

1  
2 *BMJ Global Health*  
3 *Original Paper*

4 *The role of socio-economic determinants in*  
5 *SARS-CoV-2 health outcomes: systematic*  
6 *review of population-based studies*

7 Jinane GHATTAS<sup>1,2</sup>, Tatjana T. MAKOVSKI<sup>3</sup>, Stéphanie MONNIER-BESNARD<sup>3</sup>, Lisa  
8 CAVILLOT<sup>1,2</sup>, Monika AMBROŽOVÁ<sup>4</sup>, Barbora VAŠINOVÁ<sup>4</sup>, Rodrigo FETEIRA-SANTOS<sup>5,11</sup>, Peter  
9 BEZZEGH<sup>6</sup>, Felipe Ponce BOLLMANN<sup>7</sup>, James COTTAM<sup>□</sup>,<sup>10</sup>, Romana HANEEF<sup>3</sup>, Niko  
10 SPEYBROECK<sup>2</sup>, Paulo Jorge NOGUEIRA<sup>5,11-13</sup>, Maria João FORJAZ<sup>□</sup>, Joël COSTE<sup>3</sup>, Laure  
11 CARCAILLON-BENTATA<sup>3</sup>, Brecht DEVLEESSCHAUWER<sup>2,9</sup>

12  
13 Authors' affiliations:

14 <sup>1</sup> Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, Sciensano, Brussels, Belgium

15 <sup>2</sup> Institute of Health and Society, Université catholique de Louvain, Belgium

16 <sup>3</sup> Department of Non-Communicable Diseases and Injuries, Santé Publique France, Saint-Maurice, France

17 <sup>□</sup> National Screening Centre, Institute of Health Information and Statistics of the Czech Republic, Prague,  
18 Czech Republic

19 <sup>□</sup> Área Disciplinar Autónoma de Bioestatística, Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa,  
20 Portugal

21 <sup>□</sup> Directorate for Project Management, National Directorate General for Hospitals, Hungary

22 <sup>□</sup> Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia, Spain

23 <sup>□</sup> National Center of Epidemiology, Instituto de Salud Carlos III, REDISSEC and RICAPPS, Spain

24 <sup>9</sup> Department of Translational Physiology, Infectiology and Public Health, Ghent University, Merelbeke,  
25 Belgium

26 <sup>10</sup> Institute of Tropical Medicine, Antwerp, Belgium

27 <sup>11</sup> Instituto de Saúde Ambiental, Laboratório Associado TERRA, Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade de  
28 Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal

29 <sup>12</sup> Escola Nacional de Saúde Pública, ENSP, Centro de Investigação em Saúde Pública, CISP, Comprehensive  
30 Health Research Center, CHRC, Universidade NOVA de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal

31 <sup>13</sup> CIDNUR—Centro de Investigação, Inovação e Desenvolvimento em Enfermagem de Lisboa Escola Superior  
32 de Enfermagem de Lisboa, Avenida Professor Egas Moniz, 1600-190 Lisboa, Portugal

33  
34  
35  
36

37 **Corresponding author**

38 Jinane Ghattas

39 Sciensano

40 Rue Juliette Wytzman 14

41 1050 Bruxelles

42 Belgium

43 [jinaneghattas@gmail.com](mailto:jinaneghattas@gmail.com)

44 **Abstract**

45 Introduction: The COVID-19 pandemic has accentuated a health-wealth gradient, reminiscent of  
46 patterns observed in previous influenza pandemics. This systematic review, employing a population-  
47 based approach, aims to delve into the etiological and prognostic roles of socio-economic factors on  
48 COVID-19 outcomes during the pandemic's initial phase.

49 Methods: Our search spanned PubMed, Embase, WHO COVID-19 Global literature, and PsycINFO  
50 databases from January 2020 to April 7, 2021, focusing on English peer-reviewed articles. We  
51 examined the impact of socio-economic determinants on SARS-CoV-2 infection, COVID-19 related  
52 hospitalization, ICU admission, mechanical ventilation, mortality, and a range of prognostic outcomes  
53 including quality of life and mental health.

54 Results: The initial search resulted in 9,701 records after removal of duplicates. Out of hundred  
55 articles that met our review criteria, 67 discussed the etiological role of socio-economic factors, 25  
56 addressed the prognostic role, and 8 covered both. Fifty-nine percent of the studies were from the  
57 United States of America and the United Kingdom, highlighting an increased risk of infection and  
58 severity among their Black, Asian, and Hispanic populations. Lower-income groups, crowded  
59 households, and, higher socio-economic deprivation were associated with higher COVID-19 incidence  
60 and severity. Results regarding educational status varied across different waves.

61 Conclusion: Populations groups with disadvantaged socio-economic positions and certain ethnic and  
62 racial backgrounds face a higher risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection and poorer COVID-19 outcomes. Our  
63 findings underscore the need for incorporating social determinants into routine health surveillance and  
64 monitoring, suggesting an avenue for targeted interventions.

## 65 **KEY WORDS**

66 COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2 infection risk, population-based studies, socio-economic factors, health  
67 inequities, socio-economic status, public health policy

## 68 **What is already known on this topic**

69 The association between socio-economic factors and outcomes, observed during the COVID-19  
70 pandemic and other influenza epidemics, indicates a significant health-wealth gradient. Higher  
71 mortality and worse health outcomes are observed in the most disadvantaged groups of the population

## 72 **What this study adds**

73 This study lays out a comprehensive review of population-based studies, representative of the general  
74 population, on the etiological and prognostic role of socio-economic characteristics in COVID-19  
75 outcomes covering studies across 22 countries. Our results show that population-based studies from  
76 countries in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and continental Europe were limited in the early phase of the  
77 pandemic and highlight the importance of socio-economic characteristics, alongside comorbidities, for  
78 predicting SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19 severity.

## 79 **How this study might affect research, practice or policy**

80 This evidence shows a gap in the literature in countries other than the USA and the UK and on the role  
81 of socio-economic characteristics in long-term COVID-19 outcomes. Social inequalities need to be at  
82 the heart of infectious disease monitoring and surveillance to decrease the gap in adverse outcomes  
83 between patients of different socio-economic profiles.

