3
The published table shows 46 female deaths at age 97, cohort 1875 (TU) in 1973. In order to sum across the row and down the column correctly it should be 64. The corrected value was entered into the InputDB.

4
The published table shows 371 female deaths at age 64, cohort 1913 (TL) in 1977. In order to sum across the row and down the column correctly it should be 352. The corrected value was entered into the InputDB.

5
The published table shows 352 female deaths at age 64, cohort 1912 (TU) in 1977. In order to sum across the row and down the column correctly it should be 362. The corrected value was entered into the InputDB.

6
The published table shows 557 female deaths at age 88, cohort 1888 (TU) in 1977. In order to sum across the row and down the column correctly it should be 577. The corrected value was entered into the InputDB.

7
The published table shows 183 male deaths at age 91, cohort 1886 (TU) in 1978. In order to sum across the row and down the column correctly it should be 193. The corrected value was entered into the InputDB.

8
The published table shows 12 female deaths at age 16, cohort 1963 (TL) in 1978. In order to sum across the row and down the column correctly it should be 22. The corrected value was entered into the InputDB.

9
The published table shows 208 female deaths at age 66, cohort 1918 (TL) in 1984. In order to sum across the row and down the column correctly it should be 218. The corrected value was entered into the InputDB.

10
Female deaths, age 87, upper triangle, 1985: Published table shows 925 deaths, but corrected to 923 in order to sum across the row and down the column correctly.

11
Female deaths, age 38, upper triangle, 1987: Published table shows 59 deaths, but corrected to 39 in order to sum across the row and down the column correctly.

12
Female deaths, age 74, upper triangle, 1987: Published table shows 705 deaths, but corrected to 703 in order to sum across the row and down the column correctly.

13
Female deaths, age 56, upper triangle, 1988: Published table shows 147 deaths, but corrected to 151 in order to sum down the column correctly.

14
Male deaths, age 51, lower triangle, 1989: Published table shows 193 deaths, but corrected to 153 in order to sum down the column correctly.

15
Male deaths, age 55, upper triangle, 1989: Published table shows 298 deaths, but corrected to 238 in order to sum down the column correctly.

16
Live births, males, 1914: Count for males (80,020) plus females (79,396) as shown on published table do not match total shown (156,389). Births by province indicates that females should be 76,396 for the entire country, which gives the correct total for both sexes. Corrected values was input.

17
The total deaths given for females in 1998 (Table 26, p. 70) does not match sum across all ages. The discrepancy appears to be for females aged 104-109: counts by 5-year age groups (p. 71) show 6 deaths in the upper triangle (age 104-109). The sum of counts given by Lexis triangle (p. 78) for that same group is 5 deaths. We assumed that the counts by Lexis Triangle are correct and changed the total accordingly (to 52,473 instead of 52,474).

18
The birth counts (prior to 1886 and during 1914-18) do not include présentés sans vie (i.e., newborns born alive but dying before birth registration). Data are not available to correct birth counts so that they include these false stillbirths.

19
These birth counts for 1895-1913 and 1919 have been corrected to include présentés sans vie (i.e., newborns born alive but dying before birth registration) by summing the original birth counts [Area=110] and the false stillbirths [Area=130]. See also NoteCode=33 & 34.

20
Published birth counts for 1886-1894 and since 1920 already include présentés sans vie (i.e., newborns born alive but dying before birth registration). No correction is necessary.

21
The total deaths given for females in 2001 (Table 26, p. 70) does not match sum across all ages. The discrepancy appears to be for females aged 100+: the table gives 416 deaths in the open age interval (p. 70), but the sum of counts given by Lexis triangle (pp.

77-78) for that same group is 413 deaths. We assumed that the counts by Lexis Triangle are correct and changed the total accordingly (to 51,938 instead of 51,941).

