

No. 2217

September 2026

Is it psychologically dangerous to live in a rich area? Evidence from census-matched micro data on UK suicides

Caspar Kaiser
Ekaterina Oparina
Andrew J. Oswald

Abstract

This paper uses micro data on UK suicides to implement a new test of relative-deprivation theory. Research into the potential consequences of relative comparisons had in the past had to rely on subjective data on wellbeing or on particular types of biomarker information. With information that was released under strict confidentiality requirements by the Office for National Statistics, we here report the first econometric results that are able to draw upon full census-matched micro-level records with register data on suicides in the United Kingdom. The paper's key result is that suicide risk is greatest, *ceteris paribus*, in rich areas. Thus the long-standing belief that it is hazardous to live in a deprived place appears to be incorrect. For reasons explained in the paper, we believe it is possible that our estimates may understate the extent of the suicide risk.

Keywords: relative income; despair; suicide; relative comparisons

JEL codes: I31, C25

This paper was produced as part of the Wellbeing Programme. The Centre for Economic Performance is financed by the Economic and Social Research Council.

This work was undertaken in the Office for National Statistics Secure Research Service using data from ONS and other owners and does not imply the endorsement of the ONS or other data owners.

Caspar Kaiser, University of Warwick. Ekaterina Oparina, Centre for Economics London School of Economics. Andrew J. Oswald, University of Warwick.

Published by

Centre for Economic Performance

London School of Economic and Political Science

Houghton Street

London WC2A 2AE

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior permission in writing of the publisher nor be issued to the public or circulated in any form other than that in which it is published.

Requests for permission to reproduce any article or part of the Working Paper should be sent to the editor at the above address.

© C. Kaiser, E. Oparina and A. J. Oswald, submitted 2026.

1. Introduction

This paper describes a new and unconventional test of relative-deprivation theory. It uses recently available micro-data on suicides in England and Wales. The intuitive idea on which the paper builds is that when a person contemplates suicide it is possible that they have been influenced by whether they appear -- inwardly to themselves -- to be a failure relative to how well-off and successful they feel they are compared to those who live around them.

Discussion of relative deprivation has a substantial modern history (including Runciman 1966; Crosby 1976; Wilkinson and Pickett 2007; Smith et al. 2012) and goes back at least to the writings of Karl Marx in *Das Kapital* and other early scholars. The central idea is that comparisons matter. Absolute income is not, according to relative-deprivation theory, a sufficient statistic to understand human feelings and actions. Although a person's own income and happiness are thought to protect them somewhat from suicide risk (as shown in longitudinal data in Koivumaa-Honkanen et al. 2001), the level of others' prosperity is, according to a relative-deprivation account, a risk factor.

Relative-status concerns have been found to be influential in the domain of happiness, where what matters is relative rather than absolute income. Whether consciously or subconsciously, humans seem to compare their income to those of others (Luttmer 2005). Similar such results have been found in the domain of job loss, both with respect to self-reported wellbeing (Clark 2003) and suicide risk (Platt, Micciolo, and Tansella 1992; Pescosolido, Lee, and Kafadar 2020). A person may feel less like a failure when many of their neighbours are facing similar problems (Daly, Wilson, and Johnson 2008). Our paper thereby also connects indirectly to a broad set of work on happiness and human subjective wellbeing (Easterlin 2003; Layard 2005; Steptoe, Wardle, and Marmot 2005; Graham 2008; Dwyer and Dunn 2022).

However, unlike much of the prior work on relative comparisons, we do not here analyze subjective happiness and life-satisfaction variables (see Blanchflower and Oswald 2004; Budria and Ferrer-I-Carbonell 2019; Ifcher, Zarghamee, and Graham 2018; 2019; Kudrna 2024; Layard 1980; Luttmer 2005) or variables such as self-reported measures of health and sleep (Jones and Wildman 2008; Akay, Martinsson, and Ralsmark 2019).

Instead, we take the conceptual idea of relative concerns to the domain of suicide. We use complete Census-linked micro-level data on suicides. Previous work had to rely on limited information about people's characteristics. For example, Classen and Dunn (2012) make use of state-level characteristics, Tadmon and Bearman (2023) use county-level information, and Case and Deaton (2015) only had individual-level information on ethnicity and education. In contrast, we observe for most individuals that died of suicide between 2011 and 2020¹ their census records, which, *inter alia*, include individual's sex, age, ethnicity, religion, marital status, household composition, health, education, socio-economic status, and home ownership.

¹Our main analyses only use 2011-2012 data, but the results do hold for the full period, see page 9.

On that basis, we show later, in the right-hand columns of tables such as Table 1, that the paper’s central result stems from a *ceteris paribus* condition on individual characteristics. What turns out to be crucial here is an adjustment, in particular, for economic variables. In part, we have been influenced by the emphasis in Kudrna (2024) on the potential role of comparative wealth rather than income alone. Rich people can create negative externalities, in a sense.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 sets out the background literature on relative comparisons and on suicide. Section 3 describes the census-linked micro data and the empirical approach. Section 4 presents the paper’s central results. Section 5 reports a set of robustness checks, including an order-invariant decomposition of the contribution of different blocks of covariates. Section 6 concludes.

2. Background

There is, as is known, a large research literature on suicide, including, famously, Durkheim (1897). The writer Wilfrid Sheed is reputed to have said that ‘suicide is the sincerest criticism that life ever gets’. Suicide is a clear marker of extreme ill-being (Case and Deaton 2015; Zheng and Choi 2024; Tadmon and Bearman 2023). We link later to ideas on the potential health implications and psychological harm of relative deprivation (Pham-Kanter 2009; Mishra and Carleton 2015; Payne, Brown-Iannuzzi, and Hannay 2017). Other related research has examined the spatial patterns in suicide (such as the early work of Dorling and Gunnell (2003) and of Cairns et al. (2017)). Further research that relates to this paper’s analysis includes Agerbo, Sterne, and Gunnell (2007), Gradus et al. (2020), and Helliwell (2007). Gascoigne et al. (2025), which was published after this paper was first submitted, study spatio-temporal trends in suicide across England between 2002 and 2022 and examine socio-environmental determinants measured at the level of middle-layer super output areas. This is an ecological study, in the sense that the personal characteristics of the individuals who died are not observed, and that is the respect in which our paper differs from it. Notably, they find suicide risk to rise with area deprivation. That is the conventional gradient, and it is the same pattern that emerges in the first column of our own Table 1. What the later columns of that table suggest is that this gradient does not survive an adjustment for the characteristics of the individuals who happen to live in those areas.

Particular mention, although it does not have data on actual suicides, should be made of Pak and Choung (2020), which uses longitudinal data from the Korea Welfare Panel Study (KoWePS) and finds that relative income deprivation—feeling poorer compared to one’s reference group—is independently associated with a higher likelihood of suicidal ideation, planning, and attempts. We also point to seminal prior work by Mary Daly and colleagues (Daly, Wilson, and Johnson 2008; Daly et al. 2011; Daly and Wilson 2009; Daly, Wilson, and Johnson 2013) who link actual suicide in US data to both own family income (entering negatively) and county-level income (entering positively). They thereby emphasize the possibility of, and indeed try to estimate the size of, relative-income and relative-happiness effects on suicide risk. Our later analysis differs from theirs in that our method uses a measure of highly generalized geographical-area disadvantage. It

is closer to a ‘stock’ variable than to a ‘flow’ variable and was created by British government statisticians from a large set of indicators of area deprivation, including not just income but also health, education, crime, housing, employment opportunities, and the quality of the environment.

The main modern similar studies – i.e. where a fairly complete set of micro data are able to be used to study this kind of question – of which we are aware are Daly et al. (2013) for the USA, Liu (2017) for the city of Stockholm, and Berkelmans et al. (2021) for the Netherlands. The last of the three adds a substantial set of personal controls. In that way, the authors manage to drive the geographical-area coefficient in a suicide equation from a significant negative gradient (moving from poorest areas with most suicides to richest areas with least suicides) to zero. On that basis, they conclude that regional differences are driven by the differences in the demographic makeup of the regions as opposed to specific local causes. On that account, areas do not matter *per se*. In the current paper, we instead suggest that regions do have consequences, albeit in the opposing direction.

Although it is only for one city, Liu (2017) is a major contribution, and is closer in spirit to the current paper. It draws upon median income by sub-city-area rather than, as in the later analysis, a wider measure of socio-economic disadvantage, but establishes the result that suicide risk is higher in the high-income sections of the city of Stockholm, and thus argues, as we later do, that income comparison can have negative consequences. Finally, Daly et al. (2013) is important although does not follow the exact form of the current paper. Its approach is to estimate models of the suicide hazard using two independent data sets: the US National Longitudinal Mortality Study and the US National Center for Health Statistics' Multiple Cause of Death Files combined with the 5% Public Use Micro Sample of the 1990 US decennial census. The authors demonstrate that, controlling for own income and individual characteristics, individual suicide risk rises with others' income.

3. Empirical Approach

Our data, the Public Health Research Database², allow us to link suicides to detailed information on individuals' personal characteristics (gathered from the 2011 UK Census), including information about the place in which the person lived. In the later analysis, this is done for England and Wales down to the level of LSOAs (so-called Lower Layer Super Output Areas). A typical LSOA is small. It has an average of 700 households.

We then match each LSOA with government-calculated measures of deprivation. Specifically, the *Index of Multiple Deprivation* (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government 2019) for England and the *Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation* (Welsh Government 2019)

² Office for National Statistics, and NHS Digital. (2023). Public Health Research Database - England and Wales. ONS SRS Metadata Catalogue. <https://doi.org/10.57906/b8zx-6x19>.

measures relative disadvantage in each of these approximately 35,000 local geographical areas.³⁴ The indices are designed by government statisticians as averages across several domains of potential deprivation, including income, employment, health, education, crime, housing, and environment. Each domain is weighted, with income and employment assigned the largest importance in the weighting. Based on their overall scores, areas are ranked and then for our analysis divided into five quintiles. Quintile 1 represents the most deprived 20% of areas, while quintile 5 represents the least deprived 20%.

It is thus feasible to use as a key independent variable what might be thought of as an aggregate ‘externality’ characteristic that is common to citizens of a place, namely, the level of prosperity in that geographical area. We assume that everyone within such a small area is exposed – to a lesser or greater amount – to the sight of neighbours who are either more or less affluent. Such exposure may for example run via the size and quality of neighbouring houses, observation of conspicuous consumption (e.g. via clothing choices), or the type of cars parked on the streets. One potential advantage of the paper’s approach is that the area deprivation level captures, in part, wealth and not just income. Wealth may matter in comparisons (and may be more easily observable than income).

Our data contains all residents of England and Wales who died of any cause between the Census and the beginning of 2020, plus a 5% random sample of those still alive at the end of December 2019 (which is why the stated number of observations in later tables exceeds 1 million people). In the analyses to follow, we only include individuals who have died of suicide or who are still alive by December 2019.

Linear-probability models are estimated using OLS, with heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors. Probit models were also estimated (as given in the Online Supplementary Materials Table M3) as a check on the findings.

The crucial information for the current study is on individuals who responded to the national Census and who died by suicide in the 21 months between 27 March 2011 and 31 December 2012. In this way, we deliberately restrict the sample to just under the first two years following the Census. That time cut-off is to ensure that key individual characteristics, including the place of residence, are unlikely to have changed from the Census date. However, as discussed in the section on robustness tests, the results do not depend on this cutoff.

³ The English and Welsh indices differ in some minor respects. For example, while the Welsh index splits housing and access to services into separate domains, the English index combines these. There are also some small differences in the weights given to each domain (e.g., crime is weighted at 9% in England and at 5% in Wales). Because of these differences, we re-estimate our specifications of Table 1 after excluding data from Wales. See Table S3. Results are unchanged in that case.

⁴ Our data cover England and Wales but not Scotland or Northern Ireland. This is because the census and death-registration systems of the United Kingdom are administered separately: Scotland’s records are held by National Records of Scotland and Northern Ireland’s by the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency, and neither is included in our linked database. Each nation also constructs its own index of multiple deprivation, and those indices are not directly comparable across nations.

In order to define suicide, we use the definition from ICD-10 ranges X60-X84 (intentional self-harm) and Y10-Y34 (injury or poisoning of undetermined intent).

Our sample ultimately covers 1,816,771 observations. Out of this total, 6,584 individuals died from suicide (the individuals who died from other causes are excluded). We constrain the sample in one more way. We include only adults who were between the age of 20 and 75 at Census. The final total leaves us with 1,695,550 individuals. Of these, 5,913 people died of suicide. See Table S1, in the appendix at the end of this article, and Table M1 in the Online Supplementary Materials, for detailed descriptives, to be discussed in more detail in the next section.⁵

To correct for confounding influences, we begin by using a basic set of controls. These include: sex, a set of age dummies, ethnicity, region, and religion. Given our particular data set we can then gradually add further controls into the regression equations, including family variables (marital status, number of children), health variables (health status), education variables, and economic variables (employment status, socio-economic classification, home ownership, living conditions). The latter turn out to be particularly influential and would not be possible with aggregate data. We observe these variables at the level of the individual, from the individual's Census record, and we do not separately construct area-level aggregates of them. The deprivation index is the area-level measure that we use. It should be mentioned that we think of these latter independent variables (especially education, employment, ethnicity, and housing type) as standing in for an income variable -- not available to us in the Census -- at the person level. It is known that these variables are strong predictors in standard wage equations, for example.

