

Why does COVID-19 case fatality rate vary among countries?

Gabriele Sorci^{1*}, Bruno Faivre¹, Serge Morand^{2,3}

1. Biogéosciences, CNRS UMR 6282, Université de Bourgogne France-Comté, Dijon, France

2. CNRS ISEM - CIRAD ASTRE - Montpellier Université, Montpellier, France

3. Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

*Corresponding author:

Gabriele Sorci, Biogéosciences, CNRS UMR 6282, Université de Bourgogne Franche-Comté, 6
Boulevard Gabriel, 21000 Dijon, France

Email : gabriele.sorci@u-bourgogne.fr

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

33 **Summary**

34 *Background* While the epidemic of SARS-CoV-2 is spreading worldwide, there is much concern over
35 the mortality rate that the infection induces. Available data suggest that COVID-19 case fatality rate
36 varies temporally (as the epidemic progresses) and spatially (among countries). Here, we attempted
37 to identify key factors possibly explaining the variability in case fatality rate across countries.

38 *Methods* We used data on the temporal trajectory of case fatality rate provided by the European
39 Center for Disease Prevention and Control, and country-specific data on different metrics describing
40 the incidence of known comorbidity factors associated with an increased risk of COVID-19 mortality at
41 the individual level (Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation). We also compiled data on
42 demography, economy and political regimes for each country.

43 *Findings* We first showed that temporal trajectories of case fatality rate greatly vary among countries.
44 We found no evidence for association between comorbidities and case fatality rate at the country
45 level. Case fatality rate was negatively associated with number of hospital beds x1,000 inhabitants. We
46 also report evidence suggesting an association between case fatality rate and the political regime, with
47 democracies suffering from the highest mortality burden, compared to autocratic regimes. However,
48 most of the among-country variance in case fatality rate remained unexplained.

49 *Interpretation* Overall, these results emphasize the role of socio-economic and political factors as
50 possible drivers of COVID-19 case fatality rate at the country level.

51 *Funding* None.

52

53 *Keywords:* comorbidity; democracy level; epidemic; infectious diseases; mortality; public health; SARS-
54 CoV-2; socio-economic factors

55 **Introduction**

56 At the end of 2019, a novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) emerged from an animal reservoir in the city of
57 Wuhan, China^{1,2}. Having established a human-to-human transmission, the virus rapidly spread, first
58 within China, and subsequently outside China. Currently, more than 152 countries have reported at
59 least one case of infection with SARS-CoV-2, and on 11th March 2020 the WHO declared SARS-CoV-2
60 as a pandemic³. The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) produces a series of respiratory symptoms
61 that vary in severity⁴. Although, in most infected people the infection results in mild symptoms that do
62 not require particular medical care (or even in asymptomatic disease), in a substantial fraction of
63 patients the disease develops into severe respiratory distress, requiring hospitalization in intensive
64 care units⁵. In the absence of specific treatments that prevent or block viral replication, a serious
65 matter of concern is the proportion of infected patients that will eventually die. Current data indicate
66 that, worldwide, case fatality rate (CFR, the ratio between number of deaths and number of cases)
67 might be around 2 – 3%. However, at the country level, CFR ranges from 0 to a frightening 12%⁶. There
68 are many possible reasons for such a variation. First, the epidemic has spread in some countries earlier
69 than in others and therefore the difference in CFR might reflect different stages during the spread of
70 the disease. According to this hypothesis, one might expect an increase in CFR with time in countries
71 where CFR is currently low. Second, at the individual level, clinical data have reported several risk
72 factors associated with a poor prognosis. Age and comorbidities (cardiovascular diseases, cancers,
73 diabetes mellitus, chronic lung diseases) seem to greatly increase the mortality risk⁷⁻¹⁰. Therefore,
74 countries with a greater share of elderly in the population, or with higher incidence of recognized
75 comorbidity factors might pay the highest toll to the infection. Third, as said before, in the absence of
76 effective treatments, patients that develop severe symptoms require hospitalization in intensive care
77 units for respiratory assistance. A major concern is that, as the number of infected people increases,
78 the healthcare system will be overwhelmed¹¹. Under this scenario, mortality rate might reflect the
79 country-specific capacity to tackle a large number of patients requiring respiratory assistance and

80 intensive care. Finally, countries might differ in their methodology to count and communicate the
81 actual number of patients that have succumbed from SARS-CoV-2 infection.

