

1        **Geographical inequalities in the evolution of the COVID-19 pandemic: An ecological study of**  
2        **inequalities in mortality in the first wave and the effects of the first national lockdown in England**

3

4        **Claire E. Welsh PhD (0000-0001-9477-0775)<sup>1\*</sup>, Viviana Albani (0000-0001-9584-7631)<sup>1</sup>, Fiona E.**  
5        **Matthews PhD (0000-0002-1728-2388)<sup>1,2</sup>, Clare Bamba PhD (0000-0002-1294-6851)<sup>1,2</sup>**

6

7        <sup>1</sup>Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, UK, NE4 5PL

8        <sup>2</sup> Applied Research Collaboration North East and North Cumbria, Newcastle University, UK, NE4 5PL

9

10        \*Corresponding author: [Claire.Welsh@newcastle.ac.uk](mailto:Claire.Welsh@newcastle.ac.uk), Room 2.38 Biomedical Research Building,  
11        Campus for Aging and Vitality, Newcastle University, Newcastle, NE4 5PL.

12

13

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

## 14 **Authorship**

15 FM, CB and CW designed the study. CW completed all analyses with input from FM and CB. CW, VA,  
16 FM and CB all contributed to drafting the manuscript. The corresponding author attests that all listed  
17 authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted. CW is  
18 guarantor of the analysis.

19 The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of  
20 all authors, a worldwide licence to the Publishers and its licensees in perpetuity, in all forms, formats  
21 and media (whether known now or created in the future), to i) publish, reproduce, distribute, display  
22 and store the Contribution, ii) translate the Contribution into other languages, create adaptations,  
23 reprints, include within collections and create summaries, extracts and/or, abstracts of the  
24 Contribution, iii) create any other derivative work(s) based on the Contribution, iv) to exploit all  
25 subsidiary rights in the Contribution, v) the inclusion of electronic links from the Contribution to  
26 third party material where-ever it may be located; and, vi) licence any third party to do any or all of  
27 the above.

## 28 **Conflicts of Interest Statement**

29 All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at [www.icmje.org/coi\\_disclosure.pdf](http://www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf)  
30 and declare: no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the  
31 submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could appear to  
32 have influenced the submitted work.

## 33 **Data Sharing Statement**

34 All data used are publicly freely available through the ONS. Code used in the analyses is available  
35 upon request.

## 36 **Ethical Approval**

37 This study was approved by the Newcastle University Ethics Committee (Ref: 7543/2020).

38 **Transparency declaration**

39 The lead author\* affirms that this manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the  
40 study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any  
41 discrepancies from the study as planned (and, if relevant, registered) have been explained.

42

43 \*The manuscript's guarantor.

44

45 **Funding**

46 This work was supported by a grant from The Health Foundation (Ref: 2211473), who took no part in  
47 the design, analysis or writing of this study.

48

49

50 **Summary Box**

51 **Section 1: What is already known on this subject**

52 There are cross-sectional estimates of geographical inequalities in the severity of the COVID-19  
53 pandemic in England in terms of cases, hospitalisations and deaths. But these studies have not  
54 examined the evolution of the epidemic nor the impact of the national lockdown on inequalities in  
55 COVID-19 related mortality.

56 **Section 2: What this study adds**

57 This study provides the first analysis of inequalities in the evolution of the pandemic in different  
58 English local authorities and the impact of the first national lock down on them. We estimate  
59 geographical inequalities by local authority in the evolution of age-standardised COVID-19 mortality  
60 during the first wave of the pandemic in England (January to July 2020) and the impact on these  
61 inequalities in the cumulative death rates of the first national lockdown. We found that more  
62 deprived local authorities started to record COVID-19 deaths earlier, and that their death rates  
63 increased faster. Cumulative COVID-19 mortality inequalities during the first wave of the pandemic  
64 in England were moderately reduced by first national lockdown.

65

66 **Abstract**

67 **Objectives**

68 This is the first study to examine how geographical inequalities in COVID-19 mortality rates evolved  
69 in England, and whether the first national lockdown modified them. This analysis provides  
70 important lessons to inform public health planning to reduce inequalities in any future pandemics.

71 **Design**

72 Longitudinal ecological study

73 **Setting**

74 307 Lower-tier local authorities in England

75 **Primary outcome measure**

76 Age-standardised COVID-19 mortality rates by local authority and decile of index of multiple  
77 deprivation.

78 **Results**

79 Local authorities that started recording COVID-19 deaths earlier tended to be more deprived, and  
80 more deprived authorities saw faster increases in their death rates. By 2020-04-06 (week 15, the  
81 time the March 23<sup>rd</sup> lockdown could have begun affecting deaths) the cumulative death rate in local  
82 authorities in the two most deprived deciles of IMD was 54% higher than the rate in the two least  
83 deprived deciles. By 2020-07-04 (week 27), this gap had narrowed to 29%. Thus, inequalities in  
84 mortality rates by decile of deprivation persisted throughout the first wave, but reduced somewhat  
85 during the lockdown.

