Healthcare Letters* https://www.gazahealthcareletters.org/usa-letter-oct-2-2024 (2025).
12. Asmar, A. Gaza death toll passes 45,650 as Israel kills 77 more Palestinians. *Anadolu Ajansı* https://www.aa.com.tr/en/middle-east/gaza-death-toll-passes-45-650-as-israel-kills-77-more-palestinians/3441264 (2025).
13. Cohen, M. P. Raking. in *Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods* 672–673 (Sage Publications, Inc., 2008). doi:10.4135/9781412963947.
14. Dorofeev, S. & Grant, P. *Statistics for Real-Life Sample Surveys: Non-Simple-Random Samples and Weighted Data*. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006). doi:10.1017/CBO9780511543265.
15. US Census Bureau. International Database - Age Tables. https://www.census.gov/data-tools/demo/idb/#/table?dashboard_page=country&COUNTRY_YR_ANIM=2005&CCODE_SINGLE=XG&subnat_map_admin=ADM1&CCODE=XG&ANIM_PARAMS=1997,2100,5&menu=tableViz&quickReports=MORT&TABLE_YEARS=2023,2024&TABLE_USE_RANGE=N&TABLE_USE_YEARS=Y&TABLE_STEP=1&TABLE_ADD_YEARS=2023,2024 (2025).
16. PCBS. Estimated Population in the Palestine Mid-Year by Governorate,1997-2026. https://www.pcbs.gov.ps/statisticsIndicatorsTables.aspx?lang=en&table_id=676 (2021).
17. UNICEF. State of Palestine, MICS 2019-20 dataset. (2021).

18. Lumley, T., Gao, P., & Schneider, B. (2024). *survey: Analysis of Complex Survey Samples* (Version 4.4-2) [Computer software]. https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/survey/index.html
19. US Census Bureau. International Database - Death Projections. https://www.census.gov/data-tools/demo/idb/#/table?dashboard_page=country&COUNTRY_YR_ANIM=2005&CCODE_SINGLE=XG&subnat_map_admin=ADM1&CCODE=XG&ANIM_PARAMS=1997,2100,5&menu=tableViz&quickReports=MORT&TABLE_YEARS=2023,2024&TABLE_USE_RANGE=N&TABLE_USE_YEARS=Y&TABLE_STEP=1&TABLE_ADD_YEARS=2023,2024 (2025).
20. Jamaluddine, Z., Chen, Z., Abukmail, H. & Elnakib, S. Crisis in Gaza: Scenario-based Health Impact Projections - Report One: 7 February to 6 August 2024 - occupied Palestinian territory | ReliefWeb. https://reliefweb.int/report/occupied-palestinian-territory/crisis-gaza-scenario-based-health-impact-projections-report-one-7-february-6-august-2024 (2024).
21. Epstein, G. & Spagat, M. Flawed critique: how Andrew Fox's report on Gaza death toll for the Henry Jackson Society lacks evidence for key claims. *AOAV* https://aoav.org.uk/2024/flawed-critique-how-andrew-foxs-report-for-the-henry-jackson-society-on-gaza-death-toll-lacks-evidence-for-key-claims/ (2024).
22. Spagat, M. A critical analysis of The Lancet's letter 'Counting the Dead in Gaza: Difficult but Essential'. *AOAV* https://aoav.org.uk/2024/a-critical-analysis-of-the-lancets-letter-counting-the-dead-in-gaza-difficult-but-essential-professor-mike-spagat-reviews-the-claim-the-total-gaza-death-toll-may-reach-upwards-of-186000/ (2024).

23. *Krüger, J. & Ball, P. Evaluation of the Database of the Kosovo Memory Book. https://hrdag.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/Evaluation_of_the_Database_KMB-2014.pdf (2014).*
24. *Small Arms Survey. Small Arms Survey 2005: Weapons at War, Chapter 9. (Oxford University Press, 2005).*
25. *Nyssen, J. Documenting the Humanitarian Situation and Civilian Mortality in the Tigray War --- Presentation at a Hearing Organized by the Health Professionals Network for Tigray, 4 April 2022. (2022). doi:10.5281/zenodo.6414225.*
26. *Guha-Sapir, D. et al. Civil war and death in Yemen: Analysis of SMART survey and ACLED data, 2012–2019. PLOS Global Public Health* **2***, e0000581 (2022).*
27. Every Casualty Counts. What is casualty recording? *Every Casualty Counts* https://everycasualty.org/what-is-casualty-recording/.
28. Spagat, M. & Dougherty, J. Conflict Deaths in Iraq: A Methodological Critique of the ORB Survey Estimate. *Survey Research Methods* **4**, 3–15 (2010).
29. Deeb, S. E. The war in Gaza is wiping out entire Palestinian families, one branch at a time. This is how. *AP News* https://apnews.com/article/gaza-palestinians-families-deaths-israeli-strikes-79f2cb7f3b04c512092f59f327443732 (2024).
30. OCHA Palestinian Occupied Territory. Humanitarian Situation Update #259 | Gaza Strip. *United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs - Occupied Palestinian Territory* https://www.ochaopt.org/content/humanitarian-situation-update-259-gaza-strip (2025).
31. UNOPS. Joint UN statement: World must act with urgency to save Palestinians…. *UNOPS* https://www.unops.org/news-and-stories/speeches/joint-un-statement-world-must-act-with-urgency-to-save-palestinians-in-gaza (2025).

32. Ghobarah, H. A., Huth, P. & Russett, B. Civil Wars Kill and Maim People—Long After the Shooting Stops. *American Political Science Review* **97**, 189–202 (2003).

33. Wagner, Z. *et al.* Armed conflict and child mortality in Africa: a geospatial analysis. *The Lancet* **392**, 857–865 (2018).

34. Wise, P. H. The Epidemiologic Challenge to the Conduct of Just War: Confronting Indirect Civilian Casualties of War. *Daedalus* **146**, 139–154 (2017).

Gender/Age	Present	Left Gaza	Moved Out of Household	Dead	Missing	In Prison	Total
Male 0-4	509	5	0	8	1	0	523
Female 0-4	441	1	0	10	0	0	452
Male 5-11	757	12	3	27	2	0	801
Female 5-11	679	13	4	17	2	0	715
Male 12-17	534	11	2	31	7	0	585
Female 12-17	581	13	3	12	2	0	611
Male 18-29	1015	65	30	106	27	21	1264
Female 18-29	1277	53	33	53	0	0	1416
Male 30-39	631	24	20	52	14	23	764
Female 30-39	635	30	6	20	0	0	691
Male 40-64	817	22	24	42	6	6	917
Female 40-64	721	28	8	43	1	1	802
Male 65+	81	0	2	17	0	1	101
Female 65+	62	4	2	19	0	0	87
Total	8740	281	137	457	62	52	9729
Unweighted GMS Data							

Table 1: Outcomes for all people in the sample, classified by gender and age.

