Assessing the Age Specificity of Infection Fatality Rates for COVID-19: Systematic Review, Meta-Analysis, and Public Policy Implications

Andrew T. Levin, Gideon Meyerowitz-Katz, Nana Owusu-Boaitey, Kensington B. Cochran, and Seamus P. Walsh

27 August 2020

Abstract: This paper assesses the age specificity of the infection fatality rate (IFR) for COVID-19 using seroprevalence results from eight national studies and fifteen regional studies as well as five countries that have engaged in comprehensive tracing of COVID-19 infections. The estimated IFR is close to zero for children and younger adults but rises exponentially with age, reaching 0.4% at age 55, 1.3% at age 65, 4.5% at age 75, and 15% at age 85. We find that differences in the age structure of the population and the age-specific prevalence of COVID-19 explain 90% of the geographical variation in population IFR. Consequently, protecting vulnerable age groups could substantially reduce the incidence of mortality.

Affiliations: Levin is a professor of economics at Dartmouth College, research associate of the NBER, and international research fellow of the Centre for Economic Policy Research. Meyerowitz-Katz is an epidemiologist at the University of Wollongong and research monitoring and surveillance coordinator at the Western Sydney Local Health District. Owusu-Boaitey has a Ph.D. in immunology and is currently engaged in graduate work in medicine and bioethics at the Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine. Cochran and Walsh are recent graduates of Dartmouth College.

Declaration: The authors have no financial interests nor any other conflicts of interest related to this study. No funding was received for conducting this study. The views expressed here are solely those of the authors and do not represent the views of any other person or institution.

Corresponding Author: Andrew T. Levin *(andrew.t.levin@dartmouth.edu)*

Assessing the Age Specificity of Infection Fatality Rates for COVID-19: Systematic Review, Meta-Analysis, and Public Policy Implications

Andrew T. Levin, Gideon Meyerowitz-Katz, Nana Owusu-Boaitey, Kensington B. Cochran, and Seamus P. Walsh
27 August 2020

Objective: Determine age-specific infection fatality rates for COVID-19 to inform public health policies and communications that help protect vulnerable age groups.

Methods: Studies of COVID-19 prevalence were collected by conducting an online search of published articles, preprints, and government reports. A total of 89 studies were reviewed in depth and screened. Studies of 31 locations satisfied the inclusion criteria and were included in the meta-analysis. Age-specific IFRs were computed using the prevalence data in conjunction with reported fatalities four weeks after the midpoint date of the study, reflecting typical lags in fatalities and reporting. Meta-regression procedures in Stata were used to analyze IFR by age.

Results: Our analysis finds a exponential relationship between age and IFR for COVID-19. The estimated age-specific IFRs are close to zero for children and younger adults but reaching 0.4% at age 55, 1.3% at age 65, 4.5% at age 75, and 15% at age 85. We find that differences in the age structure of the population and the age-specific prevalence of COVID-19 explain 90% of the geographical variation in population IFR.

Discussion: These results indicate that COVID-19 is hazardous not only for the elderly but also for middle-aged adults, for whom the infection fatality rate is two orders of magnitude greater than the annualized risk of a fatal automobile accident. Moreover, the overall IFR for COVID-19 should not be viewed as a fixed parameter but as intrinsically linked to the age-specific pattern of infections. Consequently, individual and collective efforts that minimize infections in older adults could substantially decrease total deaths.

	Total as of July 15, 2020	Share of Infections
NYC residents	8 million	*NA*
Estimated infections	1·6 million	100%
Symptomatic infections	1·1 million	65%
Reported cases	220 thousand	12%
Hospitalized cases	55 thousand	3%
Fatal cases	23 thousand	1%

***Table 1*: COVID-19 Cases in New York City**

Introduction

As the COVID-19 pandemic has spread across the globe, some fundamental issues have remained unclear: How dangerous is COVID-19? And to whom? Answering these questions will help inform appropriate decision-making by individuals, families, and communities.

The *case fatality rate* (CFR), the ratio of deaths to reported cases, is commonly used in gauging disease severity. However, this measure can be highly misleading for SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19, because a high proportion of infections are asymptomatic or mildly symptomatic (especially for younger people) and may not be included in official case reports.[1,2] Consequently, the *infection fatality rate* (IFR), the ratio of fatalities to infections, is a more reliable metric than the CFR in assessing the hazards of COVID-19.

Assessing the IFR for COVID-19 is difficult. As shown in Table 1, a recent seroprevalence study by the New York Department of Health estimated ~1·6 million infections among the 8 million residents of NYC, but only one-tenth of those infections were captured in reported COVID-19 cases.[3,4] About one-fourth of reported cases were severe enough to require hospitalization, many of whom succumbed to the disease. All told, fatalities represented a tenth of reported cases but only a hundredth of all infections.

While the NYC data indicate an IFR of ~1%, analyses of other locations have produced a wide array of IFR estimates, e.g., 0·6% in Geneva, 1·5% in England, and 2·3% in Italy. Indeed, a recent meta-analysis noted the high degree of heterogeneity across aggregate estimates of IFR and concluded that research on age-stratified IFR is "urgently needed to inform policymaking."[5]

In this paper, we consider the hypothesis that the observed variation in IFR across locations may primarily reflect the age specificity of COVID-19 infections and fatalities. Consequently, this paper reports on a systematic review and meta-analysis of age-specific IFRs for COVID-19. Based on our findings, we are able to assess and contextualize the severity of COVID-19 and examine how age-specific prevalence affects population IFR and the total incidence of fatalities.

Methodology

To perform the present meta-analysis, we collected published papers and preprints on the seroprevalence and/or infection fatality rate of COVID-19 that were publicly disseminated prior to 13 August 2020. As described in Supplementary Appendix B, we systematically performed online searches in MedRxiv, Medline, PubMed, Google Scholar, and EMBASE, and we identified other studies listed in reports by government institutions such as the U.K. Parliament Office.[6] Data was extracted from studies by three authors and verified prior to inclusion.

We restricted our meta-analysis to studies of advanced economies, based on current membership in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), in light of the distinct challenges of health care provision and reporting of fatalities in developing economies.[7] We also excluded studies aimed on measuring prevalence in specific groups such as health care workers.