86 **Conclusions**

87 This study found significant differences in the dynamics of COVID-19 mortality at the local authority  
88 level, resulting in inequalities in cumulative mortality rates during the first wave of the pandemic.  
89 The first lockdown in England was fairly strict – and the study found that it particularly benefited  
90 those living in the more deprived local authorities. Care should be taken to implement lockdowns  
91 early enough, in the right places - and at a sufficiently strict level- to maximally benefit all  
92 communities, and reduce inequalities.

93

#### 94 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 95 • **This study interrogates the evolution of inequalities in COVID-19 in the first wave of the**  
96 **pandemic in England and the impact of the national lock down.**
- 97 • **National level official (ONS) data used, covering nearly all local authorities in England and**  
98 **including all deaths that made any mention of COVID-19 on death certificates, requiring**  
99 **sensitive data acquisition.**
- 100 • **Age-standardised deaths rates at lower geographies are not available at the time of**  
101 **writing but could lend extra nuance to these findings.**
- 102 • **Ecological study not using individual level data, so unable to examine the individual level**  
103 **risks for covid-19 mortality.**

104 **Word Count: 3405**

## 105 **Introduction**

106 Since the early days of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic in 2020, inequalities in case, hospitalisation and  
107 death rates have been noted internationally(1–7). The most deprived populations and areas in the  
108 USA, Europe and other high-income countries have suffered up to twice the mortality rates of the  
109 least deprived sections of society(2,8,9). In addition, inequalities in disease burden have been noted  
110 across levels of income, education, employment, sex, age, and especially between different ethnic  
111 groups, where people of Black and minority ethnic backgrounds have suffered many more cases  
112 (and deaths) than their white counterparts(10). However, the evolution of geographical inequalities  
113 in the pandemic over time - and the impact of national lock downs on them – has not previously  
114 been examined. This study addresses this evidence gap by providing the first analysis of inequalities  
115 in the evolution of the pandemic in different English local authorities and the impact of the first  
116 national lock down on them.

117

118 Most countries employed national lockdowns of varying duration and severity to mitigate disease  
119 spread, alongside social distancing and hygiene-related advice. The factors used to determine when  
120 a lockdown should begin or cease were rarely transparent, but most appeared to reduce infection  
121 rates to some degree after a lag phase, and saw a rebound of varying size following their release(11–  
122 13). The first confirmed cases of COVID-19 were recorded in England in York in January 2020 and the  
123 first death in England was on March 5<sup>th</sup>. From 2020-04-23 until 2020-07-04, a national lockdown was  
124 implemented across England. In keeping with many other European countries, this was  
125 characterised by a 12 week ‘stay at home’ order (SI 350) - whereby people could only go outside for  
126 certain "very limited purposes" - to buy food, to exercise once a day, for medical reasons or to care  
127 for a vulnerable person, or to go to work if they absolutely could not work from home(12). Face-to-  
128 face education was suspended and many workplaces closed down - and staff furloughed -  
129 particularly in the hospitality, travel and retail sectors. As nationally cases, hospitalisation and death

130 rates started to fall the lockdown was gradually released over a period of several months -  
131 culminating in the so-called ‘Super Saturday’ on 2020-07-04 when pubs, restaurants, hairdressers,  
132 and cinemas reopened – albeit with strict social distancing rules(13).

133

134 It has been noted that when national epidemic dynamics are used to examine population health,  
135 they can mask important sub-national variation in disease spread, thus mitigation strategies that rely  
136 solely on the national data to inform implementation timings could inadvertently worsen health  
137 inequalities across geographical areas(11,13). Previous descriptive studies and reports of inequalities  
138 in COVID-19 mortality have only focused on cumulative measures over set timespans, without  
139 documenting the disparities in evolution of mortality rates(5,14,15), have been restricted to higher  
140 geographies(18), or have not focussed on the effects of lockdowns (7,19). An understanding of how  
141 the evolution of the pandemic differed by area and the impact of national mitigation strategies on  
142 geographical inequalities in COVID-19 mortality could help inform future policies targeted at  
143 minimising viral spread whilst preventing the widening (or even actively decreasing) health  
144 inequalities.

145

146 This paper uses COVID-19 mortality data from the first wave of the pandemic in England to provide  
147 the first interrogation of geographical inequalities in the evolution of the pandemic. It sets out the  
148 first analysis of when death rates rose, peaked and fell in local authorities of differing levels of  
149 deprivation, and it describes the effects – and the timing of - the first national lockdown on these  
150 inequalities.