Gender/Age	Nonviolent	Accident	Violent	Total
Male 0-4	0	0	8	8
Female 0-4	2	0	8	10
Male 5-11	2	2	23	27
Female 5-11	0	1	16	17
Male 12-17	0	0	31	31
Female 12-17	1	0	11	12
Male 18-29	2	0	104	106
Female 18-29	0	0	53	53
Male 30-39	0	1	51	52
Female 30-39	1	0	19	20
Male 40-64	8	0	34	42
Female 40-64	17	0	26	43
Male 65+	9	1	7	17
Female 65+	17	0	2	19
Total	59	5	393	457
Unweighted GMS Data				

Table 2: All deaths in the sample, classified by gender and age.

Governorates	Violent Deaths	Violent Deaths as Percent of Sample
Northern Gaza	68	3.9
Gaza City	164	4.7
Deir al-Balah	39	3.2
Khan Younis	87	4.3
Rafah	35	2.9
Unweighted GMS Data		

Table 3: All violent deaths in the sample, classified by governorate of origin.

Categories	Estimate	Standarderror	ConfidenceInterval
Violent deaths			
Children (<18)	22,800	3,090	(16,700, 28,800)
Women (18-64)	16,600	2,220	(12,200, 20,900)
Elderly (65+)	2,870	943	(1,020, 4,720)
Men (18-64)	32,900	2,700	(27,600, 38,200)
Women, elderly, and children	42,200	4,630	(33,100, 51,300)
Total violent deaths	75,200	5,920	(63,600, 86,800)
Women, elderly, and children (%)	56.2	2.94	(50.4, 61.9)
Nonviolent deaths			
Total nonviolent deaths	16,300	2,040	(12,300, 20,200)
Excess nonviolent deaths	8,540	2,040	(4,540, 12,500)

Raked to age, gender, governorate, and household size

Table 4: Estimates of violent and nonviolent (including accidents) mortality by broad age and gender groups



Figure 1: Sampling points by location, colour coded for governorate of origin, of respondents with further information on the sample and estimates

Methods

The GMS is preregistered at OSF (1) and has ethical approval from Royal Holloway University of London. The Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research (PCPSR) collected the data. The rest of this section describes the sampling and field work. A companion document, also included in supplementary materials, provided further details.

1. SAMPLING

We sampled 2,000 households at 200 Primary Sampling Units (PSUs) with 10 interviews conducted at each PSU. In rare cases, PSU size differed slightly due to replacement interviews being collected in a different location after the team had moved on. The response rate was also extremely high, with only 58 eligible households refusing to be interviewed.

There were two main challenges to address in pursuit of the goal of collecting a representative sample for the whole Gaza Strip. First, most of the population was displaced and could not be located through the census. Second, active combat or Israeli evacuation orders rendered the governorates of Northern Gaza, Gaza City and Rafah inaccessible during the field work. However, for the sample to be representative, households originating in these hot zones needed to be included.

PCPSR coordinated with the local government authorities, UNRWA and other relevant international organizations to address the displacement challenge by tracking population movements throughout the war. This work resulted in the division

of current living arrangements at the time of the survey into three types.[1] Each of these residency types served as a primary stratum for the survey:

1) **Enumeration areas**

The Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (PCBS) has provided PCPSR with a sample of enumeration areas from the 2017 Palestinian Census, each containing on average 143 dwelling units. The sample includes enumeration area maps with all pre-war homes, streets and public places numbered and now also has a list of still-occupied enumeration areas, in Khan Younis and Deir al-Balah (the central Gaza Strip). The enumeration areas were selected with inclusion probabilities proportionate to their number of households.

2) **Built-up shelters**

These are buildings, mostly schools, universities, clubs and other standing structures that existed before the war and have since been converted into shelters. PCPSR has constructed a list of all the shelter centers in Deir al-Balah and Khan Younis governorates which it has divided into blocks of roughly equal population sizes. The blocks were selected with linear systematic simple random sampling.

3) **Tent gatherings**

These are shelters that were created after the war started in the areas of Khan Younis and Deir al-Balah governorates. PCPSR has satellite maps showing the areas covered by these communities which it has divided into blocks of roughly

[1] Reassuringly, PCPSR population estimates across these three dwelling types remained reasonably stable over the three months preceding the survey.

equal population sizes. Again, the blocks were selected with linear systematic random sampling.

At the moment of sample selection PCPSR estimated that roughly 35% of the population were in enumeration areas, 20.5% in built-up shelters and 44.5% in tent gatherings. Accordingly, our random selection of 200 PSU's contains 70 occupied enumeration areas, 41 built shelter blocks and 89 blocks of tent gatherings.

Households were numbered within each selected PSU. Within PSUs that were enumeration areas the interview teams proceeded systematically from a randomly selected starting number through nine further households at a fixed interval with the goal of distributing the interviews across the entire PSU.

Table M1. Households and household members by governorate:

sample versus PCBS 2023 data

Governorates	PCBS 2023 Population	% of population	number of households	% of households	number of household members	% of household members
Northern Gaza	444,412	20.0	360	18.0	1,735	17.8
Gaza City	749,100	33.6	716	35.8	3,525	36.2
Khan Younis	438,557	19.7	420	21.0	2,034	20.9
Deir al-Balah	319,208	14.3	279	14.0	1,216	12.5
Rafah	275,267	12.4	225	11.3	1,219	12.5
Total Gaza Strip	2,226,544	100.0	2,000	100.0	9,729	100.0

Data: Official data (Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics 2021) and GMS data.

To address the challenge, noted above, of including households from areas we could not access during the field work, the remaining 130 PSU's, all in built-up shelters or tent gatherings, were sub-stratified by governorate of residency based on October 6, 2023, for inaccessible governorates. Accordingly, within built up shelters and tent shelters, each PSU was assigned to include only residents displaced from

either Northern Gaza, Gaza City or Rafah. Thus, in a Northern-Gaza-designated PSU, for example, the interview team would first ask if a household had originated in Northern Gaza. If the answer was “no” then the team would immediately terminate the interview and proceed to the next household according to the fixed interval set for that PSU. The team would continue with these initial probes and actual interviews until they completed 10 interviews of households from Northern Gaza in that PSU. Table M1 suggests that these procedures did succeed in drawing a sample that closely mirrors the pre-war population distribution by governorate in the Gaza Strip.

