Short-term Birth Sequelae of the 1918-20 Influenza Pandemic in the United States: State-Level Analysis

Siddharth Chandra, PhD
Asian Studies Center, James Madison College, and Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Michigan State University
Asian Studies Center, James Madison
Phone: 1 517 884-2116
Fax: 1 517 432 2659
Email: chandr45@msu.edu

Julia Christensen, BA
Asian Studies Center, Michigan State University
Phone: NA
Fax: NA
Email: chris591@msu.edu

Svenn-Erik Mamelund, PhD
Work Research Institute, Oslo Metropolitan University
Phone: +47 971 000 44
Fax: NA
Email: masv@oslomet.no

Nigel Paneth, MD, MPH
Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Michigan State University
Phone: 1 517 884-3961
Fax: NA
Email: paneth@epi.msu.edu

Abstract word count: 191

Text word count: 3,391

Abstract

This paper illuminates short-term birth sequelae of the influenza pandemic of 1918-20 in the USA using monthly data on births and all-cause deaths for 19 US states in conjunction with data on maternal deaths, stillbirths, and premature births. The data on births and all-cause deaths are adjusted for seasonal and trend effects, and the residual components of the two time series coinciding with the timing of peak influenza mortality are examined for these sequelae. Notable findings include (i) a drop in births in the three months following peak mortality, (ii) a reversion in births to normal levels occurring 5-7 months after peak mortality, and (iii) a steep drop in births occurring 9-10 months after peak mortality. Interpreted in the context of parallel data showing elevated premature births, stillbirths, and maternal mortality during times of peak influenza mortality, these findings suggest that the main impacts of the 1918-20 influenza on reproduction occurred through (a) impaired conceptions, possibly due to effects on fertility and behavioral changes, (b) an increase in the preterm delivery rate during the peak of the pandemic, and (c) elevated maternal and fetal mortality, resulting in late-term losses in pregnancy.

Key words: Influenza; pandemic; 1918; USA; deaths; fertility; mortality; preterm births

Abbreviations:
NC: North Carolina
SAS: Statistical Analysis System
UK: United Kingdom
US: United States (adjective)
USA: United States of America (noun)

Accounting for an estimated 675,000 deaths in the USA and 50 million deaths worldwide, the 1918-20 influenza pandemic dealt a severe blow to populations across the world (1). While the mortality effects of the pandemic have received substantial attention, its effects on a second key demographic driver, births, are not well studied. Yet we know that epidemic influenza had profound impacts on those planning to get pregnant, pregnant women, and fetal outcomes. For example, a 1919 study of maternal mortality during the pandemic found that "in cases complicated by pneumonia, 50 percent of patients died," (2, p.980; see also 3). In addition, a report from the Bureau of the Census revealed a noticeable decline in the birth rate in 1919 (4), suggesting that, even after adjusting for maternal deaths, births declined.

Viewed in this context, an understanding of the associations between the pandemic and subsequent patterns of births can shed light on a variety of significant health phenomena: (i) the risks posed to the developing fetus from the influenza virus (5); (ii) the implications of infection for preterm births and preparedness for such outcomes; (iii) vaccination policy for pregnant women; (iv) effects of infection on fertility (6); and (v) possible behavioral interruptions that may affect conceptions in a time of widespread illness (7-9). The aim of this paper is to explore the short-term birth sequelae of the influenza pandemic of 1918-20 in the USA with a view to parsing out the various mechanisms, listed above, linking influenza to subsequent births. In order to ascertain the robustness of the findings, we examine not only the well-recognized October 1918 wave of the pandemic, but also the subsequent and hitherto ignored February 1920 wave.

METHODS:

Data:

In order to explore associations between the 1918-20 influenza pandemic and patterns of births, we collected state-level time series data on monthly births and all-cause deaths for the years 1916-1921, for a total of 72 observations for each series for each state. We chose to use excess all-cause deaths rather than deaths from respiratory illnesses as an indicator of the timing of the pandemic for two reasons. First, the toll of the pandemic was manifested by elevated mortality from a long list of causes. A report from Massachusetts, for example, listed 85 different conditions as possible causes of pandemic-related mortality, among them influenza, three types of pneumonia, tuberculosis, meningitis, heart disease, and "accidents" of pregnancy and labor (10, pp.180-89). Second, the states that reported monthly statistics on mortality from respiratory diseases did not do so in a uniform manner.

Most US states were not part of the national births and deaths registration area by 1918 (11, 12). Therefore, we used monthly data on deaths and births for the 19 states that had joined the registration area by 1917 to study these patterns (Table 1). This balanced the need for data from a geographically diverse array of states with the need for including a mix of pre- and post-pandemic data with which to establish baseline patterns of births and deaths. These data were obtained from birth and mortality statistics produced by the United States Bureau of the Census (4, 11, 12, 13-20). We also used a geographically and temporally sparse set of monthly data on numbers of preterm births, mortality from preterm births, stillbirths, and maternal mortality to interpret the findings on births and deaths (10, 21-28; Table 2).

A common limitation of data on births and deaths is under-reporting. However, the emphasis of this paper is not on the number of births and deaths but rather on the timing of peaks and troughs in births and deaths. Therefore, even if births and deaths were being systematically underreported, significant one-time fluctuations would be captured in the data, as evidenced by the October 1918 and February 1920 spikes in mortality (Figure 1A-D).