151

152 **Methods**



153 Weekly counts of COVID-19 deaths (based on any mention of Coronavirus on the death certificate)  
154 for 312 lower-tier local authorities (excluding county councils) in England were obtained from the  
155 Office for National Statistics (ONS) covering the period from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2020 to 4<sup>th</sup> July 2020, by date  
156 of registration (16). Weekly COVID-19 death counts at the local authority level were not available per  
157 age group, thus age-standardised rates were calculated via monthly age-standardised rates.  
158 Monthly age-standardised COVID-19 mortality rates per local authority for the period March to July  
159 2020 were similarly obtained from ONS(21). The monthly rate was divided between the constituent  
160 weeks based on the share of monthly deaths in each week. Where all age-standardised rates for a  
161 local authority were suppressed by ONS due to disclosure controls, the authority was excluded from  
162 analyses (n=4). The level of deprivation of each local authority was determined by the rank of  
163 average rank of the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), which was converted into deciles (decile 1  
164 contained the most deprived 10% of local authorities) from downloaded data(17). In addition, data  
165 from the Isles of Scilly and the City of London were excluded due to well-known mortality data  
166 quality issues and low population counts.

167

168 A number of metrics were calculated for each local authority; the ‘starting week’ was the first week  
169 where 1 or more COVID-19 deaths were registered, the ‘peak’ was the highest weekly age-  
170 standardised mortality rate per area using a 3-week rolling mean of weekly death rates, and the  
171 ‘total mortality rate’ was the cumulative sum of age-standardised weekly mortality rates over the  
172 whole study period. The speed of increase was defined as the change in mortality rate between 25%  
173 of peak and the peak rate, divided by the number of weeks between them, and similarly the speed  
174 of descent was calculated using the peak rate and subsequent reduction to 50% of peak (25 and 50%  
175 selected to include time window when epidemic peaks were visibly most stable). An assumption was  
176 made that any change in population incidence of COVID-19 cases may begin to be seen 2 weeks later  
177 in mortality data, thus analyses of the effect of lockdown focused on the period before or after week

178 15 (lockdown was announced in week 13 [March 2020] and ended on ‘Super Saturday’ [July 4<sup>th</sup>,  
179 week 27], which is shown in timeline plots). The ‘peak difference’ was the difference in weeks  
180 between the peak mortality rate and the week in which lockdown began to take effect (week 15).

181

182 Weekly age-standardised mortality rates per IMD decile were not available at the time of writing,  
183 thus they were calculated from other existing data, in a similar but distinct method from local  
184 authority rates. Firstly, the denominators from local authority-level monthly age standardised  
185 mortality rates were calculated using the death counts and rates provided. These ‘modified’  
186 population estimates were summed across local authorities within the same IMD decile, and counts  
187 of COVID-19 deaths were similarly summed by decile. Weekly age-standardised rates per 100,000  
188 people were then calculated as the sum of deaths divided by the modified summed population  
189 estimate, multiplied by 100,000.

190

191 Simple linear models were employed to analyse the associations between visually normally  
192 distributed measures such as the total cumulative mortality rate with other metrics and IMD decile.  
193 No model selection was employed, covariate inclusion was based on empirical knowledge.

194

195 Maps were drawn based on 2020 geographical boundaries from the ONS Open Geography  
196 Portal(18).

197

198 All analyses were conducted in R statistical software version 3.6.2.

199

200 **Patient and Public Involvement**


201 Our public involvement panel inputted into project design and considered the research topic to be of  
202 contemporary importance and value. The data used do not require patient permissions for use and  
203 are publicly available.

204

## 205 **Results**

206 All 307 lower-tier local authorities in England began registering deaths involving COVID-19 between  
207 weeks 11 and 15. The proportion of areas of each IMD decile per 'starting week' is shown in Figure 1.  
208 From this it can be seen that more deprived areas (most deprived decile = 1) tended to begin  
209 recording COVID-19 deaths earlier than less deprived areas (least deprived decile = 10).

210




211

212 **Figure 1. Proportion of 312 English local authorities within each IMD decile that began recording**  
213 **COVID-19 deaths between weeks 11 and 15 of 2020.**

214

215 Figure 2 depicts the weekly mortality rates per 100,000 people for each IMD decile. After the first  
216 two weeks of the epidemic, the two most deprived deciles (20% of local authorities) had the highest  
217 speed of increase in age-standardised mortality rates and reached higher peak rates than less  
218 deprived areas.



219


220 **Figure 2. Weekly age-standardised COVID-19 mortality rates per 100,000 in areas of each IMD**  
221 **decile. Dotted line indicates the start of the first national lockdown (26<sup>th</sup> March).**

222

223 From the week of their first COVID-19 deaths to week 15 (when lockdown could plausibly have  
224 begun affecting death rates), local authorities in the two most deprived deciles had the highest  
225 speed of increase in death rate (albeit not statistically significantly different), and the less deprived

226 deciles increased more slowly (Figure 3). The mean speed of increase in two the most deprived local  
227 authorities was 4.03 deaths per 100,000 persons per week, and in the two least deprived local  
228 authorities was 2.18 deaths per 100,000 persons per week (a difference of 46%).