84

## 85            **1. BACKGROUND**

86    The association between socio-economic (SE) factors and influenza outcomes, evidenced across  
87    various influenza epidemics and pandemics, highlights a pronounced health-wealth gradient (1).  
88    Notably, during the 2009-2014 influenza pandemic, England witnessed higher mortality rates among  
89    its most deprived populations (2). Similarly, the COVID-19 pandemic has revealed analogous  
90    patterns, with increased mortality observed among individuals of lower socio-economic status (SES),  
91    including immigrants and ethnic minorities (3-5). Such disparities are further exacerbated by  
92    unhealthy lifestyle behaviours predominantly found in disadvantaged groups, significantly raising the  
93    odds of COVID-19 mortality (6). This underscores the critical need for incorporating health equity  
94    into the early stages of pandemic surveillance and preparedness (7, 8). Despite the growing literature  
95    on the role of socio-economic (SE) factors in COVID-19 outcomes, there remains a gap in  
96    summarizing this interplay from a population-based perspective during the pandemic's early phase  
97    before the introduction of the vaccine.

98    Using a population-based approach, this systematic review aims to fill this gap by exploring two  
99    primary objectives:

- 100            1. Assessing the etiological role of socio-economic characteristics in initially SARS-CoV-2  
101            negative cohorts of general population.
- 102            2. Investigating the prognostic role of socio-economic characteristics in SARS-CoV-2 positive  
103            general population to evaluate case severity and disease progression.

104    This study is embedded within a larger project supported by the European Union's (EU) Horizon 2020  
105    research and innovation program (grant agreement No: 101018317), alongside other factors such as  
106    multimorbidity and frailty (9-11). In this study, we will only focus on the role of socio-economic  
107    factors in COVID-19 severity.

## 108            **2. METHODS**

109    The study was structured following the guidelines of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic  
110    Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (12). The protocol was officially documented in the Prospero  
111    registry for systematic review protocols under the identification number CRD42021249444 and  
112    subsequently published in a peer-reviewed journal where further details on the methodology can be  
113    found (9).

### 114            **2.1 Study approach**

115    We used a population-based approach defining populations within specific geographic regions during  
116    distinct time frames (13). It aims for findings generalisable to the entire population that is being

117 investigated in the study hypothesis, rather than just to the individuals who were included in the study  
118 (14).

119 Based on the Population, Exposure, Comparator, and Outcomes framework (15), we provide below a  
120 comprehensive description of the study objectives:

	Objective 1	Objective 2
Population (P)	General or well-defined population SARS-CoV-2 negative	General or well-defined population SARS-CoV-2 infected (COVID-19 diagnosed, with for example, PCR test, medical imaging or similar)
Exposure (E)	Lower socio-economic status	Lower socio-economic status
Comparator (C)	General population with better socio-economic status	SARS-CoV-2 infected subjects from the population with no frailty or no multimorbidity or with better socio-economic status
Outcome(s) (O)	Infection by SARS-COV-2, hospitalisation for COVID-19, ICU admission, mechanical ventilation and mortality due to COVID-19	COVID-19-related hospitalisation, ICU admission, mechanical ventilation, COVID-19-related mortality, COVID-19 related survival defined as the time between exposure and death (16), worse functioning, quality of life, disability, mental health difficulties and work absence/sick leave.

121

122 Observational studies of all types were included, including cohort studies, cross-sectional studies,  
123 case-control studies, and ecological studies considering the importance of including contextual factors.  
124 Quantitative papers published in English were considered.

125 The following standard socio-economic indicators were included: income, education, occupation,  
126 employment, housing, urban/rural setting, household size, race, ethnicity, nationality and marital  
127 status. These indicators were examined at the individual or area level (ecological studies).  
128 Acknowledging that socio-economic differences may be observed across all ages, all age groups were  
129 considered.

## 130 **2.2 Search strategy and study selection**

131 Databases search included PubMed, Embase, WHO COVID-19 Global literature, and PsycINFO  
132 databases, from January 2020 to April 7, 2021. A 'backwards' snowball search enhanced our literature  
133 review. Independent reviewer pairs screened titles, abstracts, and full texts, using Rayyan for data  
134 management (17). Pairs of reviewers independently completed the title/abstract screening and full text  
135 reading. Any disagreements were resolved via consensus or a third reviewer. Exclusion criteria were  
136 applied systematically, focusing on language, originality of research, relevance, and study design.

137 List 1 details the reasons for excluding studies at the initial screening stage, including language  
138 barriers, lack of original research, irrelevance to the review's scope, non-population-based studies, and  
139 focus on specific subpopulations. The enumeration of excluded studies underscores the stringent  
140 criteria applied to ensure the review's focus and quality. Further refinement during the full-text  
141 assessment phase led to exclusions based on more specific criteria, such as unclear COVID-19  
142 diagnosis, absence of socio-economic data, outcomes outside the study objectives, and duplication of  
143 populations across studies (List 2). This process ensured that only studies directly relevant and  
144 methodologically sound were included in the final review.

## 145 **2.3 Data synthesis**

146 A piloted data extraction template guided the independent extraction process, incorporating study  
147 details, population characteristics, COVID-19 diagnostics, and outcome measurements. Any  
148 disagreements were resolved via consensus or a third reviewer. Data extraction was conducted using  
149 Microsoft Excel.

## 150 **2.4 Quality assessment**

151 The Newcastle-Ottawa scale was used to assess the risk of bias in cohort and case-control studies (18).

152 An adjusted version of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale was used to assess the quality of cross-sectional  
153 studies. A higher score indicates higher study quality with a maximum of 9 points for cohort and case-  
154 control studies and 10 points for cross-sectional studies (Supplemental file 4).

## 155 **2.5 Patient and public involvement**

156 Patients and public were not directly involved in this systematic review.

## 157 **3. RESULTS**

158 Our database search identified 19,108 records. After deduplication, we screened the titles/abstracts of  
159 9,701 records. 411 records were included in the full-text screening phase of which 276 records focused  
160 on the etiological and prognostic role of socio-economic factors in SARS-CoV-2 infection and  
161 COVID-19 severity. In this phase, 198 records were excluded and 78 studies were finally included in

162 the narrative review. The backward “snowballing” resulted in additional 22 articles that were extracted  
 163 (Figure 1). In sum, a total of 100 articles were reviewed.

