

## Supplementary material

### Definition of key variables

#### *Ethnicity*

We defined ethnic groups using the 16+1 categories defined in the 2001 census which form the UK national mandatory standard for the collection and analysis of ethnicity in the NHS data dictionary. Importantly, in the UK ‘Asian’ ethnic category refers predominantly to those of a South Asian background (including Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi), while patients of a Chinese background are placed in the ‘Other Ethnic Groups’ category.

White	A British B Irish C Any other White background
Mixed	D White and Black Caribbean E White and Black African F White and Asian G Any other mixed background
Asian or Asian British	H Indian J Pakistani K Bangladeshi L Any other Asian background
Black or Black British	M Caribbean N African P Any other Black background
Other Ethnic Groups	R Chinese S Any other ethnic group
+1 category	Z Not stated (Reserved for cases where patients declined to provide information)

In order to preserve statistical power to detect differences between groups, pre-specified analysis was carried out between ethnicity defined by the 5-high level groups White, Mixed, Asian or Asian British, Black or Black British and Other with merging of the “Mixed” and “Other” categories. Category Z was excluded from our primary analysis as were cases where no ethnicity data was recorded (Unknown).

#### *Index of Multiple Deprivation*

Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) was defined from patient home address postcode using UK government statistics (<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2019>). Matching of Lower-layer Super Output Areas (LSOAs) was undertaken against the Office of National Statistics Postcode Directory (ONSPD) February 2020 datafile (<https://geoportal.statistics.gov.uk/datasets/ons-postcode-directory-february-2020>; accessed on 1st May 2020). IMD was presented as quintiles within England using raw scores for descriptive results and quintiles within the study cohort in multivariable analysis.

#### *Smoking*

History of tobacco use was defined by presence of the WHO ICD-10 codes F17·1-F17·2, Z72·0, Z87·8, Z71·6 and T65·2.

#### *Comorbidity*

Diagnosis of co-morbidities and assignment of Charlson Comorbidity Index was based on mapping from ICD-10 coding from previous admissions using the mapping of Quan H, et al.

Quan H, et al. Coding algorithms for defining comorbidities in ICD-9-CM and ICD-10 administrative data. *Med Care* 2005;43(11):1130-9.

Diagnosis of Hypertension was based on mapping ICD-10 codes to the Elixhauser comorbidity index.

Elixhauser A, et al. Comorbidity measures for use with administrative data. *Med Care* 1998;36:8-27.

#### *Hospital frailty risk score*

Hospital frailty risk score was calculated from mapping ICD-10 coding of hospital attendances.

*Gilbert T, et al. Development and validation of a Hospital Frailty Risk Score focusing on older people in acute care settings using electronic hospital records: an observational study. Lancet 2018;391(10132):1775-1782.*

#### *Acute Kidney injury*

Acute kidney injury (AKI) within first 7 days of admission was defined using the KDIGO 2012 creatinine criteria either a 1.5-fold rise over baseline within 7 days or 26  $\mu\text{mol}$  rise within 48 hours. Baseline creatinine will be the median value in the 7 to 365 days before hospitalisation. Absent baseline creatinine was determined based on an eGFR of 75 ml/min/1.72m<sup>2</sup> using the CKD<sub>epi</sub> formula or the admission value whichever was lower.

#### *Chronic kidney disease*

History of chronic kidney disease (CKD) using baseline eGFR was calculated using last creatinine value available from results earlier than 7 days before hospitalisation. CKD was defined as baseline eGFR below 60 ml/min/1.72m<sup>2</sup>.

**Table S1:** IMD breakdown by National IMD deciles showing the majority of our study population residing in IMD deciles 1-4.

Characteristic	n	White, n = 1,805 <sup>1</sup>	Black, n = 634 <sup>1</sup>	Asian, n = 1,983 <sup>1</sup>	Mixed/Other, n = 433 <sup>1</sup>	Unknown, n = 678 <sup>1</sup>	p-value <sup>2</sup>
National IMD Decile	5,490						<0.001
1		43 (2.4%)	29 (4.6%)	33 (1.7%)	14 (3.3%)	21 (3.1%)	
2		368 (21%)	206 (33%)	506 (26%)	118 (28%)	170 (25%)	
3		468 (26%)	182 (29%)	705 (36%)	125 (29%)	210 (31%)	
4		261 (15%)	107 (17%)	378 (19%)	74 (17%)	117 (17%)	
5		154 (8.6%)	56 (8.9%)	136 (6.9%)	41 (9.6%)	55 (8.2%)	
6		155 (8.7%)	26 (4.1%)	84 (4.3%)	23 (5.4%)	37 (5.5%)	
7		98 (5.5%)	8 (1.3%)	47 (2.4%)	12 (2.8%)	21 (3.1%)	
8		104 (5.8%)	6 (1.0%)	36 (1.8%)	11 (2.6%)	20 (3.0%)	
9		85 (4.7%)	7 (1.1%)	32 (1.6%)	6 (1.4%)	13 (1.9%)	
10		55 (3.1%)	2 (0.3%)	16 (0.8%)	3 (0.7%)	6 (0.9%)	
Unknown		14	5	10	6	8	

