

COMPUTATION OF LIFE EXPECTANCY FROM
INCOMPLETE DATA

Arni S.R. Srinivasa Rao¹

Augusta University

1120 15th Street

Augusta, GA 30912, USA

Email: arrao@augusta.edu

James R. Carey

Department of Entomology

University of California,

Davis, CA 95616 USA

and

Center for the Economics and Demography of Aging

University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720

Email: jrcarey@ucdavis.edu

¹Corresponding author

ABSTRACT. Estimating the human longevity and computing of life expectancy are central to the population dynamics. These aspects were studied seriously by scientists since fifteenth century, including renowned astronomer Edmund Halley. From basic principles of population dynamics, we propose a method to compute life expectancy from incomplete data.

Key words: modeling, history of life expectancy, population biology
[2000]MSC: 92D20

INTRODUCTION

In 1570 the Italian mathematician Girolamo Cardano suggested that a man who took care of himself would have a certain life expectancy of α (so that at any age x we could expect him to live $e(x) = \alpha - x$ more years) and then asked how many years would be squandered by imprudent lifestyles [3]. Cardano's healthiest man might be born with the potential of living to 260 years but die at age 80, having wasted away years due to bad habits and other such ill-advised choices. In this work, Cardano was in good company; mathematicians such as Fibonacci, d'Alembert, Daniel Bernoulli, Euler, Halley, Lotka and many others contributed to our understanding of population dynamics through mathematical models. We can trace the notion of life expectancy in particular back to the seventeenth century astronomer Edmund Halley who developed a method to compute life expectancy [1]. His studies led him to observe "how unjustly we repine at the shortness of our Lives, and think our selves wronged if we attain not Old Age;" for "one half of those that are born are dead in Seventeen years time" and to urge

readers "that instead of murmuring at what we call an untimely Death, we ought with Patience and unconcern to submit to that Dissolution which is the necessary Condition of our perishable Materials, and of our nice and frail Structure and Composition: And to account it as a Blessing that we have survived, perhaps by many Years, that Period of Life, whereat the one half of the whole Race of Mankind does not arrive" [postscript to [1]]. Besides his philosophical musings Halley's essay contained many tables and detailed analyses.

Life expectancy at birth, is defined as the number of years remaining to the average newborn. It is arguably the most important summary metric in the life table because it is based on and thus reflects the longevity outcome of the mortality experience of newborns throughout their life course. When life expectancy is referred to without qualification the value at birth is normally assumed [2]. Life expectancy is intuitive and thus easily understandable by lay persons, independent of population age structure, an indicator of health conditions in different societies, used in insurance annuity computations and as a baseline for estimating the impact on longevity of diseases (e.g. AIDS; cancer, diabetes) and lifestyle choices (e.g. smoking; alcohol consumption). The value of life expectancy at birth is identical to the average age in a life table population. The difference in life expectancies between men and women is known as the gender gap. The inverse of life expectancy equals both the per capita birth (b) and per capita death (d) rates in stationary populations ($b - d = 0$). And since $b + d$ is a measure of the number of vital events in a population, double the inverse of life

expectancy equals what is referred to as “population metabolism” as applied to stationary populations. Life expectancy at birth is the most frequently-used comparative metric in biological studies of plants and animals.

The first substantive demographic work in which life expectancy was estimated was the "Bills of Mortality" published in 1662 by John Graunt [4] who noted "From when it follows, that of the said 100 conceived there remains at six years 64, at thirty-six 26 at sixty-six 3 and at eighty 0". Although Edmund Halley [1] and Joshua Milne [5] both introduced life table methods for computing life expectancy, George King [6] is generally attributed to introducing the life table and life expectancy in modern notation. It was not until 1947 that life tables in general and life expectancy in particular were introduced to the population biology literature for studying longevity in non-human species [7]. Although life expectancy is computed straightforwardly from life table survival data, complete information is often not available.