Our meta-analysis encompasses two distinct approaches for assessing the prevalence of COVID-19: (1) seroprevalence studies that test for antibodies produced in response to the virus, and (2) comprehensive tracing programs using extensive live-virus testing of everyone who has had contact with a potentially infected individual. Seroprevalence estimates are associated with uncertainty related to the sensitivity and specificity of the test method and the extent to which the sampling frame provides an accurate representation of prevalence in the general population; see Supplementary Appendix C. Prevalence measures from comprehensive tracing programs are associated with uncertainty about the extent of inclusion of infected individuals, especially those who are asymptomatic.

Sampling frame

To assess prevalence in the general population, a study should be specifically designed to utilize a random sample using standard survey procedures such as stratification and weighting by demographic characteristics. Other sampling frames may be useful for specific purposes such as sentinel surveillance but not well-suited for assessing prevalence due to substantial risk of systemic bias. Consequently, our meta-analysis excludes the following types of studies:

- *Blood donor studies*. Only a small fraction of blood donors are ages 60 and above—a fundamental limitation in assessing COVID-19 prevalence and IFRs for older age groups—and the social behavior of blood donors may be systematically different from their peers.[8,9] These concerns can be directly investigated by comparing alternative seroprevalence surveys of the same geographical location. As of early June, Public Health England (PHE) reported seroprevalence of 8·5% based on specimens from blood donors, whereas the U.K. Office of National Statistics (ONS) reported markedly lower seroprevalence of 5·4% (CI: 4·3–6·5%) based on its monitoring of a representative sample of the English population.[10,11]

- *Hospitals and Urgent Care Clinics.* Estimates of seroprevalence among current medical patients are subject to substantial bias, as evident from a pair of studies conducted in

Tokyo, Japan: One study found 41 positive cases among 1071 urgent care clinic patients, whereas the other study found only two confirmed positive results in a random sample of nearly 2000 Tokyo residents (seroprevalence estimates of 3·8% vs. 0·1%).[12,13]

- *Active Recruitment*. Soliciting participants is particularly problematic in contexts of low prevalence, because seroprevalence can be markedly affected by a few individuals who volunteer due to concerns about prior exposure. For example, a Luxembourg study obtained positive antibody results for 35 out of 1,807 participants, but nearly half of those individuals (15 of 35) had previously had a positive live virus test, were residing in a household with someone who had a confirmed positive test, or had direct contact with someone else who had been infected.[14]

Our critical review has also underscored the pitfalls of seroprevalence studies based on "convenience samples" of residual sera collected for other purposes. For example, two studies assessed seroprevalence of Utah residents during spring 2020. The first study analyzed residual sera from two commercial laboratories and obtained a prevalence estimate of 2·2% (CI: 1·2–3·4%), whereas the second study collected specimens from a representative sample and obtained a markedly lower prevalence estimate of 0·96% (CI: 0·4–1·8%).[15,16] In light of these issues, our meta-analysis includes residual serum studies but we flag such studies as having an elevated risk of bias.

Comprehensive Tracing Programs

Our meta-analysis incorporates data on COVID-19 prevalence and fatalities in countries that have consistently maintained comprehensive tracing programs since the early stages of the pandemic. Such a program was only feasible in places where public health officials could conduct repeated tests of potentially infected individuals and trace those whom they had direct contact. We identify such countries using a threshold of 300 for the ratio of cumulative tests to reported cases as of 30 April 2020.[17] That threshold was chosen based on comparisons of prevalence estimates and reported cases in the Czech Republic vs. Iceland; see Supplementary Appendix D. Studies of Iceland and Korea found that estimated prevalence was moderately higher than the number of reported cases, especially for younger age groups; see Supplementary Appendix E.[18-20] Consequently, we make corresponding adjustments in inferring prevalence from reported cases for other countries with comprehensive tracing programs, and we identify these estimates as subject to an elevated risk of bias.

Measurement of fatalities

Accurately measuring total deaths is a substantial issue in assessing IFR due to time lags from onset of symptoms to death and from death to official reporting. Symptoms typically develop within 6 days after exposure but may develop as early as 2 days or as late as 14 days.[1,21] More than 95% of symptomatic COVID patients have positive antibody (IgG) titres within 17-19 days of symptom onset, and those antibodies remain elevated over a sustained period.[22-25] The mean time interval from symptom onset to death is 15 days for ages 18–64 and 12 days for ages 65+,



Figure 1: Time lags in the incidence and reporting of COVID-19 fatalities

with interquartile ranges of 9–24 days and 7–19 days, respectively, while the mean interval from date of death to the reporting of that person's death is ~7 days with an IQR of 2–19 days; thus, the upper bound of the 95% confidence interval between symptom onset and reporting of fatalities is about six weeks (41 days).[26]

Figure 1 illustrates these findings in a hypothetical scenario where the pandemic was curtailed two weeks prior to the date of the seroprevalence study. This figure shows the results of a simulation calibrated to reflect the estimated distribution for time lags between symptom onset, death, and inclusion in official fatality reports. The histogram shows the frequency of deaths and reported fatalities associated with the infections that occurred on the last day prior to full containment. Consistent with the confidence intervals noted above, 95% of cumulative fatalities are reported within roughly four weeks of the date of the seroprevalence study.

As shown in Table 2, the precise timing of the count of cumulative fatalities is relatively innocuous in locations where the outbreak had been contained for more than a month prior to the date of the seroprevalence study. By contrast, in instances where the outbreak had only recently been contained, the death count continued rising markedly for several more weeks after the midpoint of the seroprevalence study.

Therefore, we construct age-specific IFRs using the seroprevalence data in conjunction with cumulative fatalities four weeks after the midpoint date of each study; see Supplementary Appendix F. We have also conducted sensitivity analysis using cumulative fatalities five weeks after the midpoint date, and we flag studies as having an elevated risk of bias if the change in cumulative fatalities between weeks 4 and 5 exceeds 10%.