<sup>1</sup>n (%)

<sup>2</sup>Pearson's Chi-squared test

**Table S2:** Rockwood (clinical) and Hospital Frailty Risk (coding-based) scoring within our study cohort.

Characteristic	n	White, n = 1,805 <sup>1</sup>	Black, n = 634 <sup>1</sup>	Asian, n = 1,983 <sup>1</sup>	Mixed/Other, n = 433 <sup>1</sup>	Unknown, n = 678 <sup>1</sup>	p-value <sup>2</sup>
Rockwood	2,435						0.002
1. Very fit		23 (2.2%)	6 (2.2%)	20 (2.6%)	4 (2.5%)	7 (3.4%)	
2. Well		90 (8.7%)	27 (10%)	80 (11%)	29 (18%)	28 (13%)	
3. Managing well		234 (23%)	77 (29%)	216 (28%)	52 (32%)	49 (24%)	
4. Vulnerable		191 (18%)	56 (21%)	164 (22%)	26 (16%)	43 (21%)	
5. Mildly frail		149 (14%)	33 (12%)	89 (12%)	10 (6.1%)	27 (13%)	
6. Moderately frail		199 (19%)	39 (14%)	114 (15%)	26 (16%)	28 (13%)	
7. Severely frail		113 (11%)	23 (8.6%)	60 (7.9%)	11 (6.7%)	20 (9.6%)	
8. Very severely frail		38 (3.7%)	8 (3.0%)	13 (1.7%)	5 (3.1%)	5 (2.4%)	
9. Terminally ill		0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.5%)	
Unknown		768	365	1,225	270	470	
HFRS	5,518						<0.001
<5		964 (53%)	377 (60%)	1,326 (67%)	315 (73%)	506 (75%)	
5-15		627 (35%)	180 (29%)	509 (26%)	98 (23%)	147 (22%)	
>15		211 (12%)	74 (12%)	144 (7.3%)	19 (4.4%)	21 (3.1%)	
Score (median)		4.3 (1.0, 9.9)	3.6 (0.5, 8.4)	2.3 (0.0, 6.5)	1.8 (0.0, 5.3)	1.5 (0.0, 4.9)	<0.001
Unknown		3	3	4	1	4	

<sup>1</sup>n (%); Median (IQR)

<sup>2</sup>Pearson's Chi-squared test; Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test

**Table S3:** Age and ethnicity breakdown of First Wave COVID-19 associated hospital admission population residing within Tower Hamlets, Newham or Waltham Forest.

First Wave n = 1409	White	Black	Asian	Mixed	Other	Unknown
<i>Age 16 to 19</i>	2	0	6	0	0	1
<i>Age 20 to 24</i>	3	3	6	1	0	2
<i>Age 25 to 29</i>	5	3	24	0	3	3
<i>Age 30 to 34</i>	7	6	25	1	2	6
<i>Age 35 to 39</i>	12	8	20	0	8	9
<i>Age 40 to 44</i>	12	13	32	0	2	7
<i>Age 45 to 49</i>	19	15	44	1	11	7
<i>Age 50 to 54</i>	31	23	34	1	8	16
<i>Age 55 to 59</i>	40	32	35	1	18	17
<i>Age 60 to 64</i>	40	24	47	1	7	11
<i>Age 65 to 69</i>	27	19	48	1	8	9
<i>Age 70 to 74</i>	50	26	22	1	10	16
<i>Age 75 to 79</i>	51	28	22	0	5	10
<i>Age 80 to 84</i>	65	39	38	1	3	8
<i>Age 85 and over</i>	109	33	28	2	7	8
<b>Total</b>	473	272	431	11	92	130
<b>% Total</b>	33.6%	19.3%	30.6%	0.8%	6.5%	9.2%

**Table S4:** Age and ethnicity Breakdown of Second Wave COVID-19 associated hospital admission population residing within Tower Hamlets, Newham or Waltham Forest.