To assess the relative importance of these groups of variables in a way that does not depend on the order in which covariates are entered, we use the decomposition proposed by Gelbach (2016). This allows us to show how much of the change in the deprivation-quintile coefficients, across specifications, can be attributed to each block of covariates.

Sampling weights are applied throughout. Complete equation specifications are presented in the Online Supplementary Materials Table M2. Because of the long list of independent variables, the full tables take up a number of printed pages, so for brevity the main body of the paper concentrates on compressed versions that focus on the principal covariates in which we are interested.

4. Results

In Panel A of Table S1, the rate of suicide among men is, as is already widely known from aggregate statistics, approximately three times the rate among women. Panel B of Table S1 illustrates that, as is similarly well-known, economically deprived geographical areas tend, as a matter of correlation, to have substantially higher suicide rates. The 'raw' area effect is large. Here the rate varies from approximately 20.7 suicides per hundred thousand people in the most

⁵ Throughout, tables and figures numbered with an S appear in the appendix at the end of this article. Those numbered with an M are in the Online Supplementary Materials.

deprived quintile in England and Wales' geographical areas to approximately 14.5 per hundred thousand in the most prosperous quintile of areas. For reference, the overall average across all areas is 17.5 suicides per hundred thousand people over the 21-month window that our main sample covers. In these calculations, no account is taken of the personal heterogeneity of individuals in any other dimensions. The numbers are simply averages. Online Supplementary Materials Table M1 provides further descriptive statistics.

Regression equations are given in Table 1. The dependent variable is suicides. It is expressed, for ease of reading, as a rate out of 100,000 people. Column 1 of Table 1 depicts the area pattern classified by deprivation quintile (where LSOAs are the underlying smaller areas) of suicide in England and Wales. In this first column, the only independent variables in the regression are sex, age, ethnicity, Government region (i.e. NUTS 1 regions), and religion. We call these the basic controls. They have been used in large numbers of previous studies of UK suicide, partly because they are made available at the aggregate level by the Office for National Statistics, and partly because they have been used in suicide studies in many countries. Berkelmans et al. (2021) demonstrate their statistical relevance in individual-level information for the Netherlands. In our own regressions, each of these variables is measured at the level of the individual, taken from that person's own Census record, and not as an area aggregate. The only variable that enters at the area level is the deprivation quintile itself.

[TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

It can be seen here, in the initial column of Table 1, that the more affluent the area (as measured by deprivation level) the lower is the rate of suicide among citizens who live there. This is the conventional and long-believed pattern. Disadvantaged geographical areas have many more individuals who die of suicide. In this specification, with basic controls only, the estimated difference between the highest and the lowest deprivation quintile is almost 10 more suicides per hundred thousand people. For one early review of related research on these large area coefficients see Buka and Rehkopf (2006); a more recent and comprehensive review is given by Cairns et al. (2017).

Columns 2, 3, and 4 of Table 1 gradually adjust for extra covariates. The underlying regressions include many dozens of independent variables. For clarity, these are not all listed here, but can be seen in the Online Supplementary Materials Table M2.

We deliberately lay out these regressions in succession, looking across the columns of Table 1, to aid understanding of the statistical consequences of different kinds of controls. In column 2, for example, after adding dummy variables for marital status and the number of children, the monotonic-decline pattern that is visible in the coefficients across areas is maintained. However, the gradient is slightly reduced in size. This is primarily driven by there being more married individuals in less deprived LSOAs and marriage potentially 'protecting' against suicide (as can be seen from the relevant coefficients in column 2 of Online Supplementary Materials Table M2).

Column 3 of Table 1 is different. Here the evidence for a suicide pattern in geographical areas has almost disappeared. What this means is that once we bear in mind that health – as subjectively assessed and reported by the individuals in the Census – is different across advantaged and disadvantaged kinds of places there is approximately no further suicide-risk gradient by quintile of area deprivation. There is then no intrinsic ‘area effect’.

Importantly, it should be noted here that the work of Berkelmans et al. (2021) uncovers essentially a similar way to produce a null finding. In their own words, the authors conclude (for the Netherlands) “the regional differences found in raw frequencies are mostly explained away after correction of correlating risk factors, indicating that these differences were primarily caused due to the differences in the demographic makeup of the regions.”

Moving further to the right across Table 1, column 4 now adds a set of education dummy variables. Doing so leads to slightly upward-sloping coefficients across the area-deprivation quintiles. Nevertheless, the null hypothesis of zero on each of the latter four coefficients cannot be rejected at the conventional 95% confidence level.

Column 5 in Table 1 has the complete specification. It conveys the main result of the paper. In this case, controls have been added for employment status (that is, whether working, unemployed, etc., as well as the respondent’s NS-SEC level) and for proxy variables for wealth and resources (in particular: homeownership and number of persons per room in current dwelling). These, it can be seen, make a fundamental difference. In this final and fullest specification, within Table 1, the substantive conclusion is that suicide risk is greatest, *ceteris paribus*, in the most-advantaged quintile of areas in England or Wales.⁶

It can be seen that the finding in column 5 of Table 1 is in essence the opposite of that in column 1 of the table. It is also the opposite of the conclusion drawn in almost all prior literature – where, for sheer data reasons, researchers were unable to make an adjustment for a complete set of controls.

A coefficient of 3.319 in column 5 implies that there are almost three and half extra suicides per hundred thousand citizens in these richer geographical places (compared to the highest-deprivation quintile of areas in England and Wales). In comparison, in the same regression specification, people with tertiary education have 1.7 more suicides per 100,000 than people with no formal education (this difference is not statistically significant at conventional levels), among Christians there are estimated to be about 3.9 fewer suicides than among individuals declaring no religion, individuals who are single are estimated to have 8.5 more suicides than individuals who are married, and unemployed individuals are estimated to have 17.2 more suicides per 100,000 than full-time employed people. Thus, it seems that the observed association of suicide with a lack of

⁶ One may wonder whether the *method* of suicide differs across deprivation quintiles. Given the sensitive nature of the data, we refrain from providing a more detailed breakdown by deprivation quintile. However, Supplementary Table S2 provides a coarser tabulation by deprivation quintile, showing whether the method of suicide was strangulation (the most common method) or some other method. We find no clear pattern across levels of area deprivation. When examining more detailed breakdowns (not published here), we also find no such patterns.

area deprivation, is substantial, roughly of the order of association with religious belief. For the full set of coefficients, see Table M2 in the Online Supplementary Materials.

However, it may be worth appreciating that there is likely to be a form of potential bias here. The paper's estimated effect size may understate the true effect. Table 1's fifth column is consistent with the idea that relative-deprivation feelings are dangerous and might operate to explain the reversal of the traditional inverse area-gradient. But it seems valuable to think about the nature of affluent areas. It is probable that a number of advantageous factors – more hospitals, greater leisure facilities like sports halls and cinemas, less crime, a wider range of transport options, etc. – lie in part behind the dummy variables for deprivation quintiles. Therefore, a dangerous-psychology interpretation has to outweigh those otherwise unmeasured benefits of living in a prosperous region. Put differently, any relative-deprivation effects felt by unhappy inhabitants have, given the findings in column 5 of Table 1, to be sufficiently strong to be able to offset the various possible hidden positive plusses from living in an area of low deprivation. It may be that a coefficient 3.319 is an underestimate of the psychological 'danger'. A second consideration points in the same direction. Area deprivation is likely to proxy, in part, for a person's own income and wealth, which the Census does not record. In a specification without full personal economic controls, the deprivation dummies will therefore pick up some individual disadvantage, and deprived areas will appear more dangerous than they are. The paper does control at the person level for detailed measures of education, housing type, and the salariat level under which the individual is classified. Nevertheless, in so far as some omitted-variable bias remains, it biases the coefficient on living in a prosperous area downwards. On this argument too, the estimate of 3.319 should be read as a conservative one.

Figure 1 and Figure S1 present some of the earlier tabular information in a different and pictorial way. The important reversal of the gradient across the two parts of Figure 1, for example, is fairly straightforward to see in this graphical layout.

[FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE]

Before turning to a series of robustness checks in the next section, we note that one of the strongest other results that we have seen in the data, and a pattern consistent with the much-discussed U shape in happiness through life in the statistical literature on personal happiness and wellbeing (Blanchflower and Oswald 2008, for example), is the hill-shaped relationship here between a person's age and their probability of dying of suicide. Figures 2 and 3 illustrate the 'midlife crisis' as traced out in suicide risk (see originally Jaques (1965), and more recently, for example, Giuntella et al. (2023)). A recent compilation of graphs from the official statistical agencies of Britain, the United States, and Australia points in the same direction (Oswald 2026). Once again, these graphs in Figures 2 and 3 come from regression equations in which a substantial set of controls are included. The Supporting Information, Figure S2, reveals that the hill-shape emerges even in a non-parametric way with a complete set of individual-age dummies. Hence the psychological mechanisms at work behind the curved shape cannot be explained by standard socio-economic controls and must somehow be deep ones not currently understood.

[FIGURES 2 AND 3 ABOUT HERE]

Indeed, more broadly, the pattern of coefficient signs and magnitudes in the full regression table (see Table M2 in the Online Supplementary Materials) is remarkably similar to the typical structure of ‘life satisfaction’ regressions: Roughly speaking, married and religious individuals who are in good health are less likely to die of suicide, while persons who are unemployed, have lower socio-economic status, and who rent (rather than own) are statistically significantly more likely to die of suicide. These convergent findings may be viewed as corroborating ‘revealed’ behavioural evidence about subjective survey data.

5. Checks

How robust is the paper’s principal finding?

First, one might worry that our core finding – that adding economic controls makes a large difference to the estimated coefficients and thereby reverses the sign of the deprivation gradient – depends on the particular order in which covariates are entered. In Table 2, we therefore present results from a decomposition proposed by Gelbach (2016). The idea underlying the decomposition is that what is needed, and what the Gelbach method delivers, is a persuasive way to check on which independent variables matter most. Adding variables singly is not reliable because results depend on the sequencing of the additional variables. The Gelbach decomposition solves this problem. It is sequence-invariant. It computes the unique contribution of every control all at once, mathematically guaranteeing that the sum of the individual contributions equals the total difference between the simple and full models. Crucially, this decomposition therefore gives us an order-independent means of assessing how much our economic controls matter.

[TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

The table shows, for each of the four deprivation quintile dummies, how much of their change between the basic specification (Column (1) of Table 1) and the full specification (Column (5)) can be attributed to each of our blocks of covariates (i.e. *Family, Health, Education, Economic*). Broadly, Table 2 indicates that the block for health contributes most, followed by the economic variables, to the change in coefficient signs and magnitudes (about 5.9 and 4.4 points respectively for the fifth quintile). Individual education contributes little to the change in coefficients on area deprivation, in line with our earlier discussion.⁷

Beyond these decomposition results, it might further be argued that controlling for subjective health, as we do, starting from the third column in Table 1, is over-controlling? Could local area

⁷ A simple comparison of the raw differences (see Panel B of Table S1) and Column 1 of Table 1 (our specification with basic controls) shows that the basic controls *increase* the gap in suicide rates between the least and the most deprived areas. Supplementary Table S4 provides results from a similar Gelbach decomposition, showing the change in coefficients between these two specifications. We observe that age and ethnicity are most responsible for the increase in the gap (e.g., individuals in age groups with higher baseline suicide risk are themselves more likely to live in less-deprived areas). Controlling for individuals' religion also increases the gaps, though to a smaller extent. Among the basic controls, only government region (i.e. dummies for e.g., the 'West Midlands') tends to act in the opposite direction, mostly compressing the gap.

deprivation affect individuals' health, which in turn affects suicide probabilities? We would then impair an important path from area deprivation to suicide risk. As a first robustness check, we therefore remove our control for subjective health from the regression equation. The result, shown in column 6 of Table 1, indicates that the coefficients on area deprivation fall somewhat when subjective health is excluded, but they remain positive, substantial, and statistically significant.

Table S5 reproduces our results for the north compared to the south (Columns 1 and 2) and for females compared to males (Columns 3 and 4). The coefficients in these two tables are not quite monotonic across quintiles; but the general gradient remains visible; the tables again do not offer evidence for the traditional idea that it is psychologically worse to live in a poorer area.