82 Here, we conducted an analysis of the factors that might account for the variability of COVID-
83 19 CFR among countries. Using data updated to 4th Avril 2020, we first show that CFR significantly
84 varies between countries, independently from the stage of the epidemic wave. Second, we used
85 country-specific variables assessing the occurrence of comorbidities, as well as demographic,
86 economic and political variables to uncover any association pattern with COVID-19 CFR. Overall, we
87 could only account for a small fraction of the variance in CFR among countries, with no association
88 between comorbidities and CFR. Among the demographic, economic and political variables, only
89 number of hospital beds and the political regime were associated with CFR. These results emphasize
90 the importance of strategic decisions for the management of health crisis during infectious disease
91 pandemics.

92

93 **Methods**

94 We used data on daily number of confirmed cases and deaths for each countries reported by
95 the European Center for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC). We computed the case fatality rate
96 as the ratio between deaths and confirmed cases. We restricted the dataset to countries with at least
97 100 confirmed cases to avoid spurious results due to small numbers. For each country, we also counted
98 the number of days between the 100th case and 4th Avril 2020, indicating the progression of the
99 epidemic.

100 We used the online resource <https://ourworldindata.org/> to retrieve data on the incidence of
101 known comorbidity factors for each country, as well as information on demographics, economics and
102 political regimes. In particular, we used different metrics to describe comorbidities: 1) disability-
103 adjusted life years (DALYs); 2) age-standardized DALYs per 100,000; 3) share of total disease burden;
104 4) age-standardized death rates per 100,000; 5) share of deaths. We focused on known comorbidities
105 such as cardiovascular diseases, cancers, chronic respiratory diseases, and diabetes. We also included

106 metrics related to factors that might impinge on the severity of respiratory syndromes, such as
107 smoking and air pollution. We also used <https://ourworldindata.org/> to retrieve information on
108 demographic, economic and political indicators. Table S1, in the supplementary information, reports
109 the list, description and source of the variables used here, according to the GATHER statement¹².

110

111 *Statistical analyses*

112 We first aimed at exploring whether CFR varied among countries while controlling for the
113 differences in the epidemic progression. To this purpose, we run a linear mixed model where CFR was
114 the dependent variable, time since 100th case (in days) and squared time since 100th case (as to model
115 non-linear variation), country and the two-way interactions between country and time were the fixed
116 factors. Country was also included as a random effect. The covariance structure of R matrix was
117 modeled using a first-order autoregression, to take into account the correlation between values from
118 one day to the other. Degrees of freedom were computed using the Satterthwaite approximation. Only
119 countries for which at least 10 days had elapsed between the record of the 100th case and 4th April
120 2020 were included in this model, to allow a better estimate of the variation between CFR and time.
121 This model included 89 countries.

122 To assess the pattern of association between country-specific CFR (as assessed on 4th April
123 2020) and comorbidities, we ran five multiple regression models that included different metrics. The
124 first model included share of disease burden, the second model included share of deaths, the third
125 model included DALYs per cause, the fourth model included age-standardized DALYs, and the fifth
126 model included age-standardized death rates. All models always included a set of covariates that
127 described demographic, economic and political variables, namely population size, life expectancy,
128 share of the population over 70 years old, gross domestic product (GDP) per capita, total health care
129 expenditure as share of GDP, number of hospital beds (x1,000 inhabitants), political regime. This last
130 variable scores political regimes according to the level of democracy, between -10 (full autocracy) to
131 +10 (full democracy) (Polity IV as reported in <https://ourworldindata.org/>). Finally, all models also

132 included time to the 100th case (in days), as to take into account the different progression of the
133 epidemic in each country. Models were selected using a backward procedure with the criterion for
134 staying in the model set at 0.05. For each variable included in the final model, we computed the partial
135 R^2 . We also checked model fit and collinearity diagnostics (condition index¹³). All variables were
136 standardized with mean = 0 and standard deviation = 1 to make parameter estimates directly
137 comparable (variables with asymmetrical distribution were previously log-transformed to reduce
138 skewness).

139 Different countries might have similar values of the different metrics used here because of
140 their geographical proximity; in this case considering each country has a statistical unit might violate
141 the assumption of independence of observations. We used Moran's I coefficient to test if CFR and the
142 explanatory variables were spatially autocorrelated (for each country we used the latitude and
143 longitude of the capital to construct the distance matrix). We subsequently retested the association
144 between CFR and explanatory variables using linear mixed models (LMMs) that, in addition to the fixed
145 effects listed above (i.e., those included in the multiple regression models) also included three nested
146 effects as random variables: continent (5 levels), geographic region (19 levels¹⁴) nested within
147 continent, country (102 levels) nested within geographic region nested within continent.

