How the 1918–1920 Influenza Pandemic Spread Across Switzerland - Spatial Patterns and Determinants of Incidence and Mortality

Sofie Jörg[1], Rick J Mourits[2], Katarina L Matthes[1]*

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

[2] International Institute of Social History, Netherlands

* **Corresponding author:** Katarina Matthes, katarina.matthes@iem.uzh.ch

Abstract

This study shows that the quality of the morbidity data is sufficient to allow for meaningful analyses of spatiotemporal dynamics and provides a significant contribution to understanding the 1918–1920 influenza pandemic in Switzerland by complementing existing mortality-focused research with a morbidity perspective. Previous studies have examined the spatial patterns of mortality during the 1918–1920 influenza pandemic and associated explanatory factors. However, while mortality reflects the severity of a pandemic, a full understanding requires analysis of both morbidity and mortality. For the first time, this study systematically analysed district-level morbidity data for all of Switzerland and their associations with several ecological determinants. The spatial pattern of morbidity with the spatial pattern of mortality were also compared to investigate potential differences. Spatial clustering was assessed using the Getis-Ord Gi* statistic, and geographically weighted regression was employed to evaluate local relationships between incidence and ecological variables. Across all waves, higher incidence rates were positively associated with population density, GDP per capita, the share of industry, and the number of private physicians per km². Conversely, GDP per capita and industrial activity were associated with lower mortality, while a higher proportion of men in a district correlated with lower incidence and higher mortality. The share of individuals aged 20–39 years was associated with both higher incidence and higher mortality. These findings highlight that those factors shaping morbidity patterns can differ from those influencing mortality, emphasizing the importance of examining both dimensions for a comprehensive understanding of pandemic dynamics.

1. Introduction

The 1918-1920 flu pandemic, also known as 'Spanish flu', was the most severe influenza pandemic in recorded history. The virus infected approximately 500 million people [1], about one-third of the global population at that time. Mortality estimates ranges from in 20-50 million deaths worldwide [1,2] . Switzerland was not spared from this pandemic. The first reports of increased influenza cases appeared in Switzerland in May 1918, but it took until the end of June before the country became aware of the pandemic threat. Initial cases were reported among the military, most likely in Basel and western Switzerland and rapidly spread to the civil population [3–5]. Cases were reported sporadically until the end of June, therefore, the end of June to early July is generally considered the actual onset of the pandemic in Switzerland [3].

In 1886, Switzerland passed its first epidemic act, which initially covered four diseases - smallpox, cholera, typhoid, and plague- and whose implementation fell under the jurisdiction of the cantons [6]. A comprehensive revision followed in 1913, making it possible for any infectious disease to be reported [7]. In the following years, the list of notifiable diseases was gradually expanded. On October 11, 1918, influenza was officially added to this list [8]. However, the Federal Office of Public Health had already issued a directive on July 6, 1918, requiring weekly reporting of influenza cases [8]. This recommendation prompted several cantons, including Zurich and Bern, to introduce mandatory reporting as early as July 25, 1918 [9] . Other cantons, did not impose a reporting obligation before October 11, 1918 [8]. The reporting obligation applied to physicians and established the basis for the cantons to report influenza cases to the Federal Office of Public Health on a weekly basis. In some cantons, the weekly figures formed the basis for decisions on measures.

Historical sources show that various non-pharmaceutical interventions were applied during the pandemic. However, there was no nationwide introduction of measures, as the implementation of these measures was the responsibility of the cantons and, at times, even the municipalities [10]. Previous studies have shown that measures were implemented[11–15], for example, that summer holidays started earlier and ended later, schools in Valais remained closed from mid-November to early January, while in Bern and Zurich, schools were closed from mid-October to mid-December. Furthermore, public events were banned, theatres were closed, and preaching in churches or visits to hospitals were prohibited.

The effectiveness of these measures was probably decreased by a general strike from November 11-14,1918, right in the peak of the pandemic. Approximately 250,000 workers took part in the strike, opposed by 95,000 soldiers, many of whom were themselves suffering from influenza

[16,17]. As a result, Switzerland experienced a further rise in morbidity and mortality mid-end November 1918.

A map of Switzerland and its cantons and geographical regions (Jura, Swiss Plateau and Alps) is displayed in Supplementary Figure S1 and S2. Switzerland exhibited significant regional differences in terms of geography, population and economic activity in 1918 [18] (Supplementary Figure S1-S3). Urban areas, particularly in the Jura and Swiss Plateau, were densely populated and served as industrial and commercial hubs, with a concentration of multi-family apartment building. Rural areas, especially in the alpine regions, were more sparsely populated, with households being often larger and communities more agrarian in nature. The Alps themselves were characterized by isolated settlements and limited health infrastructure[14].

Previous research in Switzerland has focused on mortality, hospitalization, and related outcomes during the 1918-1919 pandemic[19,20] or on regional morbidity outcomes [12,21]. In contrast to mortality data, weekly morbidity data for the whole of Switzerland have not yet been systematically compiled or analysed at the district level [20]. Concerns have been raised about the limitations and likely underestimation of the available data [4], however, the often-assumed limitations of the morbidity data are so far rooted in conjecture rather than empirically assessed or substantiated through systematic analysis. Moreover, two previous studies of incidence in specific Swiss regions have confirmed the adequacy of using morbidity data [11,21].

The analysis of morbidity gives another important perspective on a pandemic, since mortality does not necessarily reflect morbidity. A survey from 1918-19 pandemic of the United States showed that during the first wave, individuals aged 0-9 were disproportionately affected, yet did not exhibit the highest mortality [22]. Similarly, morbidity was reported to be higher among women, whereas mortality was higher among men [22] . Nevertheless, comparative analyses of morbidity and mortality data have yet to be conducted. Internationally, there are very few studies examining morbidity [22–26], and to our knowledge, none that examine the spatial distribution and dynamics of morbidity data, only mortality data [27–37]. While mortality certainly reflects the severity of a pandemic, a comprehensive understanding requires analyses of both morbidity and mortality. This study seeks to fill this gap by transcribing and studying morbidity data for whole Switzerland for the first time and associate them to several ecological determinants. In addition, we compare the spatial pattern of morbidity with the spatial pattern of mortality to investigate potential differences.

2. Data

2.1 Influenza cases

Since only isolated cases were reported until late June, the onset of the pandemic in Switzerland is generally dated to late June/early July [3].We defined three waves: the summer wave from late June to late August 1918 and the second major wave from September 1918 to May 1919. A later third wave, is observed from January to May 1920.