Statistical methods:

The original monthly time series data on deaths and births were decomposed into three components using the SAS (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC) PROC X12 seasonal decomposition algorithm (29, 30) with outlier detection. These included the seasonal (wavelength of 12 months), trend (long-wavelength), and irregular (residual or non-seasonal/non-trend) components. This method is appropriate for filtering out those components of births and deaths that were attributable to systematic seasonal (such as seasonal influenza) or trend (such as long-term improvements in life-saving health interventions) phenomena, bringing into focus one-time events such as the influenza pandemic. The irregular component of the death series was used as the measure of excess deaths associated with the pandemic. We applied the same methods to the birth data and examined the irregular component of the birth data in the (temporal) vicinity of the pandemic for anomalies whose timing may have been associated with the pandemic. The algorithm provided satisfactory results for the birth data for all 19 states. However, for seven of the 19 states, the decomposition algorithm allocated a large portion of the excess deaths to the trend component rather than the irregular component. This mis-allocation occurred for states for which the mortality peak occurred for an extended period of time (two or three months, rather than the more commonly observed one month), resulting in the algorithm treating a portion of the deaths occurring at that time as regular. In these cases, the influenza-attributable deaths were computed as the sum of the trend and irregular components of the original series (henceforth ‘seasonally adjusted’ mortality) rather than just the irregular (henceforth ‘excess’ mortality) component, bringing the data into alignment with the data for the other 12 states.

RESULTS:

Table 3 provides a summary of the results for the 19 states of the USA. Figure 1A-D shows patterns of excess deaths and births occurring at the time of the pandemic for the four states with the highest numbers of excess deaths estimated using only the irregular component of the original series, namely New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Maryland. These are states for which birth-related sequelae are most likely to be detectable given the greater impact of the pandemic in terms of lives lost and, presumably, infections. The first point to note is how similar the graphs are for the four states. All four states experienced a major excess mortality peak in October 1918, followed by a second and smaller excess mortality peak in February 1920. The immediate aftermath of the October 1918 mortality peak was marked by a dip in births, followed by a noticeable spike in births peaking at six months after the excess mortality peak, and then followed by a precipitous drop in births in July 1919, nine months after the October 1918 mortality peak. This last phenomenon is also discernible for the USA as a whole in a graph published in the *Birth Statistics* report of 1921 (4), reproduced here as Figure 2. These findings extend to the other states examined, albeit with more variability as states with lower numbers of deaths are included in the sample, as follows:

i) There is a depression in births for three months after peak mortality (Figure 1A-D).

ii) There is an apparent spike in births occurring 5-7 months after peak mortality. This phenomenon is seen in 15 of the 19 states. The (arithmetic) mean size of the spike in births in percentage terms across the states is 6% (Table 3, column 10). This spike occurs uniformly between March and June 1919; for 10 of the 15 states, it occurs in April 1919 (Table 3, column 8). For the six largest states (in terms of seasonally adjusted as well as excess mortality), this peak uniformly occurs six months after the mortality peak, in April 1919 (Table 3, column 8).

iii) There is a notable depression in births occurring 9-10 months after peak mortality in all 19 states analyzed. The (arithmetic) mean size of the dip in births in percentage terms across the states is 10% (Table 3, column 7), which is related to the decline in the birth rate seen in 1919 in Figure 2, from approximately 23 per 1,000 population to 20 per 1,000 population or 13%. This dip occurs uniformly in July or August 1919 (Table 3, column 5).

An additional notable finding is that the fall 1918 mortality wave was followed in early 1920 by another wave. This 1920 wave, though also noted in Chile, Japan, Scandinavia, and Taiwan, has not been closely examined in the context of the USA or much of Europe (1, 8, 9, 31). Although the data show that the 1920 wave was less severe than the 1918 wave in most (but not all) locations, it was widespread and reported in both the domestic and international press (32-35). In addition to the states for which we have data, a number of others also experienced the 1920 wave, including Texas and Hawaii (36-38). A *Manchester Guardian* headline referred to "the American influenza epidemic" on January 23, 1920 (35). Press reports indicate that the 1920 wave struck Europe as well (39, 40).

Our analysis found that the 1920 wave occurred in February in 17 of the 19 states for which we have data, and in February and March in the remaining two (Table 4). Interestingly, here again we observe two dips in births, the first during the three months immediately following the February 1920 mortality peak and then again nine months after the peak (Table 4 and Figure 1A-D).

DISCUSSION:

The effects of influenza on reproductive outcomes can take many forms, only some of which can be directly monitored in vital data of the time. Early fetal deaths are not recorded in any vital data system, and stillbirths, during the period of interest, were only occasionally recorded on a monthly basis (10, 21-28). Monthly infant deaths were frequently distinguished in vital data, as were childbirth-associated maternal deaths. Therefore, while monitoring some of the direct effects of reproductive damage from the influenza of 1918 is possible, for other effects it remains difficult.

A few authors have examined birth rates in periods surrounding the peak mortality of the epidemic in an attempt to infer the likely effect of the epidemic on the course of pregnancy (5-9). However, ambiguities necessarily attend such an exercise. For example, the US Army was at war in Europe during the height of the pandemic. In November 1918, the draft and mobilization were at full capacity. By May 1918, hundreds of thousands of troops were deploying overseas monthly (41). The extensive mobilization process feeding this system had to be reversed over the course of winter 1918-1919. Thus, troops from overseas did not return in large numbers until late spring and summer 1919, with the last division arriving in September

1919 (42). Based on this chronology, we would expect a steady decline in births starting nine months after the first sizeable deployments. Such a drawdown would be captured and filtered out in the trend component of the time series. Notably, the draft appears to have had only a slight impact on the birth rate (43) and, as Table 5 shows, there is no evidence in US birth rate statistics of a baby boom in the aftermath of the war.