Further explorations are provided in the Online Supplementary Materials Tables M4 to M10. These tables check whether the results hold across different education-levels, tenure type, employment statuses, marital statuses, health levels, and religion. A positive gradient, where suicide risk is larger in prosperous places, continues in general to hold. In certain cases, the standard errors are large, such as in the final column of Table M4 where the number of suicides among those with higher-education qualifications is particularly few. The first column of Table M6 is also notable, because it performs a scientifically useful check of the paper's central conclusion on what might be viewed as a sample of all regular workers in England and Wales. Table M8, concerned with heterogeneity in associations across levels of health, whilst it has some coefficients for which the null of zero cannot be rejected, has large estimated effects – approaching 28-38 extra suicide deaths per hundred thousand citizens – of deprivation quintile among those with poor health (who are generally more prone to die of suicide).

In Table M9 we examine differences across age groups. Unfortunately, these estimates are, again, very noisy. However, broadly speaking we find the same patterns as main results across almost all age groups with the sole exception of individuals aged 30 to 34. Table M10 looks at differences across religious groups, by re-estimating Table 1 separately for respondents who identify as Christian, as having no religion, or as having some other religion. The results hold across all groups, though coefficients on deprivation quintiles are insignificant across most columns in the 'other religion' group (which also has the smallest N).

In Table S6, we show results from a set of multinomial logistic regressions (with three outcomes: alive, death from a non-suicide cause, and death by suicide) that mirror the specifications of Table 1. Regarding suicide, we obtain the same qualitative results. However, concerning deaths from any other causes we find that while moving from column 1 to column 5 (i.e. adding controls) tends to reduce the gap between most and least deprived LSOAs, it is still the case that mortality rates for non-suicide cases are smaller in less deprived regions.

Finally, we tested whether our results are robust to including suicides that occurred after 2012. We did so by iteratively expanding the window of included years (i.e. years 2011-2013, 2011-2014, ..., 2011-2020) and re-estimating the specifications of Table 1. In almost every window we find the same pattern: the deprivation gradient flips sign once economic controls are included. The only exception is the 2011–2013 window.

6. Conclusions

Could suicide risk be particularly elevated when an unhappy person is surrounded by those with prosperous, advantaged circumstances? This empirical study suggests that the answer is yes.

We have drawn upon the first full release of micro data on suicides in England and Wales in an attempt to explore the research question. The design of the paper is ultimately a simple one. The main result is illustrated in the final column of Table 1. We find that suicide is more likely, *ceteris paribus*, in affluent areas of England and Wales.

Later tables probe the robustness and generality of the study's main idea. The paper has been able to examine, using a larger set of controls than previously feasible, the patterns in individual information on thousands of suicides in England and Wales. We believe the only previous hint of this paper's result in aggregate ecological-level UK data was in certain tables for parts of the male population within Middleton et al. (2004).⁸ That work had no access to the underlying micro data.

Personal economic prosperity is, on our estimates, associated with reduced suicide risk. Yet, contrary to the conclusions of a large literature (on the risks of living in a poor area), the reverse, as a statistical matter, appears to be true of the level of prosperity in the geographical area where someone lives. An interpretation of this pattern in the data is that invidious relative comparisons provoke feelings of failure and depression. The results in this paper are therefore consistent with the idea that it is psychologically dangerous to be surrounded by advantaged citizens. Our main conclusion is redolent of a diverse scholarly literature that rests on the idea that humans are deeply affected by comparisons (Wilkinson and Pickett 2007; 2009; Pickett and Wilkinson 2015; Ifcher, Zarghamee, and Graham 2018). It is also broadly consistent with the paradox noted by Daly et al. (2011) on the surprisingly high *ceteris-paribus* suicide rates in happy countries and happy states of the USA.

Future work may be able to go beyond the ideas on which this paper builds. In particular, if it were possible to study 'switchers' between regions, that might allow an inquiry closer to a quasi-experimental test of the paper's hypothesis. This would, nevertheless, require a large and empirically remarkable kind of data set.

One reason we believe that data on suicide are of special importance is because the act of suicide is surely -- to use the language of Anne Case and Angus Deaton -- the ultimate cry of human despair.

⁸ We here thank David Gunnell for his deep knowledge of the history of suicide research in the United Kingdom and for alerting us to this point.

References

- Agerbo, E., J. Sterne, and D. Gunnell. 2007. 'Combining Individual and Ecological Data to Determine Compositional and Contextual Socioeconomic Risk Factors for Suicide'. *Social Science & Medicine* 64:451–61.
- Akay, A., P. Martinsson, and H. Ralsmark. 2019. 'Relative Concerns and Sleep Behavior'. *Economics and Human Biology* 33:1–14.
- Berkelmans, G., R. Mei, S. Bhulai, and R. Gilissen. 2021. 'Identifying Socio-Demographic Risk Factors for Suicide Using Data on an Individual Level'. *BMC Public Health* 21.
- Blanchflower, D.G., and A.J. Oswald. 2004. 'Well-Being over Time in Britain and the USA'. *Journal of Public Economics* 88:1359–86.
- Blanchflower, David G., and Andrew J. Oswald. 2008. 'Is Well-Being U-Shaped over the Life Cycle?' *Social Science & Medicine* 66 (8): 1733–49.
- Brodeur, A., and S. Fleche. 2019. 'Neighbors' Income, Public Goods, and Well-being'. *Review of Income and Wealth* 65:337–57.
- Budria, S., and A. Ferrer-I-Carbonell. 2019. 'Life Satisfaction, Income Comparisons and Individual Traits'. *Review of Income and Wealth* 65:217–238.
- Cairns, J.M., E. Graham, and C. Bambra. 2017. 'Area-Level Socioeconomic Disadvantage and Suicidal Behaviour in Europe: A Systematic Review'. *Social Science & Medicine* 192:102–11.
- Case, A., and A. Deaton. 2015. 'Rising Morbidity and Mortality in Midlife among White Non-Hispanic Americans in the 21st Century'. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 112 (49): 15078–83.
- Clark, Andrew E. 2003. 'Unemployment as a Social Norm: Psychological Evidence from Panel Data'. *Journal of Labor Economics* 21 (2): 289–322.
- Clark, Andrew E. 2018. 'Four Decades of the Economics of Happiness: Where Next?' *Review of Income and Wealth* 64 (2): 245–269.
- Classen, T. J., and R. A. Dunn. 2012. 'The Effect of Job Loss and Unemployment Duration on Suicide Risk in the United States: A New Look Using Mass-Layoffs and Unemployment Duration'. *Health Economics* 21 (3): 338–350.
- Crosby, F. 1976. 'Model of Egotistical Relative Deprivation'. *Psychological Review* 83:85–113.
- Cuesta, M.B and S. Budria. 2014. 'Deprivation and Subjective Wellbeing: Evidence from Panel Data'. *Review of Income and Wealth* 60:655–682.
- Daly, Mary C., Andrew J. Oswald, Daniel Wilson, and Stephen Wu. 2011. 'Dark Contrasts: The Paradox of High Rates of Suicide in Happy Places'. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 80 (3): 435–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2011.04.007>.
- Daly, M.C., and D.J. Wilson. 2009. 'Happiness, Unhappiness, and Suicide: An Empirical Assessment'. *Journal of the European Economic Association* 7:539–49.
- Daly, M.C., D.J. Wilson, and N. Johnson. 2008. *Relative Status and Well-Being: Evidence from U.S. Suicide Deaths*. Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco Working Paper.
- . 2013. 'Relative Status and Well-Being: Evidence from U.S. Suicide Deaths'. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 95:1480–1500.
- Dorling, D., and D. Gunnell. 2003. 'Suicide: The Spatial and Social Components of Despair in Britain 1980-2000'. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 28:442–60.
- Durkheim, E. 1897. *Suicide: A Study in Sociology*. Translated by J.A. Spaulding and G. Simpson. London: Routledge.

- Dwyer, Ryan J., and Elizabeth W. Dunn. 2022. 'Wealth Redistribution Promotes Happiness'. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 119 (46): e2211123119. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2211123119>.
- Easterlin, R.A. 2003. 'Explaining Happiness'. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 100:11176–83.
- Gascoigne, C., A. Jeffery, I. Rotous, X. Yu, S. Geneletti, B. Davies, G. Baio, J. B. Kirkbride, A. Pitman, and M. Blangiardo. 2025. 'Spatio-Temporal Trends and Socio-Environmental Determinants of Suicides in England (2002–2022): An Ecological Population-Based Study'. *The Lancet Regional Health – Europe* 56: 101386.
- Giuntella, O., S. McManus, R. Mujcic, N. Powdthavee, A.J. Oswald, and A. Tohamy. 2023. 'The Midlife Crisis'. *Economica*, special series, 100 (357): 65–110.
- Gradus, Jaimie L., Anthony J. Rosellini, Erzsébet Horváth-Puhó, Amy E. Street, Isaac Galatzer-Levy, Tammy Jiang, Timothy L. Lash, and Henrik T. Sørensen. 2020. 'Prediction of Sex-Specific Suicide Risk Using Machine Learning and Single-Payer Health Care Registry Data From Denmark'. *JAMA Psychiatry* 77 (1): 25.
- Graham, C. 2008. 'Happiness and Health: Lessons – and Questions – for Public Policy'. *Health Affairs* 27:72–87.
- Helliwell, J.F. 2007. 'Well-Being and Social Capital: Does Suicide Pose a Puzzle?' *Social Indicators Research* 81:455–96.
- Ifcher, J., H. Zarghamee, and C. Graham. 2018. 'Local Neighbors as Positives, Regional Neighbors as Negatives: Competing Channels in the Relationship between Others' Income, Health, and Happiness'. *Journal of Health Economics* 57:263–76.
- . 2019. 'Income Inequality and Well-Being in the US: Evidence of Geographic-Scale- and Measure-Dependence'. *Journal of Economic Inequality* 17:415–34.
- Jaques, E. 1965. 'Death and the Mid-Life Crisis'. *The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 46 (4): 502–14.
- Jones, A.M., and J. Wildman. 2008. 'Health, Income and Relative Deprivation: Evidence from the BHPS'. *Journal of Health Economics* 27:308–24.
- Koivumaa-Honkanen, H., R. Hakanen, H.H. Viinama, K. Heikkila, J. Kaprio, and M. Koskenvuo. 2001. 'Life Satisfaction and Suicide: A 20-Year Follow-up Study'. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 158:433–39.
- Kudrna, L. 2024. 'Reference Groups and Relative Effects on Well-Being'. *Review of Income and Wealth* 70:581–604.
- Layard, R. 1980. 'Human Satisfaction and Public Policy'. *Economic Journal* 90:737–50.
- Layard, Richard. 2005. *Happiness: Lessons from a New Science*. London/New York: Penguin Press.
- Liu, K. 2017. 'To Compare Is to Despair? A Population-Wide Study of Neighborhood Composition and Suicide in Stockholm'. *Social Problems* 64:532–57.
- Luttmer, E.F.P. 2005. 'Neighbors as Negatives: Relative Earnings and Well-Being'. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 120:963–1002.
- Middleton, N., E. Whitley, S. Frankel, D. Dorling, J. Sterne, and D. Gunnell. 2004. 'Suicide Risk in Small Areas in England and Wales, 1991-1993'. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology* 39:45–52.
- Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. 2019. *English Indices of Deprivation 2019*. United Kingdom Government. <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2019>.

- Mishra, S., and R.N. Carleton. 2015. 'Subjective Relative Deprivation Is Associated with Poorer Physical and Mental Health'. *Social Science & Medicine* 147:144–49.
- Oswald, A. J. 2026. 'A Note on a Continuing Societal Problem: Suicide and the Midlife Crisis in Rich Nations'. Mimeo, University of Warwick.
- Pak, T.Y., and Y. Choung. 2020. 'Relative Deprivation and Suicide Risk in South Korea'. *Social Science & Medicine* 247:112815.
- Payne, B. Keith, Jazmin L. Brown-Iannuzzi, and Jason W. Hannay. 2017. 'Economic Inequality Increases Risk Taking'. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114 (18): 4643–48.
- Pham-Kanter, G. 2009. 'Social Comparisons and Health: Can Having Richer Friends and Neighbors Make You Sick?' *Social Science & Medicine* 69:335–44.
- Pickett, K.E., and R.G. Wilkinson. 2015. 'Income Inequality and Health: A Causal Review'. *Social Science & Medicine* 128:316–26.
- Platt, S., R. Micciolo, and M. Tansella. 1992. 'Suicide and Unemployment in Italy: Description, Analysis and Interpretation of Recent Trends'. *Social Science & Medicine* 34 (11): 1191–1201.
- Rehkopf, D.H., and S.L. Buka. 2006. 'The Association between Suicide and the Socio-Economic Characteristics of Geographical Areas: A Systematic Review'. *Psychological Medicine* 36:145–57.
- Pescosolido, B. A., B. Lee, and K. Kafadar. 2020. 'Cross-Level Sociodemographic Homogeneity Alters Individual Risk for Completed Suicide'. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 117 (42): 26170–26175.
- Runciman, W. G. 1966. *Relative Deprivation and Social Justice: A Study of Attitudes to Social Inequality in Twentieth-Century England. Reports of the Institute of Community Studies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Smith, H.J., T.F. Pettigrew, G.M. Pippin, and S. Bialosiewicz. 2012. 'Relative Deprivation: A Theoretical and Meta-Analytic Review'. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 16:203–32.
- Steptoe, A., J. Wardle, and M. Marmot. 2005. 'Positive Affect and Health-Related Neuroendocrine, Cardiovascular, and Inflammatory Processes'. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 102:6508–12.
- Tadmon, Daniel, and Peter S. Bearman. 2023. 'Differential Spatial-Social Accessibility to Mental Health Care and Suicide'. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 120 (19): e2301304120.
- Welsh Government. 2019. *Welsh index of multiple deprivation 2019*. Welsh Government. <https://gov.wales/welsh-index-multiple-deprivation>.
- Wilkinson, R.G., and K.E. Pickett. 2007. 'The Problems of Relative Deprivation: Why Some Societies Do Better than Others'. *Social Science & Medicine* 65:1965–78.
- . 2009. *The Spirit Level*. London: Bloomsbury Press.
- Zheng, Hui, and Yoonyoung Choi. 2024. 'Reevaluating the “Deaths of Despair” Narrative: Racial/Ethnic Heterogeneity in the Trend of Psychological Distress-Related Death'. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 121 (8): e2307656121.