The weekly influenza cases were taken from the Federal Statistical Office's weekly bulletin on vital statistics (Bulletin des Schweizerischen Gesundheitsamtes), which are freely available online in the Swiss Federal Archives [38]. The weekly influenza figures were collected from Bulletin 1918 No. 27, covering the week from June 30, 1918 - July 6, 1918 until Bulletin 1919 No. 20, for the week of May 11, 1919 - May 17, 1919, as well as from 1920 Bulletin No. 1, for week of December 28, 1919 - January 3, 1920 to Bulletin No. 18, covering the week of April 25, 1920 - May 1, 1920. In each week, the number of cases were reported for the canton and for the Swiss municipalities or at least the district level. Especially during the peak of the pandemic, figures were often only reported at the district level. Therefore, case numbers are analysed only at the district level in this study.

In certain weeks, the aggregation of case numbers is inconsistent, with municipal totals not matching district figures and district totals not aligning with cantonal values. To ensure the quality of the morbidity data, we check the internal consistency across municipalities, districts, and cantons from the lowest to the highest administrative level for each week. Reported case counts were harmonized using a stepwise adjustment procedure, described underneath and in Supplementary Figure S4. This procedure guarantees that municipality totals never fall below district totals, district totals never fall below canton totals, and that any excess at the cantonal level was fairly reallocated while preserving the minimum reported values.

Step 1a) Municipality vs. District: The reported number of cases $C_{d,w}$ for each district d and in each week w were compared with the sum of the cases of the municipalities $C_{m,w}$ in each district d and in each week w. If the sum of the cases in the municipalities was larger than the number of cases in each district then the sum of the cases of the municipalities was taken as number of cases for the district $C_{d,w}^{\wedge}$, otherwise the number of districts. This procedure ensures consistency across administrative levels.

$$C_{d,w}^{\wedge} = \begin{cases} \sum_{m \in M_d} C_{m,w} if \sum_{m \in M_d} C_{m,w} \geq C_{d,w} \\ C_{d,w} if \quad \sum_{m \in M_d} C_{m,w} < C_{d,w} \end{cases}$$

Step 1b) District vs. Canton: If the sum of the cases in each district for each canton $C_{d,w}^{\wedge}$ was larger or equal than the reported cantonal cases $C_{c,w}$the adjusted $C_{d,w}^{\wedge}$ were taken as final number of cases in the districts $C_{d,w}^{\wedge}$, otherwise the finale $C_{d,w}^{\wedge}$ were estimated further in step 2. This procedure ensures consistency across administrative levels.

$$C_{d,w}^{\wedge} = C_{d,w}^{\wedge} \; if \sum_{d \in D_c} C_{d,w}^{\wedge} \geq C_{c,w}$$

$$C_{d,w}^{\wedge} \neq C_{d,w}^{\wedge} \; if \sum_{d \in D_c} C_{d,w}^{\wedge} < C_{c,w}$$

If $\sum_{d \in D_c} C_{d,w}^{\wedge} < C_{c,w}$ then $C_{d,w}^{\wedge}$ was estimated further in step 2.

The adjusted total number of cases for each canton $C_{c,w}^{\wedge}$ was defined as the sum of the adjusted district-level cases when this sum exceeded or equalled the reported cantonal total, and otherwise as the reported cantonal number. This rule preserves consistency between district and cantonal data while accounting for potential underreporting at higher administrative levels.

$$C_{c,w}^{\wedge} = \begin{cases} \sum_{d \in D_c} C_{d,w}^{\wedge} \; if \sum_{d \in D_c} C_{d,w}^{\wedge} \geq C_{c,w} \\ C_{c,w} \quad if \sum_{d \in D_c} C_{d,w}^{\wedge} < C_{d,w} \end{cases}$$

Step 2a) Remaining cases: For each canton and in each week where $\sum_{d \in D_c} C_{d,w}^{\wedge} < C_{c,w}^{\wedge}$ the excess number of cases $R_{c,w}$ was calculated

$$R_{c,w} = C_{c,w}^{\wedge} - \sum_{d \in D_c} C_{d,w}^{\wedge}$$

Step 2b) Expected cases: The expected cases for each district $E_{d,w}$given the numbers of the cantons and the total population in each district were estimated by

$$E_{d,w} = \frac{pop_{d,w}}{\sum_{d \in D_c} pop_{d,w}} * C_{c,w}^{\wedge}$$

Step 2c) Redistribution of cantonal excess: The adjusted cases for each district and week $C_{d,w}^{\wedge}$ were compared with the expected number of cases in each district and week $E_{d,w}$. If $C_{d,w}^{\wedge} \geq E_{d,w}$ then $C_{d,w}^{\wedge}$ was the final number of cases for each district $C_{d,w}^{\wedge}$. For all districts for which $C_{d,w}^{\wedge} < E_{d,w}$ the remaining cases $R_{c,w}$ was redistributed across districts in proportion to their population

shares and summed up to $C^{\wedge}_{d,w}$. This ensures that no district was assigned fewer cases than its original report.

$$\widehat{C'_{d,w}} = \begin{cases} \widehat{C_{d,w}} & if \;\; \widehat{C_{d,w}} \geq E_{d,w} \\ \widehat{C_{d,w}} + \frac{pop_{d,w}}{\sum_{d \in D_c} pop_{d,w}} * R_{c,w} & if \;\; \widehat{C_{d,w}} < E_{d,w} \end{cases}$$

District data was missing in 13%, and in 12% the district case numbers are adjusted upward due to higher canton-level figures. The canton of Fribourg is particularly affected, the very first weeks of the pandemic 1918 and some weeks in 1920. Otherwise, missing or underestimated district values were randomly distributed across weeks and districts. For redistributing excess canton cases, the total population of each district was used. A sensitivity analysis was also performed using the population aged 20–39, based on the assumption that this age group was primarily affected by the pandemic, with districts having a higher share of 20–39-year-olds receiving greater weight. As the sensitivity analysis yielded very similar results (not shown), the total population was retained for the estimation.

2.2 Population at risk

Census data for 1910 and 1920 by district and sex were provided by the Swiss Federal Statistical Office (FSO) [39,40]. For 1910, additional data were available by 5-year age groups (e.g., 0–4, 5–9, 10–14, etc.). Annual population estimates by sex and age were linearly interpolated for each district using the 1910 and 1920 census data. Based on this, the age distribution for 1910 was calculated for each district and then applied to estimate the population of each age group for the intervening years.

2.3 Ecological determinants

Ecological determinants potentially explaining incidence and mortality rates at the district level were collected. Population density was calculated as the total population divided by the district's surface area. Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita was used as defined by Stohr [18]. Age structure was measured as the share of the population aged 5–14, 20–39, and ≥60 years and the proportion of men was also calculated for each district. Additional ecological determinants transcribed from the 1920 census [41] included the number of private doctors per square kilometer, share of industry, mean household size, and households per house. The spatial distributions of the ecological determinates are shown on choropleth maps in Supplementary Figure S3.

3. Statistical methods

The incidence rates per district were calculated per 10,000 inhabitants. The monthly population per district was estimated by linear interpolation between the annual population figures.

