**Age standardisation using weights**

Let be an event rate in region at time . Then

where is the proportion of population in age group

and is event rate in age group in region .

Using direct standardisation for region compared with a reference population, the age adjusted event rate per population is

where is defined as the weight for region compared with the reference population.

**Infection Fatality Ratio**

Let be the overall infection fatality ratio in region and be the age stratified infection fatality ratio for age group . Age stratified infection fatality ratios from China and Italy have been reported [7-8], so weights for China or Italy relative to other regions can be calculated using Equation (3) and the population age profiles in each region.

If rates from China are standardised to other populations, then from Equation (2) and the overall IFR from China, (Verity), the point estimate for the IFR for China standardised to a reference region is

Similarly, lower and upper confidence limits for can be estimated using the 95% credible interval for and : (lower, upper) =

**Death rates per population**

Consider when is a death rate per population in region at time

where is the death rate in age group in region .

and is the number of deaths in age group in region .

Equation (3) can be re-written as

where are the rates relative to the 80+ age group. If is the infection rate in age group in region at time , then

and

If the disease spreads evenly through the population, the infection rate is constant across age groups at every time , so that for all and the relative event rate is stable over time, Further, if is intrinsic to the disease (accounting for age but excluding other risk factors such as co-morbidities and obesity) and constant for every region

Then an approximation to the weight is

To summarise, the weights in Equation (8) are equivalent to Equation (4) if: (1) is the same for every nation and (2) the infection rate is constant across age groups at every time . Age stratified relative rates compared with the 80+ age groups presented in S1 Table for China and Italy, using different age groupings, are in broad agreement, except for 50-60 age group. Since the Chinese study had the highest number of detected cases in the 50–59 age group relative to population size and the Italian study to date is a preprint, data from China were assumed to be more accurate.

In addition,

Let region be the population of interest. The age adjusted death rates per population for the region standardised to reference region can then be calculated using the crude death rates per population using Equation (2)

Using the weights derived from the IFRs in China used in Equation (5),

**S1 Table: Relative death rates compared with the 80+ age group from China and Italy.** Confidence limits for IFR/IFR 80+ were estimated using the upper and lower limits for IFR and dividing by the point estimate for IFR 80+ (IFR 81+ for Italy).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Age group** | **IFR (%) (95% credible interval)** | **IFR/IFR 80+ (%)\* (95% confidence limits)** |
| **China (Verity et al)** | | |
| 0-9 | 0.00161 (0.000185, 0.0249) | 0.02 (0.00, 0.32) |
| 10-19 | 0.00695 (0.00149, 0.0502) | 0.09 (0.02, 0.64) |
| 20-29 | 0.0309 (0.0138, 0.0923) | 0.40 (0.18, 1.18) |
| 30-39 | 0.0844 (0.0408, 0.185) | 1.1 (0.52, 2.37) |
| 40-49 | 0.161 (0.0764, 0.323) | 2.1 (0.98, 4.14) |
| 50-59 | 0.595 (0.344, 1.28) | 7.6 (4.41, 16.41) |
| 60-69 | 1.93 (1.11, 3.89) | 24.7 (14.2, 49.9) |
| 70-79 | 4.28 (2.45, 8.44) | 54.9 (31.4, 108.2) |
| 80+ | 7.80 (3.80, 13.3) | 100.0 |
| **Italy (Rinaldo)** | | |
| 0-20 | 0.049 (0.0048, 0.178) | 0.54 (0.05, 1.97) |
| 21-40 | 0.0176 (0.0008, 0.0952) | 0.19 (0.01, 1.05) |
| 41-50 | 0.0476 (0.0020, 0.200) | 0.53 (0.02, 2.21) |
| 51-60 | 0.1076 (0.0096, 0.314) | 1.19 (0.11, 3.47) |
| 61-70 | 1.028 (0.588, 1.74) | 11.4 (6.50, 19.3) |
| 71-80 | 4.66 (3.32, 6.99) | 51.6 (36.7, 77.3) |
| 81+ | 9.04 (6.62, 13.3) | 100.0 |

\*IFR/IFR 81+ (%) for Italy

**Model diagnostics for clustering of Infection Fatality Ratios**

S1 Fig shows the probability density function from the sum of the three Gaussian normal distribution and the observed histogram. Tests for normality (Quantile-Quantile plot) and model fit are found in S2 Fig and provide evidence of good model fit.

**S1 Figure**: **Probability density function and histogram.** Probability density function of fitted distributions from three clusters (solid line) and histogram of observed IFRs.

**S2 Figure:** **Model diagnostics.** Quantile-Quantile plots to test normality (left) and estimated and empirical cumulative density functions (CDF) (right).

**Trajectory analysis**

The ‘traj’ package used three steps to classify trajectories into clusters: (1) calculating 24 measures describing the change in death rates over time (eg direction of change, nonlinearity, fluctuations) [https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/traj/vignettes/trajVignette.pdf]; (2) A subset of the measures which describe the main features of the trajectories was selected using factor analysis and (3) the selected measures were clustered with the R package ‘Nbclust’ to determine the optimal number of clusters, using k-means clustering with 2 to 15 clusters and selecting the number of clusters based on the maximum cubic clustering criterion (ccc) (S3 and S4 Figs). The scree plots in S3 and S4 Figs indicate that two clusters are a better fit than one cluster, since the within groups sum of squares for two clusters is lower than for one cluster.

Statistical measures selected using principal components analysis and associated eigenvalues can be found in S2 Table. Two clusters were found for both 50 day (S3 Fig) and 100 day (S4 Fig) trajectories.

**S2 Table: Statistical measures of trajectory clusters.** Statistical measures selected by factor analysis to describe the 50 and 100 day trajectories by cluster.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Description** | **Eigenvalue** | **Cluster 1 (‘Stable’) median (IQR)** | **Cluster 2 (‘Accelerating’) median (IQR)** |
| **50 day trajectory** | | | | |
| Measure 1 | Change relative to the mean over time | 8.55 | 2.50 (2.09-2.74) | 3.90 (3.51-4.32) |
| Measure 2 | Mean of the absolute second differences | 5.39 | 0.01 (0.00-0.02) | 0.02 (0.00-0.08) |
| Measure 3 | Ratio of the maximum absolute second difference to mean absolute first difference | 1.57 | 0.19 (0.13-0.25) | 0.17 (0.14-0.25) |
| **100 day trajectory** | | | | |
| Measure 1 | Change relative to the mean over time | 7.48 | 1.93 (1.69-2.38) | 4.09 (3.66-4.37) |
| Measure 2 | Mean of the absolute second differences | 6.09 | 0.02 (0.01-0.04) | 0.01 (0.01-0.04) |
| Measure 3 | Ratio of the mean absolute second difference to the mean absolute first difference | 2.04 | 0.05 (0.04-0.06) | 0.05 (0.03-0.07) |

**S3 Figure: Criteria used to determine optimal number of clusters for 50 day trajectories.** Ccc criteria for 2-15 clusters (left) and within groups sum of squares for 1-15 clusters (right).

**S4 Figure: Criteria used to determine optimal number of clusters for 100 day trajectories.** Ccc criteria for 2-15 clusters (left) and within groups sum of squares for 1-15 clusters (right).