148 To further explore the association between political regime and CFR, the -10 to 10 score was
149 congregated into four classes indicating: 1) autocratic regimes (score from -10 to -6), 2) closed
150 anocracy (from -5 to 0), 3) open anocracy (1 to 5), 4) democracy (6 to 10) (see
151 <https://ourworldindata.org/>). Anocracy refers to political systems that combine features of both
152 democratic and autocratic regimes, and that are therefore intermediate between the two¹⁵. This four
153 level democracy score was included (as a fixed effect) in a LMM where CFR was the dependent variable.
154 Time since the 100th case and squared time plus the two-way interactions with the democracy score
155 were also included as fixed effects, and the three nested effects accounting for the spatial clustering
156 of countries were included as random effects. This model therefore informs us if countries with
157 different levels of democracy have different trajectories of time-dependent CFR.

158 All the analyses were conducted with SAS 14.3.

159

160 **Results**

161 We found strong evidence for among-country differences in COVID-19 CFR. The LMM showed
162 a highly significant interaction between time since the 100th case and country, indicating that CFR
163 trajectories (both linear and quadratic components), do differ among countries as the epidemic
164 progresses (Table 1, Figure 1).

165 In order to uncover the factors that might account for such among-country variation in CFR,
166 we ran five multiple regression models that included different explanatory variables related to
167 comorbidities, demographic, economic and political factors. These models used CFR estimated on 4th
168 April 2020 as the dependent variable. Among the comorbidity metrics, none was associated with CFR,
169 the only exception being the model on DALYs that showed a positive association between DALYs lost
170 to diabetes, urogenital, blood and endocrine diseases and CFR (Table 2). It should be noted that DALYs
171 are highly correlated with population size and therefore, it is possible that this is a spurious result due
172 to the covariation between the two variables. Using other metrics of comorbidities (share of disease
173 burden, share of deaths, age-standardized death rates x100,000, age-standardized DALYs x100,000)
174 produced no association with CFR (Table 2). Four demographic, economic and political variables were
175 associated with CFR across different models (Table 2). Population size was positively associated with
176 CFR in all models, except the one on DALYs, corroborating the idea that the above reported association
177 between DALYs lost to diabetes, urogenital, blood and endocrine diseases might merely result from
178 the covariation with population size. Number of hospital beds per 1,000 inhabitants was negatively
179 associated with CFR in all models run. Life expectancy (in four models) and share of the population
180 over 70 years old (in one model) were positively associated to CFR. Finally, in four models, we found a
181 positive association between CFR and level of democracy. Overall, the amount of CFR variance
182 accounted by the different factors (comorbidities, demographics, economics, politics) was small

183 (around 20% of variance explained by the model), and the partial amount of variance explained by the
184 factors that were retained in the final models was very small (ranging from 2% to 8%).

185 Neighboring countries can have similar values of CFR, comorbidities, economic, demographic
186 and political variables, because of their geographical proximity, violating the assumption of
187 independence of statistical units. A spatial autocorrelation analysis showed, indeed, positive
188 autocorrelation for CFR, life expectancy, share of the population over 70 years, number of hospital
189 beds, and political regime (Moran's I, all p 's < 0.0001). We therefore reran the association models using
190 five LMMs that incorporated the spatial clustering of countries (into continents and geographical
191 regions). These LMMs confirmed 1) the lack of association between CFR and comorbidity factors, 2)
192 the negative association between number of hospital beds and CFR, 3) the positive association
193 between level of democracy and CFR (Table 3). Contrary to the regression models, LMMs that
194 integrated spatial information did not provide evidence for an association between life expectancy (or
195 share of the population over 70 years) and CFR (Table 3).

196 To further explore the association between democracy level and time-dependent variation in
197 CFR, we grouped countries as having an autocratic, closed anocratic, open anocratic or democratic
198 political regime. We then ran a LMM to test whether time-dependent trajectories of CFR differed
199 according to this four level variable. The LMM also included the information on spatial clustering
200 (nested factors declared as random effects). The model showed highly significant interactions between
201 time since 100th case (both linear and quadratic components) and political regime (Table 4, Figure 2).
202 Therefore, CFR increased with a steeper slope in countries with democratic regimes compared to less
203 democratic political systems (Figure 2).

204

205 **Discussion**

206 As the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic continues to spread worldwide, there is an increasing concern
207 related to the mortality induced by the disease. Currently, some European countries are paying the
208 highest toll to the infection, with case fatality rate between 10 and 12%. In this light, it is important to

209 understand why some countries seem to experience lower mortality rate than others and possibly to
210 predict how CFR might change as the epidemic progresses.

211 Assessing case fatality rate during an ongoing outbreak is particularly difficult for, at least two
212 reasons^{6,16}. CFR at a given time might be an underestimate of the final mortality rate because
213 cumulative number of deaths will eventually keep increasing as some patients are still hosted in
214 intensive care units. Conversely, CFR might overestimate actual mortality if a large fraction of infected
215 people do not develop disease symptoms (or develop mild symptoms) and therefore this fraction is
216 not included into the population of confirmed infection cases.