Therefore our objective in this paper is to describe a model that we derived for use in estimating life expectancy at birth from a limited amount of information. The information required to estimate life expectancy in a given year with our model includes the number of births, the number of infant deaths, and the number in the population at each age from 0 through the maximal age, ω . Our computational concept for $\omega = 2$ is based on the following logic: (1) person-years lived for a newborn cohort during the first year is the difference between the number born and the number of infants that died. *Person-years* is the

sum of the number of years lived by all persons in a cohort or population. The number of person-years equals the life expectancy of this cohort if their maximal age is one year (i.e. $l(1) = \text{maximal age}$); (2) person-years lived for this cohort during their first two years of life is equal to person years lived up to one year and person years that would be lived by people who have lived up to age 1. Person-years lived by the newborn cohort during their second year of life is less than the person years lived by newborn during the first year; (3) the hypothetical number of person-years lived by the newborn cohort during their third year of life (i.e. $l(3) = 0$) equals the number in the birth cohort minus the person-years lost due to deaths during the third year. We use number of newborn and population at age 1 to compute person years to be lived by newborn during first three years of life. And this process continues through the oldest age, $\omega > 2$.

Traditionally, the life expectancy of a population is computed through life table techniques. Life table of a population is a stationary population mathematical model which primarily uses populations and death numbers in all the single year ages for an year or for a period of years to produce life expectancy through construction of several columns. The last column of the life table usually consists of life expectancies for each single year ages and first value of this column is called life expectancy of the corresponding population for the year for which the life table was constructed. See Figure 1 for the life table of US population in 2010 [8]. There are seven columns in this life table and the second column in the Figure 1, which consists the values of probability of dying

between ages x to $x + 1$ for $x = 0, 1, \dots, 100+$ is first computed from the raw data (See Figure 2 for the data needed for a life table) and other columns are derived from the second column using formulae without any raw data. The last column of the table in Figure 2 consists the values of expectation of life at age x for $x = 0, 1, \dots, 100 +$. The first value in the last column of the table in the Figure 1 is 78.7, which means life expectancy for the new born babies during 2010 in the US population (boys and girls combined who are of aged 0-1 during 2010) is 78.7 years. In [8] we give the various steps involved at Figure 1.

For standard life table methods, see [9], for recent developments in computing life expectancy see [10], for astronomer Edmund Haley's life table constructed in 17th century, see [3]. Recent advances in the theory of stationary population models [11] are serving the purpose of computing life expectancies for populations in the captive cohorts [12]. We propose a very simple formula for computing life expectancy of newly born babies within a time interval when age-specific death rates and life tables are not available. Age-specific death rates at age a are traditionally defined as the ratio of the number of deaths at age a to the population size at age a [9]. The method of calculating life expectancies given in standard life tables uses age-specific death rates which is computed from deaths and populations in each single year ages. Refer to Figure 2 for the data needed in traditional life table approach and for the newly proposed method.