229



230

231 **Figure 3. Simple linear gradient of age-standardised COVID-19 death rate per 100,000 people**  
 232 **between the first week of recorded COVID-19 deaths and week 15, across rank of average rank of**  
 233 **IMD deciles.**

234  
 235 All local authorities' death rate curves peaked and began to decline between 3 and 10 weeks  
 236 following the start of the first lockdown. Those local authorities whose death rates were increasing  
 237 faster before lockdown peaked sooner after lockdown commenced compared to slower local  
 238 authorities.

239 The total age-standardised cumulative mortality over the first wave (up to week 27, week  
 240 commencing 2020-06-28) varied from 119 to 2349 deaths per 100,000 persons per local authority.  
 241 Table 1 describes the multivariable linear model of total cumulative death rates per local authority.  
 242 It shows that, compared to the most deprived 10% of local authorities, less deprived areas (deciles 3-  
 243 10) recorded lower cumulative death rates, and that areas with higher speeds of increase - and more  
 244 weeks of recorded COVID-19 deaths before lockdown (plus those that peaked later) - saw higher  
 245 total death rates.

246  
 247 **Table 1. Linear multivariable model of the total cumulative age-standardised COVID-19 death rate**  
 248 **per 100,000 persons between weeks 1 and 27 of 2020, among 307 local authorities in England.**

Metric	Coefficient (SE)	P-value
<b>IMD decile</b>		
<b>1 (most deprived)</b>	REF	
<b>2</b>	-41.16 (49.30)	0.40
<b>3</b>	-108.20 (50.46)	0.03
<b>4</b>	-132.11 (49.80)	0.008

<b>5</b>	-140.82 (50.83)	0.006
<b>6</b>	-183.66 (50.64)	<0.001
<b>7</b>	-225.06 (50.81)	<0.001
<b>8</b>	-170.43 (51.01)	<0.001
<b>9</b>	-213.73 (50.82)	<0.001
<b>10</b>	-262.16 (50.28)	<0.001
<b>Speed of increase (to week 15), deaths per 100,000 per week</b>	12.87 (0.47)	<0.001
<b>Weeks from week of first registered COVID-19 deaths to lockdown</b>	216.98 (13.04)	<0.001
<b>Weeks between peak and lockdown</b>	104.56 (17.38)	<0.001

249

250 As mentioned, all local authorities began recording COVID-19 deaths between weeks 11 and 15, i.e.,  
 251 from 2 weeks before the announcement of the first lockdown, to 2 weeks after. The difference in  
 252 total cumulative death rates for areas grouped by starting week are as seen in Table 2.

253

254 **Table 2. Mean cumulative COVID-19 death rate per 100,000 persons over the first wave (weeks 1**  
 255 **to 27, 2020) of the pandemic among 307 local authorities in England.**

<b>Timing of start week relative to week 13</b>	<b>Total cumulative age-standardised COVID-19 death rate per 100,000</b>	<b>Number of local authorities</b>
---	--	------------------------------------




<b>(when lockdown 1 was announced)</b>	<b>persons for whole of wave 1 (weeks 1 to 27, 2020), (SD)</b>	
<b>2 weeks before</b>	465 (451)	14
<b>1 week before</b>	780 (324)	124
<b>Same week</b>	984 (407)	101
<b>1 week after</b>	1188 (505)	63
<b>2 weeks after</b>	1147 (255)	5

256

257

258 Figure 4 depicts the cumulative COVID-19 death rates of each IMD decile over the whole of the first  
 259 wave. Mortality rates in more deprived areas (deciles 1 and 2) were rising faster than others at the  
 260 start of lockdown (vertical dotted line), and the disparity in cumulative mortality grew as the  
 261 pandemic progressed.



262

263 **Figure 4. Cumulative COVID-19 death rates per 100,000 for areas of each IMD decile over the first**

264 **wave of the pandemic in 307 local authorities in England. Dotted line marks timing of the**

265 **announcement of the first lockdown, zoomed in area between weeks 13 and 14.**

266


267 Up until week 15 when the effects of lockdown may have started to be seen in mortality data, the

268 cumulative death rate per 100,000 persons already differed by IMD decile. The two most deprived

269 deciles recorded 77.16 deaths per 100,000 persons by this time, whereas the two least deprived  
270 deciles recorded only 50.01 deaths per 100,000 persons. This inequality reduced by the time the first  
271 wave had passed (by week 27), but did not equalise, with the most deprived two deciles recording  
272 316.14 total deaths per 100,000 persons, and the least deprived recording 245.10 deaths per 100,00  
273 persons. These equate to an excess of 54% before lockdown versus 29% after lockdown.