Location	Cumulative Fatalities: Study midpoint	Cumulative Fatalities: 4 weeks later	Cumulative Fatalities: 5 weeks later	Change (%): Weeks 0 to 4	Change (%): Weeks 4 to 5
Europe					
Belgium	6,262	8,843	9,150	41	3
Geneva, Switzerland	255	287	291	13	1
Spain	26,834	27,136	28,324	1	4
Sweden	2,586	3,831	3,940	48	3
United States					
Connecticut	2,257	3,637	3,686	61	1
Indiana	932	1,984	2,142	113	8
Louisiana	477	2,012	2,286	322	14
Miami	513	1,160	1,290	126	11
Minneapolis	393	964	1093	145	13
Missouri	218	562	661	158	18
New York	20,212	28,663	29,438	42	3
Philadelphia	456	1509	1754	231	16
San Francisco	265	424	449	60	6
Seattle	536	732	775	37	6
Utah	41	96	98	134	2

Table 2: **Timing of reported fatalities for selected seroprevalence studies**

By contrast, matching prevalence estimates with subsequent fatalities is not feasible if a seroprevalence study was conducted in the midst of an accelerating outbreak. Therefore, our meta-analysis excludes seroprevalence studies for which the change in cumulative fatalities from week 0 to week 4 exceeds 200%.

Metaregression procedure

To analyze IFR by age, we use meta-regression with random effects, using the *meta regress* procedure in *Stata* v16.[27,28] We used a random-effects procedures to allow for residual heterogeneity between studies and across age groups by assuming that these divergences are drawn from a Gaussian distribution. Publication bias was assessed using Egger's regression and the trim-and-fill method. See Supplementary Appendix G for further details of these procedures.



Figure 2: Study selection (PRISMA flow diagram)

Location	Population, millions	Sample size, thousands	Dates in 2020	Age-specific prevalence and 95% confidence interval (%)
Representative samples				
England[29]	56·286	109·076	June 20–July 13	0–17 yrs: 7·9 (7·3–8·5) 18–24 yrs: 7·9 (7·3–8·5) 25–34 yrs: 7·8 (7·4–8·3) 35-44 yrs: 6·1 (5·7–6·6) 45-54 yrs: 6·4 (6·0–6·9) 55–64 yrs: 5·9 (5·5–6·4) 65–74 yrs: 3·2 (2·8–3·6) 75+ yrs: 3·3 (2·9–3·8)
Hungary[30]	9·660	10·474	May 1–16	0-14 yrs: 0·6 (0·3–0·9) 15-39 yrs: 0·6 (0·3–0·9) 40–64 yrs: 0·7 (0·4–1·0) 65+ yrs: 0·8 (0·4–1·3)
Italy[31]	60·345	64·660	July 6–27	0–19 yrs: 2·2 (1·7–2·8) 20–29 yrs: 2·1 (1·7–2·4) 30–49 yrs: 2·4 (2·1–2·8) 50–59 yrs: 3·1 (2·7–3·5) 60–69 yrs: 2·6 (2·1–2·9) 70+ yrs: 2·5 (2·1–2·9)
Netherlands[32]	17·135	2·096	April 1–17	0–49 yrs: 3·5 (2·5–5·2) 50–59 yrs: 4·3 (3·2–5·8) 60–69 yrs: 3·5 (2·5–5·0) 70–79 yrs: 3·0 (1·7–5·3) 80+ yrs: 2·8 (0·9–7·3)
Portugal[33]	10·197	2·301	May 21–July 8	0–9 yrs: 2·1 (0·8–5·4) 10–19 yrs: 2·1 (0·8–5·5) 20–39 yrs: 0·7 (0·1–4·8) 40–59 yrs: 2·4 (0·9–5·9) 60+ yrs: 2·4 (1·1–4·9)
Spain[34]	46·755	51·958	May 18–June 1	0–9 yrs: 2·8 (1·5–5·2) 10–19 yrs: 3·3 (2·4–4·5) 20–29 yrs: 3·8 (2·8–5·2)) 30–39 yrs: 5·0 4·1–6·0) 40–49 yrs: 5·3 (4·6–6·2) 50–59 yrs: 5·2 (4·5–6·1) 60–69 yrs: 5·0 (4·1–5·9) 70+ yrs: 4·7 (3·6–6·3)
Sweden[35]	10·099	2·000	April 27–May 24	0–19 yrs: 5·7 (4·5–7·0) 20–49 yrs: 6·5 (5·2–7·8) 50–69 yrs: 4·8 (3·6–6·0) 70+ yrs: 3·1 (2·1–4·1)
Geneva, Switzerland[36]	0·507	2·766	April 13–May 8	5–19 yrs: 9·2 (5·4–14·1) 20–49 yrs: 13·1 (9·8–17·0) 50–64 yrs: 10·5 (7·3–14·1) 65+ yrs: 6·8 (3·8–10·5)
Atlanta, USA[37]	1·823	0·696	April 28–May 3	0–17 yrs: 0·0 (0·0–1·0) 18–49 yrs: 3·3 (1·6–6·4) 50–64 yrs: 4·9 (1·8–12·9) 65+ yrs: 0·7 (0·1–4·5)
Indiana, USA[38]	6·732	3·632	April 25–29	0–39 yrs: 3·1 (1·9–4·3) 40–59 yrs: 3·1 (1·9–5·0) 60+ yrs: 1·7 (1·0–2·4)
New York, USA[39]	19·454	15·101	April 23	0–19 yrs: 14·6 (13·1–16·1) 20–39 yrs: 14·6 (13·1–16·1) 40–49 yrs: 15·3 (13·7–17·0) 50–59 yrs: 16·0 (14·6–17·5) 60+ yrs: 12·1 (11·2–13·1)

(Table 3 continues on next page)