Second Wave n = 3891	White	Black	Asian	Mixed	Other	Unknown
<i>Age 16 to 19</i>	8	6	16	0	1	2
<i>Age 20 to 24</i>	17	7	38	5	8	16
<i>Age 25 to 29</i>	26	13	81	1	6	21
<i>Age 30 to 34</i>	44	21	107	2	13	31
<i>Age 35 to 39</i>	44	23	116	2	18	29
<i>Age 40 to 44</i>	50	24	130	1	16	39
<i>Age 45 to 49</i>	51	34	137	1	25	38
<i>Age 50 to 54</i>	67	39	119	4	25	36
<i>Age 55 to 59</i>	79	59	142	3	24	34
<i>Age 60 to 64</i>	92	48	173	6	34	35
<i>Age 65 to 69</i>	85	39	166	1	27	23
<i>Age 70 to 74</i>	125	40	106	1	16	21
<i>Age 75 to 79</i>	115	47	95	1	11	17
<i>Age 80 to 84</i>	105	52	130	3	13	20
<i>Age 85 and over</i>	178	33	98	1	13	22
<b>Total</b>	1086	485	1654	32	250	384
<b>% Total</b>	27.9%	12.5%	42.5%	0.8%	6.4%	9.9%

**Table S5:** Age and sex breakdown of 105,867 Barts Health Emergency Hospital admissions residing within Tower Hamlets, Newham or Waltham Forest during 2013-18 inclusive.

<b>Barts Health Pre-COVID n = 105,867</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Mixed</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
<i>Age 16 to 19</i>	1161	617	1529	191	212	247
<i>Age 20 to 24</i>	2768	925	2341	223	514	560
<i>Age 25 to 29</i>	3846	973	3080	238	713	779
<i>Age 30 to 34</i>	3706	1039	3375	195	681	814
<i>Age 35 to 39</i>	3265	961	3243	151	565	672
<i>Age 40 to 44</i>	2842	978	2709	126	502	553
<i>Age 45 to 49</i>	3069	1218	2196	119	473	526
<i>Age 50 to 54</i>	3119	1320	1932	103	450	509
<i>Age 55 to 59</i>	3155	1172	1959	87	392	444
<i>Age 60 to 64</i>	2930	698	1917	61	355	347
<i>Age 65 to 69</i>	3313	589	1385	44	279	288
<i>Age 70 to 74</i>	3217	620	1322	39	232	288
<i>Age 75 to 79</i>	3152	826	1673	54	224	271
<i>Age 80 to 84</i>	3255	741	1148	32	180	245
<i>Age 85 and over</i>	4742	542	751	32	217	321
<b>Total</b>	47540	13219	30560	1695	5989	6864
<b>% Total</b>	44.9%	12.5%	28.9%	1.6%	5.7%	6.5%

**Table S6:** Age and sex breakdown by ethnicity in the Tower Hamlets, Newham or Waltham Forest population based on the 2011 UK census.

<b>Tower Hamlet, Newham &amp; Waltham Forest Census N=664295</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Mixed</b>	<b>Other</b>
<i>Age 16 to 19</i>	12068	7400	16300	2745	1957
<i>Age 20 to 24</i>	32548	10103	31710	4036	5611
<i>Age 25 to 29</i>	47264	10798	37870	3791	7379
<i>Age 30 to 34</i>	39888	9823	31114	2808	5458
<i>Age 35 to 39</i>	28682	9080	22654	2089	3631
<i>Age 40 to 44</i>	24936	11039	16200	1757	3211
<i>Age 45 to 49</i>	21841	10002	11313	1293	2148
<i>Age 50 to 54</i>	19002	7026	10316	946	1498
<i>Age 55 to 59</i>	15857	4003	8400	549	1122
<i>Age 60 to 64</i>	15047	2656	5262	362	852
<i>Age 65 to 69</i>	10637	2369	3602	278	477
<i>Age 70 to 74</i>	8521	2540	3965	231	423
<i>Age 75 to 79</i>	7560	1691	2542	159	274
<i>Age 80 to 84</i>	6336	894	1319	99	162
<i>Age 85 and over</i>	6378	483	615	67	107
<b>Total</b>	296565	89907	203182	21210	34310
<b>% Total</b>	46.0%	13.9%	31.5%	3.3%	5.3%

**Table S7:** *ETHICAL* diversity and absolute numbers of ethnic minority patients in comparison to other large UK reports.