More importantly for the purposes of this study, a deficit of births in relation to the epidemic could arise from voluntary postponement due to fear of infection or not wishing to infect the spouse, failure to conceive because of illness or spousal death from influenza or spousal separation associated with the war, from maternal death while pregnant, from fetal death, from preterm birth, or from any combination of these adversities. The timing of the birth deficit, however, might differ among these outcomes. If we use the time of peak mortality as the time when the strongest effects of influenza were felt on men or women of reproductive age, then a deficit of births 9 months later would likely indicate impaired fertility. If the effect on births were partly because of maternal deaths in pregnancy, the deficit in births would be observed whenever in gestation pregnancy influenza was most lethal. The literature of the time (2, 3, 44, 45) suggests that the largest maternal mortality effect occurred in the third trimester of pregnancy, often shortly after delivery of a stillborn infant near term, but sometimes without the mother going into labor. Such patterns would be likely to manifest as a birth deficit within the first few months after peak mortality. This phenomenon is also visible in Figure 1A-D.

The timing of a deficit of births in relation to an effect of influenza on miscarriage or fetal death without maternal death is likely to be highly variable, depending on when in gestation the principal effect occurred. In reports at the time, pregnancy losses without maternal death seemed for the most part evenly distributed throughout pregnancy (3, 44). This contrasts with the ordinary pattern of pregnancy losses, where first trimester losses exceed later stillbirths by an order of a magnitude. One must keep in mind, however, that the earliest losses were more likely to remain unreported. If influenza increased preterm birth, then one might see an excess of preterm deliveries during the peak mortality, followed by an equivalent deficit in subsequent months.

With these considerations in mind, we now turn to the available monthly data on four phenomena, preterm births, deaths attributable to preterm births, stillbirths, and childbirth-associated maternal deaths. Figures 3A-C, 4, and 5 demonstrate that all four numbers spiked during the October 1918 or February 1920 pandemic mortality waves. Viewed in the context of the above discussion, the observations identified above may be interpreted as follows:

Observation 1: A drop in births in the three months following each of the mortality peaks of October 1918 and February 1920.

Interpretation: This phenomenon is consistent with the observed excess of preterm births and prematurity-associated mortality during the pandemic (Figures 3A, 4, and 5). Reports of the course of pandemic influenza in pregnancy in recent epidemics have indicated increases in premature labor and preterm births in women with severe disease, in some but not all epidemics (3, 44). The severe Asian influenza of 1957 produced few reports of pregnancy complications. One exception was a series of some 700 pregnant women in Baltimore monitored monthly for influenza symptoms and seroconversion (46). 83% of the women were found to be seropositive to influenza A/Japan/305-57, with peaks of both reported symptoms and positive serology in October 1957. An overall relative risk of preterm birth of 1.6 (not significant) compared to uninfected women was found, but if infection occurred in the first trimester, the relative risk was 2.4 ($P < .05$).

Neonatal mortality rates are greatly influenced by prematurity rates, and further evidence for an effect of influenza on prematurity is seen in a report of elevated neonatal mortality in the UK in the first half of 1970, and especially the first quarter of that year (47). This elevated mortality was linked to the severe Asian influenza (A2 Hong-Kong variant) of the winter of 1969-1970. The British report found both an increase in mortality diagnostic codes linked to prematurity and increases in low birthweight prevalence in several parts of the UK that paralleled the neonatal mortality increase. The occurrence of this excess neonatal mortality only months after the epidemic peak was interpreted as further evidence for an effect on preterm birth. Interestingly, no increase in neonatal mortality was found in UK vital data in relation to four earlier severe influenza epidemics in the UK (1951, 1953, 1959, and 1961). A French report also linked the 1969-70 influenza to an increase in prematurity (48), but the effect of the Hong-Kong influenza on neonatal mortality in other countries was mixed (47), with increases similar to those found in the UK in New York City, Scotland, Germany and the Netherlands. However, there were no changes in prematurity rates in Poland or Ireland.

The 2009 pandemic A/H1N1 influenza is the most studied pandemic in recent history. Numerous reports from that epidemic have reported substantial increases in preterm birth, with relative risk ranging from 2 – 5 (49-55), and several series described prematurity rates above 30%. This effect, however, was largely restricted to hospitalized or severely ill pregnant patients. Studies reflecting the general population experience showed little or no increase in preterm birth (56, 57). The 1918-19 experience, in which the number of severely affected women was very high, appears to be compatible with the increases in preterm birth found in severely affected women during some pandemics of recent years, especially the pandemics of 1969 and 2009, although the number of severely affected cases in 2009 was apparently too few to change the overall prematurity rate in the general population.

In addition to elevated preterm deliveries, fetal loss coinciding with the pandemic could explain a deficit in births in the first few months after peak mortality if the infection have occurred in the third trimester of pregnancy, i.e. producing stillbirths (Figures 3B, 4), and not early fetal losses. Contemporary accounts of the course of influenza in pregnancy also uniformly describe high maternal mortality, often occurring late in pregnancy, with concomitant fetal loss shortly before death (2, 3, 44, 58; Figures 3C, 5). Thus, this early drop in births may have reflected a combination of preterm births and stillbirths associated with maternal deaths. Among women who died from influenza in pregnancy, only a small fraction appear to have delivered a live infant (2, 3, 44, 58).

Observation 2: A noticeable spike in births occurring 5-7 months after peak mortality. This phenomenon is seen in 15 of the 19 states. For the six worst affected states (in terms of seasonally adjusted as well as excess mortality), this peak uniformly occurs six months after the mortality peak.