In summary, the sample is a stratified (by governorate/dwelling type pairs) two-stage cluster sample.

2. FIELD WORK

We first developed a questionnaire in English that was then passed to a PCPSR team which recommended a few changes and translated it into Arabic appropriate for the Gaza Strip. PCPSR people then tested the Arabic questionnaire and modified it in response to feedback received. The finalized version (appendix B) performed satisfactorily in a one-day pilot experiment in the Gaza Strip.

The essence of the questionnaire is to first build a roster of the respondent’s household members as of October 6, 2023, and then to account for each member’s post-October-7 fate, including whether they are alive, dead, or missing. A follow-up question asks respondents to divide reported deaths into violent and nonviolent ones.

PCPSR field teams have extensive experience in conducting public opinion surveys in the Gaza Strip. However, the GMS was their first mortality survey.

Accurate mortality estimation relies on partitioning the population into non-overlapping units for selection, ensuring that any death can enter the sample through only a single channel, i.e., the household to which the decedent belonged. Accordingly, the pre-survey training for interview teams stressed the importance of respondents only being allowed to report household members (as of October 6, 2023) and not to report deaths of extended family members who did not live within the respondent's household. This aspect of the training was, evidently, successful as the mean household size for the sample, 4.9, is rather lower than the mean of 5.5 reported by the PCBS (Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics 2023).

Data collection began on December 30, 2024, and ended on January 5, 2025. At this stage, PCPSR deployed ten two-person teams, mostly females, of highly experienced data collectors. Four supervisors continuously monitored the fieldwork and attended more than a fifth of the interviews. A fieldwork coordinator ensured accurate deployment of the supervisors throughout the full workday.

Interviews were conducted using tablets or mobile phones that recorded GPS locations of each team during the data collection. A quality control team from PCPSR's central office in Ramallah used these data to monitor team movements in the field. There was also continuous communication among PCPSR workers via WhatsApp.

All interviews were conducted face to face with adults aged 16 and above. Completed interviews were automatically uploaded to a secure, central server that can be accessed only by PCPSR researchers.

3. Data and Code

All data and code can be accessed at this URL:

https://gitfront.io/r/mspagat/tZwP79d7Pntz/Gaza-Mortality-Survey/

along with supplementary tables, a sensitivity analysis and further information on sampling and fieldwork.

Methods Bibliography

1. Spagat, M. *et al.* Gaza Death Toll Survey. https://osf.io/fnxsg/ (2024).

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank Mr. Mr. Walid Ladadweh for supervising the sample selection and the deployment of the data collection team and the data collection team itself who must remain anonymous.

Contributions

MS, DGS and JP conceived the project. DGS played a critical role in organizing the team and, along with HH, securing funding. MS, DGS, JP, KS and MR did the initial survey planning with all authors eventually contributing. All authors, but especially KS, monitored and provided feedback during data collection. JP, MS, KS and EB conducted analysis

with all authors feeding back. KS and MR drafted the first description of the sampling and fieldwork. MS wrote the first draft of the main paper with EB playing a strong role in bringing it to completion. All authors contributed to, reviewed and approved all written material.

No authors of this paper have a competing interest.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Supplementary Tables

Table S1: Mortality rates for the Gaza Strip October 6, 2023 to January 5, 2025

Type	CDR	Standard error	Confidence Interval
Violent	33.1	8.01	(27.9, 38.4)
Nonviolent	7.16	2.70	(5.40, 8.93)
Total	40.3	8.74	(34.6, 46.0)

Raked to age, gender, governorate, and household size

Based on household roster and births and IDB US Census Bureau population estimates

Deaths per 1,000 per year

Table S2: Estimates of violent and nonviolent mortality by governorate of residence on October 6, 2023

Governorate	Estimate	Standard error	Confidence Interval
Total			
Northern Gaza	16,000	3,230	(9,630, 22,300)
Gaza city	35,700	4,670	(26,500, 44,800)
Deir al-Balah	12,400	1,890	(8,660, 16,100)
Khan Younis	18,200	2,470	(13,400, 23,000)
Rafah	9,220	1,820	(5,660, 12,800)
Total	91,400	6,450	(78,800, 104,000)
Violent deaths			
Northern Gaza	13,200	2,850	(7,620, 18,800)
Gaza city	31,300	4,550	(22,400, 40,200)
Deir al-Balah	8,280	1,420	(5,490, 11,100)
Khan Younis	15,100	2,160	(10,800, 19,300)
Rafah	7,330	1,630	(4,140, 10,500)
Total	75,200	5,920	(63,600, 86,800)
Nonviolent deaths			
Northern Gaza	2,760	821	(1,150, 4,370)
Gaza city	4,370	975	(2,460, 6,280)
Deir al-Balah	4,100	1,170	(1,800, 6,400)
Khan Younis	3,130	890	(1,390, 4,880)
Rafah	1,890	704	(509, 3,270)
Total	16,300	2,040	(12,300, 20,200)

Raked to age, gender, governorate, and household size

Based on GMS Household roster.sav

Table S3: Gaza Strip population at risk 2023, broad age groups based on the International Data Base, U.S Census Bureau

Age	Males	Male percent	Females	Female percent
0-4	182,000	8.4	174,000	8.0
5-11	200,000	9.2	189,000	8.7
12-17	165,000	7.6	158,000	7.3
18-29	248,000	11.4	240,000	11.0
30-39	131,000	6.0	133,000	6.1
40-64	147,000	6.8	150,000	6.9
65+	29,900	1.4	28,700	1.3
Total	1,100,000	50.7	1,070,000	49.3

Percentages are based on the total population

Births during survey period added

Source: https://www.census.gov/ International Programs Main/ Data /International Database.