274

275 Figure 5 illustrates the geographical distribution of deprivation based on IMD and the total  
276 cumulative age-standardised COVID-19 death rate per 100,000 persons over the first wave of the  
277 pandemic. London and the North West featured many of the areas with the highest overall death  
278 rates. Although these areas featured many deprived local authorities, the distributions were not  
279 identical.



280

281 **Figure 5. Average rank of the index of multiple deprivation (IMD) and total cumulative COVID-19**  
282 **death rate per 100,000 persons over the first wave of the pandemic (weeks 1 to 27, 2020) per local**  
283 **authority in England.**

284

## 285 **Discussion**

286 This study has provided the first examination of the evolution of inequalities in the COVID-19  
287 pandemic. It has found that inequalities in COVID-19 mortality rates by deprivation in England began  
288 to appear early in the first wave. More deprived local authorities generally started recording COVID-  
289 19 deaths earlier than less deprived areas, and mortality rates also increased faster in more deprived  
290 areas, and rose to higher peak rates. All of the 307 lower-tier local authorities in England began  
291 recording COVID-19 deaths as early as 2 weeks before first national lockdown in England was  
292 announced, or up to 2 weeks afterwards, with the latter – less deprived - group of local authorities  
293 recording fewer cumulative deaths over the whole of the first wave, compared to the former – more  
294 deprived – group of local authorities.

295

296 The study has also provided the first assessment of the impacts of the first English national lock  
297 down on the evolution of the pandemic. It has found that following the implementation of the  
298 national lockdown, local authorities where death rates had been rising faster (i.e. more deprived  
299 areas), peaked and began to descend earlier than the other – less deprived – local authorities.  
300 Cumulative death rates were higher in more deprived areas by the time lockdown began, but the  
301 difference narrowed moderately towards the end of the first wave.

302

303

304 England imposed a national lockdown during the first wave of the COVID-19 epidemic in March  
305 2020(19). This measure aimed to drastically reduce instances of interpersonal contact between  
306 infected individuals (whether symptomatic or not) and the wider susceptible population. Confining  
307 the public to their homes, suspending face-to-face education and restricting travel placed great  
308 burdens upon the health and welfare of many individuals and communities, through a number of  
309 pathways that are still being elucidated, and which will continue to emerge(20–22). There is no  
310 doubt that the economic implications of such lockdowns can be severe, and disruptions to usual  
311 health care provision have led to increased mortality from non-COVID causes (23). However, the  
312 risks posed to society of not imposing such lockdowns are likely much greater(24). Unchecked viral  
313 spread would lead to mass fatalities, increased disability rates especially in the young from the  
314 effects of non-fatal infection (so-called ‘Long COVID’(25)), and an increased risk of viral mutation  
315 into forms which may pose even greater threat(26). Importantly, the National Health Service (NHS)  
316 could potentially be filled beyond capacity with COVID-19 patients, leaving insufficient resources for  
317 non-COVID patients of all ages and diagnoses. Economic implications of unchecked viral spread are  
318 likely to be considerably worse than those caused by national lockdowns, and could continue for  
319 longer due to the likelihood of future outbreaks of mutated viral strains and multiple waves of  
320 infection(24). A well-timed national lockdown has the ability to reduce case incidence to low levels  
321 at which ‘test, trace and isolate’ programs can efficiently extinguish local outbreaks, and lends time  
322 for mass vaccination to offer protection, especially to the most vulnerable. However, a lockdown  
323 that is imposed too late, i.e. when disease incidence is already high and rising, needs to be  
324 substantially more stringent and protracted to offer the same slowing effect on case numbers and,  
325 subsequently, deaths(24).

326

327 Previous work has focused on comparing COVID-19 mortality rates between areas of England using  
328 set time periods without considering the evolution of the inequalities reported(21), or have

329 identified inequalities in case rates and other metrics(13). Using mortality data removes some of the  
330 uncertainty surrounding early case ascertainment, since early in the English epidemic, testing was  
331 only being performed in hospitals on symptomatic individuals, and so many infections would not  
332 have been recorded.

333

334 It has been noted internationally that the seeding of SARS-CoV-2 into a country tends to be via travel  
335 by people at the upper end of the socio-economic spectrum, taking international holidays or  
336 travelling for business(27,28). Cases then increase within these less deprived populations until social  
337 distancing and national lockdowns are advised or mandated. At this point, the disease burden shifts  
338 to the more deprived, who are less able to fully adhere to these guidelines due to less ability to work  
339 from home, fewer resources, precarious work, higher population densities and other pre-existing  
340 factors(27). These two ‘phases’ of pandemic spread likely apply to COVID-19 cases in England, where  
341 the index cases were holidaymakers returning from skiing trips to Austria(29,30). Plümper *et al*  
342 (2020) reported that in Germany, despite a somewhat reduced likelihood of infection for those in  
343 more deprived areas in the first phase of the epidemic, these communities were nevertheless at  
344 similar risk of death. This relative risk of mortality increases for more deprived areas once  
345 transmission is established in ‘phase 2’ of the pandemic – due to population vulnerabilities including  
346 poverty, overcrowding and pre-existing chronic conditions(6). Our analysis of early-stage mortality in  
347 England confirmed this structure, in that mortality rates rose first to a small initial ‘peak’ in less  
348 deprived areas, before being dominated by more deprived local authorities. The earliest data  
349 available to the German study began more than 2 weeks following the implementation of  
350 government lockdowns, whereas the analysis we present here predate the UK lockdown by a  
351 number of months, and hence capture the very earliest data available on COVID-19 deaths.