Figures and Tables

Figures




Figure 1. Adjusted marginal suicide rates per 100,000 people per LSOA deprivation quintile, compared to the Highest Deprivation Quintile, 2011-2012.

Note: This Figure reveals that once a person's economic status is included in the regression covariates the influence of local-area deprivation switches from negative to positive. Observations are measured in individuals. There are 5,913 suicides. The base group is approximately 1.7 million citizens. The geographical deprivation areas are at the level of LSOAs (the acronym stands for Lower Layer Super Output Areas) in England and Wales. Bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

Data: Suicides between 27 March 2011 (UK Census 2011) and 31 Dec 2012 and 5% of those alive at the end of the study period in December 2019; characteristics are measured on Census (27 March 2011). Weight applied. Linear probability model. Basic controls include sex, a full set of age dummies, ethnicity, region, and religion. Other controls additionally include family (marital status, number of children), health (health status), education, and economic controls (employment status, socio-economic classification, home ownership, living conditions). Underlying full equations are presented in the main and online Appendices. There are approximately 35,000 LSOAs in the UK; on average they contain approximately 700 households.

Source: Authors' computations based on the ONS Public Health Research Database for England and Wales, and on the English and Welsh Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2019.




Figure 2. Adjusted marginal suicide rates per 100,000 people by age, compared to the rate at 20-24 years old. Model with *all controls*, 2011-2012.

Source: Authors' computations based on the ONS Public Health Research Database for England and Wales, and on the English and Welsh Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2019.




Figure 3. Adjusted marginal suicide rates per 100,000 people by age, compared to the rate at 20-24 years old. Model with *all controls*, 2011-2012. By deprivation quintiles.

Source: Authors' computations based on the ONS Public Health Research Database for England and Wales, and on the English and Welsh Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2019.

Tables

Table 1 Individual-level regression of suicide outcome on geographical area (LSOA) deprivation quintiles. Suicides per 100,000 over 21 months.

	(1) Basic Controls	(2) + Family	(3) + Health	(4) + Education	(5) + Economic controls	(6) - Health
<i>Deprivation quintile</i>						
Highest Deprivation Quintile	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
Quintile 2	-2.528** (0.799)	-1.578** (0.799)	0.922 (0.801)	1.234 (0.803)	2.487*** (0.813)	2.215*** (0.813)
Quintile 3	-5.950*** (0.794)	-4.017*** (0.793)	0.192 (0.796)	0.714 (0.799)	2.312*** (0.819)	1.801** (0.818)
Quintile 4	-7.422*** (0.800)	-4.598*** (0.797)	0.783 (0.802)	1.466* (0.809)	3.196*** (0.833)	2.547*** (0.831)
Lowest Deprivation Quintile	-9.551*** (0.807)	-5.759*** (0.801)	0.653 (0.809)	1.525* (0.821)	3.319*** (0.855)	2.544*** (0.853)
Average Suicide Rate per 100,000 over 21 months	17.495 (0.228)	17.495 (0.228)	17.495 (0.228)	17.495 (0.228)	17.495 (0.228)	17.495 (0.228)
Basic controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Family controls	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Health controls	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Education controls	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Economic controls	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Observations	1,695,550	1,695,550	1,695,550	1,695,550	1,695,550	1,695,550

Note: In column (6), on the far right, we remove the controls for subjective health from the regression. Observations are measured in individuals. There are 5,913 suicides. The base group is approximately 1.7 million citizens. The geographical deprivation areas are at the level of LSOAs (the acronym stands for Lower Layer Super Output Areas) in England and Wales.

Data: Suicides between 27 March 2011 (UK Census 2011) and 31 Dec 2012 and 5% of those alive at the end of the study period in December 2019; characteristics are measured on Census (27 March 2011). Weights applied. Linear probability model. Basic controls include sex, a full set of age dummies, ethnicity, region, and religion. Other controls additionally include family (marital status, number of children), health (health status), education, and economic controls (employment status, socio-economic classification, home ownership, living conditions). Underlying full equations are presented in the main and online Appendices. There are approximately 35,000 LSOAs in the UK; on average they contain approximately 700 households.

The Average Suicide Rate is estimated here by calculating the constant in a linear probability model with no other controls. The reason that it appears higher than is normal in a western industrialized nation (a normal rate is approximately 10 suicides per 100,000 citizens per year) is because our time period extends to approximately 21 months. Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors in parentheses. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

The Online Supplementary Materials Table M3 presents the results for a probit model. The findings are similar.

Source: Authors' computations based on the ONS Public Health Research Database for England and Wales, and on the English and Welsh Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2019.

Table 2 Gelbach decomposition based on results shown in Table 1.

Deprivation quintile	Covariate Block			
	Family	Health	Education	Economic
Quintile 2	-0.678	-2.263	0.094	-2.169
Quintile 3	-1.417	-3.838	0.164	-3.170
Quintile 4	-2.097	-4.938	0.216	-3.799
Quintile 5 (Least deprived)	-2.847	-5.928	0.272	-4.366


Note: The table shows how each of the blocks of covariates shown in Table 1 contributes to the change in coefficients from those shown in column 1 of Table 1, to those shown in column 5. Calculations are based on the decomposition of Gelbach (2016). For each row, the columns sum to the difference in coefficients between those in columns 5 and 1 of Table 1. Controls relating to health and economic conditions are most responsible for the change in the sign of the relationship between suicide and local area deprivation. Table S4 in the supplementary materials presents a similar table, comparing column 1 of Table 1 with a specification with no controls at all.

Source: Authors' computations based on the ONS Public Health Research Database for England and Wales, and on the English and Welsh Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2019.

Appendix / Supplementary Material

Tables and figures numbered with an S appear in the appendix at the end of this article. Those numbered with an M are in the Online Supplementary Materials.


Additional Figures



Note: Bars represent 95% confidence intervals. Data: suicides between 27 March 2011 (UK Census 2011) and 31 Dec 2012 and 5% of those alive at the end of the study period in December 2019; characteristics are measured on Census (27 March 2011).

Figure S1 Differences in adjusted marginal suicide rates per 100,000 people. Model with *all controls*, 2011-2012.

Source: Authors' computations based on the ONS Public Health Research Database for England and Wales, and on the English and Welsh Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2019.




Note: Bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

Figure S2 Adjusted marginal suicide rates per 100,000 people by age, compared to the rate at 20 years old. Full set of age-year dummy variables. Model with *all controls*, 2011-2012.

Source: Authors' computations based on the ONS Public Health Research Database for England and Wales, and on the English and Welsh Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2019.

Local Area Deprivation and Suicide Risk




Note: Bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

Figure S3 Adjusted marginal suicide rates per 100,000 people per LSOA deprivation decile. Model with *No Controls*, 2011-2012. All populations. By decile of deprivation.

Source: Authors' computations based on the ONS Public Health Research Database for England and Wales, and on the English and Welsh Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2019.

Local Area Deprivation and Suicide Risk



Note: Bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

Figure S4 Adjusted marginal suicide rates per 100,000 people per LSOA deprivation decile. Model with *All Controls*, 2011-2012. All populations. By decile of deprivation.

Source: Authors' computations based on the ONS Public Health Research Database for England and Wales, and on the English and Welsh Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2019.

Additional Tables**Table S1** Suicide numbers and rates by sex and deprivation quintile.

	Number	Rate per 100,000 over 21 months	SE
Panel A: Suicide numbers and rates by sex			
Male	4,515	27.784	(0.415)
Female	1,398	7.966	(0.213)
Total	5,913		
Panel B: Suicide numbers and rates by LSOA area deprivation quintile			
1 – Most deprived	1,312	20.717	(0.573)
2	1,303	19.304	(0.536)
3	1,178	17.023	(0.497)
4	1,123	16.224	(0.485)
5 – Least deprived	997	14.505	(0.460)

Note: The definition of suicide in the ONS data used throughout the paper: *ICD-10 ranges X60-X84 (intentional self-harm) and Y10-Y34 (injury or poisoning of undetermined intent).*

Source: Authors' computations based on the ONS Public Health Research Database for England and Wales, and on the English and Welsh Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2019.

Table S2 Share of strangulation as method of suicide across LSOA deprivation quintiles

Deprivation quintile	Quintile 1 (most deprived)	Quintile 2	Quintile 3	Quintile 4	Quintile 5 (least deprived)
% strangulation as method of suicide	44.6%	44.1%	47.0%	48.7%	45.8%

Notes: The table shows, among all population-weighted observations where an individual died of suicide the share for which strangulation was the method of suicide across each LSOA deprivation quintile.

Source: Authors' computations based on the ONS Public Health Research Database for England and Wales, and on the English and Welsh Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2019.

Table S3 Individual-level regression of suicide outcome on geographical area (LSOA) deprivation quintiles. England Only. Suicides per 100,000.

	(1) Basic Controls	(2) + Family	(3) + Health	(4) + Education	(5) + Economic controls	(6) - Health
<i>Deprivation quintile</i>						
Highest Deprivation Quintile	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
	-2.804***	-1.853**	0.664	0.946	2.140***	1.869**
Quintile 2	(0.816)	(0.816)	(0.817)	(0.819)	(0.829)	(0.829)
	-6.265***	-4.293***	-0.090	0.379	1.900**	1.388*
Quintile 3	(0.813)	(0.812)	(0.814)	(0.818)	(0.838)	(0.837)
	-7.767***	-4.877***	0.496	1.110	2.759***	2.102**
Quintile 4	(0.819)	(0.816)	(0.821)	(0.827)	(0.852)	(0.850)
Lowest Deprivation Quintile	-9.585***	-5.732***	0.660	1.447*	3.160***	2.385***
	(0.830)	(0.824)	(0.832)	(0.844)	(0.878)	(0.876)
Basic controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Family controls	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Health controls	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Education controls	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Economic controls	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Observations	1,604,129	1,604,129	1,604,129	1,604,129	1,604,129	1,604,129

Note: Same specification as Table 1 of the main text, but excluding Wales.

Source: Authors' computations based on the ONS Public Health Research Database for England and Wales, and on the English and Welsh Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2019.

Table S4 Gelbach decomposition comparing Panel B of Table S1 with column 1 of Table 1.

Deprivation quintile	Sex	Age	Covariate Block		
			Ethnicity	Government Region	Religion
Quintile 2	0.132	0.262	0.494	-0.299	0.527
Quintile 3	0.176	0.730	0.894	-0.101	0.558
Quintile 4	0.143	1.125	1.152	-0.004	0.512
Quintile 5 (Least deprived)	0.171	1.427	1.209	0.048	0.486

Notes: The table shows how the 'basic' covariates used in column 1 of Table 1 contribute to the change in coefficients between those shown in column 1 of Table 1, to those shown in Panel B of Table S1 (i.e. an analysis where no covariate adjustment is made). Calculations are based on the decomposition of Gelbach (2016). For each row, the columns sum to the difference in coefficients between specifications.

Source: Authors' computations based on the ONS Public Health Research Database for England and Wales, and on the English and Welsh Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2019.

Table S5 Individual-level regression of suicide outcome on LSOA deprivation quintiles. Suicides per 100,000. North vs South. Full controls included.

	(1) North	(2) South	(3) Female	(4) Male
Highest Deprivation Quintile	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
Quintile 2	1.840 (1.127)	3.107** (1.183)	1.629** (0.758)	3.568** (1.487)
Quintile 3	2.399** (1.129)	2.488** (1.193)	1.870* (0.768)	2.846** (1.492)
Quintile 4	3.343*** (1.143)	3.296*** (1.216)	1.594*** (0.766)	5.070** (1.529)
Lowest Deprivation Quintile	2.866** (1.168)	4.075*** (1.230)	3.053** (0.818)	3.874*** (1.549)
Observations	842670	852880	878756	816794

Note: Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors in parentheses. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Source: Authors' computations based on the ONS Public Health Research Database for England and Wales, and on the English and Welsh Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2019.

Table S6 Individual-level multinomial logistic regression of (A) suicide outcome or (B) death from other causes on geographical area (LSOA) deprivation quintiles. Raw multinomial logit coefficients.