Interpretation: This spike reflects a reversion in the direction of normal levels of births for a brief period between the declines in births immediately following the pandemic (Observation 1, above) and the subsequent drop eight to ten months after the pandemic (Observation 3, below). The seasonal adjustment algorithm identifies this mean reversion as a spike (i.e., excess births) because it is observed against the backdrop of lower levels of births in the preceding and subsequent months. Yet evidence from both birth statistics and birth rates shows that this ‘spike’ merely brought these numbers back into the normal range (see, for example the data for the spring of 1919 in Figure 2).

Observation 3: A notable dip in births occurring 8-10 months after peak mortality in 18 of the 19 states analyzed with Washington, the exception, showing a dip 7-10 months after the mortality peak.

Interpretation: This suggests that primary infertility was produced by the epidemic, with fewer conceptions for either behavioral or biological reasons. This dip in births nine months after the peak mortality month parallels findings on Japan, Taiwan, and Norway (6-9). The behavioral reasons for a drop in conceptions during the peak of the epidemic in October 1918 include voluntary postponement of conceptions due to fear from the pandemic and a wish not to infect the spouse and, among couples not pregnant, spousal sickness or death (6, 7). A biological reason for a decline in conception was the temporary sterility reported among men (but not women) infected by influenza (59).

Conclusion:

From our analysis of nationally disaggregated data on pandemic activity, stillbirths, birth rates, preterm births, deaths from preterm births, and childbirth-associated mortality from both the October 1918 and the February 1920 waves of the influenza pandemic we can conclude, first, that the major impact of the pandemic on reproduction was felt through impaired conceptions. The degree to which this phenomenon can be attributed to effects on fertility and behavioral changes is a topic for future research. Second, a combined phenomenon of elevated preterm delivery and mortality, maternal mortality, and fetal mortality was observed coinciding with peak influenza mortality, followed by a natality depression in the three months immediately following the pandemic peaks. This shows that significant fetal losses occurred late in pregnancy. Third, we do not see evidence in these data for early pregnancy loss as hypothesized in earlier research (5), which used nationally aggregated data on pandemic activity, stillbirths, and birth rates to find a natality depression that reached its nadir 6.1-6.8 months after peak influenza activity and concluded that first-trimester miscarriages were responsible for this phenomenon. In other words, the risks posed to the developing fetus from the 1918-20 influenza virus appear to have stemmed primarily from the mechanisms of maternal mortality, preterm delivery, and fetal infection. These risks could have important implications for vaccination policies relating to pregnant women, indicating the need for a second line of research emerging from our findings.

Acknowledgements

Siddharth Chandra, Michigan State University and Julia Christensen, Michigan State University gratefully acknowledge financial support from Michigan State University's James Madison College and International Studies and Programs.

Siddharth Chandra, Michigan State University, Julia Christensen, Michigan State University Svenn-Erik Mamelund, Oslo Metropolitan University, and Nigel Paneth, Michigan State University have no conflicts of interest to declare.

References

1. Johnson NP, Mueller J. Updating the accounts: global mortality of the 1918-1920 "Spanish" influenza pandemic. *Bull Hist Med.* 2002 Spring;76(1):105-15.

2. Harris J. Influenza occurring in pregnant women: a statistical study of thirteen hundred and fifty cases. *JAMA.* 1919; 72(14):978–980.

3. Titus P, Jamison J. Pregnancy complicated by epidemic influenza. *JAMA*. 1919;72(23):1665–1668.

4. Bureau of the Census. *Birth Statistics for the Registration Area of the United States 1921*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office; 1923. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=hvd.li4xns;view=1up;seq=3. Accessed 9 December 2018.

5. Bloom-Feshbach K, Simonsen L, Viboud C et al. Natality decline and miscarriages associated with the 1918 influenza pandemic: The Scandinavian and United States experiences. *J. Infect. Dis*. 2011;204(8):1157-1164.

6. Mamelund SE. Can the Spanish influenza pandemic of 1918 explain the baby boom of 1920 in neutral Norway? *Population* (Engl Ed). 2004;59(2):229-260.

7. Mamelund SE. Fertility fluctuations in times of war and pandemic influenza. *J. Infect. Dis*. 2012;206(1):140-141.

8. Chandra S, Yu Y. Fertility decline and the 1918 influenza pandemic in Taiwan. *Biodemography Soc Biol*. 2015;61(3):266-272.

9. Chandra S, Yu Y. The 1918 influenza pandemic and subsequent birth deficit in Japan. *Demogr Res*. 2015;33(11):313-326.

10. Office of the Secretary of the Division of Vital Statistics, The Commonwealth of Massachusetts. *Seventy-Seventh Annual Report of the Vital Statistics of Massachusetts: Births, Marriages, Divorces, and Deaths for the Year 1918*. Boston, MA: Wright & Potter Printing Co., State Printers; 1920. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.b5327610;view=1up;seq=5. Accessed 16 June 2018.

11. Bureau of the Census. *Birth Statistics for the Registration Area of the United States 1917. Third Annual Report.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office; 1919. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uiug.30112051430939;view=1up;seq=3. Accessed 30 November 2018.

12. Bureau of the Census. *Mortality Statistics 1917: Eighteenth Annual Report*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office; 1919. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=msu.31293008112728. Accessed 2 December 2017.

13. Bureau of the Census. *Birth Statistics for the Registration Area of the United States 1918. Fourth Annual Report.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office; 1920. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uiug.30112051430939;view=1up;seq=3. Accessed 30 November 2018.