Monthly incidence rates for each of the 183 districts is displayed in choropleth maps using quartiles. Getis-Ord Gi* statistic [42] is applied to identify clusters of districts with higher or lower incidence rates. The Getis-Ord Gi* statistic is expressed as a z-value: values greater than 2 indicate significantly higher incidence rates, while values less than -2 indicate significantly lower rates compared to Switzerland overall. A nearest-neighbour approach was used, with five neighbours providing the best model fit. The geometries of the districts that formed the basis of the spatial analysis were obtained from the Swiss Federal Statistical Office [43]. Additionally, datasets from the Federal Office of Topography (swisstopo) were used to depict Switzerland's geographical regions and topographic relief [44,45].

The spatial diffusion of each of the three waves was estimated using the maximum incidence rate in each district in each of the three waves. Especially at the beginning of the pandemic, the first cases were not reported, making it difficult to trace the spread based on initial notifications. Assuming a relatively constant number of physicians diligently reporting each week, and a comparable baseline reproduction number across Switzerland, we consider the peak of each wave in every district to be a reliable measure of the diffusion process.

An exploratory analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between the described ecological variables and the incidence rate for each wave. All explanatory variables were z-transformed for comparability. A Geographically Weighted Regression (GWR) was used [46], which extends ordinary least squares (OLS) by allowing relationships between independent and dependent variables to vary geographically, generating localized models to assess spatial variation in coefficients. To overcome the issue of outliers and extreme values a robust GWR is applied. Due to multicollinearity among the explanatory variables (see correlation matrix in Supplementary Figure S5) and in order to examine the direct effect of each variable on the incidence rate, only univariate analyses are performed. The model can be specified as:

$$y_i = \beta_{i0} + \beta_{i1}x + \varepsilon_{i1}$$

Where y_i denotes is the dependent variable, namely incidence rate, at location i, and β_{i0} the intercept, $\beta_{i1}x$ the coefficient representing the change in in y_i due to a one-unit increase in x, and ε_{i1} the error term at location i. The parameters in GWR are estimated using weighted least

squares, with a diagonal weighting matrix w_{ij}. A gaussian kernel density function weighted function was used to determine the weights:

$$w_{ij} = exp\left(\frac{-d_{ij}^2}{h^2}\right)$$

where d_{ij} is the distance between location i and j. h is the bandwidth. The optimal bandwidth (distance of neighbours used for each local regression) was found via an adjusted Akaike Information Criterion (AICc) and an adaptive bandwidth with a fixed number of neighbours was used [47]. Besides the local-specific coefficients for each independent variable, which are shown on choropleth maps, the median coefficients across all 183 districts were calculated and 95% bias-corrected and accelerated (BCa) bootstrap confidence intervals (CIs)[48] were estimated by using 2,000 samples.

To compare incidence and mortality, we calculated excess mortality using all-cause deaths, as district-level data on influenza-specific deaths are unavailable. Excess mortality indicates how many more individuals than expected died in each district during the pandemic. We estimated excess mortality for 1918 by using a Bayesian spatial model for disease mapping, following the approach used in a previous paper on excess mortality [20]. Unlike that study, however, we included all 183 districts rather than harmonizing the data to 130 districts. Since overall mortality data were not available at weekly or monthly level, excess mortality could only be calculated at annual level. Since excess mortality in Switzerland was low in 1919 and 1920, we restrict the comparison to 1918, the most severe pandemic year with markedly elevated excess mortality[20]. To investigate how ecological determinants relate to the spatial distribution of incidence compared to the excess mortality, we used the z-values from the G* analysis of incidence rates as the outcome variable. The excess mortality was also transformed into z-scores. A robust univariate linear regression model was employed.

All statistical analyses were performed using R Version 4.5.0 [49]. The R package GWmodel for the GWR regression[50]. Spatial analysis and map creation were carried out using ArcGIS Pro, version 3.5.2[51]. The data is publicly available via zenodo: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17508352 and the code via GitHub: https://github.com/KaMatthes/Spatial_temporal_morbidity_1918

4. Results

The course of the morbidity data for whole Switzerland confirms the expected pattern of three waves (Supplementary Figure S6): a first mild wave in the summer of 1918 (total number of cases 101,406), a severe wave in the fall of 1918 (total number of cases 649,662), where the renewed rise in cases after the national strike is clearly visible, and a real mild wave at the beginning of 1919. In addition, there was a later, third wave in the first quarter of 1920 (total number of 141,797). This pattern has also been documented in previous mortality studies of Switzerland [4,13,19,21]. In the Supplementary Figure S7, the course is displayed for each canton. Most of the cantons show the expected pattern. However, Appenzell Innerrhoden (AI) recorded no cases of influenza between August 1918 and May 1919. which is very unlikely, as Appenzell Innerrhoden also experienced excess mortality in 1918 [20] . Elsewhere, the development of cases in Fribourg (FR), Glarus (GL), and Valais (VS) appears somewhat irregular, which could be related to delayed reporting in the second strong wave. However, the overall pattern - a mild first wave, a severe second wave, a very mild 1919 wave, and an additional wave in 1920 - also aligns with the course observed in earlier studies in Switzerland.

Figure 1 shows the incidence rate per month and Figure 2 the results of the Getis-Ord Gi* analysis. A Z-score below 0 means that the incidence in these regions was lower than the Swiss average, which was in most cases still elevated. In July, a pandemic hotspot emerged in North-western Switzerland (Jura). By August, the epidemic focus had shifted further eastward, although parts of the northern region, particularly the Jura, remained affected. The entire canton of Vaud reported no cases in August. In September, the pandemic advanced further east into Grisons (Graubünden), where distinct hotspots became apparent, while incidence in the rest of Switzerland began to decline. During October and November, the incidence increased substantially, with hotspots relocating toward central Switzerland.

From December 1918 to May 1919, infection rates gradually declined throughout Switzerland. However, southern Switzerland (the canton of Ticino) continued to record elevated infection rates in 1919. While the pandemic had largely subsided in most parts of the country, several districts in Ticino continued to report significant numbers of cases. In January 1920, the first hotspot seems to reappear in Geneva in the west, and another one in Ticino in the south of Switzerland. In February, the northern part of the country is particularly affected. From March onward, case numbers gradually decline across all cantons. In April and May, some hotspots remain in the east of Switzerland, in Grisons, and in the south, although case numbers decreased here as well and are low in May.

Figure 1: Monthly incidence rates in each district



Figure 2: Monthly results of the Getis-Ord Gi* analysis Higher z-values indicate greater intensity of clustering and the direction (positive (red color) or negative (blue color)) indicates a cluster of high or low incidence rate.