Downloaded 25.01.2025

Table S4: Gaza Strip Survey main status outcomes

Status	Estimate	Standard error	Confidence Interval
Male			
Resident	983,000	7,000	(969,000, 997,000)
Left the Gaza Strip	28,300	3,120	(22,200, 34,400)
Elsewhere in the Gaza Strip	15,100	2,260	(10,700, 19,500)
Dead	56,700	4,000	(48,900, 64,500)
Missing	11,100	1,980	(7,190, 15,000)
Imprisoned	9,420	1,670	(6,150, 12,700)
Female			
Resident	995,000	6,370	(983,000, 1,010,000)
Left the Gaza Strip	28,900	4,080	(20,900, 36,900)
Elsewhere in the Gaza Strip	11,900	2,160	(7,690, 16,200)
Dead	34,700	3,750	(27,400, 42,100)
Missing	1,140	559	(42.0, 2,230)
Imprisoned	157	160	(-156, 470)
Total			
Resident	1,980,000	11,500	(1,960,000, 2,000,000)
Left the Gaza Strip	57,200	6,020	(45,400, 69,000)
Elsewhere in the Gaza Strip	27,000	3,740	(19,700, 34,400)
Dead	91,400	6,450	(78,800, 104,000)
Missing	12,200	2,200	(7,900, 16,500)
Imprisoned	9,580	1,690	(6,260, 12,900)

Raked to age, gender, governorate, and household size

Based on Gaza Mortality Survey GMS Household roster.sav

Table S5: Estimates of missing persons by broad age and gender groups

	Estimate	Standard error	Confidence Interval
Missing persons			
Children (<18)	3,610	1,040	(1,570, 5,650)
Women (18-64)	131	134	(-133, 394)
Elderly (65+)	0	0	(0, 0)
Men (18-64)	8,470	1,650	(5,240, 11,700)
Total missing persons	12,200	2,200	(7,900, 16,500)
Women, elderly, and children	30.6	6.40	(18.1, 43.2)

Raked to age, gender, governorate, and household size
Based on GMS Household roster.sav

Table S5a: Gaza Strip Survey Non violent deaths by child/adult status and gender

Child/adult	Deaths	Standard error	Confidence interval
Men			
Adults	5,210	1,180	(2,900, 7,510)
Children<18	1,680	741	(229, 3,130)
Women			
Adults	8,250	1,350	(5,590, 10,900)
Children<18	1,120	579	(-17.3, 2,250)
Total			
Adults	13,500	1,760	(10,000, 16,900)
Children<18	2,800	925	(986, 4,610)

Raked to age, gender, governorate, and household size
Based on Gaza Mortality Survey GMS Household roster.sav

Sensitivity Analysis

Table S6: Sensitivity of estimates to model assumptions

	Main model		Team 9 excluded		Census 2017 household size adjustment		Full rake, no weight trim		PCBS population, full rake		No household size adjustment		Unadjusted equal probability	
Categories	Estimate	SE[1]	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE
Violent deaths														
Children (<18)	22,800	3,090	19,200	2,810	22,400	3,040	22,800	3,080	24,100	3,260	25,800	3,600	21,100	2,850
Women (18-64)	16,600	2,220	13,200	2,090	16,000	2,140	16,100	2,170	17,100	2,300	17,700	2,300	21,400	2,810
Elderly (65+)	2,870	943	3,060	1,110	3,440	1,200	3,350	1,170	3,550	1,240	2,800	909	1,940	637
Men (18-64)	32,900	2,700	28,700	2,640	32,000	2,640	32,100	2,640	34,000	2,800	33,600	2,740	40,800	3,330
Total violent deaths	75,200	5,920	64,100	5,410	73,800	5,780	74,400	5,860	78,700	6,200	79,900	6,640	85,200	6,710
Violent deaths %														
Women, elderly, and children	56.2	2.94	55.2	3.39	56.6	2.94	56.9	2.94	56.9	2.94	57.9	2.88	52.2	2.89
Nonviolent deaths														
Total nonviolent deaths	16,300	2,040	17,500	2,230	17,200	2,240	17,300	2,230	18,300	2,360	16,200	2,020	14,200	1,840
Excess nonviolent deaths	8,540	2,040	9,790	2,230	9,510	2,240	9,600	2,230	10,600	2,360	8,520	2,020	6,520	1,840
Missing persons														
Children (<18)	3,610	1,040	3,300	1,010	3,510	1,020	3,540	1,020	3,750	1,080	3,960	1,120	3,020	828
Women (18-64)	131	134	136	139	125	129	126	129	133	137	194	196	216	216
Elderly (65+)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Men (18-64)	8,470	1,650	8,360	1,710	8,100	1,560	8,230	1,600	8,720	1,700	8,720	1,790	10,100	1,980
Total missing persons	12,200	2,200	11,800	2,270	11,700	2,090	11,900	2,140	12,600	2,270	12,900	2,520	13,400	2,430
Missing persons %														
Women, elderly, and children	30.6	6.40	29.1	6.36	31.0	6.55	30.8	6.43	30.8	6.43	32.3	6.07	24.2	5.17

[1]SE: Standard error

Based on GMS Household roster.sav

Table S6A. Scheme showing the cases for the models in table S6

Model	USCB population projection	PCBS population projection	MICS Household size	Census 2017 Household size	Age distribution	Gender	Governorate of origin	Trim
Main	■		■		■	■	■	■
Team 9 excluded	■		■		■	■	■	
Census 2017 adjustment for household size	■			■	■	■	■	
Full rake, no trim	■		■		■	■	■	
PCBS Population, full rake		■	■		■	■	■	
No household size adjustment	■				■	■	■	
Unadjusted equal probability	■							

Table S6 gives results from six new estimations, each one departing from some of the assumptions made in the main model. Table S6A displays the differences between the cases. Only one model uses the estimate for the total population of the Gaza Strip made by the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (PCBS). All other models use the US Census Bureau (UCB) total population estimates. Four models use a Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) of the Gaza Strip to weight for household size while one weights for household size using UCB data and two models do not weight for household size at all. All but one model weight for gender, age and governorate of origin using UCB data while one model presents unweighted estimate. None of the six new models trims relatively extreme weights to back to more moderate values (1).

Only two models produce estimates that differ substantially for those of the main model and the other four models, “Team 9 excluded” and “Unadjusted equal probability”, so we consider each one in greater depth below.

The survey used ten interview teams and one, known as “gaza9”, recorded 100 out of the 393 violent deaths in the sample. So, we ran a model that excludes the gaza9 data. Compared to the main estimates this scenario (a) decreases the central estimate for violent deaths by more than 10,000 deaths, from 75,200 to 64,100; (b) slightly changes the central estimate for the percentage of women, children, and elderly among the violent deaths from 56.2% to 55.2%; (c) increases nonviolent excess deaths from 8,540 to 9,790. Thus, exclusion of the gaza9 data does not affect our main qualitative conclusions regarding the fact of MoH undercount, the percentage of women, children, and elderly or excess nonviolent deaths.