14. Bureau of the Census. *Birth Statistics for the Registration Area of the United States 1919*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office; 1921.

https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=hvd.li4xnq;view=1up;seq=3. Accessed 1 December 2017.

15. Bureau of the Census. *Birth Statistics for the Registration Area of the United States 1920*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office; 1922. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=hvd.li4xnr;view=thumb;seq=1. Accessed 1 December 2017.

16. Bureau of the Census. *Mortality Statistics 1918: Nineteenth Annual Report*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office; 1920. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=msu.31293008112736;view=thumb;seq=1. Accessed 2 December 2017.

17. Bureau of the Census. *Mortality Statistics 1919: Twentieth Annual Report*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office; 1921. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=msu.31293008112744;view=thumb;seq=1. Accessed: 2 December 2017.

18. Bureau of the Census. *Mortality Statistics 1920: Twenty-First Annual Report*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office; 1922. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=msu.31293008112751. Accessed 2 December 2017.

19. Bureau of the Census. *Mortality Statistics 1921: Twenty-First Annual Report*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office; 1923. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.c3036838;view=thumb;seq=9. Accessed 2 December 2017.

20. Bureau of the Census. *Special Tables of Mortality from Influenza and Pneumonia in Indiana, Kansas, and Philadelphia, PA.: September 1 to December 31, 1918*. Washington D.C: Government Printing Office; 1920. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=coo1.ark:/13960/t1tf0c54q;view=thumb;seq=9. Accessed 14 December 2017.

21. New York State Department of Health. *Thirty-eighth Annual Report of the State Department of Health of New York,* Volume 1. Albany, NY: J.B. Lyon Company, Printers; 1918. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.b3063659;view=1up;seq=1. Accessed: 13 June 2018.

22. New York State Department of Health. *Forty-first Annual Report of the State Department of Health of New York,* Volume 1. Albany, NY: J.B. Lyon Company, Printers; 1922. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.b3063665;view=1up;seq=262. Accessed 13 June 2018.

23. Buffalo Department of Health. *Buffalo Sanitary Bulletin, 1917*. Buffalo, NY: Buffalo Department of Health; 1918. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uiug.30112111808173;view=1up;seq=18. Accessed 14 June 2018.

24. Buffalo Department of Health. *Buffalo Sanitary Bulletin, 1918*. Buffalo, NY: Buffalo Department of Health; 1919. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uiug.30112111808173;view=1up;seq=18. Accessed 14 June 2018.

25. Buffalo Department of Health. *Buffalo Sanitary Bulletin, 1919*. Buffalo, NY: Buffalo Department of Health; 1920. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uiug.30112111808173;view=1up;seq=18. Accessed 14 June 2018.

26. Office of the Secretary of the Division of Vital Statistics, The Commonwealth of Massachusetts. *Seventy-Seventh Annual Report of the Vital Statistics of Massachusetts: Births, Marriages, Divorces, and Deaths for the Year 1917*. Boston, MA: Wright & Potter Printing Co., State Printers; 1920. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015067927635;view=1up;seq=5. Accessed 16 June 2018.

27. Office of the Secretary of the Division of Vital Statistics, The Commonwealth of Massachusetts. *Seventy-Seventh Annual Report of the Vital Statistics of Massachusetts: Births, Marriages, Divorces, and Deaths for the Year 1919*. Boston, MA: Wright & Potter Printing Co., State Printers; 1921. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015067927650;view=1up;seq=167. Accessed 16 June 2018.

28. Office of the Secretary of the Division of Vital Statistics, The Commonwealth of Massachusetts. *Seventy-Seventh Annual Report of the Vital Statistics of Massachusetts: Births, Marriages, Divorces, and Deaths for the Year 1920*. Boston, MA: Wright & Potter Printing Co., State Printers; 1922.

https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015067927676;view=thumb;seq=5. Accessed 16 June 2018.

29. Dagum E. *The X-11-ARIMA Seasonal Adjustment Method.* Ottawa: Statistics Canada; 1980. Canada. https://www.census.gov/ts/papers/1980X11ARIMAManual.pdf. Accessed 13 June 2018.

30. SAS Institute, Inc. SAS/ETS® 14.1 User's Guide. Cary, NC: SAS Institute, Inc.; 2015. https://support.sas.com/documentation/onlinedoc/ets/141/x12.pdf. Accessed 18 April 2018.

31. Chowell G, Simonsen L, Flores J et al. Death patterns during the 1918 Influenza pandemic in Chile. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2014;20(11):1803–1811.

32. Evans W. How to Keep Well: Flu Wave Receding. *Chicago Daily Tribune*. March 11, 1920:6.

33. 2,551 More Chicago Cases: Influenza Also Spreads in New Jersey and Delaware. *New York Times*. Jan 24 1920:4.

34. Grip is Showing Steady Spread: Increase in Disease Reported in All States; Death Toll is Increasing. *Courier-Journal*. January 30, 1920:8.

35. The American Influenza Epidemic. *The Manchester Guardian*. January 23, 1920:11

36. Spreading of Malady Is Seen as Health Officials Issue Report on Influenza: Supply of Nurses Said to Be "Adequate." *Cincinnati Enquirer*. January 31, 1920:2.

37. Mamelund, SE. Geography May Explain Adult Mortality from the 1918–20 Influenza Pandemic. *Epidemics* 2011 3(1):46-60.