	(1) Basic Controls	(2) + Family	(3) + Health	(4) + Education	(5) + Economic controls	(6) - Health
(A) Deaths due to suicide						
<i>Deprivation quintile</i>						
Highest Deprivation Quintile	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
Quintile 2	-0.131*** (0.040)	-0.056 (0.040)	0.077* (0.040)	0.089** (0.040)	0.137*** (0.041)	0.126*** (0.041)
Quintile 3	-0.318*** (0.041)	-0.181*** (0.041)	0.038 (0.042)	0.058 (0.042)	0.126*** (0.043)	0.104** (0.043)
Quintile 4	-0.400*** (0.042)	-0.208*** (0.042)	0.077* (0.043)	0.104** (0.043)	0.187*** (0.045)	0.155*** (0.045)
Lowest Deprivation Quintile	-0.532*** (0.044)	-0.279*** (0.045)	0.063 (0.046)	0.099** (0.046)	0.193*** (0.048)	0.153*** (0.048)
(B) Deaths due to other causes						
<i>Deprivation quintile</i>						
Highest Deprivation Quintile	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
Quintile 2	-0.310*** (0.008)	-0.259*** (0.008)	-0.008 (0.011)	0.001 (0.011)	0.011 (0.011)	-0.023** (0.010)
Quintile 3	-0.567*** (0.008)	-0.483*** (0.008)	-0.040*** (0.011)	-0.025** (0.011)	-0.008 (0.011)	-0.052*** (0.010)
Quintile 4	-0.762*** (0.008)	-0.652*** (0.008)	-0.073*** (0.011)	-0.052*** (0.011)	-0.026** (0.012)	-0.087*** (0.011)
Lowest Deprivation Quintile	-0.927*** (0.009)	-0.793*** (0.009)	-0.077*** (0.011)	-0.048*** (0.012)	-0.018 (0.012)	-0.093*** (0.011)
Family controls	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Health controls	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Education controls	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Economic controls	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Observations	1,963,522	1,963,522	1,963,522	1,963,522	1,963,522	1,963,522

Note: Table replicates Table 1 of the main text, but uses a multinomial logistic regression, where individuals who died from any other (non-suicide) causes are now included, too. Results on suicide mirror those shown in Table 1.

Source: Authors' computations based on the ONS Public Health Research Database for England and Wales, and on the English and Welsh Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2019.

Online Supplementary Materials

Table M1 Suicide numbers and rates by individual characteristics.

	Number	Rate per 100,000	SE
Panel A: Suicide numbers and rates by marital status			
Married/Civil partnership	1,968	11.225	(0.253)
Divorced/Dissolved/Separated	1,322	31.182	(0.860)
Widowed	202	21.674	(1.528)
Single	2,421	21.821	(0.444)
Panel B: Suicide numbers and rates by education level			
No formal qualifications	1,553	26.605	(0.677)
Some high school, apprenticeship	2,045	18.735	(0.415)
Completed high school, diploma, advanced	2,026	13.462	(0.299)
Completed tertiary education	289	14.478	(0.853)
Panel C: Suicide numbers and rates by housing tenure			
Owned outright	1,432	16.295	(0.431)
Owned with mortgage	1,838	12.911	(0.302)
Rented from council, social landlord or	1,352	30.414	(0.829)
Privately rented	1,084	19.271	(0.586)
Rent-free or missing	75	22.408	(2.593)
NA	132	35.682	(3.116)
Panel D: Suicide numbers and rates by employment status			
FT employed	1,923	13.360	(0.305)
FT self-employed	559	21.906	(0.928)
PT employed	480	8.861	(0.405)
PT self-employed	190	17.353	(1.261)
Unemployed	456	32.348	(1.519)
FT student	*	*	*
Retired	777	17.756	(0.638)
Other	1,522	34.215	(0.880)
Panel E: Suicide numbers and rates by health status			
Very good	1,393	9.621	(0.258)
Good	2,011	14.756	(0.329)
Fair	1,386	32.820	(0.884)
Bad	832	70.200	(2.449)
Very bad	291	102.446	(6.061)
Panel F: Suicide numbers and rates by region			
North	3,230	19.235	(0.339)
South	2,683	15.776	(0.305)
Panel G: Suicide numbers and rates by age group			
20 to 24	360	10.471	(0.552)

Local Area Deprivation and Suicide Risk

25 to 29	396	11.558	(0.581)
30 to 34	462	13.848	(0.645)
35 to 39	611	17.836	(0.723)
40 to 44	815	21.502	(0.755)
45 to 49	880	23.215	(0.784)
50 to 54	766	23.111	(0.837)
55 to 59	549	19.424	(0.830)
60 to 64	459	16.184	(0.757)
65 to 69	322	15.780	(0.881)
70 to 75	293	18.614	(1.089)

Note: some values suppressed due to too few observations. These are marked by *. In regions, South includes South East, South West, East of England and Greater London.

Source: Authors' computations based on the ONS Public Health Research Database for England and Wales, and on the English and Welsh Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2019.

Table M2 Full results of Table 1: individual-level regression of suicide outcome x100,000 on LSOA deprivation quintile, 2011-2012.

	(1) Basic Controls	(2) + Family	(3) + Health	(4) + Education	(5) + Economic controls	(6) - Subjective health
<i>Deprivation quintile</i>						
Highest Deprivation Quintile	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(.)	(.)	(.)	(.)	(.)	(.)
Quintile 2	-2.528*** (0.799)	-1.578** (0.799)	0.922 (0.801)	1.234 (0.803)	2.487*** (0.813)	2.215*** (0.813)
Quintile 3	-5.950*** (0.794)	-4.017*** (0.793)	0.192 (0.796)	0.714 (0.799)	2.312*** (0.819)	1.801** (0.818)
Quintile 4	-7.422*** (0.800)	-4.598*** (0.797)	0.783 (0.802)	1.466* (0.809)	3.196*** (0.833)	2.547*** (0.831)
Lowest Deprivation Quintile	-9.551*** (0.807)	-5.759*** (0.801)	0.653 (0.809)	1.525* (0.821)	3.319*** (0.855)	2.544*** (0.853)
<i>Sex</i>						
Male	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
Female	-19.405*** (0.466)	-19.081*** (0.469)	-19.603*** (0.472)	-19.635*** (0.473)	-21.646*** (0.537)	-21.852*** (0.538)
<i>Age</i>						
age=20	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
age=21	3.789** (1.754)	4.107** (1.755)	3.978** (1.756)	3.996** (1.757)	3.870** (1.763)	3.919** (1.763)
age=22	3.023* (1.712)	3.999** (1.715)	3.797** (1.716)	3.874** (1.716)	3.205* (1.736)	3.295* (1.736)
age=23	2.219 (1.654)	3.748** (1.658)	3.471** (1.659)	3.578** (1.659)	2.816* (1.699)	2.931* (1.699)
age=24	2.081 (1.656)	4.230** (1.663)	3.757** (1.663)	3.861** (1.663)	3.103* (1.729)	3.345* (1.729)
age=25	3.669** (1.730)	6.324*** (1.739)	5.636*** (1.739)	5.745*** (1.740)	5.093*** (1.812)	5.358*** (1.812)
age=26	1.641 (1.633)	5.087*** (1.646)	4.196** (1.646)	4.316*** (1.645)	3.645** (1.734)	4.007** (1.735)
age=27	3.095* (1.698)	7.474*** (1.724)	6.248*** (1.724)	6.380*** (1.724)	5.750*** (1.817)	6.181*** (1.817)
age=28	4.713*** (1.758)	9.903*** (1.792)	8.376*** (1.791)	8.533*** (1.792)	7.901*** (1.881)	8.451*** (1.881)
age=29	5.664*** (1.790)	11.744*** (1.828)	9.922*** (1.827)	10.058*** (1.828)	9.419*** (1.918)	9.989*** (1.919)
age=30	6.359*** (1.802)	13.269*** (1.850)	11.123*** (1.848)	11.267*** (1.850)	10.577*** (1.933)	11.254*** (1.934)

Local Area Deprivation and Suicide Risk

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Basic Controls	+ Family	+ Health	+ Education	+ Economic controls	- Subjective health
age=31	5.609*** (1.772)	13.270*** (1.831)	10.919*** (1.828)	11.061*** (1.829)	10.375*** (1.917)	11.130*** (1.918)
age=32	7.050*** (1.854)	15.415*** (1.920)	12.684*** (1.916)	12.843*** (1.916)	12.268*** (2.002)	13.094*** (2.003)
age=33	6.345*** (1.847)	15.245*** (1.919)	12.259*** (1.915)	12.396*** (1.915)	11.778*** (2.003)	12.683*** (2.004)
age=34	7.759*** (1.907)	17.143*** (1.988)	13.766*** (1.982)	13.906*** (1.984)	13.244*** (2.075)	14.336*** (2.077)
age=35	8.191*** (1.914)	17.896*** (2.003)	14.237*** (1.999)	14.346*** (1.999)	13.740*** (2.092)	14.872*** (2.093)
age=36	10.561*** (1.995)	20.516*** (2.086)	16.528*** (2.081)	16.588*** (2.083)	16.048*** (2.167)	17.271*** (2.169)
age=37	12.053*** (2.032)	22.266*** (2.132)	17.787*** (2.121)	17.806*** (2.122)	17.220*** (2.207)	18.550*** (2.210)
age=38	11.564*** (1.991)	21.951*** (2.108)	17.268*** (2.097)	17.244*** (2.097)	16.799*** (2.189)	18.202*** (2.193)
age=39	10.696*** (1.929)	21.164*** (2.051)	16.213*** (2.044)	16.111*** (2.043)	15.675*** (2.127)	17.185*** (2.128)
age=40	15.377*** (2.068)	25.946*** (2.174)	20.659*** (2.163)	20.525*** (2.163)	20.170*** (2.248)	21.767*** (2.251)
age=41	12.497*** (1.983)	22.975*** (2.103)	17.430*** (2.091)	17.243*** (2.091)	16.976*** (2.183)	18.675*** (2.186)
age=42	12.758*** (1.981)	23.112*** (2.092)	17.361*** (2.082)	17.146*** (2.082)	16.933*** (2.178)	18.717*** (2.181)
age=43	15.536*** (2.066)	25.773*** (2.180)	19.570*** (2.170)	19.357*** (2.170)	19.112*** (2.261)	21.038*** (2.265)
age=44	15.630*** (2.062)	25.890*** (2.160)	19.542*** (2.148)	19.307*** (2.148)	19.058*** (2.233)	21.073*** (2.235)
age=45	17.654*** (2.119)	27.830*** (2.236)	21.153*** (2.224)	20.905*** (2.225)	20.608*** (2.311)	22.687*** (2.313)
age=46	16.190*** (2.069)	26.293*** (2.176)	19.427*** (2.167)	19.166*** (2.167)	18.803*** (2.259)	20.979*** (2.261)
age=47	15.437*** (2.072)	25.435*** (2.190)	18.195*** (2.179)	17.923*** (2.179)	17.495*** (2.265)	19.826*** (2.267)
age=48	15.865*** (2.090)	25.794*** (2.209)	18.421*** (2.202)	18.120*** (2.202)	17.565*** (2.283)	19.868*** (2.284)
age=49	15.453*** (2.093)	25.257*** (2.208)	17.495*** (2.196)	17.160*** (2.198)	16.532*** (2.282)	18.976*** (2.284)
age=50	13.480*** (2.048)	23.156*** (2.161)	14.992*** (2.155)	14.650*** (2.156)	13.902*** (2.240)	16.450*** (2.239)
age=51	14.922*** (2.129)	24.472*** (2.242)	16.079*** (2.235)	15.726*** (2.238)	14.680*** (2.322)	17.338*** (2.323)