22
The total deaths given for males in 1929 (62,193) on the published table from Annuaire Statistique does not match the sum across all ages. The source of the discrepancy is deaths for age 85-89. The published table gives a total of 1,942 for this age group, but the sum across age in the Excel file is 1,952. We assume that the counts by age are correct and adjust the total to match the sum across all ages (62,203).

23
The birth adjustment factor (Rb) is based on the population adjustment factor (Vx) for the same year.

24
Population counts for the territories added/lost (i.e. East Cantons) are not available by sex and age. Thus, Vx factors are based on the total population before and after the territorial change (i.e., Vx does not vary by sex or age).

25
These infant death counts (1886-1924 & 1940-43) have been corrected to include présentés sans vie (i.e., newborns born alive but dying before birth registration) by summing the original death counts [Area=110] and the false stillbirths [Area=130]. See also NoteCode=34 & 35.

26
For deaths in 1876, counts are available by age (both sexes combined) and by sex (across all ages). We have estimated the sex distribution at each age. With the exception of age zero, we calculate the average percent male among deaths within each age during 1877-79 and then apply this average to the counts for 1899 to redistribute deaths by sex. For age zero, we estimate the death count for each sex based on the difference between the sum of estimated deaths for all other ages and the total death count for that sex.

27
For death counts in 1903, the published table from Statistique du Mouvement de la Population shows 1195 male and 1624 females (1195+1624=2819) deaths at ages 85-90, whereas the table from Annuaire Statistique shows a total of 2873 deaths at ages 85-90. The sum of deaths across all ages from the former results in a total of 62295 male and 56326 female deaths, although the totals shown on the table are 62355 and 56320, respectively (i.e., 60 too few male deaths and 6 too many female deaths). If we adjust the death counts at ages 85-90 by +60 for males and -6 for females, the discrepancy of 54 deaths is resolved and the data sum across the row and down the column correctly. We have input the adjusted values of 1255 male and 1618 female deaths for this age group.

28

For deaths in 1899, counts are available by age (both sexes combined) and by sex (across all ages). We have estimated the sex distribution at each age. With the exception of age zero, we calculate the average percent male among deaths within each age during 1896-98 and then apply this average to the counts for 1899 to redistribute deaths by sex. For age zero, we estimate the death count for each sex based on the difference between the sum of estimated deaths for all other ages (including deaths of unknown age) and the total death count for that sex.

29
For 1888, the sum of deaths across all ages is 121,098 in the file received from Michel Poulain, but the total shown on the table published in Annuaire Statistique is 121,097. The source of the difference appears to be infant deaths (file from Poulain shows 29,024 whereas the sum of all infant deaths shown in Annuaire Statistique is 29,023). We have assumed that the infant death counts in the file from Poulain are correct.

30
For 1885, deaths by sex for ages 0,1,...9,10-14 have been estimated. For ages 0,1,...9, we calculated the average % male among deaths at each age during 1886-89 and applied this distribution to the total death counts (from published tables) at those ages (for both sexes combined). For age group 10-14, we estimated deaths by sex as the difference between deaths at ages 0-14 and the sum of estimated deaths at ages 0-9 for that sex.

32
For 1870-75, deaths by sex for age 0 have been estimated. Death counts by sex for 1870-75 are available only in period-cohort format (5-year cohorts). So, the youngest age group includes deaths that occurred at ages 0-3 plus the lower triangle of age 4. Infant death counts are available, but not by sex. Thus, for each year during 1870-75, we multiply the total number of infant deaths by the average % male (among deaths at age 0) during 1877-79 to estimate the sex distribution. We include the total infant death counts (and estimated counts by sex) as well as the deaths in period-cohort format in the raw data files. So, the infant deaths (Lexis=RR, Age=0, AgeInterval=1) overlap with the period-cohort data for the youngest 5-year cohort (Lexis==RV, Age=0, AgeInterval=4). That is, the former is a subset of the latter.