352

353 We have shown that inequalities in cumulative death rates during the first wave of infection in  
354 England existed from the earliest stages of COVID-19 mortality reporting, and were entrenched by  
355 differences in the speed of increase, leading to unequal burdens of cumulative mortality at local  
356 authority level by the time the first national lockdown was called. These inequalities reduced  
357 marginally but were not abolished by the national control measures implemented in the lockdown.  
358 The first national lockdown in England was fairly strict (e.g. a ‘stay at home order’) and it was a  
359 universal intervention, enforced and applied to the whole population and thereby requiring little by  
360 way of individual agency. Previous public health research has shown that such measures are more  
361 likely to reduce inequalities in health than those that require individual choice/compliance(31). That  
362 the lockdown did not completely eliminate geographical inequalities in COVID-19 mortality may well  
363 be as a result of inequalities in (1) *vulnerability* (whereby more deprived areas had a higher burden  
364 of clinical risk factors); (2) *susceptibility* (whereby immune response was lower in more deprived  
365 populations due to the adverse consequences of long term exposures to harmful living and  
366 environmental conditions); (3) *exposure* (inequalities in working conditions notably less ability to  
367 work at home in the low income jobs predominating within more deprived local authorities); and (4)  
368 *transmission* (higher rates of overcrowding and population density in the community may have  
369 impacted on infection spread in more deprived areas)(6).

370

## 371 **Conclusion**

372 This study has found that inequalities in death rates during the first wave of infection in England  
373 existed from the earliest stages of the COVID-19 pandemic, and were entrenched by differences in  
374 the speed of increase. This led to a significant unequal burden in cumulative mortality between the  
375 most and least deprived local authorities by the time the first national lockdown was implemented.  
376 These inequalities reduced marginally - but were not abolished - during the national lockdown. It is  
377 impossible to say with certainty whether an earlier – or longer - national lockdown could have

378 further reduced these inequalities, but it should be noted that, although the lockdown did reverse  
379 the trend in mortality rates across the country, it had to do so at more advanced stages of the  
380 epidemic in more deprived areas, compounding the unequal disease burden upon these  
381 communities and local health care systems. Susceptibility to infection and fatality from COVID-19 is  
382 undoubtedly closely associated with deprivation, but other factors also play an important part, as  
383 well as the stochasticity implicit in viral spread. Nevertheless, our understanding of how deprivation  
384 associates with mortality from a novel infectious disease within a virgin population it can help to  
385 focus future public health attention on those communities most in need and at risk.

386

### 387 **Limitations**

388 Weekly age-standardised mortality rates were not available at local authority level at the time of  
389 writing. However, we were able to pro rata monthly age-standardised rates to weekly ones using  
390 weekly death counts. Age-standardised weekly rates are unlikely to become available at lower  
391 geography levels due to disclosure risks. Death counts did not include deaths of non-residents of  
392 England, nor where place of residence was unknown, and was based on date of registration rather  
393 than date of death.

394 Deprivation is undoubtedly linked to COVID-19 mortality, it cannot explain all of the variation in  
395 area-level mortality rates, hence COVID-19 mortality and IMD are not perfectly correlated. Many  
396 other factors including comorbidity, healthcare provision, employment types and variation in  
397 transport links all likely play a part in the causal web linking lockdowns to mortality inequalities. A  
398 deeper analysis of these underlying associations was beyond the scope of the current paper, but  
399 warrants further scrutiny.