38. Schmitt, RC, Nordyke EC. Influenza Deaths in Hawai'i, 1918 – 1920. *Hawaiian Journal of History*. 1999;33:101-117.

39. Virulent Influenza Sweeping Poland. *The Atlanta Constitution.* January 19, 1920:2

40. Renwick G. Influenza Afflicts Berlin: Of a More Virulent Type Than in 1918. *New York Times.* February 15, 1920:14.

41. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 1918 Pandemic Influenza Historic Timeline. https://www.cdc.gov/flu/pandemic-resources/1918-commemoration/pandemic-timeline-1918.htm. Reviewed March 30, 2018. Updated May 3, 2018. Accessed June 4, 2018.

42. Crowell B, Wilson R. *Demobilization: Our Industrial and Military Demobilization After the Armistice, 1918-1920.* Vol. 6. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press; 1921.

43. Dublin L. War and the Birth Rate – A Brief Historical Summary. *AJPH*. 1945;35(4):315-320

44. Woolstone W, Conley D. Epidemic pneumonia (Spanish influenza) in pregnancy: effect in one hundred and one cases. *JAMA*. 1918;71(23):1898–1899.

45. Davis E. Obstetrics. *Am J Med Sci.* 1919;158(6):897-900.

46. Hardy M, Azarowicz E, Mannini A, et al. The effect of Asian influenza on the outcome of pregnancy, Baltimore, 1957-1958. *Am J Public Health*. 1961;51(8):11-82-11-88.

47. Griffith G, Adelstein A, Lambert P, Weatherall J. Influenza and infant mortality. *BMJ.* 1972; 3(5826):553-556.

48. Charvet F, Broussard P. Premature labor and influenza: a recent epidemic. *Bull Fed Soc Gynecol Obstet Lang Fr*. 1971;23(3):320-1

49. Boger H, Boer K, Duvekot J. Complications of the 2009 influenza A/h1n1 pandemic in pregnant women in The Netherlands: a national cohort study. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses*. 2011; 6(5): 309-312.

50. Doyle T, Goodin K, Hamilton J. Maternal and neonatal outcomes among pregnant women with 2009 pandemic influenza A(H1N1) illness in Florida, 2009-2010: a population-based cohort study. *PLoS One*. 2013;8(10): e79040.

51. Michaan N, Amazallag S, Laskov I, et al. Maternal and neonatal outcome of pregnant women infected with H1N1 influenza virus (swine flu). *J Matern Fetal Neontal Med*. 2012;25(2):130-132.

52. Mosby L, Rasmussen S, Jamieson D. 2009 pandemic influenza A (H1N1) in pregnancy: a systemic review of the literature. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2011;205(1):10-18.

53. Pierce M, Kurinzuk J, Spark P, et al. Perinatal outcomes after maternal 2009/H1N1 infection: national cohort study. *BMJ*. 2011; 342:d3214.

54. Siston A, Rasmussen S, Honein M, et al. Pandemic 2009 influenza A(H1N1) virus illness among pregnant women in the United States. *JAMA*. 2010;303(15):1517-1525.

55. Yates L, Pierce M, Stephens S, et al. Influenza A/H1N1v in pregnancy: an investigation of the characteristics and management of affected women and the relationship to pregnancy outcomes for mother and infant. *Health Technol Assess*. 2010;14(34):109-182.

56. Ács N, Bánhidy F, Puhó E, Czeizel A. Pregnancy complications and delivery outcomes of pregnant women with influenza. *J Matern Fetal Neontal Med*. 2006;19(3):135-140.

57. Fell D, Platt R, Basso O, et al. The relationship between 2009 pandemic H1N1 influenza during pregnancy and preterm birth: a population-based cohort study. *Epidemiology*. 2018;29(1):107-116.

58. Ball M. Abortion as a sequela of influenza. *JAMA* 1918; 71(16):1336.

59. Biraben, J-N. Aspects médicaux et biologiques de la démographie historique. *International Population Conference*, Liège, IUSSP, 1973; 3:9-22.

60. Bureau of the Census. *Thirteenth Census of the United States, Taken in the Year 1910: Number and Distribution of Inhabitants*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office; 1913. pg. 26. https://www2.census.gov/library/publications/decennial/1910/volume-1/volume-1-p3.pdf. Accessed 9 June 2018.

61. Bureau of the Census. *Fourteenth Census of the United States, Taken in the Year 1920: Number and Distribution of Inhabitants*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office; 1923. pg. 16. https://www2.census.gov/library/publications/decennial/1920/volume-1/41084484v1ch1.pdf. Accessed 9 June 2018.

62. Bureau of the Census, US Department of Commerce. Geographic Terms and Concepts - Census Divisions and Census Regions. https://www2.census.gov/geo/pdfs/maps-data/maps/reference/us_regdiv.pdf. Accessed June 9, 2018.

Figure Legend/Titles

Figure 1: Excess Births and Deaths in the Four States with the Highest Influenza Mortality During the 1918 Influenza Pandemic Estimated Using the 'Irregular' Component of the Seasonally Decomposed Time Series: A) New York; B) Pennsylvania; C) Massachusetts; D) Maryland.

Figure 2: Annual Birth Rates in the USA, 1916-1920 Reprinted from the Bureau of the Census (4)

Figure 3 A) Deaths from Prematurity in New York State, 1917 vs. 1920; B) Stillbirths in New York State, 1917 vs. 1920; C) Childbirth-associated Maternal Deaths in New York State, 1917 vs. 1920 (Excluding those Due to Septicemia).

Figure 4: Premature Births and Stillbirths in Buffalo, New York, 1917 to 1919.