Violent deaths Women (18−64)
Violent deaths Total violent deaths
Violent deaths Men (18−64)
Violent deaths Elderly (65+)
Violent deaths Children (<18)
Nonviolent deaths Total nonviolent deaths
Nonviolent deaths Excess nonviolent deaths
Missing persons Women (18−64)
Missing persons Men (18−64)
Missing persons Elderly (65+)
Missing persons Children (<18)
0
25000
50000
75000
100000
Persons (point estimate and lower and upper confidence bounds)
1. Main model, full rake, trimmed weights
2. Team 9 excluded
3. Census 2017 household size adjustment
4. Full rake, no weight trim
5. PCBS population, full rake
6. No household size adjustment
7. Unadjusted equal probability

Yet, the data collected by the gaza9 does substantially lower our estimate for the size of the MoH undercount. So, we investigated further and found that three PSUs covered by this team were in shelters that give special preference to families that have lost members during the fighting, especially to those who have lost one or both parents. An additional five gaza9 PSUs were in or near Bani Suheila, Mawasi Rafah or the northern border of Khan Yunis, all areas that have experienced heavy attacks. Thus, it appears that the high numbers recorded by the gaza9 team come mainly from sampling variation. Moreover, comparison of interviews with and without supervisors for this team reveal no discrepancies. Thus, we are confident in the quality of these interviews and just note their impact here.

The only other model that produced estimates that differ substantially from the main model is the one based on just the raw data without weighting on anything, i.e., the so-called “unadjusted equal probability model”. This model estimates (a) 7,000 more violent deaths than the main model (85,200 vs. 75,200); (b) 4 percentage points fewer women, children and elderly (52.2% vs. 56.2%); (c) 2,010 fewer nonviolent deaths (14,200 vs. 16,300). These effects come largely from overrepresentation of men and small households in the sample compared to the population from which it is drawn. Thus, it is clear that the weighting scheme, as a whole, is important but we are not tempted to adopt the unadjusted equal probability model as the main model because transforming the sample to bring it into line with population characteristics should bring our estimates closer to the truth than they can be when based on just the raw numbers.

The final point from this sensitivity analysis worth noting is that the final stage of our raking (1) procedures, i.e., the one that trims the most extreme weights back to more moderate values, has no substantial impact on the estimates and could easily be dropped. In particular, the model “Full rake, no weight trim” produces estimates that hardly differ from those of the main model. However, weight trimming is standard procedure so we have left it in the main model.

The sensitivity plot on the next page displays much of the information in table S6.

Bibliography

1. Cohen, Michael P. 2008. ‘Raking’. In *Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods*, 672–73. Sage Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412963947.

Note on Raking

Table S7 (next page) first shows how raking transforms the sample to better match population characteristics. Its second column ("Sample Percentages") gives demographic, locational and household-size characteristics of the sample. The next column ("Population Percentages") shows the same characteristics but for the population of the Gaza Strip. The third column is the transformed (after raking) sample percentages ("Raked Sample"). The final column shows differences between population and raked values.

Unraked sample proportions are close to population proportions on demographics and governorate of origin. However, the two differ markedly on the distribution of household sizes. Raking brings everything into close alignment except for the percentage of households with ten or more members for which there is a difference of slightly more than 2 percentage points even after raking.

In the raw, i.e., unraked, data 3.1% of people in households with 10 or more pre-October-7 members died violently whereas for the other households the violent death rate was 4.0%. So further upweighting the 10+ would decrease our violent death estimate, but only slightly. Thus, this outlier of the raking process is not influential.

Table S7: Comparison of Population Values with Sample and Raked Sample Values

By Demographics, Governorate and Household Size

Categories	Sample Percentages	Population Percentages	Raked Sample Percentages	Population - Raked Sample
Ages/Sexes				
Male 0-4	6.96	8.67	8.42	0.257
Female 0-4	6.25	8.29	7.53	0.759
Male 5-14	7.94	9.54	9.20	0.341
Female 5-14	7.09	9.01	8.39	0.615
Male 15-17	5.80	7.88	6.94	0.943
Female 15-17	6.06	7.52	7.65	−0.124
Male 18-29	12.5	11.8	11.1	0.771
Female 18-29	14.0	11.4	11.9	−0.473
Male 30-39	7.57	6.22	6.32	−0.102
Female 30-39	6.85	6.34	6.04	0.298
Male 40-64	9.09	7.00	7.48	−0.472
Female 40-64	7.95	7.15	6.57	0.574
Male 65+	1.00	1.43	1.31	0.115
Female 65+	0.863	1.37	1.18	0.190
Governorates				
North Gaza	17.8	20.0	19.5	0.453
Gaza City	36.1	33.6	33.9	−0.284
Deir al Balah	12.8	14.3	14.2	0.141
Khan Younis	20.8	19.7	19.8	−0.151
Rafah	12.5	12.4	12.5	−0.160
Household Sizes				
1	2.05	0.577	0.572	0.00562
2	9.20	2.63	2.72	−0.0873
3	14.8	5.61	5.82	−0.210
4	17.0	9.66	9.98	−0.323
5	18.6	12.9	13.3	−0.440
6	15.0	16.9	17.3	−0.429
7	11.2	17.3	17.6	−0.372
8	5.45	11.8	11.9	−0.104
9	3.95	9.53	9.64	−0.115
10+	2.80	13.1	11.1	2.07

Notes on the Calculations

The computer code accompanying the paper spells out each step in our calculations. We recognize, however, that some else's computer code is hard to read so here we provide a short document in Q&A form that should clarify the essential steps.

How do you make central estimates?

Every individual in the sample is assigned a weight which gives, in essence, the number of people in the Gaza Strip that this individual represents.

Once these weights are in place it is simple to make central estimates. For example, the central estimate for violent deaths is the sum of the weights for all individuals in the sample recorded as dying violently.

How are the weights calculated?

The weights have two distinct components. First, is a multiplier to scale the sample size up to the full population of the Gaza Strip. There are 9,729 individuals in the sample who were alive on October 6, 2024. In addition, we recorded 357 births during the war. The UCB estimate for the population of the Gaza Strip is just over 2,089,389. So, on average, each individual in the sample represents somewhat more than 200 Gazans.

The second component of the weights raise or lower the scaling factor for an individual depending on whether the characteristics of that individual are, respectively, less or more common than these characteristics are in the full population of the Gaza Strip. So, if, for example, the proportion of women in the sample aged 40-64 is lower than the proportion of this group in the population then the weights on individuals from this group are increased above the scaling factor. Weights are adjusted in this way for gender, age, household size and governorate to bring weighted sample proportions broadly into line with population proportions. Finally, extreme weights are trimmed back to twice the median weight for the whole sample, although the sensitivity analysis (above) shows that trimming did not have a substantial impact on the estimates.