164 **List 1: Number of rejected studies and reasons for systematic review exclusion (title/abstract or**  
 165 **records screening phase)**

Criteria for exclusion	# excluded studies
1 = Article not in English	7
2 = Not an original research (e.g. editorial, protocol, etc.) or no original results	597
3 = Unrelated topic (e.g. outside of the review scope)	8 078
4 = Not a population-based study	534
5 = Subpopulation (medical staff, students, pregnant women, etc.)	74

166

167 **List 2: Number of rejected studies and reasons for systematic review exclusion (full-text reading**  
 168 **or reports screening phase)**

Reasons for exclusion	# excluded studies
1 = Not a population-based study	84
2 = SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosis not clear*	Not assigned
3 = Study does not contain information on socio-economic characteristics	15
4 = Outcome not within the scope of our objectives	27
5 = Outcome measurement tool not clear*	1
6 = Risk factor measurement tool not clear*	Not assigned
7 = Subpopulation (e.g. pregnant women, health care workers, students etc.)	2
8 = Not an original research (e.g. editorial, protocol, review, conference abstract, grey literature, etc.), no original results or not peer-reviewed	31
9 = The same or largely the same population already considered in another study for the same outcome	2
10 = Clinical trial or intervention study	Not assigned
11 = Qualitative study	Not assigned
12 = Descriptive study, absence of a comparator group and/or no measure of the association of interest	30
13 = Other (explain)**	6

169 \*even after contacting authors

170 \*\*e.g. full text not found, research question outside of the review scope, case-series, etc.

171

172 *Insert Fig. 1 PRISMA 2020 flow diagram for new systematic reviews (adjusted)*

### 173 **Study characteristics**

174 Out of hundred articles included in this study, 67 studies reported the etiological role of socio-  
175 economic determinants in short-term COVID-19 outcomes (5, 19-84), 25 studies focused on the  
176 prognostic role (85-109) and eight articles covered both (110-117). Fifty-four studies were based on  
177 individual-level data while 46 studies included aggregate-level data. Cross-sectional study design was  
178 the most frequent design (52 studies), followed by cohort studies (45 studies) and case-control studies  
179 (3 studies).

180 Most of the studies were published in high-income countries (USA, n = 39; UK, n = 20) (Figure 2). 64  
181 studies were set in the general population, 21 in hospital settings, seven in nursing homes, three in  
182 primary care settings, two in emergency or ICU setting, and three included outcomes from the general  
183 population and hospitalised patients.

184 During the early phase of the pandemic, studies reported only short-term outcomes such as SARS-  
185 CoV-2 infection, hospitalisation, ICU admission, mechanical ventilation, mortality, survival and  
186 severe COVID-19 outcome. No studies reported long-term outcomes such as functioning, quality of  
187 life, disability, mental health difficulties or work absence/sick leave. COVID-19 diagnosis was usually  
188 confirmed by an RT-PCR test or International Classification of Diseases (118). Self-reporting,  
189 administrative data, and population-based surveys were the main sources from which the information  
190 on socio-economic characteristics was obtained. The sample size in each study varied significantly and  
191 is reported in tables 1 and 3 of the supplemental file 2.

192 Regarding quality assessment, individual-level cohort studies scored between 6 and 9 (out of 10) and  
193 studies conducted at the ecological level received a score of either 6 or 7. Quality assessment for  
194 individual-level cross-sectional studies ranged between 6 and 8 while ecological cross-sectional



195 studies varied from 4 to 10. Two case-control studies received a score of seven, while one study  
196 received a score of six (Supplemental file 3).

197 *Insert Fig. 2 Geographical distribution of population-based studies*

## 198 **Etiological role of socio-economic characteristics**

### 199 *Studies reporting on infections*

200 Fifty-five studies reported on the etiological role of socio-economic determinants in SARS-2-CoV  
201 infections (19, 21, 22, 28, 29, 33-36, 38, 39, 41-46, 48-50, 52, 53, 56-65, 67, 69-74, 76, 78-84, 110-  
202 112, 114-117, 119). Seventeen studies were performed at an individual-level (19, 21, 22, 29, 33-36,  
203 38, 39, 41, 42, 111, 112, 115, 117, 119) while ecological studies accounted for 37 of the total (43-46,  
204 48-50, 52, 53, 56-65, 67, 69-74, 76, 78-84, 110, 114, 116). One study reported both individual and  
205 aggregated data (28). In individual-level studies, the sample size ranged between 378 and 17,636,366  
206 individuals.

207 The studies with individual-level socio-economic determinants used one or several of the following  
208 indicators: race, ethnicity, country of birth, marital status, education, income, employment, housing  
209 conditions and tenure, household characteristics, urban or rural place of residence, deprivation score. In  
210 ecological studies, the socio-economic determinants included scores reporting on ethnicity, race,  
211 education, income, employment, household size and crowding, population density, housing  
212 characteristics such as tenure, insurance as well indexes of social vulnerability, development,  
213 deprivation, and inequality (Figure 3). Seventeen studies provided unadjusted and adjusted estimates  
214 while 36 provided only adjusted measures of associations and 2 reported unadjusted results.

215 According to the overall findings, Black, Hispanic, and Asian people in the UK and the USA, as well  
216 as migrants in Italy and Sweden were more likely to contract SARS-CoV-2 infection. In addition,  
217 socio-economic deprivation scores, social vulnerability, interstate migration, living in a rental  
218 property, poor housing conditions, larger household size and a lower socio-economic status (SES)  
219 were all positively associated with infection risk. SARS-CoV-2 infections were more pronounced in  
220 areas of higher inequalities.

221 The results on educational status were heterogeneous: some studies reported a higher SARS-CoV-2  
222 infection in populations with lower educational status (22, 28, 36, 38, 59, 63, 67) while other studies  
223 showed that higher educational level was associated with higher odds of COVID-19 diagnosis (48, 82,  
224 111). The results from Yang *et al*, documented that patterns of infections varied across the different  
225 waves (57) . For instance, tertiary education or above was associated with higher SARS-CoV-2  
226 infection risk during the first wave but it had a protective effect during the second and third wave (57)  
227 (Table 1 and 2, Supplemental file 2).

### 228 *Studies reporting on hospitalisations*

229 Five individual-level studies reported on the etiological role of socio-economic characteristics in  
230 COVID-19-related hospitalisations (21, 23, 26, 42, 115). Four were cohort studies and one was cross-  
231 sectional. Two studies were performed in the UK (23, 42), one in Spain (21), one in Mexico (115) and  
232 one in the USA (26). Study samples included ranged from 17,763 to 25,333,329 individuals.