33
These data comprise the original birth counts for 1895-1913 and 1919, which exclude false stillbirths (i.e., présentés sans vie: newborns born alive but dying before birth registration) [Area=110; same territory as Area=10 except that false stillbirths are excluded]. We do not use these counts for our calculations, but rather use the corrected birth counts that include these false stillbirths (see also NoteCode=019).

34
These data comprise the count of false stillbirths (i.e., présentés sans vie) for 1886-1913, 1919-1955, and 1958-60 [Area=130]. These data are used to correct birth and infant death counts.

35
These infant death counts (1925-39, 1944-55, 1958-60) have been corrected to include présentés sans vie (i.e., newborns born alive but dying before birth registration) by summing the original death counts [Area=120] and the false stillbirths [Area=130]. See also NoteCode=34 & 37. The published tables from Annuaire Statistique for 1961-62 include the following footnote: "Mort-nés et autres enfants présentés sans vie non compris." Yet, a comparision with data from Veys (1981) indicates that the false stillbirths are in fact included. Moreover, a graph of infant deaths by year reveals an abrupt increase (+20%) in infant deaths between 1960 and 1961, providing further evidence that the inclusion of false stillbirths began in 1961 (although the footnotes to the tables do not indicate as such until 1963; there is little change in the number of infant deaths between 1962 and 1963--a 1.4% increase). Thus, we have concluded that the footnote to the tables in Annuaire Statistique for 1961-62 is incorrect.

36
These data comprise the original death counts (1886-1924 & 1940-43), which exclude false stillbirths (i.e., présentés sans vie: newborns born alive but dying before birth registration) [Area=110; same territory as Area=10 except that false stillbirths are excluded]. We do not use these counts for our calculations, but rather use the corrected death counts that include these false stillbirths (see also NoteCode=025).

37
These data comprise the original death counts (1925-39, 1944-55, 1958-60), which exclude false stillbirths (i.e., présentés sans vie: newborns born alive but dying before birth registration) [Area=120; same territory as Area=20 except that false stillbirths are excluded]. We do not use these counts for our calculations, but rather use the corrected death counts that include these false stillbirths (see also NoteCode=035).

38
For 1868-69, deaths by sex for age 0 have been estimated. Death counts by sex for 1868-69 are available only in period-cohort format (5-year cohorts). So, the youngest age group includes all deaths that occurred at ages 0-3 plus the lower triangle of age 4. Infant death counts are available, but not by sex. Thus, for each year in 1968-69, we multiply the total number of infant deaths by the average % male (among deaths at age 0) during 1864-66 to estimate the sex distribution. We include the total infant death counts (and estimated counts by sex) as well as the deaths in period-cohort format in the raw data files. So, the infant deaths (Lexis=RR, Age=0, AgeInterval=1) overlap with the period-cohort data for the youngest 5-year cohort (Lexis==RV, Age=0, AgeInterval=4). That is, the former is a subset of the latter.

39
For female deaths in 2002, there is an inconsistency in the published tables: the table shows a total of 53,206 deaths to females (26,374 in TL, 26,832 in TU), yet the sum of deaths by age and cohort results in a total of only 53,203. The source of the discrepancy appears to be at ages 108+. The published table with deaths in 5-year age groups shows 22 female deaths at ages 105-109, whereas the more detailed tables show only 20 such

deaths. Also, the data in 5-year age groups shows 1 female death at ages 110-114, but the more detailed tables show no deaths above age 107. An alternative data source (Eurostat NewCronos database) indicates that among females there were three deaths at ages 108+: one at age 108 (upper triangle), one at 109 (upper triangle), and one at age 110+. NewCronos shows the same total counts as the published tables from Statistics Belgium. Therefore, we include these deaths so that the sum across age matches the total.

40
Death counts for 1914-18 are not available.

41
Monthly birth counts for years 1914-1918 are estimates generated by the European Demographic Observatory (ODE). No documentation describing these counts is available.