217 Despite the uncertainty associated with the estimation of CFR and how it will evolve over time,
218 its comparison between countries can provide useful insights into the heterogeneity in the current
219 burden paid to the disease. We showed that the trajectories of time dependent variation in CFR greatly
220 differed between countries. This quantitatively corroborates and statistically validates the intuition
221 that some countries are better dealing with the disease than others.

222 The following step was to try to understand whether such heterogeneity arises as the
223 consequence of predictable factors. Previous reports on the clinical outcome of the disease have
224 identified two major factors associated with poor prognosis: age and the presence of comorbidities.
225 Elderly people have been shown to suffer the highest mortality rate following infection with SARS-CoV-
226 2, with case fatality rates possibly higher than 20% in patients older than 80 years^{6,17}. Similarly,
227 previous history of cardiovascular disorders, cancer and diabetes have been reported to substantially
228 increase COVID-19 mortality risk^{5,18}. We therefore predicted that countries with a higher share of
229 elderly people and a higher incidence of known comorbidity factors might suffer from the highest CFR.
230 However, the results did not provide any support for this prediction. Life expectancy and share of
231 populations over 70 years were actually positively associated with CFR when running multiple
232 regression models, but these associations did not receive statistical support when using models that
233 explicitly took into account the spatial clustering of countries.

234 Economic and political parameters might equally well contribute to shape COVID-19 mortality.
235 As the number of severe cases increases during the epidemic, the health care system can get
236 overwhelmed and might be unable to receive and treat all those who need intensive care. Mortality
237 might therefore results from health care systems that are inadequate to deal with large number of
238 cases requiring simultaneous admittance in intensive care units. We used several proxies describing
239 the investment of each country into the health care system and found a negative association between
240 the number of hospital beds per 1,000 inhabitants and CFR, and this result was robust to the inclusion
241 of spatial clustering into the model. This result is therefore in agreement with the idea that socio-
242 economic factors are currently playing a role to shape COVID-19 CFR.

243 A final source of variation accounting for differences in CFR might be due to differential reports
244 of number of deaths and/or confirmed cases between countries. This might reflect different
245 counting/reporting methodology (e.g., deciding whether or not a given patient died because of COVID-
246 19). In addition, implementing effective social distancing protocols, that are currently deployed in most
247 of the countries facing the epidemic, might prove more difficult in democratic countries, compared to
248 other political regimes that exert a more stringent control over the population. In agreement with this
249 hypothesis, we found that countries with a democratic political regime had the highest CFR. A further
250 model showed that time-dependent trajectories also varied among countries according to their
251 political regimes, with democracies having the steepest increase of CFR as the epidemic progresses.
252 The role of social and cultural traits in the emergence of zoonotic diseases has already been discussed
253 in the past, including the idea that collectivistic societies might have built as a way to better control
254 epidemic waves¹⁹. In agreement with this hypothesis, Morand and Walther²⁰ found that collectivistic
255 societies were less exposed to zoonotic disease outbreaks compared to individualistic ones.

256 Although we report here some associations between economic, political variables and COVID-
257 19 CFR, we fully acknowledge that these factors explain a little fraction of the total variation in CFR
258 among countries. This might come from the coarse grain of the analyses (country level), the error
259 associated with the metrics used in our study, or the uncertainties associated with the estimation of

260 CFR while the epidemic is still ongoing. When serological tests will be available, a large-scale
261 assessment of the proportion of the population that has been infected by the virus will provide more
262 accurate data to better estimate COVID-19 CFR and the possible factors explaining the among-country
263 heterogeneity. With this in mind, we nevertheless believe that our results stress the role of socio-
264 economic and political factors as potential drivers affecting how a country deals with globally
265 threatening epidemics. In particular, past decisions on the policy of investment into the healthcare
266 system have the potential to severely impact the whole society when a major sanitary crisis outburst.
267 Another very challenging issue that many countries are currently facing, at the crossroads of our
268 modern lifestyle, is to extent to which democracies are willing to renounce to individual freedom for a
269 collectivistic benefit²¹.

270

271 **Contributors**

272 GS, BF and SM conceived the study; GS compiled the data and analyzed them; GS, BF, and SM
273 interpreted the results; GS wrote the first draft of the manuscript; GS, BF and SM revised the
274 manuscript and approved the final version.

275 **Declaration of interest**

276 The authors declare no competing interests

277

278 **References**

- 279 1. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, et al. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China,
280 2019. *N Engl J Med* 2020; **382**: 727-733, doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2001017.
- 281 2. Zhou P, Yang X-L, Wang X-G, et al. A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new coronavirus
282 of probable bat origin. *Nature* 2020; published online 3 February 2020,
283 doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2012-7.