In the first calculations we made on the data we went through characteristic by characteristic and assigned a weight for each one to match sample and population proportions. We then multiplied these weights together to get final weights. So, for example, the final weight on, e.g., a 14-year-old female in a household of size 3 in Rafah governorate was the female 12-17 weight times the household-size-3 weight times the Rafah weight.

This procedure has the virtue of being easy to understand but the drawback is that when you weight for one characteristic you can throw the weights for other

characteristics out of whack. So, we used *raking*, which is an iterative procedure that brings all included sample proportions roughly into line with population proportions.

Table S7 shows that this raking procedure was a success, but it is comforting to know that the raked results came out very close to the original ones where we weighted independently on each characteristic.

What is the purpose of weighting on sex, age, household size and governorate?

We weight to make our sample look, as much as possible, like a microcosm of the population it is drawn from. A random sample should, theoretically, come reasonably close to accomplishing this goal. However, in a sample of 2,000 there are bound to be some important deviations even if it is drawn under pristine conditions. So estimates can be improved by reshaping the sample so that the weight of people with characteristics that are under(over) represented in the sample are scaled up(down). Our sample was certainly not drawn under pristine conditions, so weighting was an important tool to make our sample look like a microcosm of the population.

How are confidence intervals calculated?

As noted above, the central estimates for death tolls are based on ratios, e.g., the number in the sample reported as dead divided by the total number of people in the sample. Nonlinear functions complicate variance estimation, the key step in calculating confidence intervals, so we (really the Survey package in R) use Taylor series to make linear approximations for our ratios. These linear approximations are not used for the central estimates themselves but, rather, for variance estimation and confidence intervals. The basic idea is that an estimated ratio is approximately equal to the true population ratio plus deviations in the numerator multiplied by the first derivative of the ratio with respect to changes in the numerator plus deviations in the denominator multiplied by the first derivative of the ratio with respect to changes in the denominator. For details see chapters 3 and 5 of:

Lumley, T. (2010). Complex Surveys: A Guide to Analysis Using R. Wiley.

It is worth noting that we also calculated confidence intervals using bootstrapping and got similar results. We haven't included these results and code because there is already quite a lot of supplementary material but we could add it if the editors want us to do so.

How are excess deaths calculated?

The US Census Bureau made projections for the number of deaths that would occur in the Gaza Strip during the period covered by the survey. These projections were made before the war and assumed that there would be no war. We simply subtracted US Census Bureau-based projected deaths from our central estimate for nonviolent deaths to get our central estimate for excess non-violent deaths. The upper (lower) limit of the 95% confidence interval for nonviolent excess deaths is the upper (lower) limit of the 95% confidence interval for nonviolent deaths minus US Census Bureau-based projected deaths.

An In-depth View of the Sampling, Fieldwork and Data Cleaning

PCPSR's sample for the mortality rate survey was designed to be representative of Gazan residents, taking into account what is feasible with the ongoing conflict. The sample design includes stratification at the first stage and two hundred Primary Sampling Units (PSUs) representing all governorates of the Gaza Strip were selected based on area probability sampling, from a frame of "enumeration areas" and shelters, or displacement centers. These enumeration areas and shelters were located in two governorates: Khan Younis and Central Gaza Strip (or Deir al Balah). Three Gazan governorates were inaccessible due to active combat or Israeli standing evacuation orders: Northern Gaza, Gaza City, and Rafah. Any Gazans currently living in these areas were excluded from the sample. However, due to Israeli military action and evacuation orders, the vast majority of Gazans have been displaced from these areas yielding a limited proportion of the population in each at the time of the survey. In August 2024, international organizations estimated that 90% of Gazans have been forced to relocate from their homes. Since then, many more people in the northern Gaza Strip were forced to relocate to the south, which includes the governorates where the survey was fielded.

Available population estimates indicate that the vast majority of the displaced persons from these three inaccessible governorates were sheltering in built up or tent shelters in the two accessible governorates. Accordingly, by interviewing those who were displaced, it is possible to develop estimates of violent and excess mortality for these areas of the Gaza Strip. Additionally, many of the displaced persons from the two accessible governorates were able to return to their own homes in these governorates after the termination of active combat and the withdrawal of the Israeli army from these areas, meaning few remained in built-up shelters or tent shelters. These formerly displaced persons were interviewed in their own homes in the "enumeration areas."

To determine the actual distribution of the population in each shelter, PCPSR works closely with three actors: 1) governmental sources, 2) the UN and UNRWA, and 3) relevant international and non-governmental actors. Satellite images provide additional information to confirm locations. PCPSR's own fieldwork force in the Gaza Strip keeps a record of all the shelters and their population which they update through updated satellite images and contacts with the local municipal authorities by our data collectors. PCPSR data collectors visit all PSUs and confirm the most updated locations and numbers by talking directly to those managing the shelters. Records have been updated every three months since the start of the Israeli military campaign to reflect the changed shelter landscape within the Gaza Strip.

Within each PSU, ten households were randomly selected for a total sample of 2,000 households. The total number of household members in these households on October 6, 2023, stood at 9,729. All interviews were conducted face-to-face with adults aged 16 and above, regardless of the adult age or the gender. In total, 58 eligible families, of which 42 were in shelters and 16 in enumeration areas, refused to be interviewed. This yields a response rate for eligible respondents of over 97%.

Table S8. Households and household members by governorate: sample versus PCBS 2023 data

Governorates	PCBS 2023 Population	% of population	number of households	% of households	number of household members	% of household members
Northern Gaza	444,412	20.0	360	18.0	1,735	17.8
Gaza City	749,100	33.6	716	35.8	3,525	36.2
Khan Younis	438,557	19.7	420	21.0	2,034	20.9
Deir al-Balah	319,208	14.3	279	14.0	1,216	12.5
Rafah	275,267	12.4	225	11.3	1,219	12.5
Total Gaza Strip	2,226,544	100.0	2,000	100.0	9,729	100.0

Data: Official data (Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics 2021) and GMS data.

Strata and PSUs:

The sample was allocated to three primary strata based on available population estimates from the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (PCBS) and estimates informed by the UN / UNRWA and relevant international and non-governmental actors. These three strata are: enumeration areas, built up shelters, and tent shelters. Governorates, based on residency on October 6, 2023, served as a substratum for each of the three primary strata. Within each stratum, PSUs were allocated in proportion to the estimated population within each. In each PSU, 10 households were randomly selected. Within each household, the respondent was not selected at random. Instead, interviews were conducted with a willing adult (ages 16+) regardless of age or gender of the respondent. This approach was implemented to minimize non-response rates as any competent adult within the household is expected to be able to enumerate the number and current status of household members living with them on October 6, 2023.