Table 1. Life table for the total population: United States, 2010

Age	Probability of dying between ages x to x+1	Number surviving to age x	Number dying between ages x to x+1	Person-years lived between ages x to x+1	Total number of person-years lived above age x	Expectation of life at age x
	qx	lx	dx	Lx	Tx	ex
0-1	0.01	100,000	612	99,485	7,866,027	78.7
1-2	0.00	99,388	43	99,366	7,866,561	78.1
2-3	0.00	99,345	27	99,331	7,867,195	77.2
3-4	0.00	99,318	21	99,307	7,867,864	76.2
4-5	0.00	99,297	16	99,289	7,868,556	75.2
5-6	0.00	99,281	14	99,274	7,869,267	74.2
6-7	0.00	99,267	13	99,260	7,869,993	73.2
7-8	0.00	99,254	11	99,249	7,870,733	72.2
8-9	0.00	99,243	10	99,238	7,871,494	71.3
9-10	0.00	99,233	9	99,229	6,972,266	70.3
10-11	0.00	99,224	8	99,220	6,973,017	69.3
11-12	0.00	99,216	8	99,212	6,973,787	68.3
12-13	0.00	99,208	12	99,202	6,974,585	67.3
13-14	0.00	99,196	17	99,188	6,975,383	66.3
14-15	0.00	99,179	25	99,167	6,976,196	65.3
15-16	0.00	99,154	33	99,139	6,977,028	64.3
16-17	0.00	99,121	41	99,101	6,977,881	63.3
17-18	0.00	99,080	49	99,056	6,178,790	62.4
18-19	0.00	99,032	57	99,003	6,079,724	61.4
19-20	0.00	98,976	65	98,942	5,980,701	60.4
20-21	0.00	98,910	74	98,873	5,881,789	59.5
21-22	0.00	98,836	82	98,795	5,782,916	58.5
22-23	0.00	98,754	88	98,710	5,684,120	57.6
23-24	0.00	98,666	91	98,621	5,585,410	56.6
24-25	0.00	98,575	92	98,529	5,486,789	55.7
25-26	0.00	98,483	92	98,437	5,388,260	54.7
26-27	0.00	98,391	93	98,344	5,289,824	53.8
27-28	0.00	98,298	94	98,251	5,191,479	52.8
28-29	0.00	98,204	95	98,157	5,093,228	51.9
29-30	0.00	98,109	98	98,060	4,995,071	50.9
30-31	0.00	98,011	101	97,961	4,897,011	50.0
31-32	0.00	97,910	104	97,859	4,799,051	49.0
32-33	0.00	97,808	108	97,752	4,701,193	48.1
33-34	0.00	97,699	111	97,643	4,603,440	47.1
34-35	0.00	97,587	115	97,530	4,505,787	46.2
35-36	0.00	97,472	120	97,412	4,408,267	45.2
36-37	0.00	97,352	127	97,289	4,310,885	44.3
37-38	0.00	97,225	134	97,168	4,213,567	43.3
38-39	0.00	97,091	142	97,000	4,116,400	42.4
39-40	0.00	96,949	151	96,874	4,019,388	41.5
40-41	0.00	96,798	161	96,719	3,922,514	40.5
41-42	0.00	96,637	173	96,551	3,825,786	39.6
42-43	0.00	96,464	189	96,370	3,729,245	38.7
43-44	0.00	96,275	210	96,170	3,632,875	37.7
44-45	0.00	96,065	233	95,949	3,536,705	36.8
45-46	0.00	95,833	256	95,704	3,440,756	35.9
46-47	0.00	95,576	283	95,436	3,345,052	35.0
47-48	0.00	95,293	305	95,143	3,249,616	34.1
48-49	0.00	94,990	333	94,824	3,154,473	33.2
49-50	0.00	94,659	363	94,476	3,059,649	32.3
50-51	0.00	94,295	394	94,098	2,965,173	31.4
51-52	0.00	93,901	426	93,688	2,871,075	30.6
52-53	0.00	93,475	458	93,246	2,777,396	29.7
53-54	0.01	93,017	491	92,771	2,684,140	28.9
54-55	0.01	92,528	526	92,263	2,591,269	28.0
55-56	0.01	92,000	563	91,718	2,498,106	27.2
56-57	0.01	91,437	603	91,136	2,407,388	26.3
57-58	0.01	90,834	644	90,512	2,318,253	25.5
58-59	0.01	90,190	688	89,846	2,225,741	24.7
59-60	0.01	89,502	732	89,136	2,135,895	23.9
60-61	0.01	88,770	778	88,361	2,048,759	23.1
61-62	0.01	87,992	827	87,578	1,968,078	22.3

Table 1. Life table for the total population: United States, 2010—Con.