- 284 3. WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 11 March 2020.
285 <https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the>
286 [media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020](https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020).
- 287 4. Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and important lessons from the coronavirus disease
288 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak in China. Summary of a report of 72314 cases from the Chinese
289 center for disease control and prevention. *JAMA* 2020; published online 24 February 2020,
290 doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.2648.
- 291 5. Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, et al. Clinical characteristics of 138 hospitalized patients with 2019 novel
292 coronavirus-infected pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA* 2020; **323**: 1061-1069,
293 doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.1585.
- 294 6. Kim D-H, Choe YJ, Jeong J-Y. Understanding and interpretation of case fatality rate of
295 coronavirus disease 2019. *J Korean Med Sci* 2020; **30**: e137,
296 doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2020.35.e137.
- 297 7. CDC COVID-19 Response Team. Preliminary Estimates of the Prevalence of Selected Underlying
298 Health Conditions Among Patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019 — United States, February
299 12–March 28, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020; **69**: 382–386.
300 doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6913e2.
- 301 8. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019
302 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. *Lancet* 2020; **395**: 507-
303 513, [doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30211-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30211-7).
- 304 9. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus
305 in Wuhan, China. *Lancet* 2020; **395**: 497-506, [doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30183-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30183-5).
- 306 10. Lescure F-X, Bouadma L, Nguyen D, Clinical and virological data of the first cases of COVID-19
307 in Europe: a case series. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020; published online 27 March 2020,
308 [doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30200-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30200-0).

- 309 11. Ji Y, Ma Z, Peppelenbosch MP, Pan Q. Potential association between COVID-19 mortality and
310 health-care resource availability. *Lancet Glob Health* 2020; published online 25 February 2020,
311 [doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(20\)30068-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30068-1).
- 312 12. Stevens GA, Alkema L, Black RE, et al. Guidelines for Accurate and Transparent Health
313 Estimates Reporting: the GATHER statement. *Lancet* 2016; **388**: e19-23,
314 [doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(16\)30388-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)30388-9).
- 315 13. Belsley DA, Kuh E, Welsch RE, Regression Diagnostics: Identifying Influential Data and Sources
316 of Collinearity. John Wiley & Sons, New York (1980).
- 317 14. United Nations. Standard country or area codes for statistical use (M49). 2017.
318 <https://unstats.un.org/unsd/methodology/m49/>.
- 319 15. Epstein D, Bates R, Goldstone J, Kristensen I. Democratic Transitions. *Am J Pol Sci* 2006; **50**:
320 551-568.
- 321 16. Rajgor DD, Lee MH, Archuleta S, Bagdasarian N, Quek SC. The many estimates of the COVID-
322 19 case fatality rate. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020; published online 27 March 2020 ,
323 [doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30244-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30244-9).
- 324 17. Ruan Q, Yang K, Wang W, Jiang L, Song J. Clinical predictors of mortality due to COVID-19 based
325 on an analysis of data of 150 patients from Wuhan, China. *Intensive Care Med* 2020; published
326 online 3 March 2020, doi.org/10.1007/s00134-020-05991-x.
- 327 18. Yang X, Yu Y, Xu J, et al. Clinical course and outcomes of critically ill patients with SARS-CoV-2
328 pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a single-centered, retrospective, observational study. *Lancet*
329 *Respir Med*, published online 21 February 2020, [doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600\(20\)30079-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30079-5).
- 330 19. Fincher CL, Thornhill R, Murray DR, Schaller M. Pathogen prevalence predicts human cross-
331 cultural variability in individualism/collectivism. *Proc R Soc Lond B* 2008; **275**: 1279–1285.
- 332 20. Morand S, Walther B. Individualistic values are related to an increase in the outbreaks of
333 infectious diseases and zoonotic diseases. *Sci Rep* 2018; **8**: 3866, [doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-22014-4)
334 [22014-4](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-22014-4).

335 21. Studdert DM, Hall MA. Disease Control, Civil Liberties, and Mass Testing — Calibrating
336 Restrictions during the Covid-19 Pandemic. *N Engl J Med* 2020; published online 9 April 2020,
337 doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp2007637.
338
339
340

341 Table 1. Linear mixed model exploring variation of COVID-19 case fatality rate (CFR) as a function of
342 time since the 100th case for each country. The model also included squared time since 100th case and
343 the interactions between country and time. Country was also declared as a random effect in the model.
344 The model was restricted to countries that had 10 or more days elapsed between the occurrence of
345 the 100th case and 4th April 2020 (to allow a better estimate of time-dependent variation in CFR). The
346 analysis is based on 89 countries and 1,872 observations.