Location	Population, millions	Sample size, thousands	Dates in 2020	Age-specific prevalence and 95% confidence interval (%)
Representative samples (contd.)				
Salt Lake City, USA[16]	2·194	6·527	May 4–June 10	0–44 yrs: 1·2 (0·4–2·5) 45–64 yrs: 0·9 (0·2–2·1) 65+ yrs: 0·6 (0·0–1·4)
Convenience samples				
Belgium[40]	11·590	16·532	April 20–26	0–24 yrs: 6·0 (4·2–8·6) 25–44 yrs: 5·9 (4·2–8·3) 45–64 yrs: 6·2 (4·7–8·3) 65–74 yrs: 4·1 (2·3–7·2) 75–84 yrs: 7·0 (4·2–11·7) 85+ yrs: 13·2 (8·9–19·6)
Connecticut, USA[15]	3·565	1·431	April 26–May3	0–19 yrs: 0·8 (0·0–2·9) 20–49 yrs: 6·1 (3·1–9·3) 50–59 yrs: 8·1 (4·8–1·6) 60+ yrs: 4·2 (2·3–6·0)
Louisiana, USA[15]	4·649	1·184	April 1–8	0–18 yrs: 2·8 (0·0–11·5) 19–49 yrs: 7·4 (4·7–10·0) 50–59 yrs: 8·3 (4·5–11·9) 60+ yrs: 4·4 (1·5–8·0)
Miami, USA[15]	6·327	1·742	April 6–10	0–19 yrs: 2·4 (0·0–7·8) 20–49 yrs: 0·9 (0·2–2·2) 50–59 yrs: 2·0 (0·3–4·0) 60+ yrs: 3·0 (1·7–4·5)
Minneapolis, USA[15]	3·894	0·860	April 30–May 12	0–18 yrs: 5·8 (0·0–14·3) 19–49 yrs: 2·3 0·8–4·2) 50–59 yrs: 0·7 (0·0–2·8) 60+ yrs: 1·0 (0·0–3·2)
Missouri, USA[15]	6·137	1·882	April 20–26	0–19 yrs: 1·4 (0·0–4·1) 20–49 yrs: 3·4 (1·4–5·5) 50–59 yrs: 2·0 (0·5–3·8) 60+ yrs: 3·2 (1·9–4·6)
Philadelphia, USA[15]	4·934	0·824	April 13–25	0–18 yrs: 2·2 (0·0–6·9) 19–49 yrs: 5·9 (2·4–9·8) 50–64 yrs: 0·8 (0·0–2·8) 65+ yrs: 1·6 (0·3–3·5)
San Francisco, USA[15]	6·660	1·224	April 23–27	0–18 yrs: 1·7 (0·0–7·7) 19–49 yrs: 1·1 (0·0–2·6) 50–64 yrs: 0·7 (0·0–2·4) 65+ yrs: 0·9 (0·2–2·5)
Seattle, USA[15]	4·326	3·264	March 23–April 1	0–19 yrs: 0·7 (0·0–2·5) 20–39 yrs: 1·3 (0·7–2·3) 40–59 yrs: 0·9 (0·3–1·9) 60+ yrs:1·7 (0·9–2·7)
Comprehensive tracing programs				
Australia[41]	25·500	16·838	February 1–June 12	0–39 yrs: 0·06 (0·03–0·09) 40–59 yrs: 0·06 (0·04–0·10) 60–69 yrs: 0·09 (0·05–0·13) 70–79 yrs: 0·08 (0·04–0·12) 80+ yrs: 0·05 (0·03–0·07)
Iceland[42]	0·341	9·199	February 1–June 15	0–29 yrs: 0·4 (0·3–0·5) 30–59 yrs: 1·1 (0·8–1·6) 60–69 yrs: 0·5 (0·3–1·0) 70–79 yrs: 0·3 (0·27–1·3) 80+ yrs: 0·2 (0·1–2·5)

(Table 3 continues on next page)

Location	Population, millions	Sample size, thousands	Dates in 2020	Age-specific prevalence and 95% confidence interval (%)
Comprehensive tracing programs (contd.)				
Republic of Korea[43]	51·269	13·106	February 1–May 17	0–29 yrs: 0·11 (0·05–0·17) 30–39 yrs: 0·08 (0·04–0·12) 40–49 yrs: 0·06 (0·03–0·09) 50–59 yrs: 0·07 (0·03–0·10) 60–69 yrs: 0·05 (0·03–0·08) 70–79 yrs: 0·05 (0·03–0·07) 80+ yrs: 0·06 (0·03–0·09)
Lithuania[44]	27·223	4·072	February 1–June 18	0–39 yrs: 0·15 (0·07–0·22) 40–49 yrs: 0·18 (0·10–0·29) 50–59 yrs: 0·17 (0·10–0·33) 60–69 yrs: 0·13 (0·08–0·20) 70–79 yrs: 0·09 (0·05–0·14) 80+ yrs: 0·13 (0·07–0·19)
New Zealand[45]	4·822	1·945	February 1–July 9	0–59 yrs: 0·1 (0·05–0·15) 50–69 yrs: 0·07 (0·04–0·10) 70–79 yrs: 0·04 (0·02–0·07) 80+ yrs: 0·04 (0·02–0·06)

For locations with comprehensive tracing programs, sample size refers to the estimated total number of cases.

Table 3: Characteristics of studies included in metaregression

Results

After an initial screening of 962 studies, we reviewed the full texts of 89 studies, of which 43 studies were excluded due to lack of age-specific data on COVID-19 prevalence or fatalities.[11-13,46-85] Seroprevalence estimates for two locations were excluded because the outbreak was still accelerating during the period when the specimens were being collected.[15,86] Studies of non-representative samples were excluded as follows: 10 studies of blood donors, 4 studies of patients of hospitals and outpatient clinics, 4 studies with active recruitment of participants, and 2 studies of elementary schools.[10,13,14,86-102] Supplementary Appendix H lists all excluded studies.

Consequently, our metaregression analyzes IFR data from 26 locations, which can be classified into three distinct groups:

- *Representative samples* from 7 national studies (England, Hungary, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, and Sweden) and from regional studies of Geneva, Switzerland and 4 U.S. locations (Atlanta, Indiana, New York, and Salt Lake City).[16,29-39]

- *Convenience samples* for Belgium and 8 U.S. locations (Connecticut, Louisiana, Miami, Minneapolis, Missouri, Philadelphia, San Francisco, and Seattle).[15,40]

- *Comprehensive tracing programs* for 5 countries (Australia, Iceland, Korea, Lithuania, and New Zealand).[41-45]

The metaregression includes results from the very large REACT-2 seroprevalence study of the English population.[29] Thus, to avoid pitfalls of nested or overlapping samples, two other

somewhat smaller studies conducted by U.K. Biobank and the U.K. Office of National Statistics are not included in the metaregression but are instead used in out-of-sample analysis of the metaregression results.[11,103] Similarly, the metaregression includes a large representative sample from Salt Lake City, and hence a smaller convenience sample of Utah residents is included in the out-of-sample analysis along with two other small-scale studies.[15,16,104,105] Supplementary Appendices I and J assess the risk of bias for each individual study and the risk that our metaregression results could be influenced by publication bias, respectively.