1) In the **enumeration areas**, representing the first stratum, interviews were conducted in the two accessible governorates, Khan Younis and Deir al Balah, in populated areas specified by the PCBS as a representative sample of these governorates. Only permanent residents of these two governorates, based on October 6, 2023 residency location, were eligible for selection within this stratum. The sample for these areas, along with its associated detailed unit-by-unit maps, was originally purchased by PCPSR from PCBS's 2017 census, the latest census conducted in the Palestinian territories. Each of these 70 selected areas represent a PSU. The total number of households where interviews were conducted stands at 699 for a total of 3250 household members.[1] The households were selected in enumeration areas by dividing the total number of units in each enumeration area over the number of interviews. The resulting number is the interval used to determine the location of the next home to be interviewed once the first interview was conducted.

2) In the **built-up shelters**, mostly schools, universities, clubs and other standing areas that have not been destroyed during the war, a regular random sample was drawn from the lists of blocks representing all the shelters in each governorate of Khan Younis and Deir al Balah. Each shelter was divided into blocks of roughly equal size and 41 PSUs were allocated to this stratum. These 41 PSUs were allocated proportionally across all the shelters, meaning multiple blocks were allocated to shelters with a particularly large number of internally displaced persons. This process resulted in the selection of 22 shelters in Khan Younis and 17 shelters in Deir al Balah for a total of 39 shelters.

Because the shelters contain internally displaced residents, a substratum based on governorate of residence on October 6, 2023 was applied to ensure greater representation. Only those who were residents of the three inaccessible governorates – Northern Gaza, Gaza City, and Rafah – were eligible for selection in built-up shelters. Interviews were allocated to each substratum based on the relative proportion of each of these three governorates on October 6, 2023. This approach

[1] In rare cases, interviews were dropped for eligibility or quality control issues. In such cases, additional interviews were sometimes collected in different areas to compensate when the team had already left the original enumeration area. As a result, the number of interviews in PSU is not always exactly 10.

was designed to ensure a fair representation of the population from the original governorates and localities (such as Northern Gaza) from which they came.

The process for interviews was as follows. The field team working in built-up shelters was informed of the allocation of each PSU to residents from a specified governorate. If a contacted household was from that governorate, then the interview process was initiated. If the household was not living in the selected governorate on October 6, 2023, then the household was deemed ineligible and the standard skip pattern applied for selecting a new household. Once the PSU reached ten eligible households that agreed to participate, the PSU was considered complete. This process was then repeated for the next PSU.

Additionally, hundreds of small gatherings, dozens of families each, were identified around these shelters and were included in our sampling frame by including them in the PSU of the nearest shelter to each such locality. The interviews were conducted inside 408 households in these built-up shelters for a total of 2,076 household members. The calculation of the interval between households in all shelters is the same as that of the enumeration areas.

3) In the **tent shelters** in the governorates of Khan Younis and Deir al Balah, PCPSR fieldwork teams, deployed on the ground since the war started, identified 65 major tent shelters in Khan Younis and 51 in Deir al Balah for a total of 116 shelters. A total of 89 PSUs were allocated to this stratum. Using the same methodology as in the case of the built-up shelters, these areas were divided into blocks of similar sizes and a regular random sample of 89 blocks were drawn. The same process of sub-stratification by the governorate of residence on October 6, 2023, was employed as in the case of built-up shelters with only those from the three inaccessible governorates eligible for inclusion. Interviews with 893 households were conducted inside the tents for a total of 4,403 household members.

Table S9: PSU type by household units

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Built up shelter	408	21.4	20.4	21.4
	Tent shelters	893	43.7	44.7	65.1
	enumeration area	699	35.0	35.0	100.0
	Total	2000	100.0	100.0	

Table S10: PSU type by household members

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Built up shelter	2076	20.9	21.3	20.9
	Tent shelters	4403	45.8	45.3	66.6
	enumeration area	3250	33.4	33.4	100.0
	Total	9729	100.0	100.0	

Table S11: Distribution of PSUs by governorates and type

		PSU type by households						
		Built up shelter		Tent shelters		enumeration area		Total
Governorates	Northern Gaza	230	63.9%	130	36.1%			360
	Gaza City	158	22.2%	558	77.8%			716
	Khan Younis					420		420
	Central Gaza Strip (Deir al Balah)					279		279
	Rafah	20	8.9%	205	91.1%			225
	Total Gaza Strip	408	20.4%	893	44.7%	699	35.0%	2000

Data collection and quality control:

Data collection started on 30 December 2024 and ended on 5 January 2025. The demographics of the respondents as of October 6, 2023 were as follows: 61% male, 39% female, 12% aged 16-24, 32% 25-34, 25% 35-44, 17% 45-54 and 14% 55+.

Ten teams of highly experienced data collectors, mostly females, were deployed each day. Each interview was conducted by two data collectors. Four supervisors were deployed to monitor fieldwork every day to ensure accurate deployment of the ten data collection teams. At least one third of the interviews were conducted in the presence of a supervisor. One fieldwork coordinator was deployed to ensure the accurate deployment of all supervisors throughout the full workday.

Interviews were conducted by using tablets or mobile phones that recorded the GPS location of teams during the data collection. PCPSR staff and the quality control team based in PCPSR's central office monitored live the movement of the data collectors by plotting the GPS locations on a map of the Gaza Strip. When each interview was completed, it was automatically sent directly to our secure, central server where only PCPSR researchers have access to it.



Figure S2. Locations of the interview teams during the survey.

All teams, monitors, coordinator, and central research teams were connected via two WhatsApp groups that ensured full simultaneous communication with the teams to resolve any emerging problems.

To ensure the safety of our data collectors in the Gaza Strip, interviews were conducted with residents in areas that did not witness active combat and were not designated as an evacuation area during the period of fieldwork.