Figure 5: Prematurity-associated Deaths and Childbirth-associated Maternal Deaths in Massachusetts, 1917-1920.

Table 1. States in the registration area by 1918, with corresponding populations and geographic locations.

State	Population 1910 (60)	Population 1920 (61)	Geographic Region (62)	Sub-Region (62)
New York	9,113,614	10,385,227	Northeast	Middle Atlantic
Pennsylvania	7,665,111	8,720,017	Northeast	Middle Atlantic
Massachusetts	3,366,416	3,852,356	Northeast	New England
Maryland	1,295,346	1,449,661	South	South Atlantic
North Carolina	2,206,287	2,559,123	South	South Atlantic
Virginia	2,061,612	2,309,187	South	South Atlantic
Connecticut	1,114,756	1,380,631	Northeast	New England
New Hampshire	430,572	443,083	Northeast	New England
Maine	742,371	768,014	Northeast	New England
Vermont	355,956	352,428	Northeast	New England
Utah	373,351	449,396	West	Mountain
Ohio	4,767,121	5,759,394	Midwest	East North Central
Michigan	2,810,173	3,668,412	Midwest	East North Central

Indiana	2,700,876	2,930,390	Midwest	East North Central
Wisconsin	2,333,860	2,632,067	Midwest	East North Central
Kentucky	2,289,905	2,416,630	South	East South Central
Kansas	1,690,949	1,769,257	Midwest	West North Central
Minnesota	2,075,708	2,387,125	Midwest	West North Central
Washington	1,141,990	1,356,621	West	Pacific

Table 2. Availability of monthly data on premature births, stillbirths, and deaths associated with childbirth and prematurity

Variable	Location		
	Buffalo, NY	*New York (state)*	*Massachusetts*
Premature births	1917, 1918, 1919		
Prematurity-associated deaths		1917, 1920	1917, 1918, 1919, 1920
Stillbirths	1917, 1918, 1919	1917, 1920	
Childbirth-associated deaths		1917, 1920	1917, 1918, 1919, 1920

Table 3. Summary of Results on Timing of Influenza-Attributable Excess Deaths and Deficit or Excess Births for 18 States of the USA, 1918 Wave.

State	Excess Deaths			Excess or Deficit Births						Lag (in Months) between Mortality Peak and	
	Peak Month(s)	*Peak Deaths, Seasonally Adjusted (Trend Included)*	*Peak Deaths, Irregular Only (Trend Excluded)*	*Lowest Month of Dip*	*Deficit At Lowest Month, Irregular Only (Trend Excluded)*	*Deficit As % Of All Births*	*Peak Month of Spike In Births*	*Excess At Peak of Spike, Irregular Only (Trend Excluded)*	*Excess As % Of All Births*	*Dip in Births*	*Spike in Births*
New York	Oct 1918	45,333	32,177	Jul 1919	−1,403	8	Apr 1919	817	4	9	6
Pennsylvania	Oct 1918	48,938	13,600	Jul 1919	−2,512	17	Apr 1919	1,172	7	9	6
Massachusetts	Oct 1918	17,273	12,055	Jul 1919	−827	13	Apr 1919	219	3	9	6
Maryland	Oct 1918	9,147	7,100	Jul 1919	−236	10	Apr 1919	427	14	9	6
North Carolina	Oct 1918	8,721	5,841	Jul 1919	−330	6	Apr 1919	447	7	9	6
Virginia	Oct 1918	8,974	5,523	Jul 1919	−321	7	Apr 1919	142	3	9	6
Connecticut	Oct 1918	7,589	5,489	Jul 1919	−356	15	May 1919	216	8	9	7
New Hampshire	Oct 1918	2,555	1,934	Jul 1919	−71	12				9	
Maine	Oct 1918	2,742	1,524	Aug 1919	−181	16				10	
Vermont	Oct 1918	1,715	1,208	Aug 1919	−38	7	Mar—Apr 1919	60 [a]	5	10	5—6
Utah	Oct-Nov 1918	2,097[a]	762	Jul—Aug 1919	−188 [a]	10	Jun 1919	92	8	8—10	7—8
Ohio	Oct-Dec 1918	37,370 [a]		Aug 1919	−673	7	Apr 1919	515	5	8—10	4—6
Michigan	Oct-Dec 1918	19,481 [a]		Aug 1919	−553	8	Apr 1919	261	4	8—10	4—6
Indiana	Oct-Dec 1918	16,884 [a]		Aug 1919	−566	12	Mar 1919	154	3	8—10	5—7
Wisconsin	Oct-Dec 1918	14,481 [a]		Aug 1919	−439	10				8—10	
Kentucky	Oct-Nov 1918	12,399 [a]		Aug 1919	−282	7	May 1919	245	5	9—10	6—7
Kansas	Oct-Dec 1918	9,916 [a]		Aug 1919	−297	10				8—10	
Minnesota	Oct-Nov 1918	9,489 [a]		Aug 1919	−424	11	Apr 1919	236	5	9—10	6—7
Washington	Oct-Dec 1918	7,276 [a]		Jul—Aug 1919	−65 [a]	2	May 1919	125	6	7—10	5—7

[a] Sum for multiple months

Table 4. Summary of Results on Timing of Influenza-Attributable Excess Deaths and Deficit Births for 18 States of the USA, 1920 Wave.