We obtain the following meta-regression results:

$$\begin{array}{rcccc} log\left(IFR_{ij}\right) & = & -7.56 & + & 0.121 * age \\ & & \textit{(0.17)} & & \textit{(0.003)} \end{array}$$

where the standard error for each estimated coefficient is given in parentheses. These estimates are highly significant with t-statistics of -44·8 and 40·5, respectively, and p-values below 0·0001. The residual heterogeneity τ^2 = 0·353 (p-value < 0.0001) and I^2 = 96·8, confirming that the random effects are essential for capturing unexplained variations across studies and age groups. The adjusted R^2 is 95·0%.

As noted above, the validity of this meta-regression rests on the condition that the data are consistent with a Gaussian distribution. The validity of that assumption is evident in Figure 3: Nearly all of the observations fall within the 95% prediction interval of the metaregression, and the remainder are moderate outliers.

Figure 4 depicts the exponential relationship between age and the level of IFR in percent. Evidently, the SARS-CoV-2 virus poses a substantial mortality risk for middle-aged adults and even higher risks for elderly people: The IFR is close to zero for younger adults but rises to 0·4% at age 55, 1·3% at age 65, 4·5% at age 75, 15% at age 85, and exceeds 25% for ages 90 and above. These metaregression predictions are well aligned with the out-of-sample IFRs; see Supplementary Appendix K.

As shown in Figure 5, the metaregression explains 90% of the geographical variation in population IFR, which ranges from ~0·5% in Salt Lake City and Geneva to 1·5% in Australia and England and 2·2% in Italy. The metaregression explains this variation in terms of differences in the age structure of the population and age-specific prevalence of COVID-19.

No publication bias was found using Egger's test (p > 0.10), and the trim-and-fill method produced precisely the same estimate as obtained from the metaregression.



Figure 3: The log-linear relationship between IFR and age



Figure 4: Benchmark analysis of the link between age and IFR



Figure 5: Variations in population IFR across geographical locations



(Figure 6 continues on next page)

Cohorts with median age of 35-54 years



Cohorts with median age of 55-64 years



(Figure 6 continues on next page)



FIgure 6: Forest plot of metaregression data

Age Group	COVID-19 Infection Fatality Rate	Automobile Fatalities		Other Accidental Fatalities	
		England	USA	England	USA
0 to 34	0·01	0·002	0·015	0·004	0·032
35 to 44	0·06	0·002	0·012	0·017	0·043
45 to 54	0·2	0·002	0·013	0·019	0·043
55 to 64	0·7	0·003	0·013	0·014	0·043
65 to 74	2·2	0·003	0·013	0·020	0·040
75 to 84	7·3	0·005	0·017	0·069	0·094
85+	27·1	0·007	0·019	0·329	0·349

Table 4: Age-specific fatality rates for COVID-19 vs. accidental deaths (%)

Discussion

Our meta-analysis indicates that COVID-19 poses a low risk for children and younger adults but is hazardous for middle-aged adults and extremely dangerous for older adults. Table 4 contextualize these risks by comparing the age-specific IFRs from our meta-regression analysis to the annualized risks of fatal automobile accidents or other unintentional injuries in England and in the United States.[106,107] For example, an English person aged 55–64 years who gets infected with SARS-CoV-2 faces a fatality risk that is more than 200 times higher than the annual risk of dying in a fatal car accident.

This analysis also confirms that COVID-19 is far more deadly than seasonal flu. For example, during the influenza season of winter 2018–19 the U.S. population had ~63 million infections and 34 thousand fatalities, with a population IFR of 0·05% an order of magnitude lower than COVID-19; see Supplementary Appendix L.

These results indicate that the population IFR should *not* be interpreted as a fixed parameter of COVID-19 but as an outcome that depends on the extent to which public health measures and communications limit the incidence of infections among vulnerable age groups. To illustrate these considerations, we have constructed three scenarios for the U.S. trajectory of COVID-19 infections and fatalities; see Supplementary Appendix M. Each scenario assumes that U.S. prevalence rises to a plateau of around 20% but with alternative patterns of age-specific prevalence. In particular, if the prevalence becomes uniform across all age groups, this analysis projects that total U.S. fatalities would exceed 500 thousand and that the population IFR would converge to around 0·8%. By contrast, a scenario with relatively low incidence of new infections

among vulnerable age groups would be associated with less than half as many deaths and a much lower population IFR of ~0·3%.

Our critical review underscores the substantial benefits of assessing prevalence using large-scale studies of representative samples of the general population (rather than convenience samples of blood donors or medical patients). Conducting such studies on an ongoing basis will enable public health officials to monitor changes in prevalence among vulnerable age groups and gauge the efficacy of public policy measures. Moreover, such studies will enable researchers to assess the extent to which antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 may gradually diminish over time as well as the extent to which advances in treatment facilitate the reduction of age-specific IFRs.

Our metaregression results are broadly consistent with the pathbreaking study of Ferguson et al. (2020), which was completed at a very early stage of the COVID-19 pandemic and characterized an exponential pattern of age-specific IFRs that was close to zero for children and much higher for middle-aged and older adults.[108] Our results are also well-aligned with a more recent meta-analysis of population IFR; indeed, our age-specific analysis explains a very high proportion of the dispersion in population IFRs highlighted by that study.[5] In contrast, our findings are markedly different from those of an earlier review of population IFR, mostly due to differences in selection criteria.[109] Finally, the exponential pattern of our age-specific IFR estimates is qualititatively similar to that of age-specific CFRs but the magnitudes are systematically different, as shown in Supplementary Appendix N.