347

<i>Fixed effects</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Country	47.08	88,1605	<0.0001
Time since 100 th case (days)	5.72	1,1605	0.0169
Squared time since 100 th case	11.47	1,1605	0.0007
Country x time since 100 th case	13.80	88,1605	<0.0001
Country x squared time since 100 th case	11.40	88,1605	<0.0001

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369 Table 2. Multiple regression models investigating the association between COVID-19 case fatality rate
 370 (CFR) and several descriptors of comorbidities, demographics, economics and political regime for each
 371 country (n = 102). Each model included the same demographic, economic and political regime variables
 372 (GDP per capita, population size, total health care expenditure as share of GDP, number of hospital
 373 beds x1,000 inhabitants, share of the population over 70 years, political regime). In addition, model 1
 374 included variables referring to the share of total disease burden due to cardiovascular diseases,
 375 cancers, chronic respiratory diseases, diabetes. Model 2 included variables referring to share of deaths
 376 for cardiovascular diseases, cancers, chronic respiratory diseases, lower respiratory diseases, diabetes,
 377 outdoor air pollution. Model 3 included variables referring to DALYs lost to cardiovascular diseases,
 378 cancers, chronic respiratory diseases, diabetes. Model 4 included variables referring to age-
 379 standardized DALYs lost per 100,000 people. Model 5 included variables referring to age-standardized
 380 death rates due to cardiovascular diseases, cancers, smoking, air pollution, ambient particulate air
 381 pollution, pneumonia over 70 years, outdoor air pollution over 70 years, smoking over 70 years. The
 382 table reports the variables selected by the backward procedure of the multiple regression. Models 1,
 383 2, and 4 retained the same variables in the final model, therefore only the results of model 1 are
 384 reported in the table. We report model R² and p-values, as well as the standardized slope (95% CI),
 385 partial R² and p-values of all variables retained in the final models.

386

<i>Model 1 (share of total disease burden) R² = 0.195, p = 0.0003</i>	<i>standardized slope (95% CI)</i>	<i>t value</i>	<i>partial R²</i>	<i>p</i>
Population size	0.910 (0.342/1.477)	3.18	0.080	0.0020
Political regime	0.729 (0.212/1.246)	2.80	0.065	0.0062
Number of hospital beds	-0.691 (-1.278/-0.105)	-2.34	0.028	0.0214
Life expectancy	0.633 (0.053/1.214)	2.16	0.022	0.0329

387

<i>Model 3 (DALYs per cause) R² = 0.203, p = 0.0002</i>	<i>standardized slope (95% CI)</i>	<i>t value</i>	<i>partial R²</i>	<i>p</i>
DALYs lost to diabetes	0.967 (0.392/1.543)	3.33	0.086	0.0012
Political regime	0.720 (0.205/1.235)	2.78	0.063	0.0066
Life expectancy	0.678 (0.095/1.259)	2.31	0.028	0.0230
Number of hospital beds	-0.668 (-1.253/-0.082)	-2.26	0.025	0.0258

388

<i>Model 5 (age-standardized death rates) R² = 0.178, p = 0.0002</i>	<i>standardized slope (95% CI)</i>	<i>t value</i>	<i>partial R²</i>	<i>p</i>
Population size	0.742 (0.179/1.306)	2.61	0.080	0.0103
Number of hospital beds	-1.037 (-1.749/-0.325)	-2.89	0.070	0.0047
Share of the population over 70	1.182 (0.447/1.889)	3.31	0.027	0.0013

389

390 Table 3. Linear mixed effects models exploring the associations between COVID-19 case fatality rate
 391 (CFR) and different comorbidity, demographic, economic, and political variables. The models included
 392 three nested factors (continent, geographical region and country) as random effects. The table reports
 393 parameter estimates (with SE and 95% CI), t and p values. Sample size is five continents, 19
 394 geographical regions, 102 countries and 1,879 observations.