Age	Probability of dying between ages x to x+1	Number surviving to age x	Number dying between ages x to x+1	Person-years lived between ages x to x+1	Total number of person-years lived above age x	Expectation of life at age x
	qx	lx	dx	Lx	Tx	ex
62-63	0.01	87,165	879	86,725	1,870,800	21.5
63-64	0.01	86,286	937	85,817	1,784,075	20.7
64-65	0.01	85,348	1,004	84,847	1,698,258	19.9
65-66	0.01	84,345	1,080	83,825	1,613,411	19.1
66-67	0.01	83,284	1,167	82,691	1,529,606	18.4
67-68	0.02	82,098	1,255	81,470	1,446,925	17.6
68-69	0.02	80,843	1,342	80,172	1,365,495	16.9
69-70	0.02	79,531	1,431	78,795	1,285,293	16.2
70-71	0.02	78,069	1,528	77,308	1,206,489	15.5
71-72	0.02	76,543	1,630	75,728	1,129,192	14.8
72-73	0.02	74,913	1,734	74,041	1,053,494	14.1
73-74	0.03	73,169	1,838	72,236	979,423	13.4
74-75	0.03	71,302	2,001	70,301	907,188	12.7
75-76	0.03	69,301	2,136	68,233	836,896	12.1
76-77	0.03	67,165	2,258	66,031	768,654	11.4
77-78	0.04	64,896	2,418	63,688	702,423	10.8
78-79	0.04	62,479	2,570	61,194	638,935	10.2
79-80	0.05	59,909	2,721	58,549	577,741	9.6
80-81	0.05	57,188	2,868	55,754	519,189	9.1
81-82	0.06	54,321	3,012	52,815	463,438	8.5
82-83	0.06	51,309	3,144	49,737	410,624	8.0
83-84	0.07	48,165	3,254	46,533	360,897	7.5
84-85	0.08	44,901	3,404	43,199	314,354	7.0
85-86	0.09	41,497	3,540	39,727	271,155	6.5
86-87	0.09	37,956	3,655	36,154	231,429	6.1
87-88	0.11	34,551	3,655	32,530	195,275	5.7
88-89	0.12	30,726	3,595	28,929	162,736	5.3
89-90	0.13	27,131	3,512	25,375	133,807	4.9
90-91	0.14	23,619	3,375	21,932	108,432	4.6
91-92	0.16	20,245	3,194	18,663	86,530	4.3
92-93	0.17	17,061	2,946	15,598	67,847	4.0
93-94	0.19	14,115	2,688	12,781	52,259	3.7
94-95	0.21	11,447	2,361	10,267	39,478	3.4
95-96	0.22	9,067	2,038	8,098	29,211	3.2
96-97	0.24	7,049	1,713	6,192	21,144	3.0
97-98	0.26	5,335	1,401	4,635	14,361	2.8
98-99	0.28	3,935	1,112	3,379	10,316	2.6
99-100	0.30	2,823	855	2,390	6,937	2.5
100 and over	1.00	1,998	1,998	4,542	4,542	2.3

FIGURE 1. United States life table for the year 2010. This life table was directly taken from National Vital Statistics Reports [8]




FIGURE 2. (a) Data needed for life table approach. (b) Data needed for computing life expectancy through new approach. Green bordered rectangles are populations and red colored rectangles are death numbers in the respective ages for an year. Blue-bordered rectangle is birth numbers for an year.

In this paper, we propose a formula for computing life expectancies is comparable to the technique used to calculate life expectancies in standard life tables, but can be applied when limited data is available. The derived formula uses effective age-specific population sizes, the number of infant deaths, and the number of live births within a year. The number of infant deaths is usually defined as the number of deaths within the first year of life in human populations. If the study population is insects, necessary data can be considered within any appropriate time interval. We tested our proposed simple formula on both small hypothetical populations and global human populations. When a sufficient amount of data on age-specific death rates is available, the life table-based life expectancy is still recommended.

LIFE EXPECTANCY OF NEWLY BORN BABIES

In this section we derive a formula for the life expectancy from basic elements of population dynamics, namely, population-age structure over two time points, simple birth and infant death numbers observed over an interval of time. Suppose, the global population at the beginning of times t_0 and t_1 (for $t_0 < t_1$) is known, and we are interested in finding the life expectancy of the people who are born during $[t_0, t_1)$. We assume the following information to be known: i) $P(t_0)$, the effective population size by single-ages during $[t_0, t_1)$, which is indirectly computed as a weighted or ordinary average of respective population sizes by single-ages that are available at the beginning of t_0 and at the end of $[t_0, t_1)$, ii) the number of live births, $B(t_0)$, and iii) the number of infant deaths, $D_0(t_0)$ during the period $[t_0, t_1)$. These quantities of known information are expressed as,

$$\begin{aligned}
 P(t_0) &= \int_0^\omega P_i(t_0) di = \int_0^\omega \left[\frac{a_i P_{t_0}(i) + b_i P_{t_1}(i)}{a_i + b_i} \right] di \\
 B(t_0) &= \int_{t_0}^{t_1} B(s) ds \\
 D_0(t_0) &= \int_{t_0}^{t_1} D_0(s) ds
 \end{aligned}$$

where $P_i(t_0)$ is the effective population aged $[i, i+1)$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, \omega$ during $[t_0, t_1)$, with $P_\omega(t_0) = 0$, for an age ω which is the next integer larger than the age of eldest surviving person in $P(t_0)$. $P_{t_0}(i)$ and $P_{t_1}(i)$ are observed populations in the age group $[i, i+1)$ at the beginning of t_0 and at the end of $[t_0, t_1)$, a_i and b_i are population weights corresponding

to $P_{t_0}(i)$ and $P_{t_1}(i)$, respectively. $B(s)$ is the number of births at a given time $s \in [t_0, t_1)$ and $D_0(s)$ is the number of infant deaths for $s \in [t_0, t_1)$.