This meta-analysis has focused on the role of age in determining the IFR of COVID-19 but has not incorporated other factors that may have significant effects on IFR. For example, a recent U.K. study found that mortality outcomes are strongly linked to specific comorbidities such as diabetes and obesity but did not resolve the question of whether those links reflect differences in prevalence or causal effects on IFR.[110] See Supplementary Appendix O for additional evidence. Likewise, we have not considered the extent to which IFRs may vary with other demographic factors such as race and ethnicity.[46,77] Further research on these issues is clearly warranted.

It should also be noted that our analysis has focused exclusively on the incidence of fatalities but has not captured the full spectrum of adverse health consequences of COVID-19, some of which may may be severe and persistent. Further research is needed to assess age-stratified rates of hospitalization as well as longer-term sequelae attributable to SARS-CoV-2 infections.

In summary, our meta-analysis demonstrates that COVID-19 is not just dangerous for the elderly and infirm but also for healthy middle-aged adults. The metaregression explains 90% of the geographical variation in population IFR, indicating that the population IFR is intrinsically linked to the age-specific pattern of infections. Consequently, public health measures to protect vulnerable age groups could substantially reduce the incidence of mortality.

References

1 Khalili M, Karamouzian M, Nasiri N, Javadi S, Mirzazadeh A, Sharifi H. Epidemiological characteristics of COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Epidemiol Infect* 2020; **148**: e130.

2 Oran DP, Topol EJ. Prevalence of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection: A Narrative Review. *Ann Intern Med* 2020.

3 New York Department of Health. COVID-19 Tracker – Fatalities by Age Group. 2020.

4 New York City Department of Health. COVID-19 Data. 2020.

5 Meyerowitz-Katz G, Merone L. A systematic review and meta-analysis of published research data on COVID-19 infection-fatality rates. 2020.

6 United Kingdom Parliament Office. Antibody Tests for COVID-19. 2020.

7 Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Member Countries. 2020.

8 Brown TS, Walensky RP. Serosurveillance and the COVID-19 Epidemic in the US: Undetected, Uncertain, and Out of Control. *JAMA* 2020.

9 Lattimore S, Wickenden C, Brailsford SR. Blood donors in England and North Wales: demography and patterns of donation. *Transfusion* 2015; **55**(1): 91-9.

10 Public Health England. Sero-Surveillance of COVID-19: Week 22. 2020.

11 United Kingdom Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus (COVID-19) infection survey: characteristics of people testing positive for COVID-19 in England, August 2020. 2020.

12 Japan Ministry of Health Labour and Welfare. Updates on COVID-19 in Japan. 2020.

13 Takita M, Matsumura T, Yamamoto K, et al. Geographical Profiles of COVID-19 Outbreak in Tokyo: An Analysis of the Primary Care Clinic-Based Point-of-Care Antibody Testing. *J Prim Care Community Health* 2020; **11**: 2150132720942695.

14 Snoeck CJ, Vaillant M, Abdelrahman T, et al. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in the Luxembourgish population: the CON-VINCE study. 2020.

15 Havers FP, Reed C, Lim T, et al. Seroprevalence of Antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in 10 Sites in the United States, March 23-May 12, 2020. *JAMA Intern Med* 2020.

16 University of Utah Health. Utah HERO project announces phase one findings. 2020.

17 Our World in Data. Coronavirus (COVID-19) testing: tests per confirmed case. 2020. https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus-testing#tests-per-confirmed-case (accessed August 18.

18 Gudbjartsson DF, Helgason A, Jonsson H, et al. Spread of SARS-CoV-2 in the Icelandic Population. *N Engl J Med* 2020; **382**(24): 2302-15.

19 Korea Center for Disease Control. Updates on COVID-19 in Korea as of July 9. 2020.

20 Song SK, Lee DH, Nam JH, et al. IgG Seroprevalence of COVID-19 among Individuals without a History of the Coronavirus Disease Infection in Daegu, Korea. *Journal of Korean medical science* 2020; **35**(29): e269-e.

21 Byrne AW, McEvoy D, Collins AB, et al. Inferred duration of infectious period of SARS-CoV-2: rapid scoping review and analysis of available evidence for asymptomatic and symptomatic COVID-19 cases. *BMJ Open* 2020; **10**(8): e039856-e.

22 Long QX, Liu BZ, Deng HJ, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with COVID-19. *Nat Med* 2020; **26**(6): 845-8.

23 Sethuraman N, Jeremiah SS, Ryo A. Interpreting Diagnostic Tests for SARS-CoV-2. *JAMA* 2020; **323**(22): 2249-51.

24 Choe PG, Kang CK, Suh HJ, et al. Antibody Responses to SARS-CoV-2 at 8 Weeks Postinfection in Asymptomatic Patients. *Emerging Infectious Disease journal* 2020; **26**(10).

25 Ripperger TJ, Uhrlaub JL, Watanabe M, et al. Detection, prevalence, and duration of humoral responses to SARS-CoV-2 under conditions of limited population exposure. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.08.14.20174490.