<i>Model 1 (share of total disease burden)</i>					
<i>Fixed effects</i>	Estimate	SE	t	<i>p</i>	95% CI
Intercept	1.798	0.939			
Time since 100 th case	1.168	0.062	18.93	<0.0001	1.047/1.289
Squared time since 100 th case	-0.393	0.063	-6.27	<0.0001	-0.516/-0.270
Cardiovascular	0.206	0.271	0.76	0.4501	-0.333/0.744
Cancer	-0.496	0.552	-0.90	0.3710	-1.595/0.602
Diabetes	0.360	0.226	1.59	0.1143	-0.089/0.809
Chronic respiratory	-0.108	0.261	-0.41	0.681	-0.626/0.410
Population size	0.717	0.297	2.41	0.018	0.126/1.308
GDP per capita	-0.538	0.294	-1.83	0.0704	-1.122/0.046
Life expectancy	0.194	0.365	0.53	0.5968	-0.533/0.921
Share of the population over 70	0.160	0.582	0.28	0.7840	-0.999/1.320
Number of hospital beds	-0.923	0.347	-2.66	0.0094	-1.613/-0.233
Total health care expenditure (share of GDP)	-0.189	0.283	-0.67	0.508	-0.753/0.376
Level of democracy	0.650	0.292	2.23	0.0285	0.070/1.229
<i>Covariance parameters</i>					
	Estimate	SE	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>	
Variance	2.414	0.384	6.29	<0.0001	
First-order autoregression	0.127	0.144	0.88	0.3781	
Residual	1.089	0.037	29.77	<0.0001	

395

<i>Model 2 (share of deaths)</i>					
<i>Fixed effects</i>	Estimate	SE	t	<i>p</i>	95% CI
Intercept	1.823	0.953			
Time since 100 th case	1.169	0.062	18.93	<0.0001	1.047/1.290
Squared time since 100 th case	-0.393	0.063	-6.27	<0.0001	-0.516/-0.270
Cardiovascular	0.054	0.373	0.14	0.8858	-0.689/0.796
Cancer	-0.676	0.519	-1.30	0.1967	-1.710/0.357
Chronic respiratory	-0.165	0.249	-0.66	0.5105	-0.660/0.331
Lower respiratory	-0.130	0.263	-0.49	0.624	-0.653/0.394
Diabetes	0.202	0.231	0.88	0.3832	-0.257/0.661

Outdoor air pollution	-0.023	0.322	-0.07	0.9438	-0.663/0.617
Population size	0.669	0.309	2.17	0.0331	0.055/1.284
GDP per capita	-0.383	0.307	-1.25	0.2166	-0.994/0.229
Life expectancy	0.412	0.395	1.04	0.3002	-0.374/1.197
Share of the population over 70	0.202	0.506	0.40	0.6909	-0.805/1.210
Number of hospital beds	-0.961	0.351	-2.74	0.0075	-1.658/-0.264
Total health care expenditure (share of GDP)	-0.195	0.283	-0.69	0.4947	-0.759/0.370
Level of democracy	0.638	0.305	2.09	0.0395	0.031/1.245
<i>Covariance parameters</i>	Estimate	SE	z	p	
Variance	2.462	0.396	6.22	<0.0001	
First-order autoregression	0.135	0.135	1.00	0.318	
Residual	1.089	0.037	29.76	<0.0001	

396

<i>Model 3 (DALYs lost)</i>					
<i>Fixed effects</i>	Estimate	SE	t	p	95% CI
Intercept	1.813	0.900			
Time since 100 th case	1.168	0.062	18.93	<0.0001	1.047/1.289
Squared time since 100 th case	-0.393	0.063	-6.27	<0.0001	-0.516/-0.270
Cardiovascular	1.805	1.253	1.44	0.1534	-0.686/4.2961
Cancer	-3.473	1.962	-1.77	0.0805	-7.377/0.432
Chronic respiratory	-0.391	1.609	-0.24	0.8086	-3.589/2.807
Diabetes	2.476	1.293	1.91	0.0587	-0.093/5.045
Population size	0.312	1.942	0.16	0.8728	-3.548/4.172
GDP per capita	-0.538	0.288	-1.87	0.0651	-1.110/0.034
Life expectancy	0.388	0.358	1.08	0.2815	-0.324/1.100
Share of the population over 70	0.337	0.580	0.58	0.5625	-0.817/1.492
Number of hospital beds	-0.968	0.340	-2.85	0.0055	-1.643/-0.293
Total health care expenditure (share of GDP)	-0.222	0.275	-0.81	0.4217	-0.768/0.325
Level of democracy	0.657	0.284	2.31	0.0230	0.093/1.221
<i>Covariance parameters</i>	Estimate	SE	z	p	
Variance	2.287	0.361	6.34	<0.0001	
First-order autoregression	0.097	0.134	0.72	0.4702	
Residual	1.089	0.037	29.76	<0.0001	