Figure 3 displays the spatial diffusion for each wave by showing when each district hit its maximum incidence rate during the three observation periods. In the first wave of 1918, from July to August, it becomes very clear how the first peak was reached in Geneva in western Switzerland, then spread from west to northeast (Jura and Swiss Plateau), with the southern part (Southern Alps) of the country being affected last. In the second wave, there is no obvious spatial diffusion; the peaks in the districts appear rather randomly. What does become apparent, however, is that Ticino in southern Switzerland was affected later, some districts even in 1919. In 1920, the spread began again in western Switzerland, but at the same time, peak values were already observed in Ticino and Grisons (in the east). Very roughly, the progression can be seen from the west toward central Switzerland and the northeast, and later to Valais in the south.

Figure 3: Spatial diffusion using the maximum incidence rate in each district in each of the three waves



Figure 4 presents the association between the median of ecological factors and morbidity of the 183 districts for each wave and explanatory variable (detailed results in Supplementary Table S1). The incidence and Getis-Ord Gi* analysis for each wave is displayed in Supplementary Figure S8 and S9 and the corresponding choropleth maps of the regression coefficients are shown in Supplementary Figure S10-S12. Population density, GDP per capita, the share of industry, the number of private physicians per km², and the number of households per house are all associated with higher incidence rates across all waves. The share of men is associated with lower incidence rates in all waves, although in the second wave (September 1918 – May 1919) this relationship appears only as a trend. The proportion of children aged 5–14 years is associated with higher incidence rate during the first wave (July 1918 – August 1918), but not in the second and third waves, where incidence is lower, though only a trend is visible in the second wave. A higher share of individuals aged 20–39 years is associated with a higher incidence rate, while a higher share of those aged 60 years and older is associated with a lower incidence rate. However, in the second wave the confidence intervals are much wider than in the other waves, indicating that the influenza had spread throughout the entire country and that many districts experienced very high incidence rates.

Figure 4: Median regression coefficient of incidence and 95% confidence intervals (CI) from the robust GWR. Each determinate is showing one model (univariable).



When examining the regression coefficients of the individual districts (Supplementary Figure S10-S12), local differences become apparent. The share of men and the share of individuals aged 20–39 play an important role during the first wave (Supplementary Figure S10), particularly in the northwest, where the highest incidence was also observed. The share of people aged ≥60 years is associated with lower incidence rates across most of Switzerland; however, there are districts in Valais where a higher share of this age group corresponds to higher incidence. Population density, GDP per capita, the share of industry, and the number of households per house appear to be less strongly associated with high incidence in western Switzerland than in the rest of the country. In contrast, factors such as household size and the share of children aged 4–15 years seem to be more influential there. In the second wave (Supplementary Figure S11), the pattern looks different. For example, when examining the age groups and their influence on incidence, a higher share of children aged 4–15 years is still associated with higher incidence rates in eastern Switzerland (Grisons) and in Ticino. In contrast, the 20–39 age group is particularly associated with higher incidence on the northern side of the Alps, in the Swiss Plateau, and in the northeast. The ≥60 age group is associated with higher incidence in various parts of Switzerland. The share of men also appears to be linked to higher incidence in the Jura and Swiss plateau and in Ticino. From January to May 1920 (Supplementary Figure S12), the share of individuals aged 20–39 is particularly associated with higher incidence in the German-speaking part of Switzerland, whereas the share of those aged ≥60 years is more strongly associated with higher incidence in the French-speaking part.

When comparing monthly incidence rate with the monthly excess mortality in Switzerland published in Staub et al. [19] (Supplementary Figure S13), the trends appear very similar. Only in September is the excess mortality lower and in November notable higher, which may be due to underreporting, but could also reflect deaths among individuals who contracted the disease in October, thereby illustrating the time lag between disease onset and mortality. Examining the differences between incidence and excess mortality by district for 1918 (Supplementary Figure S14) shows that, in most districts, incidence and excess mortality align closely. Notable discrepancies are observed in Valais, where the incidence rate is considerably lower than excess mortality (see also the excess mortality map, Supplementary Figure S15). Figure 5 shows results of the robust linear regression for incidence rate and excess mortality for 1918 (detailed results in Supplementary Table S2). The annual incidence rates and results of the Getis-Ord Gi* analysis are displayed in Supplementary Figure S16 and S17. Incidence rates were higher in districts with a higher GDP per capita and a larger industrial sector, but these factors were not associated with a higher mortality. Interestingly, the proportion of men showed a negative trend

with incidence but a positive trend with excess mortality. All other explanatory factors show similar pattern between morbidity and mortality

Figure 5: Regression coefficient and 95% confidence interval (CI) of the robust linear regression models. Each determinate is showing one model (univariable).



5. Discussion

In this study, we examined spatial patterns and differences in explanatory factors of incidence and demonstrated that, despite the high likelihood of underreporting, incidence data provide valuable insights into the dynamics of pandemics. This is particularly relevant as certain determinants of incidence differ from those associated with mortality. Our findings indicate that the quality of the morbidity data is sufficient to allow for meaningful analyses of spatiotemporal dynamics and determinants. Nevertheless, we caution that absolute case numbers should not be interpreted in isolation. Instead, the value of these data lies in their relative interpretation, revealing temporal dynamics and differences across districts. In this regard, incidence patterns can still be considered robust and epidemiologically informative, even if exact case counts remain uncertain (as is also the case in more recent pandemics).

A total of 892,865 cases were reported, however, the true figure is in all likelihood to be much higher. Some researcher suggested an incidence of approximately 2 million cases in Switzerland on a population just over 4 million people (corresponding to about 50–60% of the

population)[4,52]. Even though case numbers are underestimated, the majority of cantons display temporal patterns comparable to those observed in mortality data allowing for relative spatial comparisons.

In the first wave, the influenza dynamic is clearly visible, beginning in the west and progressing eastward and then southward. This pattern reflects the fact that troops arriving from France in the west were affected first. During the troop mobilization in western Switzerland at the beginning of July, 13 recruit schools were severely impacted by the flu, with the northern Jura region and Neuchâtel being the hardest hit [5]. The monthly morbidity data also mirror the monthly spatial mortality data reported by Sonderegger [3]. The GWR of the first wave confirms a higher incidence rate among men aged 20–39 in western Switzerland, likely reflecting the young male military population. In the second wave, Switzerland was overall affected, but especially high in the cantons of Nidwalden (NW), Obwalden (OW) and Grisons (GR) in central and east Switzerland, which is in line with the spatial mortality results of Sonderegger [3,4], showing a high influenza mortality in the second wave for these cantons. 1920 was not considered by Sonderegger and cannot be compared.