	OpenSafely First Wave		OpenSafely Second wave (1/9/20 to 31/12/20)				SGSS/CHESS (PHE report)		ISARIC (SSRN)		ONS 2/3-28/7/21		ETHICAL-1		ETHICAL-2	
COVID-related Outcome	Death		Hospital Admission		Death		Hospital Admission		Hospital Admission		Death		Hospital Admission		Hospital Admission	
White	7119	65.5%	12120	64.3%	4874	66.2%	5149	79.6%	25547	83.2%	41855	89.6%	703	35.2%	1805	32.6%
Black	250	2.3%	362	1.9%	75	1.0%	323	5.0%	1094	3.6%	1510	3.2%	340	17.0%	634	11.5%
South Asian	608	5.6%	2100	11.1%	532	7.2%	581	9.0%	1388	4.5%	2024	4.3%	538	27.0%	1983	35.8%
Other	110	1.0%	354	1.9%	61	0.8%	414	6.4%	2664	8.7%	1307	2.8%	156	7.8%	433	7.8%
Unknown	2777	25.6%	3919	20.8%	1824	24.8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	259	13.0%	678	12.3%
Total	10864	100%	18855	100%	7366	100%	6467	100%	30693	100%	46696	100%	1996	100%	5533	100%


**Table S8:** Age, sex, and mortality by detailed ethnicity breakdown.

	African, n = 262 <sup>1</sup>	Any other Asian background, n = 379 <sup>1</sup>	Any other Black background, n = 133 <sup>1</sup>	Any other ethnic group, n = 358 <sup>1</sup>	Any other mixed background, n = 22 <sup>1</sup>	Any other White background, n = 507 <sup>1</sup>	Bangladeshi, n = 926 <sup>1</sup>	British, n = 1,269 <sup>1</sup>	Caribbean, n = 239 <sup>1</sup>	Chinese, n = 30 <sup>1</sup>	Indian, n = 301 <sup>1</sup>	Irish, n = 29 <sup>1</sup>	Not known, n = 509 <sup>1</sup>	Not stated, n = 169 <sup>1</sup>	Pakistani, n = 377 <sup>1</sup>	White and Asian, n = 4 <sup>1</sup>	White and Black African, n = 13 <sup>1</sup>	White and Black Caribbean, n = 6 <sup>1</sup>
Age <sup>1</sup>	55 (43, 65)	56 (43, 70)	58 (44, 68)	58 (45, 70)	53 (36, 66)	52 (39, 68)	54 (40, 68)	74 (61, 83)	72 (58, 81)	62 (44, 73)	66 (52, 77)	74 (62, 83)	52 (39, 67)	63 (49, 74)	60 (42, 71)	51 (48, 56)	57 (33, 61)	71 (53, 83)
Male	130 (50%)	225 (59%)	66 (50%)	206 (58%)	10 (45%)	273 (54%)	484 (52%)	655 (52%)	109 (46%)	11 (37%)	165 (55%)	18 (62%)	284 (56%)	91 (54%)	206 (55%)	3 (75%)	5 (38%)	3 (50%)
30-day Mortality	27 (10%)	54 (14%)	19 (14%)	44 (12%)	2 (9.1%)	59 (12%)	166 (18%)	305 (24%)	57 (24%)	4 (13%)	76 (25%)	6 (21%)	62 (12%)	30 (18%)	59 (16%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	3 (50%)


<sup>1</sup>Median (IQR); n (%)

<sup>2</sup>Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test


**Fig S1:** Patients considered in second wave *ETHICAL* study 1/9/20 to 17/2/21. Criteria: aged  $\geq 16$  first emergency admission to one of the four Barts Health acute hospitals with a positive hospital COVID-19 PCR test during or in the two weeks prior to admission. NUH: Newham University Hospital.




**Fig S2:** Daily COVID-19 associated emergency admission during our study period.



**Fig S3:** Cox-proportional Hazard analysis included covariates: Age, Sex, Charlson Index, Smoking history, Obesity, IMD (quintiles of local study population) for survival over 30 days in the second wave *ETHICAL* cohort.




**Fig S4:** Cox-proportional Hazard analysis included covariates: Age, Sex, Hospital Frailty Risk Score, Smoking history, Obesity, IMD (quintiles of local study population) for survival over 30 days in the second wave *ETHICAL* cohort.





**Fig S5:** Logistic regression model for risk of ICU admission during first COVID associated hospitalisation in second wave adjusted for COVID-19 risk factor comorbidities.



**Fig S6:** Cox-Hazard analysis (unstratified) for survival of first wave patients to 12 months.