We use standard life table notations to relate the quantities of the population cohort life expectancy. Let, $l(x)$ be the number of survivors of $B(t_0)$ at age x for $x = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \omega$. Clearly, $l(0) = B(t_0)$ and $l(1)$ is approximated as, $l(1) \approx B(t_0) - D(t_0)$. Suppose, $l(2) = 0$. This implicitly implies that we have only observed the data for $P_0(t_0), P_1(t_0), B(t_0), D_0(t_0)$ during $[t_0, t_1)$. We will now use the concept of person-years, which is a technical phrase in the life table model. Person-years of a cohort represents the average future life time to be lived by the cohort. The person-years lived by $B(t_0)$ during their first year of life (after removing person-years lost due to deaths), and person-years lived by the remaining individuals of $B(t_0)$ who are surviving at age 1, (and removing deaths that occurred during the second year of their life) and by assuming the deaths are uniformly distributed over the age intervals $[0, 1)$ and $[1, 2)$ are:

$$(1) \quad \int_{t_0}^{t_1} B(s)ds - \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} D_0(s)ds$$

and

$$(2) \quad \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} B(s)ds - \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} D_0(s)ds.$$

The total person-years that would be lived by $B(t_0)$ during their first two-years of life is

$$(3) \quad \frac{3}{2} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} B(s) ds - \int_{t_0}^{t_1} D_0(s) ds.$$

The life expectancy of $B(t_0)$, i.e. new born babies at $[t_0, t_1)$ is,

$$(4) \quad \frac{3}{2} - \frac{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} D_0(s) ds}{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} B(s) ds}.$$

When $P(t_0) = \int_0^3 P_i(t_0) di$, then $l(1) \neq 0$ and $l(2) \neq 0$. The expression of $l(1)$ becomes $\int_{t_0}^{t_1} P_1(s) ds$. We assume, $l(2) \approx 2P_1(t_0) - l(1)$, which implies the person-years lived by $B(t_0)$, during their second year of life is approximately the same as the effective population at age 1 during $[t_0, t_1)$, instead of the previously obtained quantity in (2) (note that this effective population is computed from the observed population explained previously). Now, the person-years lived by $B(t_0)$ during their third year of life, (after removing person-years lost due to deaths during third year) and assuming the deaths are uniformly distributed over the age intervals $[2, 3)$ are:

$$(5) \quad \int_{t_0}^{t_1} P_1(s) ds - \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} B(s) ds + \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} D_0(s) ds,$$

The total person-years that would be lived by $B(t_0)$ during their first three-years of life is

$$(6) \quad \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} B(s) ds + 2 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} P_1(s) ds$$




FIGURE 3. Life expectancy with limited data. Only with the information on births, effective population by age and infant deaths in a year, the proposed formula will forecast the life expectancy of newly born babies in a year.

The life expectancy of $B(t_0)$, when $l(3) = 0$ is:

$$(7) \quad \frac{1}{2} + 2 \frac{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} P_1(s) ds}{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} B(s) ds}$$

Proceeding further with a similar approach, we can obtain $e(B(t_0))$, the life expectancy of $B(t_0)$ when $l(\omega) = 0$ as:

$$e(B(t_0)) = \begin{cases} \frac{3}{2} - \frac{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} D_0(s) ds}{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} B(s) ds} + \frac{2}{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} B(s) ds} \sum_{n=1}^{\frac{\omega}{2}-1} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} P_{2n}(s) ds & \text{if } \omega \text{ is even} \\ \frac{1}{2} + \frac{2}{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} B(s) ds} \sum_{n=0}^{\frac{\omega-3}{2}} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} P_{2n+1}(s) ds & \text{if } \omega \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

TABLE 1. Set of two hypothetically observed population age structures, births, infant deaths during $[t_0, t_1)$, and computed life expectancies.

Age	Effective Population	Births	Infant Deaths	Life Expectancy
0	10	12	1	4.5
1	12			
2	14			
3	12			
4	6			
5	0			

Age	Effective Population	Births	Infant Deaths	Life Expectancy
0	12	9	3	5.17
1	16			
2	18			
3	12			
4	0			

NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

We consider an example population of some arbitrary species, whose effective population age structures, births and infant deaths are observed during some interval $[t_0, t_1)$ (see Table 1). We give the computed life expectancies in Table 1.