State	Excess Deaths			Deficit Births			
	Peak Month(s)	*Peak Deaths, Seasonally Adjusted (Trend Included)*	*Peak Deaths, Irregular Only (Trend Excluded)*	*Lowest Month of Dip*	*Deficit At Lowest Month, Irregular Only (Trend Excluded)*	*Deficit As % Of All Births*	*Lag Between Mortality Peak and Dip in Births*
New York	Feb 1920	19,141	7,867	Nov 1920	−373[a]	2	9
Pennsylvania	Feb 1920	17,896	8,609	Oct 1920	−401	2	8
Massachusetts	Feb 1920	7,011	2,710	Oct 1920	−154	2	8
Maryland	Feb 1920	2,949	1,268	Oct—Nov 1920	−101 [b]	4	8—9
North Carolina	Feb 1920	4,689	2,259	Nov 1920	−345[c]	6	9
Virginia	Feb 1920	4,101	1,795	Dec 1920	−161[d]	3	10
Connecticut	Feb 1920	2,680	1,188	Nov 1920	−55	2	9
New Hampshire	Feb 1920	808	283	Sept 1920	−15	2	7
Maine	Feb 1920	1,668	739	Dec 1920	−40	3	10
Vermont	Feb—Mar 1920	1,265[b]		Nov 1920	−25	5	8—9
Utah	Feb 1920	1,009	636	Nov 1920	−96	9	9
Ohio	Feb 1920	11,084	4,936	Oct 1920	−350	4	8
Michigan	Feb 1920	8,645	4,163	Nov 1920	−379[e]	4	9
Indiana	Feb 1920	5,348	2,056	Dec 1920	−150	3	10
Wisconsin	Feb 1920	4,319	1,975	Nov 1920	−254	6	9
Kentucky	Feb—Mar 1920	7,201[b]		Dec 1920	−415	10	9—10
Kansas	Feb 1920	3,172	1,647	Nov 1920	−189	6	9
Minnesota	Feb 1920	3,724	1,670	Nov 1920	−429	11	9
Washington	Feb 1920	2,336	1,134	Nov 1920	−172	9	9

[a] Figure for October 1920: -344

[b] Sum for both months

[c] Figure for December 1920: -228

[d] Figure for November 1920: -140

[e] Figure for October 1920: -314

Table 5. U.S. birth rate by year, 1916-1921.

Year	**Birth Rate per 1000**
1916	24.8
1917	24.6
1918	24.4
1919	22.3
1920	23.7
1921	24.3


A)
No. of Excess Deaths
No. of Excess/Deficit Births
9 MONTHS
8–9 MONTHS
35,000
30,000
25,000
20,000
15,000
10,000
5,000
0
-5,000
1,500
1,000
500
0
-500
-1,000
-1,500
-2,000
No. of Excess/Deficit Births
July 1918
October 1918
January 1919
April 1919
July 1919
October 1919
January 1920
April 1920
July 1920
October 1920
Date


B)
40,000
35,000
30,000
25,000
20,000
15,000
10,000
5,000
0
-5,000
No. of Excess Deaths
9 MONTHS
8–9 MONTHS
2,000
1,500
1,000
500
0
-500
-1,000
-1,500
-2,000
-2,500
-3,000
-3,500
No. of Excess/Deficit Births
July 1918
October 1918
January 1919
April 1919
July 1919
October 1919
January 1920
April 1920
July 1920
October 1920
Date



C)
14,000
12,000
10,000
8,000
6,000
4,000
2,000
0
-2,000
No. of Excess Deaths
9 MONTHS
8–9 MONTHS
400
200
0
-200
-400
-600
-800
-1,000
-1,200
No. of Excess/Deficit Births
July 1918
October 1918
January 1919
April 1919
July 1919
October 1919
January 1920
April 1920
July 1920
October 1920
Date


D)
9 MONTHS
8–9 MONTHS
No. of Excess Deaths
No. of Excess/Deficit Births
8,000
7,000
6,000
5,000
4,000
3,000
2,000
1,000
0
-1,000
500
400
300
200
100
0
-100
-200
-300
-400
July 1918
October 1918
January 1919
April 1919
July 1919
October 1919
January 1920
April 1920
July 1920
October 1920
Date

ANNUAL BIRTH RATES PER 1,000 POPULATION, BY MONTHS, IN THE REGISTRATION AREA: 1917–1921.




A)
500
450
400
350
300
250
200
No. of Deaths
1920
1917
Deaths from Premature Birth, 1917
Deaths from Premature Birth, 1920
Jan
Feb
Mar
Apr
May
Jun
Jul
Aug
Sep
Oct
Nov
Dec
Month



B)
1000
950
900
850
800
750
700
650
600
No. of Stillbirths
1920
1917
Stillbirths, 1917
Stillbirths, 1920
Jan
Feb
Mar
Apr
May
Jun
Jul
Aug
Sep
Oct
Nov
Dec
Month


C)
140
120
100
80
60
40
20
0
No. of Deaths
1920
1917
Childbirth-associated Deaths, 1917
Childbirth-associated Deaths, 1920
Jan
Feb
Mar
Apr
May
Jun
Jul
Aug
Sep
Oct
Nov
Dec
Month



Premature Births
Stillbirths
No. of Premature Births or Stillbirths
0
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
January 1917
April 1917
July 1917
October 1917
January 1918
April 1918
July 1918
October 1918
January 1919
April 1919
July 1919
October 1919
Month and Year



Deaths From Premature Birth
Childbirth-Associated Deaths
No. of Deaths
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
January 1917
April 1917
July 1917
October 1917
January 1918
April 1918
July 1918
October 1918
January 1919
April 1919
July 1919
October 1919
January 1920
April 1920
July 1920
October 1920
Month and Year