Across all waves, higher incidence rates were positively associated with population density, GDP per capita, the share of industry, and the number of private physicians per km². Examining the distribution of these variables in Switzerland (see Supplementary Figure S3) reveals a similar pattern across the country, with the highest concentrations observed in the Jura and the Swiss Plateau The correlation matrix (Supplementary Figure S5) further shows that these variables are highly correlated, suggesting that they likely capture the differences between rural and urban districts. Regions with a higher density of multi-family apartment were associated with higher incidence rates, whereas the size of households played a lesser role. However, the number of multi-family apartment also reflects regions with a higher proportion of industry, except in Valais, where the proportion of industry is low, yet the density of multi-family apartment is relatively high. Household size tends to be larger in rural areas of Switzerland, which are characterised by lower levels of industrialisation. We only have information on household size, but not on the average living space per household in each district. Mamelund showed that smaller living space (used as a proxy for lower socioeconomic status) was associated with higher incidence, particularly during the first summer wave [53,54]. During the summer wave, districts with a higher proportion of children of school age (5–14 years) were particularly affected, confirming findings from survey studies conducted in the United States [22]. The proportion of individuals aged 20–39 years was associated with higher incidence rates across all waves; in the first wave, this was likely related to men serving in the military. The

proportion of individuals aged ≥60 years was associated with lower incidence in all waves, reflecting the lower mortality observed in this age group. During the second wave, the confidence intervals were substantially wider than in the other waves, indicating that influenza had spread extensively across the entire country and that many districts experienced very high incidence rates. This highlights the widespread nature of the outbreak during this period, especially in November 1918, compared with the more localized patterns observed in other waves.

The present study also reflects the paradox that, while more women were reported to be infected, more men died [55,56]. Since most studies are based on mortality data, a higher risk of disease from the 1918-1920 influenza is often anticipated for men. Yet, women appear to have been more affected by the pandemic, but not by the mortality. This finding is probably even stronger than reported, since the analysis relies on cases reported by physicians, which in the first wave had a very high coverage for the troops. Therefore, the number of cases is likely more underestimated for women than for men. Since most studies are based on mortality data, a higher risk of disease from the 1918-1920 influenza is often anticipated for men. However, this refers only to mortality, morbidity was often higher among women [24,26] and was also reported in a 1919 medical survey of Swiss factory employees [57].

GDP per capita and the share of industry also show opposite patterns for morbidity and mortality. This may indicate that districts with individuals with higher SES were more likely to visit a physician (as only physicians reported cases, leading probably to a selection bias toward higher SES), but had a lower risk of dying from influenza. Socioeconomic differences in mortality have already been demonstrated in several studies on the 1918 pandemic [37,58–63].

The analysis is restricted to ecological variables, and stratification by age or sex was not possible. Nonetheless, the district-level ecological variables provide reasonable approximations and offer a valuable overview of spatial morbidity patterns. However, due to multicollinearity among the explanatory variables and the strong influence of population size (e.g., rural versus urban contexts), the results must be interpreted with caution and should be regarded as exploratory only. Despite some resistance from the cantons to reporting influenza, and the fact that several cantons refrained from mandatory reporting during the first wave[64], undoubtedly leading to an underreporting of cases, particularly in Valais which is likely attributable to the limited availability of physicians [65] (Supplementary Figure S3). Nevertheless, our analysis shows that the wave-like pattern of the pandemic was evident across all cantons. Moreover, we are unable to account for specific public health measures, as district-level data are not available.

Nevertheless, evidence from other studies conducted in various Swiss regions indicates that such measures were implemented in 1918 [11–15]. Although there were no nationwide regulations in Switzerland, it can be assumed that measures to contain the pandemic were introduced in a large number of districts. To the best of our knowledge, no such interventions were in place in 1920.

This study provides a significant contribution to understanding the 1918–1920 influenza pandemic in Switzerland by complementing existing mortality-focused research with a morbidity perspective. Our results highlight that those factors shaping morbidity patterns may differ from those influencing mortality, underscoring the value of examining both dimensions to gain a more comprehensive understanding of pandemic dynamics.

Author statements

Funding: This work was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (Grantee Katarina Matthes, Grant-No. 221283).

Competing interests: The authors declare no competing interests.

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

Data and code: The data and code underlying this manuscript are publicly available via zenodo https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17508352 and GitHub https://github.com/KaMatthes/Spatial_temporal_morbidity_1918

Acknowledgements: A special thanks goes to Kaspar Staub for previous/ongoing collaborations and helpful comments.

Author contributions:

Conceptualization: All authors

Data curation: SJ, KM

Methodology: All authors

Data analysis: SJ, KM

Visualization: SJ, KM

Supervision: KM

Funding acquisition: KM

Writing – first draft: All authors.

Writing – review & editing: All authors

References

1. Taubenberger JK, Morens DM. 1918 Influenza: the Mother of All Pandemics. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2006;12(1):15-22. doi:10.3201/EID1201.050979

2. Spreeuwenberg P, Kroneman M, Paget J. Reassessing the Global Mortality Burden of the 1918 Influenza Pandemic. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2018;187(12):2561-2567. doi:10.1093/AJE/KWY191

3. Sonderegger C. *Die Grippeepidemie 1918/19 in Der Schweiz*. Liz.; 1991.

4. Sonderegger C, Tscherrig A. Die Grippepandemie 1918-1919 in der Schweiz. In: Krämer D, Pfister C SD, ed. *«Woche Für Woche Neue Preisaufschläge» Nahrungsmittel-, Energie- Und Ressourcenkonflikte in Der Schweiz Des Ersten Weltkrieges. Basel: Schwabe; 2016. p. 259–84.* Schwabe Verlag; 2016:259-284.

5. Nussbaum W. Grippe-Epidemie 1918/1919 in der schweizerischen Armee. *Gesnerus*. 1982;39(2):243-259. doi:10.1163/22977953-03902006

6. *Bundesgesetz Betreffend Massnahmen Gegen Gemeingefährliche Epidemien Vom 2Juli 1886.*; 1886.

7. *Motion Rickli Betr. Verfassungsrevision, Vom 18.Oktober 1909*.; 1909.

8. Jochum H. Die Meldepflicht als Grundlage der epidemiologischen Statistik: Die Auswirkungen der Meldepraxis und der Verwendung von paper technologies auf den Informationsgehalt von Morbiditätsstatistiken 1886–1921. *NTM International Journal of History and Ethics of Natural Sciences, Technology and Medicine*. 2024;32(1):1-33. doi:10.1007/s00048-024-00375-4

9. *Verfügung Der Direktion Des Gesundheitswesens Zuhanden Der Gesundheitsbehörden, Bezirksärzte Und Ärzte Des Kantons Zürich Betreffend Anzeigepflicht Der Grippe, Vom 25Juli 1918*.; 1918.

10. Brack S. *Ein Unsichtbarer Feind: Der Kommunalpolitische Umgang Mit Der Grippeepidemie 1918 in Den Drei Gemeinden Bern, Thun Und Langnau i.E.* . Universität Bern; 2015.

11. Staub K, Jüni P, Urner M, et al. Public health interventions, epidemic growth, and regional variation of the 1918 influenza pandemic outbreak in a Swiss canton and its greater regions. *Ann Intern Med*. 2021;174(4):533-539. doi:10.7326/M20-6231

12. Ziegler E, Matthes KL, Middelkamp PW, et al. Retrospective modelling of the disease and mortality burden of the 1918–1920 influenza pandemic in Zurich, Switzerland. *Epidemics*. 2025;50:100813. doi:10.1016/j.epidem.2025.100813.