233 One out of five studies stratified the analysis by sex and adjusted for age, BMI, comorbidities and  
234 treatments (23) and another study reported COVID-19 outcomes during two different waves (42). In  
235 one of the studies, information on socio-economic determinants was self-reported (42), while in the  
236 other four studies, information was extracted from administrative records (21, 23, 26, 115).

237 Overall, patients identified as White had a lower risk of hospitalisations compared to other ethnic  
238 groups independently of sex in the UK and the USA (23, 26, 42). Being Asian, Black, Hispanic,  
239 North American native, or from other mixed ethnic groups increased the risk of hospitalisation (26,  
240 42). The study by Mathur *et al*. reported results from a cohort of adults registered with primary care  
241 practices in England over two waves (42). The second waves showed an attenuated risk of  
242 hospitalisation for Black(42). Patients from Sub Saharan Africa, Latin America and Caribbean were  
243 also at higher risk of hospitalisation compared to Spanish patients (21). Indigenous ethnicity in  
244 Mexico was not significantly associated with an increased risk of COVID-19 hospitalisation (115).

245 The risk of being hospitalised for COVID-19 was higher among individuals residing in care homes,  
246 experiencing deprivation (23) and with interstate migration status (115). However, the impact of

247 urbanisation on hospitalisation risk was minimal yet statistically significant (115) (Table 1 and 2,  
248 Supplemental file 2).

#### 249 *Studies reporting on ICU admission*

250 Only one study conducted in the UK looked at the etiological role of socio-economic factors in ICU  
251 admission. It included a cohort of adults enrolled in primary care practices in England and spans two  
252 periods, from February 2020 to December 2020 (42).

253 During both waves, the adjusted analysis showed that being South Asian, Black, mixed ethnic group  
254 and others were found to have a greater risk of ICU admission when compared to White patients (42)  
255 (Table 1 and 2, Supplemental file 2).

#### 256 *Studies reporting on mortality*

257 In the thirty-six studies reporting on the etiological role of socio-economic determinants in mortality,  
258 12 studies used individual-level measures(5, 20, 23-27, 30, 32, 37, 42, 113, 120) and 24 used area-  
259 level measures(43-45, 48, 50, 51, 53-55, 59, 60, 63, 64, 66-69, 74-77, 79, 80, 84). Individual-level  
260 studies included a sample size ranging between 274,712 and 306,800,000 individuals. Studies used  
261 one or several of the following indicators: ethnicity, country of birth, country of residence, educational  
262 level, income, employment status, civil status, house tenureship, and household size. Deprivation was  
263 referred to using the index of multiple deprivation quintiles (IMD) and the Townsend deprivation  
264 index. Three studies stratified per sex (23, 24, 37) and one study reported mortality outcomes over  
265 several pandemic waves (42). The following socio-economic indicators were used in ecological  
266 studies: race, ethnicity, education, income, crowding, density, household size, urban population,  
267 employment, insurance, indexes of social vulnerability, deprivation, poverty and Gini coefficient. One  
268 study stratified the analysis by sex (54).

269 Studies from the USA and UK reported worse outcomes in Black, Hispanic and Indian COVID-19  
270 patients (5, 23, 24, 26, 27, 30, 44, 50, 51, 59, 63, 66-69, 77, 113, 120). The study conducted by Mathur  
271 et al. revealed different outcomes over multiple waves (42). Specifically, during the first wave in  
272 England, Black, Asian, and mixed-race patients were found to be at a greater risk of COVID-19

273 mortality compared to white patients. However, the results were not statistically significant for Black  
274 and mixed-race patients during the second wave. In contrast, the risk remained higher for Asian  
275 patients (42). Three studies reported demographic determinants based on country of birth. Being a  
276 migrant from low and middle income countries increased the risk of COVID-19 death compared to  
277 people born in Sweden (20, 25, 32).

278 Increased risk of death was also observed in people living in long-term care homes (20, 23, 32),  
279 crowded households (20), multigenerational households (37), and in patients with lower educational  
280 attainment and lower income (20, 25, 27, 32, 59, 63, 113). Another study came to similar findings,  
281 concluding that higher education was a protective factor against COVID-19 mortality (48).

282 A positive association was observed between deprivation and increased risk of COVID-19 mortality  
283 (5, 23, 113). The risk of COVID-19 death was consistently higher for the most disadvantaged  
284 compared to the least disadvantaged (48, 50, 54, 55, 67, 68, 75, 84). Additionally, county crowding  
285 and increased social vulnerability were linked to an increased risk of COVID-19 mortality (50, 51, 54,  
286 69). Finally, mortality rates were more pronounced in areas with greater SE inequalities (53, 67, 76)  
287 (Table 1 and 2, Supplemental file 2).

#### 288 *Studies reporting on severe COVID-19*

289 Two studies combined mortality and intensive care unit admissions in a composite score for severe  
290 COVID-19 outcomes (31, 40). Both studies were conducted in a healthcare setting in the UK. One  
291 study is a case-control study with a sample size of 41,220 patients (31), while the other study is a  
292 cohort study with a sample size of 120,075 patients (40).

293 The study conducted by McKeigue presented unadjusted findings, which indicated that patients  
294 residing in care homes and experiencing higher levels of socio-economic deprivation exhibited more  
295 unfavourable outcomes in relation to COVID-19 (31). The study by Mutambudzi reported adjusted  
296 risk ratios for occupation, socio-economic deprivation, ethnicity and education. Severe COVID-19  
297 cases were seven times higher in healthcare worker compared to non-essential workers, Black and  
298 south Asian had a higher risk compared to white (40) (Table 1 and 2, Supplemental file 2).

299 ***Insert Fig. 3 Bubble diagram summarising the etiological role of socio-economic determinants and***  
300 ***COVID-19 outcomes per study types***

### 301 **Prognostic role of socio-economic characteristics**

#### 302 *Studies reporting on hospitalisations*

303 Seven studies reported on the prognostic role of socio-economic factors in hospitalisation of infected  
304 subjects (86, 89, 95, 99, 105, 114, 116). Five were cohort studies and two were cross-sectional. The  
305 studies were conducted exclusively in high-income nations, specifically the UK, USA, Italy, and  
306 Norway. One study was conducted in small statistical areas in Utah, whereas the other six were  
307 conducted at the individual level, with sample sizes ranging between 1,052 and 418,794. The patients  
308 included in the studies were COVID-19 community cases (89, 95, 99, 105, 116), nursing home  
309 residents (114) and patients from a large integrated US health system (86, 121). The socio-economic  
310 factors considered were the following: ethnicity, race, place of birth, income (both median and  
311 average), Townsend deprivation index, and deprivation level. Age, sex and comorbidities were the  
312 most used adjustment factors.