Data Cleaning

Here are the steps in the data cleaning process:

1. Matching the number of PSUs, interviews, localities with the required sample size and locations
2. Matching question texts and answer options with questionnaire questions
3. Review the duration of the interview in terms of start and end time
4. Matching the team numbers with the counting areas/localities specified in the deployment plan
5. Matching the geographical locations, or GPS, with the geographic deployment plan
6. Matching the names of residential communities and governorates with those in the sample specification
7. Ensuring no duplication of data files during the transfer process from tablets to server
8. Review and address any outliers in answers to all questions
9. Review logical errors in answers to various questions
10. Review errors in related questions, such as skips, or follow ups, if any
11. Check the conformity of specific demographic questions, such as age or family size, with official data from PCBS

Survey on mortality in the Gaza Strip after October 6, 2023

Questionnaire

Section 1: Identification

ID01	**Household number**	To be filled in by CAPI	|__|__|__|__|
ID02	**Location number**	To be filled in by CAPI	|__|__|__|
ID03	**Stratum**	To be filled in by CAPI	|__|__|
ID04	**Date of interview (yyyy/mm/dd)**	To be filled in by CAPI	_____/__/__
ID05	**Time of interview start**	To be filled in by CAPI	__:__
ID06	**GPS coordinates of the interview location**	To be filled in by CAPI	
ID07	**Interviewer**	To be filled in by CAPI	|__|__|

Section 2: Informed consent

Thank you for taking the time to speak to me. The reason for contacting you is that we (organization) are conducting a survey of the number of deaths that occurred after the current hostilities. We carry out the study by asking a sample of persons about the members of their households and any deaths that have occurred after October 6, 2023. You have been selected as a respondent by chance. While we will ask about your name and the names of your household members during the interview, we will not retain the names after we have completed the interview. We will also not record any information that can be used to identify you after the interview, either by us or by anyone else.

You may ask me to stop the interview any time if you wish.

CO01	**Are you comfortable with us starting the interview? Would you like to refrain from answering? or do you have any questions before we start?**	1: Can start 2: Questions, start after 3: Questions, refusal 4: Refusal	*à End interview (ID08)* *à End interview (ID08)*

Section 3: Household location on October 6th, 2023 and composition

HR00	**In what governorate of the Gaza Strip did your household live on October 6, 2023?**	1: North Gaza 2: Gaza City, north of Israeli road (Netzarim corridor) 3: Khan Younis 4: Central Gaza: south of Israeli road (Netzarim corridor) Deir el Balah, Nusairat, al Buraij, and al Maghazi 5: Rafah	

Please provide information on each household member you lived with on October 6, 2023. I will also ask about each person's present situation. Start with yourself.

HR01: **Serial number of household member**	HR02: **Name of household member.** (The name will only be used for reference during the interview and will not be included in the data file)	HR03: **How old was …. on October 6, 2023?** One or two digits, 95: 95+ 98: Don't know 99: Refused	HR04: **Gender** 1: Male 2: female	HR05: **Is …. still living in the household, or has he/she moved, died, or is missing** 1 . Still resident à Next person 2. Left Gaza à Next person 3. Moved within Gaza à Next person 4. Dead 5. Missing 6. Imprisoned à Next person	HR06: **Cause of death** 1. Disease, old age, cancer, pre-existing conditions etc 2. Disease, old age, cancer, pre-existing conditions etc not receiving medical aid 3. Accident 4. Killed in/because of fighting 5. Do not know
1					1 à *Next person*
2					
3					
4					

5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					

HR08	**I have recorded that you were XX persons living together on October 6. Is that correct?**	1: yes 2: no	*àHR01 and revise*
HR09	**I have recorded that xx,yy,zzz (read list of persons, or say "no one has left your household") have left your household. Is that correct?**	1: yes 2: no	*àHR01 and revise*
HR10	**I have recorded that xx,yy,zzz (read list of persons or say "no one has died in your household") have died since October 6,2023. Is that correct?**	1: yes 2: no	*àHR01 and revise*
HR11	**I have recorded that xx,yy,zzz (read list of persons or say "no one has gone missing in your household") have gone missing since October 6,2023. Is that correct?**	1: yes 2: no	*àHR01 and revise*
HR12	**Between October 6, 2023 and today were any children born to any woman you have just listed as a household member?**	1: Yes 2: No	*àEnd interview (ID08)*

HR13: Has any member of your family, other than those who lived with you in the same house on October 6, been killed during the current war that started on October 7? 1) Yes 2) No 99) Do not know

Section 4: Children

Please list the children that have been born to any woman of the household on or after October 6, 2023

BR01: **Serial number**	BR02: **Name of child**	BR03: **Who is the**	BR04: **Date of birth**	BR05: Gender	BR07: **Is …. still living in the household**	BR08:	BR09:

of Birth	(The name will only be used for reference during the interview and will not be included in the data file)	**mother?** (serial number from HR01)	Yy,mm,dd (Depending on CAPI software, record in three variables, or use date field)		1: Male 2: female	**or has he/she moved, died, or is missing** 1. Still resident à Next person 2. Left Gaza à Next person 3. Moved within Gaza à Next person 4. Dead 5. Missing à Next person	**How old was … when he/she died**? Record in BR08A: 1: Days 2: months 3: Date (yy,mm,dd) 4: Not known Use BR08_1,BR08_2, BR08_3 for recording	**What was the reason for the death?** 1. Disease, pre-existing conditions etc 1. Disease, pre-existing conditions etc, not receiving medical aid 2. Accident 3. Killed in/because of fighting 4. Do not know
1								
2								
3								
4								
5								

BR10	**I have recorded that there were XX births to members of your household since October 6. Is that correct?**	1: yes 2: no	*àBR01 and revise*

Section 5: End of interview

Thank you for participating in this survey. (Any other messages here?)

ID08	**Time of interview end**	To be filled in by CAPI	__:__
ID09	**Duration of interview**	To be filled in by CAPI	
ID10	**Supervisor present during interview**	1: yes 2:no	

Notes for CAPI

ID01,02,03,07 should be loaded/verified from a table allocating interviewers to locations.

HR08: Compute from roster

HR09-HR11: Get the list of relevant persons' names from the roster.

HR02, BR02: Names should not be stored in data file transmitted from the device

HR03: Should be within range [0,110]

HR07 should be in range [HR03, HR03+2]

BR03 must refer to a woman 15+ in the HR section. If not, interviewers must ask for clarification and, if needed, revise HR section.

BR08 must be less than date of Interview (ID04) – date of birth (BR04)

BR04 Should be valid date in range [2023.10.7, ID04]

Field Check Tables

The following field check tables should be produced on a daily basis

a. Interviews per day and cumulative number of interviews.
b. Locations visited
c. Household size distribution
d. Average household size by interviewer, location, region of the Gaza strip and total
e. Number of deaths recorded per household by interviewer, location, region of the Gaza strip and total
f. Gender and age distribution of the household population
g. Gender distribution of the household population by interviewer, total
h. Number of children by interviewer, total
i. Cause of death by the interviewer, total
j. Duration of interview by interviewer, total
k. Distribution and average of time between interviews by interviewer, total
l. Percentage of ages with the last digit being 0 or 5 by interviewer, total