13. Ammon CE. Spanish flu epidemic in 1918 in Geneva, Switzerland. *Euro Surveill*. 2002;7(12):190-192. doi:10.2807/ESM.07.12.00391

14. Marino L. *La Grippe Espagnole En Valais (1918-1919)*. 2014.

15. Antonio Universi. *L'impatto Della Pandemia Sulla Scuola Come Comunità Educante Oggi*. Scuola universitaria professionale della Svizzera italiana; 2024.

16. Gautschi Willi. *Der Landesstreik 1918*. Chronos Verlag; 2018.

17. Senn MA., Straumann Tobias. Unruhe im Kleinstaat : der schweizerische Generalstreik von 1918 im internationalen Vergleich. Published online 2022:257. Accessed October 21, 2025. https://schwabe.ch/unruhe-im-kleinstaat-978-3-7965-4515-3

18. Stohr C. Multiple core regions: Regional inequality in Switzerland, 1860-2008. In: *Research in Economic History*. Vol 34. Emerald Group Publishing Ltd.; 2018:135-198. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/S0363-326820180000034005

19. Staub K, Panczak R, Matthes KL, et al. Historically High Excess Mortality During the COVID-19 Pandemic in Switzerland, Sweden, and Spain. *Ann Intern Med*. 2022;175(4):523-532. doi:10.7326/M21-3824

20. Matthes KL, Floris J, Merzouki A, et al. Spatial pattern of all cause excess mortality in Swiss districts during the pandemic years 1890, 1918 and 2020. *Spat Spatiotemporal Epidemiol*. 2024;51:100697. doi:10.1016/J.SSTE.2024.100697

21. Bernhard M, Leuch C, Kordi M, et al. From pandemic to endemic: Spatial-temporal patterns of influenza-like illness incidence in a Swiss canton, 1918–1924. *Econ Hum Biol*. 2023;50:101271. doi:10.1016/J.EHB.2023.101271

22. Britten RH. The Incidence of Epidemic Influenza, 1918-19: A Further Analysis According to Age, Sex, and Color of the Records of Morbidity and Mortality Obtained in Surveys of 12 Localities. *Public Health Reports (1896-1970)*. 1932;47(6):303. doi:10.2307/4580340

23. Sydenstricker E. The incidence of influenza among persons of different economic status during the epidemic of 1918. 1931. *Public Health Rep*. 2006;121 Suppl 1. doi:10.2307/4579923

24. Collins SD. Age and Sex Incidence of Influenza and Pneumonia Morbidity and Mortality in the Epidemic of 1928-29 with Comparative Data for the Epidemic of 1918-19: Based on Surveys of Families in Certain Localities in the United States following the Epidemics. *Public Health Reports (1896-1970)*. 1931;46(33):1909. doi:10.2307/4580139

25. Chowell G, Nishiura H, Bettencourt LMA. Comparative estimation of the reproduction number for pandemic influenza from daily case notification data. *J R Soc Interface*. 2007;4(12):154-166. doi:/10.1098/rsif.2006.0161

26. Mamelund SE, Haneberg B, Mjaaland S. A Missed Summer Wave of the 1918–1919 Influenza Pandemic: Evidence From Household Surveys in the United States and Norway. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2016;3(1). doi:10.1093/OFID/OFW040

27. Chowell G, Erkoreka A, Viboud C, Echeverri-Dávila B. Spatial-temporal excess mortality patterns of the 1918-1919 influenza pandemic in Spain. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2014;14(1):1-12. doi:10.1186/1471-2334-14-371

28. Chowell G, Bettencourt LMA, Johnson N, Alonso WJ, Viboud C. The 1918–1919 influenza pandemic in England and Wales: spatial patterns in transmissibility and mortality impact. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. 2007;275(1634):501-509. doi:10.1098/RSPB.2007.1477

29. Mourits RJ, Schalk R, Meroño-Peñuela A, et al. Retracing Hotbeds of the 1918–19 Influenza Pandemic. Spatial Differences in Seasonal Excess Mortality in the Netherlands. *Hist Life Course Stud*. 2021;10:145-150. doi:10.51964/HLCS9584

30. Reyes O, Lee EC, Sah P, Viboud C, Chandra S, Bansal S. Spatiotemporal Patterns and Diffusion of the 1918 Influenza Pandemic in British India. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2018;187(12):2550-2560. doi:10.1093/AJE/KWY209

31. Nunes B, Silva S, Rodrigues A, Roquette R, Batista I, Rebelo-de-Andrade H. The 1918–1919 Influenza Pandemic in Portugal: A Regional Analysis of Death Impact. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2018;187(12):2541-2549. doi:10.1093/AJE/KWY164

32. Chandra S, Kassens-Noor E. The evolution of pandemic influenza: evidence from India, 1918–19. *BMC Infectious Diseases 2014 14:1*. 2014;14(1):1-10. doi:10.1186/1471-2334-14-510

33. Eggo RM, Cauchemez S, Ferguson NM. Spatial dynamics of the 1918 influenza pandemic in England, Wales and the United States. *J R Soc Interface*. 2011;8(55):233-243. doi:10.1098/rsif.2010.0216

34. Smallman-Raynor M, Johnson N, Cliff AD. The spatial anatomy of an epidemic: Influenza in London and the county boroughs of England and Wales, 1918-1919. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*. 2002;27(4):452-470. doi:10.1111/1475-5661.00065

35. Tuckel P, Sassler S, Maisel R, Leykam A. The Diffusion of the Influenza Pandemic of 1918 in Hartford,Connecticut. *Soc Sci Hist*. 2006;30(2):167-196. doi:10.1215/01455532-30-2-167

36. Colvin CL, McLaughlin E. Death, demography and the denominator: Age-adjusted Influenza-18 mortality in Ireland. *Econ Hum Biol*. 2021;41:100984. doi:10.1016/J.EHB.2021.100984

37. Rijpma A, van Dijk IK, Schalk R, Zijdeman RL, Mourits RJ. Unequal excess mortality during the Spanish Flu pandemic in the Netherlands. *Econ Hum Biol*. 2022;47:101179. doi:10.1016/J.EHB.2022.101179

38. Detailansicht - Online-Zugang zum Bundesarchiv. Accessed October 21, 2025. https://www.recherche.bar.admin.ch/recherche/#/de/archiv/einheit/1357888

39. Die Unterscheidung der Bevölkerung nach dem Geschlechte, nach dem Familienstande und nach dem Alter - Konfessions- und Altersverhältnisse der zusammenlebenden Ehepaare - (Schweizerische Statistik 204. Lieferung) | Publikation. Accessed October 21, 2025. https://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/de/home/statistiken/katalog.assetdetail.345954.html