313 The likelihood of hospitalisation in COVID-19 patients was higher in Black, Asian, Hispanic patients  
314 (86, 95, 99, 105, 114). Non-Italians were at higher risk of hospitalisations compared to Italians after  
315 adjusting for sociodemographic factors and comorbidities in an Italian study (89). Three studies found  
316 increased odds of hospitalisation with SE deprivation (86, 99, 116) (Table 3 and 4, Supplemental file  
317 2).

#### 318 *Studies reporting on ICU admission*

319 Four individual-level studies (89, 98, 105, 111) and one ecological reported on ICU admission (106) .  
320 The studies were completed in Italy, Kuwait, Norway and USA. Regarding study design, we  
321 identified three cohort studies, one cross-sectional and one case-control. The socio-economic  
322 determinants used included: race, nationality, ethnicity, poverty, education, density, and income. Two  
323 studies included hospitalised COVID-19 cases while three included community COVID-19 cases.  
324 Only 18.7% of females included in the Kuwait study by Hamadah *et al.* (98). In individual-level  
325 studies, the sample size ranged between 1,123 and 518,739. Loomba *et al.* used state-level data to

326 study socio-economic patterns in 205 paediatric COVID-19 positive admissions and included results  
327 adjusted for age, gender and comorbidities (106). Overall, patients with higher educational level were  
328 at lower risk of being admitted to the ICU for COVID-19 (111). Black and foreign-born populations  
329 were at higher risk of severity when compared with White and native-born patients respectively (89,  
330 98, 105, 111) (Table 3 and 4, Supplemental file 2)..

### 331 *Studies reporting on mechanical ventilation*

332 Three studies in Norway, Brazil, and the USA documented the use of mechanical ventilation. Two  
333 studies used a cohort design (95, 96), while the other used a cross-sectional approach (105). The first  
334 study had a smaller sample size (N= 8,569) (95) than the other two studies (113,314 (96) and 124,780  
335 (105)). Race, ethnicity, birthplace and education were the socio-economic factors considered. Two  
336 studies included community COVID-19 cases (95, 105), whilst another included hospitalised COVID-  
337 19 patients (96). Compared to patients born in Norway, non-native patients born in Africa, Asia,  
338 Latin-America were at higher risk of mechanical ventilation (95). Studies from the USA and Brazil  
339 reported lower risk of severe outcomes in White patients and patients with higher educational  
340 attainment (96, 105) (Table 3 and 4, Supplemental file 2).

### 341 *Studies reporting on mortality*

342 Twenty studies reported on the prognostic role of socio-economic determinants in mortality. Eighteen  
343 were individual-level studies (88, 89, 91, 92, 95-98, 100-105, 112, 113, 115, 117) and two were  
344 ecological (108, 110). Studies were performed in the USA, the UK, Brazil, Columbia and Mexico. The  
345 sample sizes for the individual-level studies varied from 1,123 to 1,033,218 participants, including  
346 both community and hospitalised COVID-19 patients.

347 The included determinants were ethnicity, race nationality, place of birth, employment, deprivation,  
348 education, insurance, urbanisation, and migration. Higher COVID-19 mortality was observed in Black  
349 and mixed races COVID-19 patients in Brazil, the USA, the UK (91, 103, 105, 113, 117) and, patients  
350 from Africa, Asia and Latin America compared to Norwegian citizens (95). Compared to non-  
351 Indigenous, the mortality risk was considerably greater for Indigenous populations at large and those  
352 who received ambulatory care in Mexico and Columbia (88, 102). One study from Brazil showed

353 opposing results where Black patients had 25% lower odds of mortality compared to their White  
354 counterparts (92). Fabiani *et al.* did not observe any differences between Italian and non-Italian  
355 nationals in terms of case fatalities except for non-Italians coming from low Human Development  
356 Index (HDI) (89). A lower educational level (91, 96, 113), low socioeconomic status (88), working as  
357 a farmer, blue collar, being retired, unemployed or being a prisoner predicted higher mortality risk  
358 (104, 112). Both urbanisation and migration were associated with an increased risk of COVID-19-  
359 related mortality (115). Living in rural areas showed contrasting results. For instance, Kim *et al.*'s  
360 study revealed that patients residing in rural areas had a greater risk of death (97) while the study by  
361 Cifuentes *et al.* reported a decreased risk of mortality when living in sparse rural areas (88).

362 The two remaining studies included aggregate data on the following determinants: ethnicity,  
363 education, median family income, poverty level, race, insurance, employment and urbanisation (108,  
364 110) and included data from county-level and zip codes. The proportion of Black people in a zip code  
365 was not associated with death in COVID-19 patients (110). The odds of COVID-19 fatality decreased  
366 when the rate of primary physicians increased. After controlling for health factors, healthcare access  
367 measures, and county-level demographic characteristics, the association between race or ethnicity and  
368 COVID-19 death was not significant (108) (Table 3 and 4, Supplemental file 2).

### 369 *Studies reporting on survival*

370 Seven cohort studies (85, 90, 93, 94, 107, 109, 114) and one cross-sectional (87) performed in China,  
371 Brazil, Mexico, the UK and the USA reported survival outcomes. Seven studies were performed on an  
372 individual-level whereas one was ecological (107). The sample size ranged between 9,990 and  
373 412,017 individuals including confirmed COVID-19 cases, nursing home residents and hospitalised  
374 adults due to COVID-19. The studies reported the following socio-economic determinants: ethnicity,  
375 race, area of residence, education, health insurance, occupation, socio-economic strata, deprivation and  
376 poverty level. Higher mortality was observed in Black, Asian and Indigenous populations in Mexico  
377 and Brazil (85, 87, 93, 94), rural zones, and COVID-19 patients with lower educational level (93, 94).  
378 Poverty level also increased the risk of COVID-19 death (90, 107). Mehta *et al.* reported higher

379 mortality risk, among nursing home residents in the US, in Asian populations however, the risk of  
380 mortality for Black people was similar to white patients (114) (Table 3 and 4, Supplemental file 2).