400

401



## 402 References

- 403 1. Pillai J, Motloba P, Motaung KSC, Ozougwu LU, Ikalafeng BK, Marinda E, et al. The effect of  
404 lockdown regulations on SARS-CoV-2 infectivity in Gauteng Province, South Africa. *South*  
405 *African Medical Journal*. 2020;110(11):1119–23.
- 406 2. Chen JT, Krieger N. Revealing the unequal burden of COVID-19 by income, race/ethnicity, and  
407 household crowding: US county versus zip code analyses. *Journal of Public Health*  
408 *Management and Practice*. 2021;27(1):S46–56.
- 409 3. Laster Pirtle WN. Racial Capitalism: A Fundamental Cause of Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19)  
410 Pandemic Inequities in the United States. *Health Education and Behavior*. 2020;
- 411 4. van Barneveld K, Quinlan M, Kriesler P, Junor A, Baum F, Chowdhury A, et al. The COVID-19  
412 pandemic: Lessons on building more equal and sustainable societies. *Economic and Labour*  
413 *Relations Review*. 2020;
- 414 5. Nazroo J, Becares L. Evidence for ethnic inequalities in mortality related to COVID-19  
415 infections: Findings from an ecological analysis of England and Wales. *medRxiv*. 2020;
- 416 6. Bamba C, Riordan R, Ford J, Matthews F. The COVID-19 pandemic and health inequalities.  
417 *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*. 2020;74(11):964–8.
- 418 7. Public Health England. Disparities in the risk and outcomes of COVID-19. 2020;89. Available  
419 from: [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-review-of-disparities-in-risks-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-review-of-disparities-in-risks-and-outcomes)  
420 [and-outcomes](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-review-of-disparities-in-risks-and-outcomes)
- 421 8. Baena-Díez JM, Barroso M, Cordeiro-Coelho SI, Díaz JL, Grau M. Impact of COVID-19 outbreak  
422 by income: Hitting hardest the most deprived. *Journal of Public Health (United Kingdom)*.  
423 2020;42(4):698–703.
- 424 9. Public Health England. Disparities in the risk and outcomes of COVID-19 [Internet]. London;  
425 2020. Available from: [www.facebook.com/PublicHealthEngland](http://www.facebook.com/PublicHealthEngland)
- 426 10. Katikireddi SV, Lal S, Carrol ED, Niedzwiedz CL, Khunti K, Dundas R, et al. Unequal impact of  
427 the COVID-19 crisis on minority ethnic groups: A framework for understanding and  
428 addressing inequalities. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*. 2021;75(10):970–4.
- 429 11. Salvatore M, Basu D, Ray D, Kleinsasser M, Purkayastha S, Bhattacharyya R, et al.  
430 Comprehensive public health evaluation of lockdown as a non-pharmaceutical intervention  
431 on COVID-19 spread in India: National trends masking state-level variations. *BMJ Open*.  
432 2020;10(12).
- 433 12. Desvars-Larrive A, Dervic E, Haug N, Niederkrotenthaler T, Chen J, di Natale A, et al. A  
434 structured open dataset of government interventions in response to COVID-19. *Scientific*  
435 *Data*. 2020;7(1):1–9.
- 436 13. Morrissey K, Spooner F, Salter J, Shaddick G. Area level deprivation and monthly COVID-19  
437 cases: The impact of government policy in England. *Social Science & Medicine [Internet]*.  
438 2021;289(September):114413. Available from:  
439 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114413>

- 440 14. HM Government. The Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (England) Regulations  
441 2020 [Internet]. SI 350. 2020 [cited 2021 Feb 23]. Available from:  
442 <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2020/350/contents/made>
- 443 15. HM Government. The Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (No. 2) (England)  
444 Regulations 2020 [Internet]. SI2020/684. 2020 [cited 2021 Feb 23]. Available from:  
445 <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2020/684/contents/made>
- 446 16. Sun Y, Hu X, Xie J. Spatial inequalities of COVID-19 mortality rate in relation to socioeconomic  
447 and environmental factors across England. *Science of the Total Environment*.  
448 2021;758(January).
- 449 17. Platt L, Warwick R. COVID-19 and Ethnic Inequalities in England and Wales\*. *Fiscal Studies*.  
450 2020;41(2):259–89.
- 451 18. Timson A. What geographic inequalities in COVID-19 mortality rates and health can tell us  
452 about levelling up | The Health Foundation. The Health Foundation [Internet]. 2021;(July).  
453 Available from: [https://www.health.org.uk/news-and-comment/charts-and-](https://www.health.org.uk/news-and-comment/charts-and-infographics/what-geographic-inequalities-in-covid-19-mortality-rates-can-tell-us-about-levelling-up)  
454 [infographics/what-geographic-inequalities-in-covid-19-mortality-rates-can-tell-us-about-](https://www.health.org.uk/news-and-comment/charts-and-infographics/what-geographic-inequalities-in-covid-19-mortality-rates-can-tell-us-about-levelling-up)  
455 [levelling-up](https://www.health.org.uk/news-and-comment/charts-and-infographics/what-geographic-inequalities-in-covid-19-mortality-rates-can-tell-us-about-levelling-up)
- 456 19. Griffith GJ, Davey Smith G, Manley D, Howe LD, Owen G. Interrogating structural inequalities  
457 in COVID-19 mortality in England and Wales. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*.  
458 2021;1–7.
- 459 20. Office for National Statistics. Analysis of death registrations not involving coronavirus (COVID-  
460 19), England and Wales: 28 December 2019 to 1 May 2020. 2020.
- 461 21. ONS. Deaths due to COVID-19 by local area and deprivation [Internet]. 2021. Available from:  
462 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deaths](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deaths/datasets/deathsduetocovid19bylocalareaanddeprivation)  
463 [/datasets/deathsduetocovid19bylocalareaanddeprivation](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deaths/datasets/deathsduetocovid19bylocalareaanddeprivation)
- 464 22. Ministry of Housing Communities & Local Government. English Indices of Deprivation 2019 -  
465 Summaries at Local Authority Level [Internet]. Open Data. 2019. Available from:  
466 <http://opendatacommunities.org/data/societal-wellbeing/imd2019/indicesbyla>
- 467 23. Office for National Statistics. Local Authority Districts (December 2019) Boundaries UK BUC.  
468 Open Geography Portal [Internet]. Available from:  
469 [https://geoportal.statistics.gov.uk/datasets/local-authority-districts-december-2019-](https://geoportal.statistics.gov.uk/datasets/local-authority-districts-december-2019-boundaries-uk-buc)  
470 [boundaries-uk-buc](https://geoportal.statistics.gov.uk/datasets/local-authority-districts-december-2019-boundaries-uk-buc)
- 471 24. BBC News. Coronavirus: Strict new curbs on life in UK announced by PM [Internet]. 2020.  
472 Available from: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-52012432>
- 473 25. Richardson DL, Duncan MJ, Clarke ND, Myers TD, Tallis J. The influence of COVID-19 measures  
474 in the United Kingdom on physical activity levels, perceived physical function and mood in  
475 older adults: A survey-based observational study. *Journal of Sports Sciences* [Internet].  
476 2020;00(00):1–13. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2020.1850984>
- 477 26. Ball S, Banerjee A, Berry C, Boyle JR, Bray B, Bradlow W, et al. Monitoring indirect impact of  
478 COVID-19 pandemic on services for cardiovascular diseases in the UK. *Heart*.  
479 2020;106(24):1890–7.