Local Area Deprivation and Suicide Risk

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Basic Controls	+ Family	+ Health	+ Education	+ Economic controls	- Subjective health
age=52	18.831*** (2.289)	28.308*** (2.419)	19.343*** (2.415)	18.981*** (2.416)	17.798*** (2.501)	20.557*** (2.500)
age=53	17.798*** (2.265)	27.291*** (2.397)	18.070*** (2.387)	17.655*** (2.389)	16.371*** (2.477)	19.114*** (2.477)
age=54	15.872*** (2.232)	25.314*** (2.367)	15.678*** (2.367)	15.228*** (2.369)	13.796*** (2.461)	16.669*** (2.458)
age=55	14.138*** (2.216)	23.697*** (2.355)	13.400*** (2.352)	12.921*** (2.354)	11.209*** (2.445)	14.203*** (2.441)
age=56	15.876*** (2.294)	25.268*** (2.423)	14.778*** (2.420)	14.279*** (2.424)	12.317*** (2.507)	15.271*** (2.504)
age=57	15.023*** (2.265)	24.563*** (2.413)	13.691*** (2.414)	13.180*** (2.418)	10.985*** (2.509)	13.985*** (2.507)
age=58	9.498*** (2.056)	19.066*** (2.204)	7.992*** (2.204)	7.449*** (2.208)	5.017** (2.319)	8.001*** (2.316)
age=59	8.267*** (2.016)	17.953*** (2.165)	6.351*** (2.166)	5.744*** (2.170)	2.978 (2.275)	6.048*** (2.269)
age=60	13.085*** (2.229)	22.782*** (2.377)	11.087*** (2.381)	10.426*** (2.385)	7.739*** (2.513)	10.804*** (2.508)
age=61	7.084*** (1.943)	16.921*** (2.110)	4.899** (2.113)	4.196** (2.122)	1.360 (2.269)	4.358* (2.263)
age=62	9.248*** (2.036)	19.135*** (2.220)	6.981*** (2.227)	6.191*** (2.238)	3.056 (2.397)	5.989** (2.393)
age=63	9.985*** (2.010)	20.053*** (2.188)	7.792*** (2.195)	6.937*** (2.201)	3.569 (2.370)	6.483*** (2.362)
age=64	9.350*** (1.990)	19.361*** (2.171)	6.895*** (2.178)	5.991*** (2.189)	2.432 (2.371)	5.234** (2.365)
age=65	11.207*** (2.274)	16.716*** (2.424)	4.345* (2.432)	3.365 (2.443)	-0.079 (2.661)	2.755 (2.656)
age=66	8.450*** (2.112)	12.971*** (2.272)	0.413 (2.289)	-0.630 (2.302)	-4.183 (2.558)	-1.524 (2.552)
age=67	10.623*** (2.291)	14.580*** (2.442)	2.037 (2.455)	0.957 (2.468)	-2.635 (2.733)	-0.131 (2.729)
age=68	9.102*** (2.280)	12.295*** (2.443)	-0.414 (2.462)	-1.578 (2.480)	-5.097* (2.748)	-2.603 (2.742)
age=69	9.992*** (2.485)	12.564*** (2.627)	-0.571 (2.651)	-1.795 (2.670)	-5.220* (2.901)	-2.860 (2.896)
age=70	8.223*** (2.428)	10.501*** (2.569)	-2.970 (2.595)	-4.198 (2.614)	-7.592*** (2.879)	-5.272* (2.873)
age=71	11.333*** (2.624)	13.210*** (2.796)	-0.558 (2.815)	-1.818 (2.832)	-5.143* (3.070)	-2.774 (3.064)
age=72	14.684*** (2.903)	16.268*** (3.055)	2.166 (3.081)	0.873 (3.089)	-2.475 (3.325)	-0.277 (3.318)

Local Area Deprivation and Suicide Risk

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Basic Controls	+ Family	+ Health	+ Education	+ Economic controls	- Subjective health
age=73	15.165*** (3.038)	16.394*** (3.175)	2.132 (3.194)	0.811 (3.205)	-2.340 (3.412)	-0.288 (3.409)
age=74	17.089*** (3.270)	18.067*** (3.394)	3.293 (3.413)	1.923 (3.436)	-1.204 (3.631)	0.974 (3.627)
age=75	16.739*** (3.436)	17.454*** (3.569)	2.438 (3.586)	1.062 (3.607)	-2.008 (3.793)	0.184 (3.787)
<i>Ethnicity</i>						
Bangladeshi and Pakistani	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
Black	-2.214 (1.605)	-6.710*** (1.620)	-5.199*** (1.625)	-5.123*** (1.625)	-6.819*** (1.662)	-7.871*** (1.660)
Chinese	-3.816* (2.235)	-7.990*** (2.248)	-6.229*** (2.251)	-6.220*** (2.253)	-6.878*** (2.310)	-7.338*** (2.308)
Indian	0.450 (1.939)	-1.144 (1.941)	0.374 (1.946)	0.632 (1.946)	0.929 (1.955)	0.290 (1.953)
Mixed	11.438*** (2.490)	6.385** (2.496)	5.546** (2.500)	5.383** (2.500)	3.594 (2.509)	2.984 (2.507)
Other	-0.203 (1.324)	-2.013 (1.329)	-1.493 (1.335)	-1.371 (1.339)	-2.106 (1.368)	-2.656* (1.366)
White	6.639*** (1.436)	2.880** (1.444)	2.993** (1.450)	2.704* (1.450)	1.580 (1.476)	0.823 (1.473)
<i>Region</i>						
North East	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
North West	1.194 (1.344)	0.789 (1.344)	1.275 (1.346)	1.315 (1.346)	1.574 (1.347)	1.497 (1.346)
Yorkshire and the Humber	-1.250 (1.377)	-1.445 (1.378)	-0.732 (1.379)	-0.793 (1.380)	-0.642 (1.381)	-0.656 (1.381)
East Midlands	-1.273 (1.405)	-1.515 (1.406)	-1.039 (1.408)	-1.140 (1.409)	-1.054 (1.410)	-1.019 (1.409)
West Midlands	-1.716 (1.359)	-1.777 (1.359)	-1.074 (1.361)	-1.135 (1.361)	-0.907 (1.362)	-0.819 (1.362)
East of England	-2.669** (1.334)	-3.037** (1.334)	-2.191 (1.336)	-2.322* (1.337)	-2.298* (1.341)	-2.305* (1.341)
Greater London	-4.412*** (1.285)	-6.569*** (1.289)	-4.909*** (1.290)	-4.571*** (1.290)	-4.006*** (1.314)	-4.032*** (1.314)
South East England	-1.449 (1.292)	-2.088 (1.292)	-0.858 (1.295)	-0.842 (1.295)	-0.737 (1.299)	-0.813 (1.299)
South West	-0.007 (1.390)	-0.399 (1.391)	0.768 (1.393)	0.806 (1.393)	0.683 (1.394)	0.552 (1.394)
England	2.664* (1.600)	2.543 (1.601)	1.677 (1.603)	1.616 (1.603)	1.624 (1.605)	1.523 (1.604)
Wales						
<i>Religion</i>						

Local Area Deprivation and Suicide Risk

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Basic Controls	+ Family	+ Health	+ Education	+ Economic controls	- Subjective health
No religion	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
Christian	-6.192*** (0.623)	-4.546*** (0.626)	-4.233*** (0.626)	-4.288*** (0.625)	-3.889*** (0.627)	-4.170*** (0.627)
Buddhist	0.620 (3.358)	-0.039 (3.361)	-0.965 (3.364)	-0.905 (3.365)	-1.404 (3.369)	-1.183 (3.368)
Hindu	-6.064*** (2.267)	-3.288 (2.270)	-5.034** (2.274)	-5.155** (2.274)	-4.895** (2.277)	-4.676** (2.277)
Jewish	-10.163*** (2.643)	-7.376*** (2.649)	-6.609** (2.653)	-6.344** (2.653)	-6.522** (2.657)	-6.831** (2.656)
Muslim	-12.553*** (1.325)	-8.581*** (1.331)	-11.911*** (1.340)	-12.325*** (1.345)	-14.030*** (1.371)	-13.652*** (1.370)
Sikh	5.842* (3.357)	8.483** (3.360)	5.686* (3.364)	5.338 (3.363)	5.731* (3.368)	6.300* (3.367)
Other religion	9.923** (4.182)	7.946* (4.184)	2.908 (4.190)	3.324 (4.191)	2.584 (4.191)	3.882 (4.188)
Not stated	-2.061* (1.108)	-2.393* (1.110)	-3.525*** (1.112)	-3.513*** (1.112)	-3.385*** (1.113)	-3.091*** (1.113)
<i>Marital status</i>						
Married/Civil partnership		0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
Divorced/Dissolve d/Separated		14.761*** (0.888)	11.919*** (0.880)	11.735*** (0.880)	10.384*** (0.899)	11.009*** (0.900)
Widowed		9.645*** (1.621)	7.596*** (1.623)	7.226*** (1.626)	5.997*** (1.659)	6.367*** (1.658)
Single		12.549*** (0.764)	10.241*** (0.759)	10.044*** (0.760)	8.593*** (0.766)	8.753*** (0.766)
<i>Number of children</i>						
No children		0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
one dependent child		-0.437 (0.717)	-0.661 (0.718)	-0.862 (0.719)	-0.815 (0.763)	-1.006 (0.763)
two dependent children		-1.754** (0.727)	-1.583** (0.727)	-1.867** (0.730)	-2.489*** (0.848)	-3.065*** (0.849)
no dependent children but some non-dependent children		1.847** (0.732)	0.823 (0.733)	0.536 (0.734)	1.142 (0.776)	1.059 (0.776)
Missing/NA		13.834*** (0.807)	12.467*** (0.802)	12.511*** (0.803)	11.525*** (0.832)	11.731*** (0.833)
<i>Self-reported Health</i>						
Very good			0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	

Local Area Deprivation and Suicide Risk

	(1) Basic Controls	(2) + Family	(3) + Health	(4) + Education	(5) + Economic controls	(6) - Subjective health
Good			4.757*** (0.441)	4.459*** (0.443)	3.699*** (0.444)	
Fair			17.377*** (1.042)	16.758*** (1.046)	14.908*** (1.046)	
Bad			43.551*** (2.920)	42.857*** (2.924)	39.214*** (2.922)	
Very bad			73.182*** (6.354)	72.448*** (6.359)	68.238*** (6.357)	
<i>Health Limits</i>						
<i>Activities</i>						
Yes, a lot			0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
Yes, a little			-9.600*** (2.329)	-9.202*** (2.335)	-6.460*** (2.345)	-22.626*** (2.111)
No			-19.186*** (2.198)	-18.689*** (2.206)	-13.933*** (2.209)	-39.020*** (1.847)
<i>Qualification</i>						
no formal qualifications				0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
some highschool, apprenticeship completed				-1.884** (0.860)	0.463 (0.894)	-0.313 (0.892)
highschool, diploma, advanced craft				-4.406*** (0.838)	0.803 (0.915)	-0.223 (0.911)
completed tertiary education				-4.096*** (1.128)	-1.730 (1.159)	-2.446** (1.157)
<i>Employment Status</i>						
FT employed					0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
FT self-employed					3.863*** (1.047)	3.735*** (1.046)
PT employed					5.214*** (0.612)	5.446*** (0.612)
PT self-employed					7.414*** (1.357)	7.535*** (1.357)
Unemployed					17.246*** (1.761)	18.082*** (1.761)
FT student					10.308*** (2.552)	12.007*** (2.552)
Retired					7.497*** (1.167)	8.100*** (1.167)

Local Area Deprivation and Suicide Risk

	(1) Basic Controls	(2) + Family	(3) + Health	(4) + Education	(5) + Economic controls	(6) - Subjective health
Other					17.154*** (1.127)	19.484*** (1.131)
<i>Socioeconomic and Occupational Classification</i>						
High salariat					0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
Low salariat					1.880 (1.307)	1.904 (1.307)
Lower Professionals					3.931*** (1.199)	4.107*** (1.199)
Intermediate and self-employed					6.567*** (1.270)	6.912*** (1.270)
Lower technical					5.029*** (1.496)	5.653*** (1.496)
Semi-routine					6.525*** (1.350)	7.057*** (1.351)
Routine					9.480*** (1.489)	10.125*** (1.490)
Never worked					1.446 (2.042)	1.289 (2.040)
Student					-9.109*** (1.708)	-10.011*** (1.707)
<i>Home ownership</i>						
Owned outright					0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
Owned with mortgage					-1.542** (0.643)	-1.265** (0.643)
Rented from council, social landlord or housing association					3.538*** (1.047)	5.191*** (1.047)
Privately rented					1.648* (0.918)	2.414*** (0.917)
Rent-free or missing					4.033 (2.891)	5.082* (2.890)
NA					25.710*** (4.262)	26.396*** (4.262)
<i>Born in the UK</i>						
No					0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
Yes					0.864 (0.782)	1.017 (0.781)

Local Area Deprivation and Suicide Risk

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Basic Controls	+ Family	+ Health	+ Education	+ Economic controls	- Subjective health
<i>Living conditions</i>						
Up to 0.5 persons per room					0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
Over 0.5 and up to 1.0 persons per room					-3.237*** (0.890)	-2.957*** (0.889)
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room					-6.456*** (1.041)	-6.115*** (1.040)
Over 1.5 persons per room					-4.275*** (1.163)	-3.914*** (1.162)
Missing/NA					-23.122*** (3.036)	-24.729*** (3.037)
Constant	22.108*** (2.274)	5.645** (2.448)	20.459*** (3.323)	23.350*** (3.374)	11.750*** (3.931)	38.721*** (3.678)
Observations	1,695,550	1,695,550	1,695,550	1,695,550	1,695,550	1,695,550

Note: In column (6), on the far right, we remove the controls for subjective health from the regression. Observations are measured in individuals. There are 5,913 suicides. The base group is approximately 1.7 million citizens. The geographical deprivation areas are at the level of LSOAs (the acronym stands for Lower Layer Super Output Areas) in England and Wales.