381 ***Insert Fig. 4 Bubble diagram summarising the prognostic role of socio-economic determinants and***

382 ***COVID-19 outcomes per study types***

383



#### 384        **4. DISCUSSION**

385        This systematic review summarised the etiological and prognostic role of socio-economic  
386        determinants in various COVID-19 outcomes during the early phase of the pandemic. During the early  
387        stages of the pandemic, most the studies were performed in high-income countries and focusing on  
388        short-term outcomes. Although the selected studies included a comparable proportion of males and  
389        females, their sample size consisted mainly of white populations. Studies adjusted for age, sex, and  
390        comorbidities among other adjustment factors. Socio-economic characteristics were important  
391        features, alongside comorbidities, for predicting SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19 severity.  
392        Black, Hispanic and Asian populations were at higher risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection, COVID-19  
393        related hospitalisation, ICU admission and death, in Brazil, the USA and the UK. The infection and  
394        severity risk was also consistently higher with higher socio-economic deprivation. Higher levels of  
395        education were associated with higher odds of COVID-19 diagnosis but with lower odds of worsening  
396        outcomes. During the first wave of the pandemic, higher education was also associated with higher  
397        incidence, but this trend reversed itself in the subsequent waves. Our results provide strong evidence  
398        that inequality seems to be proportionally more important for a severe course of the disease.

399        The positive association between socio-economic disparity and worse COVID-19 outcomes has been  
400        also documented in many publications published after our review. We found additional studies  
401        completed in Brazil, Canada, France, Indonesia, Italy, Norway, Switzerland, and the US reporting on  
402        the role of socioeconomic factors in COVID-19 incidence and severity (122-131). Population-based  
403        studies from Brazil showed that higher risk of COVID-19 mortality was observed among Indigenous,  
404        Black and mixed-race patients and in more deprived areas (124-126). Lower income, lower  
405        educational level, crowded housing, larger household size, poverty and high density area were also  
406        predictors for SARS-CoV-2 infection (128) and COVID-19 mortality (123, 126, 129). According to  
407        Pereira *et al.*, COVID-19 incidence and mortality did not exhibit similar results: SARS-CoV-2  
408        infection were higher in less deprived areas (125). COVID-19 impact was not only commanded by  
409        race and ethnicity but was highly impacted by patients' socio-ethnic and socioracial profile.  
410        Vulnerable patients suffering from worsening COVID-19 outcomes need higher medical attention and

411 financial resources adding constraints for their access to treatment (125). Results from Switzerland and  
412 France, until April 2021, show different results as patients from disadvantaged socio-economic  
413 position were more likely to test positive to SARS-CoV-2 infection but less likely to get tested (127,  
414 130). A possible explanation for these findings is structural barriers to healthcare access and deprived  
415 populations' lower ability to benefit from protective measures (127, 130). This could also be  
416 potentially explained by the “inverse equity hypothesis”: new public health interventions, such as  
417 SARS-CoV-2 testing or other related preventive measures, are more utilised by people from higher  
418 socio-economic position which leads to increasing inequity in terms of coverage, morbidity and  
419 mortality (132). Furthermore, there is a large gap in the geographical distribution of the included  
420 articles where 60% of the articles were performed in the USA and the UK. There is a need for  
421 population-based studies on the role of socio-economic determinants in Africa, Asia, continental  
422 Europe and Latin America.

423 Given the positive association between area-level social determinants of health and COVID-19  
424 mortality, it remains essential to put in place targeted strategies to address the population that are  
425 disproportionately affected by the pandemic such as essential workers who did not have access to  
426 telework and were less likely to receive benefits or paid sick leave (131). Our results, covering the  
427 heterogeneity of outcomes over different phases, particularly in terms of education, are also supported  
428 by a population-based study conducted in Rome, demonstrating that the relationship between  
429 education level and infection rates varied across different waves (122). During the initial stage of the  
430 pandemic, individuals with lower and medium levels of education had a reduced risk of infection or  
431 lower testing rates, which later increased. Likewise, in the last semester of 2020, there was strong  
432 evidence that lower education was associated with an increased risk of death within 30 days of  
433 infection onset (122).

434 Two other systematic reviews focusing on the population from the US had shown a disproportionate  
435 burden of COVID-19-related infections and mortality experienced by Black and Hispanic populations  
436 and in areas with higher deprivation (133, 134). While these findings are consistent with our review,  
437 they are limited to the US and do not specifically address population-based studies, proving that no  
438 previous systematic review has examined the relationship between socio-economic characteristics and

439 the severity of COVID-19 in the general population. Our review, therefore managed to fill this gap  
440 (133, 134).

441 Our findings show substantial social inequalities in SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19 outcomes.  
442 Collecting socioeconomic data in a routine and timely manner is essential to identify better the  
443 mechanisms driving such inequalities and design preventive strategies. Addressing socio-economic  
444 health disparities is a key focus in public health, but has not been adopted in disease surveillance and  
445 pandemic preparedness (7). Countries, should, therefore, establish surveillance systems that include  
446 social variables to routinely report health outcomes by social factors routinely (130). Whilst most of  
447 the studies reported on infection and mortality outcomes, it remains important to investigate the role of  
448 socio-economic characteristics on hospitalisation and other comparable outcomes to understand better  
449 the patterns across the whole continuum of care.

450 Our study has several strengths: first, using a pre-registered protocol, which was peer-reviewed and  
451 published thereby guaranteeing a rigorous and reproducible systematic process (9, 135). Second, it  
452 includes representative studies allowing the estimation of COVID-19 risk factors at a population level.  
453 Third, this review employed a comprehensive search strategy, and fourth, included an extensive  
454 number of articles covering a large number of socio-economic determinants and their impact on  
455 COVID-19 outcomes during the early phase of the pandemic.