- 480 27. Henry N, Parthiban S, Farroha A. The effect of COVID-19 lockdown on the incidence of  
481 deliberate self-harm injuries presenting to the emergency room. *International Journal of*  
482 *Psychiatry in Medicine*. 2020;1–12.
- 483 28. Vandoros S. Excess mortality during the Covid-19 pandemic: Early evidence from England and  
484 Wales. *Social Science and Medicine* [Internet]. 2020;258(June):113101. Available from:  
485 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113101>
- 486 29. Balmford B, Annan JD, Hargreaves JC, Altoè M, Bateman IJ. Cross-Country Comparisons of  
487 Covid-19: Policy, Politics and the Price of Life. *Environmental and Resource Economics*  
488 [Internet]. 2020;76(4):525–51. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-020-00466-5>
- 489 30. Iacobucci G. Long covid: Damage to multiple organs presents in young, low risk patients. *Bmj*.  
490 2020;m4470.
- 491 31. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Risk related to the spread of new SARS-  
492 CoV-2 variants of concern in the EU/EEA-first update. 2021;(January):29. Available from:  
493 [https://beta.microreact.org/project/r8vBmatkC9mcfRJ6bUtNr-cog-uk-2021-01-09-sars-cov-](https://beta.microreact.org/project/r8vBmatkC9mcfRJ6bUtNr-cog-uk-2021-01-09-sars-cov-2-in-the-uk/)  
494 [2-in-the-uk/](https://beta.microreact.org/project/r8vBmatkC9mcfRJ6bUtNr-cog-uk-2021-01-09-sars-cov-2-in-the-uk/)
- 495 32. Plümper T, Neumayer E. The pandemic predominantly hits poor neighbourhoods? SARS-CoV-  
496 2 infections and COVID-19 fatalities in German districts. *European journal of public health*.  
497 2020;30(6):1176–80.
- 498 33. Clouston SAP, Natale G, Link BG. Socioeconomic inequalities in the spread of coronavirus-19  
499 in the United States: A examination of the emergence of social inequalities. *Social Science*  
500 *and Medicine* [Internet]. 2021;268(November 2020):113554. Available from:  
501 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113554>
- 502 34. Wikipedia. COVID-19 pandemic in the United Kingdom [Internet]. [cited 2021 Feb 4].  
503 Available from: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/COVID-19\\_pandemic\\_in\\_the\\_United\\_Kingdom](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/COVID-19_pandemic_in_the_United_Kingdom)
- 504 35. Correa-Martínez CL, Kampmeier S, Kümpers P, Schwierzeck V, Hennies M, Hafezi W, et al. A  
505 pandemic in times of global tourism: Superspreading and exportation of COVID-19 cases from  
506 a ski area in Austria. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*. 2020;58(6):19–21.
- 507 36. Adams J, Mytton O, White M, Monsivais P. Why Are Some Population Interventions for Diet  
508 and Obesity More Equitable and Effective Than Others? *The Role of Individual Agency*. *PLoS*  
509 *Medicine*. 2016;13(4):1–7.
- 510