Data: Suicides between 27 March 2011 (UK Census 2011) and 31 Dec 2012 and 5% of those alive at the end of the study period in December 2019; characteristics are measured on Census (27 March 2011). Weights applied. Linear probability model. Basic controls include sex, a full set of age dummies, ethnicity, region, and religion. Other controls additionally include family (marital status, number of children), health (health status), education, and economic controls (employment status, socio-economic classification, home ownership, living conditions). Underlying full equations are presented in the main and online Appendices. There are approximately 35,000 LSOAs in the UK; on average they contain approximately 700 households.

The Average Suicide Rate is estimated here by calculating the constant in a linear probability model with no other controls. The reason that it appears higher than is normal in a western industrialized nation (a normal rate is approximately 10 suicides per 100,000 citizens per year) is because our time period extends to approximately 21 months. Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors in parentheses. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

The Online Supplementary Materials Table M3 presents the results for a probit model. The findings are similar.

Source: Authors' computations based on the ONS Public Health Research Database for England and Wales, and on the English and Welsh Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2019.

Table M3 Probit models checking results of Table 1.

	(1) Basic Controls	(2) + Family	(3) + Health	(4) + Education	(5) + Economic controls
<i>Deprivation quintile</i>					
Highest Deprivation Quintile	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
Quintile 2	-0.035*** (0.011)	-0.015 (0.011)	0.021* (0.011)	0.025** (0.011)	0.039*** (0.011)
Quintile 3	-0.085*** (0.011)	-0.049*** (0.011)	0.009 (0.011)	0.016 (0.012)	0.035*** (0.012)
Quintile 4	-0.107*** (0.011)	-0.056*** (0.011)	0.019 (0.012)	0.027** (0.012)	0.051*** (0.012)
Lowest Deprivation Quintile	-0.140*** (0.012)	-0.074*** (0.012)	0.017 (0.012)	0.028** (0.013)	0.054*** (0.013)
<i>Sex</i>					
Male	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
Female	-0.319*** (0.008)	-0.317*** (0.008)	-0.331*** (0.008)	-0.331*** (0.008)	-0.341*** (0.009)
<i>Age</i>					
age=20	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
age=21	0.091** (0.044)	0.092** (0.044)	0.088** (0.044)	0.089** (0.044)	0.083* (0.044)
age=22	0.073* (0.044)	0.079* (0.044)	0.075* (0.045)	0.076* (0.045)	0.060 (0.045)
age=23	0.053 (0.045)	0.062 (0.045)	0.055 (0.045)	0.056 (0.045)	0.036 (0.046)
age=24	0.046 (0.045)	0.062 (0.045)	0.054 (0.046)	0.054 (0.046)	0.034 (0.047)
age=25	0.087** (0.044)	0.109** (0.044)	0.095** (0.044)	0.096** (0.044)	0.074 (0.046)
age=26	0.037 (0.046)	0.066 (0.046)	0.049 (0.046)	0.050 (0.046)	0.028 (0.048)
age=27	0.071 (0.045)	0.107** (0.045)	0.086* (0.045)	0.088* (0.045)	0.064 (0.047)
age=28	0.106** (0.043)	0.152*** (0.044)	0.124*** (0.044)	0.126*** (0.044)	0.102** (0.046)
age=29	0.123*** (0.043)	0.178*** (0.043)	0.148*** (0.043)	0.150*** (0.043)	0.127*** (0.045)
age=30	0.137*** (0.042)	0.203*** (0.043)	0.168*** (0.043)	0.170*** (0.043)	0.144*** (0.044)
age=31	0.122*** (0.043)	0.197*** (0.043)	0.158*** (0.043)	0.159*** (0.043)	0.133*** (0.045)
age=32	0.148***	0.232***	0.188***	0.189***	0.163***

Local Area Deprivation and Suicide Risk

	(1) Basic Controls	(2) + Family	(3) + Health	(4) + Education	(5) + Economic controls
age=33	(0.042) 0.136***	(0.043) 0.226***	(0.043) 0.172***	(0.043) 0.174***	(0.045) 0.146***
age=34	(0.044) 0.162***	(0.044) 0.261***	(0.044) 0.203***	(0.044) 0.204***	(0.046) 0.178***
age=35	(0.043) 0.169***	(0.043) 0.270***	(0.044) 0.206***	(0.044) 0.207***	(0.045) 0.180***
age=36	(0.042) 0.206***	(0.043) 0.313***	(0.043) 0.247***	(0.043) 0.247***	(0.045) 0.221***
age=37	(0.041) 0.225***	(0.042) 0.336***	(0.042) 0.256***	(0.042) 0.256***	(0.044) 0.229***
age=38	(0.040) 0.222***	(0.041) 0.334***	(0.041) 0.253***	(0.041) 0.252***	(0.043) 0.224***
age=39	(0.040) 0.206***	(0.041) 0.319***	(0.041) 0.235***	(0.041) 0.233***	(0.043) 0.206***
age=40	(0.040) 0.270***	(0.041) 0.386***	(0.041) 0.297***	(0.041) 0.295***	(0.043) 0.269***
age=41	(0.039) 0.233***	(0.039) 0.348***	(0.040) 0.255***	(0.040) 0.252***	(0.042) 0.226***
age=42	(0.040) 0.236***	(0.040) 0.351***	(0.041) 0.254***	(0.041) 0.250***	(0.042) 0.227***
age=43	(0.039) 0.271***	(0.040) 0.383***	(0.040) 0.281***	(0.040) 0.278***	(0.042) 0.252***
age=44	(0.039) 0.275***	(0.039) 0.389***	(0.040) 0.283***	(0.040) 0.280***	(0.042) 0.253***
age=45	(0.039) 0.297***	(0.039) 0.411***	(0.040) 0.302***	(0.040) 0.298***	(0.042) 0.271***
age=46	(0.038) 0.280***	(0.039) 0.392***	(0.039) 0.281***	(0.039) 0.278***	(0.041) 0.251***
age=47	(0.038) 0.271***	(0.039) 0.383***	(0.040) 0.266***	(0.040) 0.262***	(0.042) 0.235***
age=48	(0.039) 0.275***	(0.040) 0.385***	(0.040) 0.269***	(0.040) 0.265***	(0.042) 0.237***
age=49	(0.039) 0.271***	(0.039) 0.383***	(0.040) 0.258***	(0.040) 0.254***	(0.042) 0.225***
age=50	(0.039) 0.246***	(0.040) 0.355***	(0.040) 0.228***	(0.040) 0.224***	(0.042) 0.197***
age=51	(0.040) 0.267***	(0.040) 0.375***	(0.041) 0.246***	(0.041) 0.242***	(0.043) 0.211***
age=52	(0.040) 0.310***	(0.040) 0.417***	(0.041) 0.282***	(0.041) 0.278***	(0.043) 0.246***
age=53	(0.039) 0.300***	(0.040) 0.407***	(0.040) 0.265***	(0.040) 0.261***	(0.043) 0.228***
age=54	(0.039) 0.278***	(0.040) 0.385***	(0.041) 0.240***	(0.041) 0.235***	(0.043) 0.203***

Local Area Deprivation and Suicide Risk

	(1) Basic Controls	(2) + Family	(3) + Health	(4) + Education	(5) + Economic controls
age=55	(0.040) 0.256***	(0.041) 0.368***	(0.042) 0.214***	(0.042) 0.209***	(0.044) 0.174***
age=56	(0.041) 0.278***	(0.042) 0.386***	(0.042) 0.229***	(0.042) 0.224***	(0.044) 0.187***
age=57	(0.041) 0.267***	(0.041) 0.379***	(0.042) 0.219***	(0.042) 0.214***	(0.044) 0.175***
age=58	(0.041) 0.189***	(0.042) 0.300***	(0.043) 0.133***	(0.043) 0.127***	(0.045) 0.087*
age=59	(0.043) 0.168***	(0.044) 0.281***	(0.045) 0.106**	(0.045) 0.100**	(0.047) 0.055
age=60	(0.044) 0.242***	(0.045) 0.355***	(0.046) 0.184***	(0.046) 0.177***	(0.048) 0.130***
age=61	(0.042) 0.147***	(0.043) 0.262***	(0.044) 0.080*	(0.044) 0.074	(0.046) 0.025
age=62	(0.045) 0.184***	(0.046) 0.300***	(0.047) 0.121***	(0.047) 0.114**	(0.049) 0.061
age=63	(0.043) 0.194***	(0.044) 0.314***	(0.045) 0.131***	(0.045) 0.123***	(0.048) 0.068
age=64	(0.042) 0.185***	(0.043) 0.303***	(0.044) 0.119***	(0.044) 0.111**	(0.047) 0.052
age=65	(0.043) 0.216***	(0.044) 0.304***	(0.045) 0.123***	(0.045) 0.114**	(0.047) 0.053
age=66	(0.045) 0.168***	(0.046) 0.244***	(0.047) 0.063	(0.047) 0.053	(0.050) -0.008
age=67	(0.046) 0.204***	(0.047) 0.277***	(0.048) 0.099**	(0.048) 0.089*	(0.052) 0.025
age=68	(0.046) 0.183***	(0.047) 0.246***	(0.047) 0.065	(0.048) 0.054	(0.052) -0.008
age=69	(0.048) 0.198***	(0.049) 0.253***	(0.050) 0.072	(0.050) 0.061	(0.054) -0.004
age=70	(0.049) 0.164***	(0.050) 0.217***	(0.051) 0.030	(0.051) 0.019	(0.055) -0.045
age=71	(0.053) 0.216***	(0.054) 0.264***	(0.055) 0.072	(0.055) 0.060	(0.059) -0.004
age=72	(0.050) 0.266***	(0.051) 0.311***	(0.052) 0.123**	(0.052) 0.111**	(0.056) 0.047
age=73	(0.049) 0.275***	(0.050) 0.315***	(0.051) 0.125**	(0.051) 0.112**	(0.055) 0.049
age=74	(0.050) 0.299***	(0.051) 0.337***	(0.052) 0.139***	(0.052) 0.126**	(0.056) 0.064
age=75	(0.050) 0.295***	(0.051) 0.330***	(0.052) 0.131**	(0.052) 0.118**	(0.056) 0.056
<i>Ethnicity</i>	(0.052)	(0.054)	(0.054)	(0.055)	(0.058)

Local Area Deprivation and Suicide Risk

	(1) Basic Controls	(2) + Family	(3) + Health	(4) + Education	(5) + Economic controls
Bangladeshi and Pakistani	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
Black	-0.057 (0.060)	-0.130** (0.060)	-0.106* (0.060)	-0.106* (0.060)	-0.126** (0.060)
Chinese	-0.081 (0.076)	-0.129* (0.076)	-0.092 (0.076)	-0.092 (0.076)	-0.086 (0.076)
Indian	0.027 (0.060)	0.003 (0.062)	0.028 (0.062)	0.032 (0.062)	0.035 (0.062)
Mixed	0.207*** (0.057)	0.124** (0.057)	0.111* (0.057)	0.109* (0.057)	0.093 (0.057)
Other	-0.003 (0.053)	-0.028 (0.052)	-0.015 (0.052)	-0.012 (0.052)	-0.020 (0.052)
White	0.132*** (0.051)	0.068 (0.052)	0.071 (0.051)	0.068 (0.051)	0.062 (0.051)
<i>Region</i>					
North East	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
North West	0.018 (0.018)	0.011 (0.018)	0.016 (0.018)	0.016 (0.018)	0.020 (0.018)
Yorkshire and the Humber	-0.016 (0.019)	-0.020 (0.019)	-0.011 (0.019)	-0.011 (0.019)	-0.008 (0.019)
East Midlands	-0.015 (0.019)	-0.020 (0.020)	-0.016 (0.020)	-0.017 (0.020)	-0.015 (0.020)
West Midlands	-0.022 (0.019)	-0.024 (0.019)	-0.013 (0.019)	-0.014 (0.019)	-0.010 (0.019)
East of England	-0.038** (0.019)	-0.046** (0.019)	-0.037* (0.020)	-0.039** (0.020)	-0.038* (0.020)
Greater London	-0.070*** (0.019)	-0.101*** (0.019)	-0.074*** (0.019)	-0.070*** (0.019)	-0.063*** (0.020)
South East England	-0.019 (0.018)	-0.030* (0.018)	-0.014 (0.018)	-0.014 (0.018)	-0.011 (0.019)
South West England	0.003 (0.019)	-0.003 (0.019)	0.011 (0.019)	0.011 (0.019)	0.012 (0.019)
Wales	0.034* (0.020)	0.033 (0.020)	0.023 (0.021)	0.022 (0.021)	0.022 (0.021)
<i>Religion</i>					
No religion	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
Christian	-0.084*** (0.008)	-0.062*** (0.008)	-0.058*** (0.008)	-0.060*** (0.008)	-0.057*** (0.008)
Buddhist	0.021 (0.052)	-0.002 (0.052)	-0.026 (0.052)	-0.021 (0.052)	-0.029 (0.052)
Hindu	-0.108** (0.055)	-0.069 (0.057)	-0.088 (0.057)	-0.089 (0.057)	-0.084 (0.057)