We further simplify the life expectancy formula of (8) based on a few assumptions and we obtain (15). For details, see the Appendix. We tested this formula (for ω even and odd) on global population data [13]. Total population in 2010 was approximately 6916 million, and infant deaths were 4.801 million. We have obtained $P_{\geq}(t_0)$, the total population size with individuals whose age is one and above by

removing the size of the population, whose age is zero, from the total population. The adjusted $P_{\geq 1}(t_0)$ is 6756 million. Assuming a range of live births of 90-100 million occurred during 2010, we have calculated that the life expectancy of cohorts born in 2010 will be between 69 - 76.5 years (when ω is even), and life expectancy for these newly born will be 68.1 - 75.5 years (when ω is odd). In 2010, the actual global life expectancy was 70 years. We note that the formula in (15), and the assumption in (14) may not be true for every population's age-structure. Interestingly the formula results (15) are very close to the life table-based standard estimates for the US and UK populations. However, it should be noted that the formula did not work for some populations. The total population in US in 2011 was approximately 313 million, and the total live births are approximately 4 million. This gives us $e(B(t_0)) = 0.5 + 78.25 = 78.75$ years, whereas the actual life expectancy for the US population for 2011 is 78.64 years. Similarly, the formula-based values for UK is 78.23 years and actual value is 80.75 years.

In this paper we suggest a formula for computing life expectancy of a cohort of new born babies when it is difficult to construct a life table based life expectancy. For the standard life table technique, one requires information on $\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \int_0^\omega D_i(s) di ds$, the total deaths during $[t_0, t_1)$, where $\int_0^\omega D_i(s) di$ is the age-specific death numbers at time $s \in [t_0, t_1)$, and then, traditionally compute age-specific death rates at age i during

$[t_0, t_1)$ using,

$$(9) \quad \frac{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} D_i(s) ds}{P_i(t_0)}.$$

It is possible to obtain probability of deaths from (9), with some assumptions on the pattern of deaths within the time interval. We compute various columns of the life table from these death probabilities and compute life expectancy.

The proposed formula in (8) is very handy and can be computed by non-experts with minimal computing skills. It can be adapted by ecologists, experimental biologists, and biodemographers where the data on populations are limited. See Figure 3 for the data needed to compute life expectancy of newly born babies in a year. It requires some degree of caution to apply the proposed formula when sufficient death data by all age groups is available. Our method heavily depends on the age structure of the population at the time of data collection. Our approach needs to be explored when populations are experiencing stable conditions given in [14] and also to be tested for its accuracy at different stages of demographic transition. We still recommend to use life table methods when age-wise data on deaths and populations are available as indicated in Figure 2.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Dr. Cynthia Harper (Oxford) and Ms. Claire Edward (Kent) have helped to correct and revise several sentences. Our sincere gratitude to all.

REFERENCES

- [1] Halley, E. 1693. An estimate of the degrees of the mortality of mankind. *Philosophical Transactions* 17: 596-610.
- [2] Preston, S. H., P. Heuveline, and M. Guillot (2001). *Demography: Measuring and Modeling Population Processes*. Blackwell Publishers, Malden, Massachusetts.
- [3] Smith, D. and N. Keyfitz, Eds. (1977). *Mathematical Demography*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (p1).
- [4] Graunt, J. (1662). Natural and political observations mentioned in a following index, and made upon the bills of mortality. London. Republished with an introduction by B. Benjamin in the *Journal of the Institute of Actuaries* 90: 1-61 (1964)
- [5] Milne, J. (1815). A Treatise on the Valuation of Annuities and Assurances on Lives and Survivorships. London.
- [6] King, G. (1902). Institute of Actuaries Textbook. Part II. Second Edition. London: Charles and Edward Layton.
- [7] Deevey, E. S. Jr. (1947). Life tables for natural populations of animals. *Quarterly Review of Biology*, 22:283-314.
- [8] Arias E. United States life tables, 2010. National vital statistics reports; vol 63 no 7. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics. 2014.
- [9] Keyfitz, N and Caswell, H (2005). *Applied Mathematical Demography*, Springer (3/e).
- [10] Bongaarts, J. and G. Feeney (2003). Estimating mean lifetime. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 100, 23, 13127-13131.
- [11] Arni S.R. Srinivasa Rao and James R. Carey (2015). Carey's Equality and a theorem on Stationary Population, *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 71, 3, 583-594.
- [12] Age Tables Behind Bars by Ben Pittman-Polletta, (Math Digest Section of American Mathematical Society's Math in the Media), October 28,

2014 (<http://www.ams.org/news/math-in-the-media/md-201410-toc#201410-populations>)

[13] UN (2012). <http://esa.un.org/unpd/wpp/index.htm>.