26 U.S. Center for Disease Control and Prevention. COVID-19 Pandemic Planning Scenarios. 2020.

27 Harbord RM, Higgins JPT. Meta-regression in Stata. *Stata Journal* 2008; **8**(4): 493-519.
28 Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Spiegelhalter DJ. A re-evaluation of random-effects meta-analysis. *J R Stat Soc Ser A Stat Soc* 2009; **172**(1): 137-59.
29 Ward H, Atchison CJ, Whitaker M, et al. Antibody prevalence for SARS-CoV-2 in England following first peak of the pandemic: REACT2 study in 100,000 adults. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.08.12.20173690.
30 Merkely B, Szabo AJ, Kosztin A, et al. Novel coronavirus epidemic in the Hungarian population, a cross-sectional nationwide survey to support the exit policy in Hungary. *Geroscience* 2020; **42**(4): 1063-74.
31 Italy National Institute of Statistics. Primi risultati dell'indagine di sieroprevalenza sul SARS-CoV-2. 2020.
32 Netherlands National Institute for Public Health and the Environment. Children and COVID-19. 2020.
33 Portugal National Institute of Health. Relatório de Apresentação dos Resultados Preliminares do Primeiro Inquérito Serológico Nacional COVID-19. 2020.
34 Pastor-Barriuso R, Perez-Gomez B, Hernan MA, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection fatality risk in a nationwide seroepidemiological study. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.08.06.20169722.
35 Sweden Public Health Authority. COVID-19 Report for Week 24 - COVID-19 veckorapport vecka 24. 2020.
36 Perez-Saez J, Lauer SA, Kaiser L, et al. Serology-informed estimates of SARS-CoV-2 infection fatality risk in Geneva, Switzerland. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*.
37 Biggs HM. Estimated Community Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies — Two Georgia Counties, April 28–May 3, 2020. *morbidity and mortality weekly report* 2020; **69**(29): 965-70.
38 Menachemi N, Yiannoutsos CT, Dixon BE, et al. Population Point Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 Infection Based on a Statewide Random Sample — Indiana, April 25–29, 2020. *morbidity and mortality weekly report* 2020; **69**(29): 960-4.
39 Rosenberg ES, Tesoriero JM, Rosenthal EM, et al. Cumulative incidence and diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection in New York. *annals of epidemiology* 2020.
40 Molenberghs G, Faes C, Aerts J, et al. Belgian Covid-19 Mortality, Excess Deaths, Number of Deaths per Million, and Infection Fatality Rates (8 March - 9 May 2020). 2020.
41 Australia Department of Health. Coronavirus (COVID-19) current situation and case numbers. 2020.
42 Iceland Directorate of Health. COVID-19 in Iceland - Statistics 28 Feb to 14 June 2020. 2020.
43 Korea Center for Disease Control. Weekly Report on the COVID-19 Situation in the Republic of Korea. 2020.
44 Lithuania Central Registry. Koronaviruso (COVID-19) Lietuvoje statistika. 2020.
45 New Zealand Ministry of Health. COVID-19 Current Cases. 2020.
46 Chamie G, Marquez C, Crawford E, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Community Transmission During Shelter-in-Place in San Francisco. 2020.
47 Czech Ministry of Health. Collective Immunity Study SARS-CoV-2: Czech Prevalence. 2020.
48 Denmark State Blood Institute. Notat: Nye foreløbige resultater fra den repræsentative seroprævalensundersøgelse af COVID-19. 2020.
49 Dimeglio C, Loubes J-M, Miedougé M, Herin F, Soulat J-M, Izopet J. The real seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in France and its consequences for virus dynamics. Research Square; 2020.
50 Feehan AK, Fort D, Garcia-Diaz J, et al. Point prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 and infection fatality rate in Orleans and Jefferson Parish, Louisiana, May 9-15, 2020. 2020.
51 Jersey Health & Community Services. Prevalence of Antibodies – Community Survey Round 2. 2020.
52 Lavezzo E, Franchin E, Ciavarella C, et al. Suppression of COVID-19 outbreak in the municipality of Vo, Italy. 2020.

53 Mahajan S, Srinivasan R, Redlich CA, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2-Specific IgG Antibodies Among Adults Living in Connecticut Between March 1 and June 1, 2020: Post-Infection Prevalence (PIP) Study. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.08.04.20168203.
54 McLaughlin CC, Doll MK, Morrison KT, et al. High Community SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Seroprevalence in a Ski Resort Community, Blaine County, Idaho, US. Preliminary Results. *medRxiv* 2020.
55 Nawa N, Kuramochi J, Sonoda S, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 IgG Antibodies in Utsunomiya City, Greater Tokyo, after first pandemic in 2020 (U-CORONA): a household- and population-based study. 2020.
56 Nishiura H, Kobayashi T, Yang Y, et al. The Rate of Underascertainment of Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Infection: Estimation Using Japanese Passengers Data on Evacuation Flights. *J Clin Med* 2020; **9**(2).
57 Norrbotten Region. Forekomst av antikroppar mot covid-19 - Norrbottens befolkning maj 2020. 2020.
58 Norway Public Health Institute. Truleg berre ein liten andel av befolkninga som har vore smitta av koronavirus. 2020.
59 Oklahoma State Department of Health. Weekly Epidemiology and Surveillance Report. 2020.
60 Oregon State University. TRACE results suggest 17% of Hermiston community infected with SARS-CoV-2. 2020.
61 Petersen MS, Strøm M, Christiansen DH, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2–Specific Antibodies, Faroe Islands. *emerging infectious diseases* 2020; **26**(11).
62 Rhode Island Department of Health. COVID-19 serology testing brief. 2020.
63 Riverside County Joint Information Center. Antibody study shows coronavirus spread wider in Riverside County. 2020.
64 Saltzman J. Nearly a third of 200 blood samples taken in Chelsea show exposure to coronavirus. Boston Globe. 2020 4/17/2020.
65 San Miguel County Department of Health & Environment. IgG Antibody Tests: Statistics and Demographics. 2020.
66 Skowronski DM, Sekirov I, Sabaiduc S, et al. Low SARS-CoV-2 sero-prevalence based on anonymized residual sero-survey before and after first wave measures in British Columbia, Canada, March-May 2020. 2020.
67 Slovenia Government Communication Office. First study carried out on herd immunity of the population in the whole territory of Slovenia. 2020.
68 Stadlbauer D, Tan J, Jiang K, et al. Seroconversion of a city: Longitudinal monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in New York City. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.06.28.20142190.
69 Stockholm Region. Lägesrapport om arbetet med det nya coronaviruset. 2020.
70 Streeck H, Schulte B, Kuemmerer B, et al. Infection fatality rate of SARS-CoV-2 infection in a German community with a super-spreading event. 2020.
71 University of Miami. SPARK-C: understanding the burden of COVID-19 in Miami-Dade County through rapid serological testing of a representative random sample. 2020.
72 von Laer D. U.S. National Institutes of Health COVID-19 lecture: high seroprevalence, drastic decline of incidence, and low infection fatality rate of SARS-CoV-2 infections in children and adults in the ski resort Ischgl, Austria. 2020.
73 Washoe County Health District. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 Specific Antibodies Among Adults in Washoe County, Nevada on June 9-10, 2020. 2020.
74 Weis S, Scherag A, Baier M, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in an entirely PCR-sampled and quarantined community after a COVID-19 outbreak - the CoNAN study. 2020.
75 Wells PM, Doores KM, Couvreur S, et al. Estimates of the rate of infection and asymptomatic COVID-19 disease in a population sample from SE England. 2020.