Local Area Deprivation and Suicide Risk

	(1) Basic Controls	(2) + Family	(3) + Health	(4) + Education	(5) + Economic controls
Jewish	-0.180*** (0.069)	-0.146** (0.070)	-0.145** (0.071)	-0.141** (0.071)	-0.137* (0.071)
Muslim	-0.292*** (0.043)	-0.240*** (0.043)	-0.289*** (0.043)	-0.293*** (0.043)	-0.307*** (0.043)
Sikh	0.109** (0.052)	0.147*** (0.053)	0.118** (0.054)	0.112** (0.054)	0.113** (0.054)
Other religion	0.119*** (0.038)	0.092** (0.039)	0.033 (0.039)	0.039 (0.039)	0.030 (0.040)
Not stated	-0.024* (0.014)	-0.030** (0.014)	-0.045*** (0.014)	-0.045*** (0.014)	-0.043*** (0.015)
<i>Marital Status</i>					
Married/Civil partnership		0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
Divorced/Dissolved/Separated		0.201*** (0.010)	0.169*** (0.011)	0.167*** (0.011)	0.146*** (0.011)
Widowed		0.180*** (0.021)	0.160*** (0.021)	0.156*** (0.021)	0.135*** (0.022)
Single		0.190*** (0.011)	0.156*** (0.011)	0.153*** (0.011)	0.128*** (0.011)
<i>Number of children</i>					
No children		0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
One dependent child		-0.000 (0.014)	-0.002 (0.014)	-0.005 (0.014)	0.005 (0.014)
Two or more dependent children		-0.029** (0.014)	-0.024* (0.014)	-0.027* (0.014)	-0.017 (0.016)
No dependent children, some non-dependent children		0.039*** (0.012)	0.022* (0.013)	0.018 (0.013)	0.025* (0.013)
Missing		0.153*** (0.011)	0.125*** (0.011)	0.125*** (0.011)	0.110*** (0.012)
<i>Self-Reported Health</i>					
Very good			0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
Good			0.098*** (0.009)	0.094*** (0.009)	0.084*** (0.009)
Fair			0.246*** (0.013)	0.239*** (0.013)	0.213*** (0.013)
Bad			0.367*** (0.018)	0.359*** (0.018)	0.320*** (0.019)
Very bad			0.465*** (0.024)	0.458*** (0.024)	0.417*** (0.025)
<i>Health Limits Activities</i>					
Yes, a lot			0.000	0.000	0.000

Local Area Deprivation and Suicide Risk

	(1) Basic Controls	(2) + Family	(3) + Health	(4) + Education	(5) + Economic controls
			(.)	(.)	(.)
Yes, a little			-0.052*** (0.014)	-0.047*** (0.015)	-0.023 (0.015)
No			-0.167*** (0.015)	-0.160*** (0.015)	-0.107*** (0.016)
<i>Qualification</i>					
No formal qualifications				0.000 (.)	0.000 (.)
Non-completed high school				-0.015 (0.010)	0.012 (0.011)
Completed high school, diploma, advanced craft				-0.052*** (0.011)	0.012 (0.012)
Completed tertiary education				-0.044** (0.018)	-0.020 (0.018)
<i>Employment Status</i>					
FT employed					0.000 (.)
FT self-employed					0.080*** (0.015)
PT employed					0.030** (0.014)
PT self-employed					0.108*** (0.022)
Unemployed					0.181*** (0.017)
FT student					0.048 (0.107)
Retired					0.115*** (0.019)
Other					0.157*** (0.013)
<i>Socioeconomic and Occupational Classification</i>					
High salariat					0.000 (.)
Low salariat					0.033 (0.030)
Lower Professionals					0.057** (0.028)
Intermediate and self- employed					0.093*** (0.029)
Lower technical					0.088*** (0.030)
Semi-routine					0.118*** (0.029)

Local Area Deprivation and Suicide Risk

	(1) Basic Controls	(2) + Family	(3) + Health	(4) + Education	(5) + Economic controls
Routine					0.138*** (0.029)
Never worked					0.059* (0.032)
Student					-0.114*** (0.042)
<i>Home ownership</i>					
Owned outright					0.000 (.)
Owned with mortgage					-0.023** (0.011)
Rented from council, social landlord or housing association					0.032** (0.012)
Privately rented					0.026** (0.013)
Rent-free or missing					0.054 (0.034)
Missing					2.887*** (0.075)
<i>Born in the UK</i>					
No					0.000 (.)
Yes					-0.005 (0.015)
<i>Living conditions</i>					
Up to 0.5 persons per room					0.000 (.)
Over 0.5 and up to 1.0 persons per room					-0.031*** (0.011)
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room					-0.077*** (0.015)
Over 1.5 persons per room					-0.036** (0.017)
Missing					-2.860*** (0.071)
Constant	-3.636*** (0.064)	-3.866*** (0.065)	-3.776*** (0.068)	-3.745*** (0.068)	-3.889*** (0.077)
Observations	1695550	1695550	1695550	1695550	1695550

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Source: Authors' computations based on the ONS Public Health Research Database for England and Wales, and on the English and Welsh Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2019.

Table M4 Individual-level regression of suicide outcome on LSOA deprivation quintiles. Suicides per 100,000. By education level. Full controls included.

	(1) No formal qualifications	(2) Some high school, apprenticeship	(3) Completed high school, diploma, advanced craft	(4) Completed tertiary education
Highest Deprivation Quintile	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
Quintile 2	4.886** (2.076)	2.000 (1.458)	1.587 (1.138)	1.009 (2.489)
Quintile 3	2.291 (2.148)	2.809* (1.485)	1.740 (1.143)	-0.050 (2.712)
Quintile 4	5.304** (2.294)	3.725** (1.508)	2.373** (1.160)	-3.633 (2.699)
Lowest Deprivation Quintile	6.341** (2.553)	3.905** (1.544)	1.959* (1.171)	1.874 (3.219)
Observations	293337	547714	754417	100082

Note: Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors in parentheses. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Source: Authors' computations based on the ONS Public Health Research Database for England and Wales, and on the English and Welsh Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2019.

Table M5 Individual-level regression of suicide outcome on LSOA deprivation quintiles. Suicides per 100,000. By tenure type. Full controls included.

	(1) Owned outright	(2) Owned with mortgage	(3) Rented from council, social landlord or housing association	(4) Privately rented	(5) Rent-free or missing
Highest Deprivation Quintile	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
Quintile 2	3.311* (1.788)	1.480 (1.146)	5.586*** (2.139)	-0.429 (1.747)	10.397 (8.372)
Quintile 3	4.306** (1.753)	0.748 (1.121)	5.616** (2.671)	0.278 (1.855)	9.152 (8.093)
Quintile 4	4.232** (1.715)	1.239 (1.136)	5.004 (3.277)	2.790 (2.031)	8.104 (8.955)
Lowest Deprivation Quintile	3.696** (1.720)	1.347 (1.148)	9.819** (4.468)	3.247 (2.288)	18.302* (10.378)
Observations	440765	713519	223553	282285	16806

Note: Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors in parentheses. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Source: Authors' computations based on the ONS Public Health Research Database for England and Wales, and on the English and Welsh Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2019.

Table M6 Individual-level regression of suicide outcome on LSOA deprivation quintiles. Suicides per 100,000. By employment type. Full controls included.

	(1) FT employe d	(2) FT self- employe d	(3) PT employe d	(4) PT self- employe d	(5) Unempl oyed	(6) FT student	(7) Retired	(8) Other
Highest Deprivation Quintile	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
Quintile 2	1.933* (1.089)	3.543 (3.337)	0.634 (1.414)	1.986 (5.003)	-6.950* (4.024)	0.794 (6.596)	4.249 (2.614)	7.686*** (2.670)
Quintile 3	1.221 (1.080)	5.378 (3.320)	0.555 (1.439)	1.815 (4.997)	-0.487 (4.933)	-1.708 (5.458)	5.214** (2.545)	4.693 (2.888)
Quintile 4	1.939* (1.112)	8.130** (3.387)	1.975 (1.525)	0.314 (5.037)	5.581 (5.692)	4.692 (8.778)	6.847*** (2.553)	2.570 (2.984)
Lowest Deprivation Quintile	3.001*** (1.161)	3.714 (3.351)	2.224 (1.530)	4.174 (5.304)	1.278 (6.158)	20.054 (21.089)	3.829 (2.490)	7.505** (3.350)
Observation s	721525	128119	271312	54926	70917	5357	219533	223861

Note: Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors in parentheses. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Source: Authors' computations based on the ONS Public Health Research Database for England and Wales, and on the English and Welsh Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2019.

Table M7 Individual-level regression of suicide outcome on LSOA deprivation quintiles. Suicides per 100,000. By marital status. Full controls included.

	(1) Married/Civil partnership	(2) Divorced/Dissol ved/Separated	(3) Widowed	(4) Single
Highest Deprivation Quintile	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
Quintile 2	3.191*** (0.945)	-1.259 (2.797)	6.028 (5.077)	3.305** (1.397)
Quintile 3	2.304** (0.925)	2.777 (2.975)	10.632* (5.744)	1.765 (1.447)
Quintile 4	2.770*** (0.940)	4.786 (3.109)	7.525 (5.498)	3.290** (1.513)
Lowest Deprivation Quintile	2.624*** (0.949)	5.846* (3.243)	8.977 (5.894)	3.271** (1.638)
Observations	878488	213239	46792	557031

Note: Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors in parentheses. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Source: Authors' computations based on the ONS Public Health Research Database for England and Wales, and on the English and Welsh Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2019.

Table M8 Individual-level regression of suicide outcome on LSOA deprivation quintiles. Suicides per 100,000. By health status. Full controls included.

	(1) Very good	(2) Good	(3) Fair	(4) Bad	(5) Very bad
Highest Deprivation Quintile	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
Quintile 2	2.220** (0.952)	0.843 (1.116)	3.613 (2.717)	15.540** (6.896)	-9.839 (15.790)
Quintile 3	0.458 (0.937)	1.334 (1.148)	5.057* (2.892)	14.513* (7.578)	6.256 (19.455)
Quintile 4	0.346 (0.946)	2.465** (1.183)	6.957** (3.022)	22.794*** (8.673)	16.575 (22.093)
Lowest Deprivation Quintile	0.197 (0.974)	3.057** (1.236)	4.992 (3.187)	27.966*** (10.157)	38.207 (27.668)
Observations	725248	683307	212466	60050	14479

Note: Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors in parentheses. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Source: Authors' computations based on the ONS Public Health Research Database for England and Wales, and on the English and Welsh Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2019.

Table M9 Individual-level regression of suicide outcome on LSOA deprivation quintiles. Suicides per 100,000. By age group. Full controls included.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
	20 to 24	25 to 29	30 to 34	35 to 39	40 to 44	45 to 49	50 to 54	55 to 59	60 to 64	65 to 69	70 to 75
Highest Deprivation Quintile	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
Quintile 2	0.726 (1.715)	-0.032 (1.794)	3.449* (2.041)	-1.098 (2.641)	6.185** (2.822)	3.559 (3.118)	1.266 (3.196)	2.324 (3.213)	12.092*** (3.105)	2.435 (3.606)	6.161 (4.381)
Quintile 3	-0.748 (1.754)	-0.284 (1.927)	3.523* (2.115)	1.135 (2.788)	4.343 (2.782)	0.252 (3.001)	1.851 (3.199)	4.057 (3.203)	10.815*** (2.929)	5.350 (3.550)	5.110 (4.187)
Quintile 4	0.960 (1.851)	0.592 (2.023)	6.803*** (2.396)	-0.676 (2.667)	7.281** (2.842)	3.325 (3.045)	-1.602 (3.120)	4.050 (3.188)	9.801*** (2.874)	5.545 (3.518)	9.623** (4.265)
Lowest Deprivation Quintile	1.349 (2.064)	3.155 (2.425)	5.492** (2.395)	-0.355 (2.703)	8.597*** (2.887)	0.133 (2.976)	3.945 (3.338)	4.141 (3.262)	9.279*** (2.878)	4.551 (3.448)	5.750 (4.217)
Observations	172252	171683	167249	171861	190293	190365	166451	141843	142239	102332	78982

Note: Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors in parentheses. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Source: Authors' computations based on the ONS Public Health Research Database for England and Wales, and on the English and Welsh Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2019.

Table M10 Individual-level regression of suicide outcome on LSOA deprivation quintiles. Suicides per 100,000. By religion. Full controls included.

	(1) Christian	(2) No religion	(3) Other religion
Highest Deprivation Quintile	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
Quintile 2	2.149** (1.067)	2.955 (1.804)	2.728* (1.641)
Quintile 3	1.678 (1.053)	3.169* (1.824)	2.936 (1.794)
Quintile 4	3.348*** (1.062)	3.249* (1.851)	1.378 (1.929)
Lowest Deprivation Quintile	2.534** (1.068)	4.832** (1.932)	3.442 (2.107)
Observations	1,009,761	434,372	251,417

Note: Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors in parentheses. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Source: Authors' computations based on the ONS Public Health Research Database for England and Wales, and on the English and Welsh Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2019.