[14] Arni S.R. Srinivasa Rao (2014). Population Stability and Momentum. *Notices of the American Mathematical Society*, 61, 9, 1062-1065.

APPENDIX: ANALYSIS OF THE LIFE EXPECTANCY FUNCTION

In general, $\int_{t_0}^{t_1} D(s)ds < \int_{t_0}^{t_1} B(s)ds$. When ω is even, the supremum and infimum of $\left(\frac{3}{2} - \frac{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} D_0(s)ds}{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} B(s)ds}\right)$ are $\frac{3}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$. The contribution of the term $\left(\frac{3}{2} - \frac{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} D_0(s)ds}{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} B(s)ds}\right)$ in computation of life expectancy is very minimal in comparison with the term $\left(\frac{2}{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} B(s)ds} \sum_{n=1}^{\frac{\omega}{2}-1} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} P_{2n}(s)ds\right)$, hence $e(B(t_0))$ can be approximated by,

$$e(B(t_0)) \approx \frac{2}{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} B(s)ds} \sum_{n=1}^{\frac{\omega}{2}-1} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} P_{2n}(s)ds$$

Similarly, when ω is odd, $e(B(t_0))$ can be approximated by,

$$e(B(t_0)) \approx \frac{2}{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} B(s)ds} \sum_{n=1}^{\frac{\omega-3}{2}} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} P_{2n+1}(s)ds$$

Remark 1. Suppose $(P_n(t_0))_0^\omega$ is an increasing, then, we will arrive at the two inequalities (10) and (11).

$$(10) \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\frac{\omega}{2}-1} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} P_{2n}(s)ds < \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\omega} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} P_n(s)ds \text{ if } \omega \text{ is even,}$$

$$(11) \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\frac{\omega-3}{2}} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} P_{2n+1}(s)ds > \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\omega} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} P_n(s)ds \text{ if } \omega \text{ is odd.}$$

Remark 2. In general when $(P_n(t_0))_0^\omega$ is an increasing, without any condition on ω , we can write the inequality (12) by combining (10) and (11) as,

$$(12) \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\frac{\omega}{2}-1} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} P_{2n}(s)ds < \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\omega} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} P_n(s)ds < \sum_{n=1}^{\frac{\omega-3}{2}} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} P_{2n+1}(s)ds$$

Remark 3. Suppose $\int_{t_0}^{t_1} D_0(s)ds = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} B(s)ds$ in (8), then, the life expectancy, irrespective of ω is even or odd, becomes,

$$(13) \quad e(B(t_0)) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{2}{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} B(s)ds} \sum_{n=0}^{\frac{\omega-3}{2}} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} P_{2n+1}(s)ds$$

Remark 4. When the total population aged one and above at t_0 is approximately same as twice the sum of the populations of even single year ages and also twice the sum of the populations of odd single year

ages, i.e.

$$(14) \quad 2\sum_{n=1}^{\frac{\omega}{2}-1} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} P_{2n}(s)ds \approx \int_{t_0}^{t_1} P(s)ds \approx 2\sum_{n=0}^{\frac{\omega-3}{2}} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} P_{2n+1}(s)ds,$$

then, life expectancy in (8) further reduces into,

$$(15) \quad e(B(t_0)) = \begin{cases} \frac{3}{2} - \frac{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} D_0(s)ds}{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} B(s)ds} + \frac{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} P_{\geq 1}(s)ds}{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} B(s)ds} & \text{if } \omega \text{ is even} \\ \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} P_{\geq 1}(s)ds}{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} B(s)ds} & \text{if } \omega \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

where $P_{\geq 1}(s)$ is the effective population who are aged one and above at time $s \in [t_0, t_1)$.