397

398

<i>Model 4 (DALYs lost x100,000)</i>					
<i>Fixed effects</i>	Estimate	SE	t	<i>p</i>	95% CI
Intercept	1.788	0.956			
Time since 100 th case	1.168	0.062	18.93	<0.0001	1.047/1.289
Squared time since 100 th case	-0.393	0.063	-6.27	<0.0001	-0.516/-0.270
DALYs lost all ages	-0.173	0.610	-0.28	0.7770	-1.385/1.039
DALYs lost over 70	-0.459	0.435	-1.06	0.2943	-1.324/0.406
DALYs lost age-standardized	1.204	1.096	1.10	0.2750	-0.975/3.382
Population size	0.420	0.276	1.52	0.1318	-0.129/0.969
GDP per capita	-0.468	0.319	-1.47	0.1459	-1.103/0.166
Life expectancy	0.527	0.537	0.98	0.3290	-0.541/1.595
Share of the population over 70	0.295	0.600	0.49	0.6244	-0.898/1.488
Number of hospital beds	-0.868	0.349	-2.49	0.0148	-1.563/-0.174
Total health care expenditure (share of GDP)	-0.326	0.280	-1.16	0.2476	-0.882/0.231
Level of democracy	0.481	0.269	1.79	0.0768	-0.053/1.014
<i>Covariance parameters</i>	Estimate	SE	z	<i>p</i>	
Variance	2.483	0.393	6.31	<0.0001	
First-order autoregression	0.133	0.142	0.94	0.3471	
Residual	1.089	0.037	29.76	<0.0001	

399

<i>Model 5 (age-standardized death rates x100,000)</i>					
<i>Fixed effects</i>	Estimate	SE	t	<i>p</i>	95% CI
Intercept	1.822	0.912			
Time since 100 th case	1.169	0.062	18.94	<0.0001	1.048/1.290
Squared time since 100 th case	-0.394	0.063	-6.28	<0.0001	-0.517/-0.271
Cardiovascular	0.351	0.507	0.69	0.4908	-0.660/1.360
Cancer	-0.372	0.246	-1.51	0.1346	-0.862/0.118
Smoking	-0.333	0.653	-0.51	0.6111	-1.632/0.965
Air pollution	0.405	0.911	0.44	0.658	-1.407/2.218
Ambient particulate air pollution	1.217	1.541	0.79	0.4323	-1.850/4.283
Pneumonia over 70	-0.160	0.265	-0.60	0.5474	-0.686/0.367
Outdoor air pollution over 70	-1.113	1.254	-0.89	0.3774	-3.609/1.383
Smoking over 70	0.233	0.488	0.48	0.6343	-0.738/1.203
Population size	0.679	0.282	2.41	0.0181	0.119/1.239
GDP per capita	-0.271	0.389	-0.70	0.4883	-1.046/0.504
Life expectancy	0.358	0.405	0.89	0.3784	-0.446/1.163

Share of the population over 70	0.256	0.499	0.51	0.6099	-0.739/1.250
Number of hospital beds	-0.973	0.357	-2.73	0.0077	-1.683/-0.264
Total health care expenditure (share of GDP)	-0.109	0.298	-0.37	0.7137	-0.701/0.482
Level of democracy	0.690	0.297	2.32	0.0226	0.099/1.280
<i>Covariance parameters</i>	Estimate	SE	z	<i>p</i>	
Variance	2.447	0.395	6.19	<0.0001	
First-order autoregression	0.081	0.155	0.52	0.560	
Residual	1.089	0.037	29.76	<0.0001	

400

401

402 Table 4. Linear mixed effect models exploring the association between political system (autocracy,
403 closed anocracy, open anocracy, democracy) and CFR. The model included time since 100th case and
404 squared time and the interactions between time and political system. The model also included three
405 nested factors (continent, geographical region and country) as random effects. Sample size is five
406 continents, 18 geographical regions, 103 countries and 1,981 observations.

407

<i>Fixed effects</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Political system	0.65	3,108	0.5823
Time since 100 th case (days)	14.39	1,1877	0.0002
Squared time since 100 th case	0.71	1,1876	0.4007
Political system x time since 100 th case	6.87	3,1879	0.0001
Political system x squared time since 100 th case	12.44	3,1879	<0.0001

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421 **Figure captions.**

422

423 Figure 1. Time-dependent variation in COVID-19 case fatality rate (CFR). Time refers to the number of
424 days between the occurrence of the 100th case and 4th April 2020. The different panels refer to
425 countries with at least 30 days elapsed since the occurrence of the 100th case. Red lines describe the
426 observed values, the dotted lines refer to the predictions of a linear mixed model.

427

428 Figure 2. Time-dependent variation in COVID-19 case fatality rate (CFR) according to the political
429 regime. Time refers to the number of days between the occurrence of the 100th case and 4th April
430 2020. The different lines refer to the predictions of a linear mixed model (red = autocracy, orange =
431 closed anocracy, blue = open anocracy, green = democracy).


432

433

434

435 Figure 1.

436




437

438

439 Figure 2.

440



441

442

443

444