456 One limitation of our study is that it relies solely on English-language peer-reviewed articles. This  
457 may have resulted in excluding population-based studies or grey literature published in other  
458 languages. The socio-economic characteristics included were heterogeneous with various definitions  
459 and stratifications, resulting in difficult comparison between the reported results. Another drawback is  
460 that many included articles considered potential mediators as confounding factors such as  
461 comorbidities, which could have caused an over-adjustment bias and decreased the estimates of risk  
462 linked to socio-economic determinants. Controlling for comorbidities is unnecessary in this context  
463 because they serve as intermediary variables along the causal pathway between socio-economic  
464 factors and health outcomes (136). We are also aware that our search strategy covers only articles until  
465 April 2022. However, our study aims to look at the scientific literature published in the early phase of

466 the pandemic, focusing on a limited number of variants and avoiding the impact of vaccination, which  
467 could potentially act as a mediator and mitigate certain outcomes. Hence, our study addresses the  
468 direct interaction between socioeconomic characteristics and COVID-19 morbidity and mortality.  
469 After extracting 100 articles we also concluded that we reached a saturation of results and that an  
470 update was redundant to cover this period.  
471

472        **5. CONCLUSION**

473        This review underscores the significant correlation between socio-economic disadvantages, ethnicity,  
474        and the severity of COVID-19 outcomes. Particularly, individuals identifying as Black, Asian, or  
475        Indigenous are more vulnerable to both infection and adverse prognosis. There is a lack of evidence on  
476        long-term COVID-19 outcomes despite growing evidence on the association between deprivation and  
477        “long COVID-19” (137). Future research should prioritise these high-risk groups in order to inform  
478        and refine intervention strategies, aiming to bridge disparities in health outcomes. Moreover, it's  
479        essential for surveillance systems to broaden their scope, incorporating a wider array of socio-  
480        economic factors to capture the full spectrum of determinants impacting health outcomes.

481

482        **6. Authors Contribution**

483        LCB, JCo, BD, PJN and MJF formulated the research questions. All authors conceptualised  
484        the search strategy together. JG and TM acted as first reviewers, while LCB, SMB, LC, RH,  
485        RFS, FPB, JC, MA, BV, PB, PJN shared the role of the second reviewer. JCo acted as a third  
486        party and resolved all disagreements. JG authored the initial draft of the manuscript. All co-  
487        authors reviewed and approved the manuscript.

488        **7. Funding statement**

489        The study has been completed within the Population Health Information Research Infrastructure  
490        (PHIRI) project. PHIRI is funded by the European Union's (EU) Horizon 2020 research and  
491        innovation            program            (Grant            agreement            No:            101018317  
492        <https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/101018317/fr>). The funding body had no involvement in the  
493        study's design, collection, analysis and interpretation of data, or in writing the manuscript. The content  
494        of this publication reflects the views of the authors only and do not represent the views of the  
495        European Commission or any other body of the European Union. The European Commission does not  
496        take any responsibility for use that may be made of the information it contains.

497        **8. Competing interests statement**

498        Authors declare no competing interests.

499

## 500 References

- 501 1. Mamelund S-E, Shelley-Egan C, Rogeberg O. The association between  
502 socioeconomic status and pandemic influenza: Systematic review and meta-analysis.  
503 PLOS ONE. 2021;16(9):e0244346.
- 504 2. Rutter PD, Mytton OT, Mak M, Donaldson LJ. Socio-economic disparities in  
505 mortality due to pandemic influenza in England. *International Journal of Public*  
506 *Health*. 2012;57(4):745-50.
- 507 3. Islamoska S, Petersen JH, Benfield T, Norredam M. Socioeconomic and  
508 demographic risk factors in COVID-19 hospitalization among immigrants and ethnic  
509 minorities. *European Journal of Public Health*. 2021;32(2):302-10.
- 510 4. Pathak EB, Menard JM, Garcia RB, Salemi JL. Joint Effects of Socioeconomic  
511 Position, Race/Ethnicity, and Gender on COVID-19 Mortality among Working-Age  
512 Adults in the United States. *International Journal of Environmental Research and*  
513 *Public Health*. 2022;19(9):5479.
- 514 5. Williamson EJ, Walker AJ, Bhaskaran K, Bacon S, Bates C, Morton CE, et al.  
515 Factors associated with COVID-19-related death using OpenSAFELY. *Nature*.  
516 2020;584(7821):430-6.
- 517 6. Foster HME, Ho FK, Mair FS, Jani BD, Sattar N, Katikireddi SV, et al. The  
518 association between a lifestyle score, socioeconomic status, and COVID-19  
519 outcomes within the UK Biobank cohort. *BMC Infectious Diseases*. 2022;22(1):273.
- 520 7. Mamelund S-E. "Social inequality a forgotten factor in pandemic influenza  
521 preparedness"  
522 *Tidsskrift for den Norske laegeforening: Tidsskrift for praktisk medicin, ny raekke*.  
523 2017;137(12-13):911–13.
- 524 8. Varkey S, Kandpal E, Neelsen S. Why addressing inequality must be central  
525 to pandemic preparedness. *BMJ Global Health*. 2022;7(9):e010453.
- 526 9. Makovski TT, Ghattas J, Monnier Besnard S, Ambrozova M, Vasinova B,  
527 Feteira-Santos R, et al. Aetiological and prognostic roles of frailty, multimorbidity and  
528 socioeconomic characteristics in the development of SARS-CoV-2 health outcomes:  
529 protocol for systematic reviews of population-based studies. *BMJ Open*.  
530 2022;12(11):e063573.
- 531 10. European Commission: Horizon 2020. Population Health Information  
532 Research Infrastructure (PHIRI), [Available from:  
533 <https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/101018317>.
- 534 11. Makovski TT, Ghattas J, Monnier-Besnard S, Cavillot L, Ambrožová M,  
535 Vašinová B, et al. Multimorbidity and frailty are associated with poorer SARS-CoV-2-  
536 related outcomes: systematic review of population-based studies. *Aging Clin Exp*  
537 *Res*. 2024;36(1):40.
- 538 12. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al.  
539 Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols  
540 (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. *BMJ*. 2015;350:g7647.
- 541 13. MH G. Population based study. Chichester: Wiley1998. 3450 p.
- 542 14. Lieb R. Population-Based Study. In: Gellman MD, Turner JR, editors.  
543 *Encyclopedia of Behavioral Medicine*. New York, NY2013.
- 544 15. Morgan RL, Whaley P, Thayer KA, Schunemann HJ. Identifying the PECO: A  
545 framework for formulating good questions to explore the association of environmental  
546 and other exposures with health outcomes. *Environ Int*. 2018;121(Pt 1):1027-31.