40. Allgemeine Ergebnisse - (Schweizerische Statistische Mitteilungen. VII. Jahrgang 1925. 6. Heft) | Publikation. Accessed October 21, 2025. https://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/de/home/statistiken/katalog.assetdetail.345938.html

41. Haushaltungsstatistik - (Schweizerische Statistische Mitteilungen. VIII. Jahrgang 1926. 1. Heft) | Publikation. Accessed October 21, 2025. https://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/de/home/statistiken/katalog.assetdetail.345942.html

42. Getis A, Ord JK. The Analysis of Spatial Association by Use of Distance Statistics. *Geogr Anal*. 1992;24(3):189-206. doi:/10.1111/j.1538-4632.1992.tb00261.x

43. Gemeindegrenzen: Zeitreihe seit 1850 | Bundesamt für Statistik - BFS. Accessed November 10, 2025. https://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/de/home/dienstleistungen/geostat/geodaten-bundesstatistik/raumgliederungen/gemeindegrenzen-zeitreihe.html

44. swissNAMES3D. Accessed November 10, 2025. https://www.swisstopo.admin.ch/de/landschaftsmodell-swissnames3d

45. swissALTI3D. Accessed November 10, 2025. https://www.swisstopo.admin.ch/de/hoehenmodell-swissalti3d

46. Brunsdont C, Fotheringham S, Charlton M. Geographically Weighted Regression. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series D (The Statistician)*. 1998;47(3):431-443. doi:10.1111/1467-9884.00145

47. Comber A, Brunsdon C, Charlton M, et al. A Route Map for Successful Applications of Geographically Weighted Regression. *Geogr Anal*. 2023;55(1):155-178. doi:10.1111/GEAN.12316

48. DiCiccio TJ, Efron B. Bootstrap confidence intervals. *Statistical Science*. 1996;11(3):189-228. doi:10.1214/ss/1032280214

49. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Preprint posted online 2025. Accessed October 29, 2025. https://www.R-project.org/

50. Gollini I, Lu B, Charlton M, Brunsdon C, Harris P. GWmodel: An R Package for Exploring Spatial Heterogeneity Using Geographically Weighted Models. *J Stat Softw*. 2015;63(17):1-50. doi:10.18637/JSS.V063.I17

51. ArcGIS Pro (Esri). ArcGIS Pro (Esri). 2025. Accessed November 10, 2025. https://pro.arcgis.com/en/pro-app/latest/get-started/get-started.htm

52. Thalmann H. *Die Grippeepidemie 1918/19 in Zürich*. 1968.

53. Mamelund SE. 1918 pandemic morbidity: The first wave hits the poor, the second wave hits the rich. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses*. 2018;12(3):307-313. doi:10.1111/IRV.12541

54. Mamelund SE. A socially neutral disease? Individual social class, household wealth and mortality from Spanish influenza in two socially contrasting parishes in Kristiania 1918–19. *Soc Sci Med*. 2006;62(4):923-940. doi:10.1016/J.SOCSCIMED.2005.06.051

55. Case A, Paxson C. Sex differences in morbidity and mortality. *Demography*. 2005;42(2):189-214. doi:10.1353/DEM.2005.0011

56. Alberts SC, Archie EA, Gesquiere LR, Altmann J, Vaupel JW, Christensen K. The Male-Female Health-Survival Paradox: A Comparative Perspective on Sex Differences in Aging and Mortality. Published online September 22, 2014. Accessed November 2, 2025. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK242444/

57. Matthes KL, Le Vu M, Bhattacharyya U, et al. Reinfections and Cross-Protection in the 1918/19 Influenza Pandemic: Revisiting a Survey Among Male and Female Factory Workers. *Int J Public Health*. 2023;68:1605777.

58. Murray CJ, Lopez AD, Chin B, Feehan D, Hill KH. Estimation of potential global pandemic influenza mortality on the basis of vital registry data from the 1918–20 pandemic: a quantitative analysis. *The Lancet*. 2006;368(9554):2211-2218. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(06)69895-4

59. Bengtsson T, Dribe M, Eriksson B. Social Class and Excess Mortality in Sweden During the 1918 Influenza Pandemic. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2018;187(12):2568-2576. doi:10.1093/AJE/KWY151

60. Clay K, Lewis J, Severnini E. What explains cross-city variation in mortality during the 1918 influenza pandemic? Evidence from 438 U.S. cities. *Econ Hum Biol*. 2019;35:42-50. doi:10.1016/J.EHB.2019.03.010

61. Grantz KH, Rane MS, Salje H, Glass GE, Schachterle SE, Cummings DAT. Disparities in influenza mortality and transmission related to sociodemographic factors within Chicago in the pandemic of 1918. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2016;113(48):13839-13844. doi:10.1073/pnas.1612838113

62. Mamelund SE, Dimka J. Not the great equalizers: Covid-19, 1918–20 influenza, and the need for a paradigm shift in pandemic preparedness. *Popul Stud (NY)*. 2021;75(S1):179-199. doi:10.1080/00324728.2021.1959630

63. Mamelund SE, Dimka J. Social inequalities in infectious diseases. *Scand J Public Health*. 2021;49(7):675-680. doi:10.1177/1403494821997228

64. Jochum H. Mandatory Reporting as the Basis of Epidemiological Statistics: The Impact of the Reporting Practice and Usage of Paper Technologies on the Informative Content of Morbidity Statistics 1886–1921. *NTM International Journal of History and Ethics of Natural Sciences, Technology and Medicine*. 2024;32(1):1-33. doi:10.1007/S00048-024-00375-4/FIGURES/2

65. Kanertz AG. Die Medizin im Wallis bis zum Ausgang des 19. Jahrhunderts. *Gesnerus : Swiss Journal of the history of medicine and sciences*. 1979;36(1-2):50-54. doi:10.5169/seals-520881

Supplementary material

Supplementary Figure S1: The map shows the cantons of Switzerland for the period 1918-1920.



Supplementary Figure S2: The map shows the geographical regions of Switzerland.



Supplementary Figure S3: Spatial distribution of explanatory variables



Supplementary Figure S4: Flowchart of the stepwise adjustment procedure to estimate the district cases



Supplementary Figure S5: Correlation matrix of the explanatory variables



Supplementary Figure S6: Weekly incidence for whole Switzerland.



Supplementary Figure S7: Weekly incidence for each canton.



Supplementary Figure S8: Incidence rate per wave



Supplementary Figure S9: Results per wave of the local spatial statistic G*. Higher z-values indicate greater intensity of clustering and the direction (positive (red color) or negative (blue color)) indicates a cluster of high or low incidence rate.



Supplementary Figure S10: Regression coefficients of the GWR model for the first wave (July–August 1918). Red indicates a positive association between higher incidence rates and higher values of the determinant, while blue indicates a negative association.