76 Sweden Public Health Authority. The Infection Fatality Rate of COVID-19 in Stockholm – Technical Report. 2020.
77 Feehan AK, Fort D, Garcia-Diaz J, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 and Infection Fatality Ratio, Orleans and Jefferson Parishes, Louisiana, USA, May 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2020; **26**(11).
78 Giustizia News. Coronavirus, l'incubo senza fine di Ariano Irpino: 60 positivi al tampone dopo i test sierologici. May 28.
79 Austria Statistik. COVID-19 prevalence study: a maximum of 0.15% of the population in Austria infected with SARS-CoV-2. 2020.
80 University of California-San Francisco. Town of Bolinas antibody tests find minimal history of infection. 2020.
81 Saltzman J. Study: 1 out of 10 residents in 4 neighborhoods unwittingly had coronavirus. Boston Globe. 2020 May 15.
82 Micolitti A. Caldari Ortona: 12% cittadini sottoposti a test sierologici positivi con anticorpi al Covid 19. Rete8. 2020 June 3.
83 Finland National Institute for Health and Welfare. Weekly report of THL serological population study of the coronavirus epidemic. 2020.
84 Bogogiannidou Z, Vontas A, Dadouli K, et al. Repeated leftover serosurvey of SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies, Greece, March and April 2020. *Eurosurveillance* 2020; **25**(31): 2001369.
85 Times of Israel Staff. Coronavirus : Israël est encore loin de l'immunité de groupe. Times of Israel. 2020 July 23.
86 Reifer J, Hayum N, Heszkel B, Klagsbald I, Streva VA. SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody responses in New York City. *diagnostic microbiology and infectious disease* 2020.
87 Armann JP, Unrath M, Kirsten C, Lueck C, Dalpke A, Berner R. Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies in adolescent students and their teachers in Saxony, Germany (SchoolCoviDD19): very low seropraevalence and transmission rates. 2020.
88 Bendavid E, Mulaney B, Sood N, et al. COVID-19 Antibody Seroprevalence in Santa Clara County, California. 2020.
89 Bryan A, Pepper G, Wener MH, et al. Performance Characteristics of the Abbott Architect SARS-CoV-2 IgG Assay and Seroprevalence in Boise, Idaho. *J Clin Microbiol* 2020; **58**(8).
90 Erikstrup C, Hother CE, Pedersen OBV, et al. Estimation of SARS-CoV-2 infection fatality rate by real-time antibody screening of blood donors. *clinical infectious diseases* 2020.
91 Fiore J, Centra M, de Carlo A, et al. Far away from herd immunity to SARS-CoV-2: results from a survey in healthy blood donors in southeastern Italy. 2020.
92 Fischer B, Knabbe C, Vollmer T. SARS-CoV-2 IgG seroprevalence in blood donors located in three different federal states, Germany, March to June 2020. *Euro Surveill* 2020; **25**(28).
93 Fontanet A, Tondeur L, Madec Y, et al. Cluster of COVID-19 in northern France: A retrospective closed cohort study. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.04.18.20071134.
94 Kraehling V, Kern M, Halwe S, et al. Epidemiological study to detect active SARS-CoV-2 infections and seropositive persons in a selected cohort of employees in the Frankfurt am Main metropolitan area. 2020.
95 Nesbitt DJ, Jin D, Hogan JW, et al. Low Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Rhode Island Blood Donors Determined using Multiple Serological Assay Formats. 2020.
96 Ng D, Goldgof G, Shy B, et al. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and neutralizing activity in donor and patient blood from the San Francisco Bay Area. *medRxiv* 2020.
97 Percivalle E, Cambie G, Cassaniti I, et al. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 specific neutralising antibodies in blood donors from the Lodi Red Zone in Lombardy, Italy, as at 06 April 2020. *Euro Surveill* 2020; **25**(24).
98 Slot E, Hogema BM, Reusken CBEM, et al. Herd immunity is not a realistic exit strategy during a COVID-19 outbreak. 2020.

99 Thompson CP, Grayson N, Paton R, et al. Detection of neutralising antibodies to SARS coronavirus 2 to determine population exposure in Scottish blood donors between March and May 2020. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.04.13.20060467.
100 Valenti L, Bergna A, Pelusi S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence trends in healthy blood donors during the COVID-19 Milan outbreak. 2020.
101 Doi A, Iwata K, Kuroda H, et al. Estimation of seroprevalence of novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) using preserved serum at an outpatient setting in Kobe, Japan: A cross-sectional study. 2020.
102 Emmenegger M, Cecco ED, Lamparter D, et al. Population-wide evolution of SARS-CoV-2 immunity tracked by a ternary immunoassay. 2020.
103 United Kingdom BioBank. UK Biobank SARS-CoV-2 Serology Study Weekly Report - 21 July 2020. 2020.
104 Mizumoto K, Kagaya K, Zarebski A, Chowell G. Estimating the asymptomatic proportion of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases on board the Diamond Princess cruise ship, Yokohama, Japan, 2020. *eurosurveillance* 2020; **25**(10).
105 Pagani G, Conti F, Giacomelli A, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 IgG significantly varies with age: results from a mass population screening (SARS-2-SCREEN-CdA). 2020.
106 U.S. National Center for Health Statistics. Underlying Cause of Death, 1999-2018. 2020.
107 United Kingdom Office of National Statistics. Mortality statistics - underlying cause, sex and age. 2020.
108 Ferguson N, Laydon D, Nedjati-Gilani G, et al. Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand; 2020.
109 Ioannidis J. The infection fatality rate of COVID-19 inferred from seroprevalence data. 2020.
110 Williamson EJ, Walker AJ, Bhaskaran K, et al. Factors associated with COVID-19-related death using OpenSAFELY. *Nature* 2020.