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Health Profile: Riga, Latvia

Taking cities to a healthier future

EURO-URHIS 2 European Urban Health Indicators System Part 2 Urban Health Monitoring and Analysis System to Inform Policy
All-cause mortality in both males and females is higher in Riga compared to other EURO-URHIS 2 cities. Male mortality from malignant neoplasms and mortality from diseases of the circulatory system are substantially higher than the overall EURO-URHIS 2 mean. Mortality from diseases of the respiratory system is substantially lower.

This health profile describes the health situation and associated health determinants in Riga compared with those observed in other European urban areas.

Riga is one of the urban areas chosen for EURO-URHIS 2 (European Urban Health Indicator System Part 2), a project that aims to identify health problems in urban areas. The EURO-URHIS 2 project describes health and health determinants specific to urban areas in Europe, covering cities in North, East, South, and West Europe. This project may add to information that is already locally available, in that it is the first study to enable reliable comparisons of health status between different cities in Europe. Policy makers can use the information to prioritise topics for urban health policy and for interventions in an evidence-based way.

EURO-URHIS 2 gathered information by collecting data from routinely available registration data, and by conducting youth and adult surveys at the end of 2010. In total, data from 26 urban areas in Europe were available for between-city comparisons and benchmarking.

The routinely available registration data relate to the most recently available year (2008-2009). The youth and adult surveys were not conducted in Riga.

More detailed information on the justification of methods and instruments that were used, as well as response rates, selection of cities and indicators, and statistical methodology, can be found on our websites: www.urhis.eu and http://results.urhis.eu. The websites also provide data from other participating urban areas and comparisons between specific cities can be made.

![Figure 1. Age distribution](http://results.urhis.eu)

Differences in health status may possibly be explained by age. Figure 1 shows the age distribution in Riga compared to the other EURO-URHIS 2 urban areas.
### Health-related Characteristics of Riga

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Riga</th>
<th>Latvia</th>
<th>EURO-URHIS 2 range (percentiles)</th>
<th>EURO-URHIS 2 mean</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>min</td>
<td>25th</td>
<td>50th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Population size (x1,000)</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>2,271</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Population density</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>2,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Population aged 0-19 years</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Population aged 65+ years</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Live births</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teenage pregnancies</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Pregnancies after age 35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Riga</th>
<th>Latvia</th>
<th>EURO-URHIS 2 range (percentiles)</th>
<th>EURO-URHIS 2 mean</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>min</td>
<td>25th</td>
<td>50th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Unemployment (age 19-64)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Higher level education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Not enough money</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Low family wealth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. MMR vaccinated</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. DTP vaccinated</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Cervical smear test</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Cholesterol measurement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Health-related characteristics of Riga

Source. Indicators 1-7, 12-13, and 16-19: routinely available registration data; indicators 8-10 and 14-15: adult survey; indicator 11: youth survey. Missing data are indicated by “-“.

N = number of urban areas that were able to collect data on the specific indicator.

1. number of inhabitants; 2. number of inhabitants per km²; 3. % of inhabitants aged 0-19 years; 4. % of inhabitants aged 65 years or older; 5. number of births per 1,000 women aged 15-44 years; 6. number of births per 1,000 women aged 15-19 years; 7. number of births per 1,000 women aged 35-44 years; 8. % of adults aged 19-64 years who are unemployed; 9. % of adults who attained higher level education; 10. % of adults who do not have enough money for daily expenses; 11. % of youth who live in a low wealth family, as defined by a FAS (Family Affluence Scale) score of ≤3; 12. % of population who have completed measles, mumps, and rubella (MMR) vaccination courses before school-age; 13. % of population who have completed diphtheria, tetanus, and poliomyelitis (DTP) vaccination courses before school-age; 14. % of adult women who have undergone a cervical smear test within the past three years; 15. % of adults who had their serum cholesterol measured within the last year; 16-17. number of years that a newborn is expected to live if current mortality rates continue to apply; 18. annual number of deaths of children under one year of age, per 1,000 births; 19. % of total live births weighing less than 2,500 grams.

Compared to other cities in EURO-URHIS 2, Riga is an urban area with average population density and an average aged male population and a somewhat older female population. The number of annual live births in Riga is comparable to the overall EURO-URHIS 2 mean.

The percentage of the population who have completed DTP vaccination courses before school-age is relatively low in Riga.

Infant mortality is an indicator for population health and quality of health care services. With an infant mortality rate of 5.1 per 1,000 live births, Riga is comparable to other EURO-URHIS 2 urban areas.

At the population level, low birth weight is an indicator for pregnancy conditions and perinatal care. Low birth weight can at the individual level also result in health problems later in life. Of all newborns in Riga, 4.1% had a low birth weight, which is lower than the overall EURO-URHIS 2 mean.

http://results.urhis.eu
Table 2. Morbidity and mortality

Source. Indicators 1-14: routinely available registration data. Missing data are indicated by “-“.

* Country level data include HIV incidence only.

N = number of urban areas that were able to collect data on the specific indicator.

1-4. Number of newly diagnosed cases with a specific disease per 100,000 persons per year; 5-6. All-cause mortality rate per 100,000 persons per year (standardised on European population); 7-14. Mortality rate due to a specific cause per 100,000 persons per year (standardised on European population)

The health status of a population can be assessed by using a number of parameters, such as those referring to acute and chronic disease, mortality, psychological well-being, and self-perceived health. Table 2 shows the overall health status among adults in Riga, compared to other cities in Europe. The results show that in Riga the incidence of tuberculosis is similar to the overall average in all EURO-URHIS 2 urban areas, whereas HIV/AIDS occurs more often.

All-cause mortality in both males and females is higher than in other cities. Mortality from malignant neoplasms in males, from diseases of the circulatory system, and from suicide and intentional harm is substantially higher. Mortality from diseases of the respiratory system occurs less often.

DISCLAIMER

To achieve maximum quality of the data, all instruments used were based on knowledge of earlier studies and expert consultations, and were piloted, validated, and optimised. The survey questionnaires of EURO-URHIS 2 were based on already existing, validated instruments; selected indicators were as little culturally sensitive as possible. Questionnaires were translated in the local language(s) and, for validation purposes, back-translated into English. Youth survey response rates were generally very high. In the adult survey, a minimum response rate of 30% was required to be included for benchmarking. Despite all our efforts, and as in any survey, the point estimates for certain health indicators in your urban area may deviate from other estimates, and may not be comparable to other local information due to differences in study methodology and indicator definitions. If you would like further information regarding the methodology, please see our websites: http://www.urhis.eu and http://results.urhis.eu.
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