July 1918 - August 1918



Supplementary Figure S11: Regression coefficients of the GWR model for the second wave (September 1918 – May 1919). Red indicates a positive association between higher incidence rates and higher values of the determinant, while blue indicates a negative association.

September 1918 - May 1919



Supplementary Figure S12: Regression coefficients of the GWR model for the second wave (January 1920 – May 1920). Red indicates a positive association between higher incidence rates and higher values of the determinant, while blue indicates a negative association.

January 1920 - May 1920



Supplementary Figure S13: Comparison of monthly incidence and excess mortality in Switzerland. Excess mortality values are from a previous publication (Staub K, Panczak R, Matthes KL, et al. Historically High Excess Mortality During the COVID-19 Pandemic in Switzerland, Sweden, and Spain. Ann Intern Med. 2022;175(4):523-532. doi:10.7326/M21-3824)



Supplementary Figure S14: Areas shown in brown represent weak correspondence between incidence and excess mortality, whereas dark purple indicates a strong correspondence. The relationship may be positive in either direction, reflecting both low–low and high–high combinations of incidence and excess mortality.



Supplementary Figure S15: Excess mortality in each district.



Supplementary Figure S16: Annual incidence rate



Supplementary Figure S17: Annual results of the local spatial statistic G*. Higher z-values indicate greater intensity of clustering and the direction (positive (red color) or negative (blue color)) indicates a cluster of high or low incidence rate.



Supplementary Table S1: Median regression coefficient of incidence and 95% confidence intervals (CI) from the robust GWR and a global linear regression. Each determinate is showing one model (univariable).

Cofactor	Wave	GWR	Global
Population density	Jul 1918 - Aug 1918	21.22 (7.56 to 31.09)	39.16 (12.97 to 65.34)
GDP per capita	Jul 1918 - Aug 1918	18.65 (11.36 to 27.97)	50.44 (24.67 to 76.22)
Share of industry	Jul 1918 - Aug 1918	42.04 (31.36 to 50.06)	66.23 (41.23 to 91.23)
Private physicians per km2	Jul 1918 - Aug 1918	16.63 (2.46 to 22.64)	24.94 (-1.61 to 51.5)
Households per house	Jul 1918 - Aug 1918	23.4 (14.15 to 33.95)	28.12 (1.63 to 54.61)
Household size	Jul 1918 - Aug 1918	1.5 (-6.83 to 8.76)	21.16 (-5.47 to 47.78)
Share of men	Jul 1918 - Aug 1918	-14.64 (-20.38 to -4.98)	11.84 (-14.91 to 38.58)
Share of 5-14 years old	Jul 1918 - Aug 1918	20.73 (11.56 to 26.98)	47.63 (21.74 to 73.52)
Share of 20-39 years old	Jul 1918 - Aug 1918	25.42 (5.07 to 39.47)	-0.38 (-27.18 to 26.42)
Share of >= 60 years old	Jul 1918 - Aug 1918	-34.78 (-41.52 to -20.08)	-51.8 (-77.52 to -26.08)
Population density	Sep 1918 - May 1919	10.74 (-42.48 to 34.56)	-22.89 (-151.39 to 105.62)
GDP per capita	Sep 1918 - May 1919	35.54 (3.1 to 53.23)	15.64 (-112.89 to 144.16)
Share of industry	Sep 1918 - May 1919	41.27 (-3.31 to 83.05)	-25.94 (-154.44 to 102.55)
Private physicians per km2	Sep 1918 - May 1919	22.17 (2.32 to 54.66)	0.84 (-127.71 to 129.39)
Households per house	Sep 1918 - May 1919	57.03 (30.32 to 99.97)	-35 (-163.45 to 93.45)
Household size	Sep 1918 - May 1919	-0.5 (-33.44 to 22.35)	-16.42 (-144.95 to 112.1)
Share of men	Sep 1918 - May 1919	-24.39 (-100.88 to 19.32)	-84.74 (-212.69 to 43.22)
Share of 5-14 years old	Sep 1918 - May 1919	-23.65 (-57.66 to 11.88)	-105.91 (-233.53 to 21.71)
Share of 20-39 years old	Sep 1918 - May 1919	34.63 (1.41 to 62.15)	29.81 (-98.66 to 158.29)
Share of >= 60 years old	Sep 1918 - May 1919	-28.28 (-57.16 to -4.51)	120.33 (-7.02 to 247.67)
Population density	Jan 1920 - May 1920	40.74 (34.88 to 52.84)	47.4 (15.71 to 79.1)
GDP per capita	Jan 1920 - May 1920	27.16 (18.33 to 39.59)	38.53 (6.58 to 70.48)
Share of industry	Jan 1920 - May 1920	37.28 (23.09 to 48.82)	40.94 (9.06 to 72.83)
Private physicians per km2	Jan 1920 - May 1920	57.14 (42.58 to 71.99)	29.96 (-2.18 to 62.11)
Households per house	Jan 1920 - May 1920	41.71 (32.16 to 56.48)	35.38 (3.35 to 67.41)
Household size	Jan 1920 - May 1920	-25.34 (-37.23 to -16.27)	-7.82 (-40.24 to 24.6)
Share of men	Jan 1920 - May 1920	-38.26 (-42.96 to -34.09)	-37.45 (-69.43 to -5.47)
Share of 5-14 years old	Jan 1920 - May 1920	-45.37 (-70.42 to -27.91)	-32.22 (-64.32 to -0.12)
Share of 20-39 years old	Jan 1920 - May 1920	71.05 (57.3 to 87.67)	37.46 (5.48 to 69.44)
Share of >= 60 years old	Jan 1920 - May 1920	-16.75 (-25.21 to -8.38)	-10.41 (-42.81 to 22)

Supplementary Table S2: Regression coefficient and 95% confidence interval (CI) of the robust linear regression models. Each determinate is showing one model (univariable).

Cofactor	Incidence	Excess mortality
Population density	0.09 (-0.02 to 0.2)	0.02 (-0.09 to 0.14)
GDP per capita	0.18 (0.08 to 0.28)	-0.04 (-0.15 to 0.07)
Share of industry	0.2 (0.1 to 0.3)	-0.02 (-0.13 to 0.09)
Private physicians per km2	0.07 (-0.03 to 0.18)	0.03 (-0.08 to 0.15)
Households per house	0.07 (-0.04 to 0.18)	0.16 (0.05 to 0.27)
Household size	0.03 (-0.08 to 0.14)	0.11 (0 to 0.22)
Share of men	-0.03 (-0.14 to 0.08)	0.1 (-0.01 to 0.21)
Share of 5-14 years old	-0.04 (-0.14 to 0.07)	-0.04 (-0.16 to 0.07)
Share of 20-39 years old	0.08 (-0.02 to 0.19)	0.21 (0.1 to 0.32)
Share of >= 60 years old	-0.06 (-0.17 to 0.05)	-0.23 (-0.34 to -0.12)