- 547 16. Ferreira JC, Patino CM. What is survival analysis, and when should I use it? *J*  
548 *Bras Pneumol.* 2016;42(1):77.
- 549 17. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan-a web and  
550 mobile app for systematic reviews. *Syst Rev.* 2016;5(1):210.
- 551 18. GA Wells BS, D O'Connell, J Peterson, V Welch, M Losos, P Tugwell,. The  
552 Newcastle--Ottawa scale (NOS) for assessing the quality if nonrandomized studies in  
553 meta--analyses.
- 554 19. Hanson AE, Hains DS, Schwaderer AL, Starr MC. Variation in COVID-19  
555 Diagnosis by Zip Code and Race and Ethnicity in Indiana. *Front Public Health.*  
556 2020;8:593861.
- 557 20. Brandén M, Aradhya S, Kolk M, Härkönen J, Drefahl S, Malmberg B, et al.  
558 Residential context and COVID-19 mortality among adults aged 70 years and older in  
559 Stockholm: a population-based, observational study using individual-level data. *The*  
560 *Lancet Healthy Longevity.* 2020;1(2):e80-e8.
- 561 21. Guijarro C, Perez-Fernandez E, Gonzalez-Pineiro B, Melendez V, Goyanes  
562 MJ, Renilla ME, et al. Differential risk for COVID-19 in the first wave of the disease  
563 among Spaniards and migrants from different areas of the world living in Spain. *Rev*  
564 *Clin Esp (Barc).* 2021;221(5):264-73.
- 565 22. Chadeau-Hyam M, Bodinier B, Elliott J, Whitaker MD, Tzoulaki I, Vermeulen  
566 R, et al. Risk factors for positive and negative COVID-19 tests: a cautious and in-  
567 depth analysis of UK biobank data. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2020;49(5):1454-67.
- 568 23. Clift AK, Coupland CAC, Keogh RH, Diaz-Ordaz K, Williamson E, Harrison  
569 EM, et al. Living risk prediction algorithm (QCOVID) for risk of hospital admission and  
570 mortality from coronavirus 19 in adults: national derivation and validation cohort  
571 study. *BMJ.* 2020;371:m3731.
- 572 24. Ayoubkhani D, Nafilyan V, White C, Goldblatt P, Gaughan C, Blackwell L, et  
573 al. Ethnic-minority groups in England and Wales-factors associated with the size and  
574 timing of elevated COVID-19 mortality: a retrospective cohort study linking census  
575 and death records. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2021;49(6):1951-62.
- 576 25. Drefahl S, Wallace M, Mussino E, Aradhya S, Kolk M, Branden M, et al. A  
577 population-based cohort study of socio-demographic risk factors for COVID-19  
578 deaths in Sweden. *Nat Commun.* 2020;11(1):5097.
- 579 26. Izurieta HS, Graham DJ, Jiao Y, Hu M, Lu Y, Wu Y, et al. Natural History of  
580 Coronavirus Disease 2019: Risk Factors for Hospitalizations and Deaths Among >26  
581 Million US Medicare Beneficiaries. *J Infect Dis.* 2021;223(6):945-56.
- 582 27. Elliott J, Bodinier B, Whitaker M, Delpierre C, Vermeulen R, Tzoulaki I, et al.  
583 COVID-19 mortality in the UK Biobank cohort: revisiting and evaluating risk factors.  
584 *Eur J Epidemiol.* 2021;36(3):299-309.
- 585 28. Kolin DA, Kulm S, Christos PJ, Elemento O. Clinical, regional, and genetic  
586 characteristics of Covid-19 patients from UK Biobank. *PLoS One.*  
587 2020;15(11):e0241264.
- 588 29. Bailey LC, Razzaghi H, Burrows EK, Bunnell HT, Camacho PEF, Christakis  
589 DA, et al. Assessment of 135794 Pediatric Patients Tested for Severe Acute  
590 Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Across the United States. *JAMA Pediatr.*  
591 2021;175(2):176-84.
- 592 30. Bassett MT, Chen JT, Krieger N. Variation in racial/ethnic disparities in  
593 COVID-19 mortality by age in the United States: A cross-sectional study. *PLoS Med.*  
594 2020;17(10):e1003402.
- 595 31. McKeigue PM, Weir A, Bishop J, McGurnaghan SJ, Kennedy S, McAllister D,  
596 et al. Rapid Epidemiological Analysis of Comorbidities and Treatments as risk factors



- 597 for COVID-19 in Scotland (REACT-SCOT): A population-based case-control study.  
598 PLoS Med. 2020;17(10):e1003374.
- 599 32. Rostila M, Cederström A, Wallace M, Brandén M, Malmberg B, Andersson G.  
600 Disparities in COVID-19 deaths by country of birth in Stockholm, Sweden: A total  
601 population based cohort study. 2021.
- 602 33. Raisi-Estabragh Z, McCracken C, Ardissino M, Bethell MS, Cooper J, Cooper  
603 C, et al. Renin-Angiotensin-Aldosterone System Blockers Are Not Associated With  
604 Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Hospitalization: Study of 1,439 UK Biobank  
605 Cases. *Front Cardiovasc Med*. 2020;7:138.
- 606 34. al. Le. COVID-19 in Pediatric Patients: Observations from the Initial Phase of  
607 the Global Pandemic in Rhode Island.
- 608 35. Shahbazi F, Solgi M, Khazaei S. Predisposing risk factors for COVID-19  
609 infection: A case-control study. *Caspian J Intern Med*. 2020;11(Suppl 1):495-500.
- 610 36. Aung S, Vittinghoff E, Nah G, Peyser ND, Pletcher MJ, Olgin JE, et al.  
611 Characteristics and Behaviors Associated with Prevalent SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *Int J*  
612 *Gen Med*. 2021;14:1063-7.
- 613 37. Nafilyan V, Islam N, Ayoubkhani D, Gilles C, Katikireddi SV, Mathur R, et al.  
614 Ethnicity, household composition and COVID-19 mortality: a national linked data  
615 study. *J R Soc Med*. 2021;114(4):182-211.
- 616 38. Atkins JL, Masoli JAH, Delgado J, Pilling LC, Kuo CL, Kuchel GA, et al.  
617 Preexisting Comorbidities Predicting COVID-19 and Mortality in the UK Biobank  
618 Community Cohort. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2020;75(11):2224-30.
- 619 39. Ho FK, Celis-Morales CA, Gray SR, Katikireddi SV, Niedzwiedz CL, Hastie C,  
620 et al. Modifiable and non-modifiable risk factors for COVID-19, and comparison to  
621 risk factors for influenza and pneumonia: results from a UK Biobank prospective  
622 cohort study. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10(11):e040402.
- 623 40. Mutambudzi M, Niedzwiedz C, Macdonald EB, Leyland A, Mair F, Anderson J,  
624 et al. Occupation and risk of severe COVID-19: prospective cohort study of 120 075  
625 UK Biobank participants. *Occup Environ Med*. 2020;78(5):307-14.
- 626 41. The Reggio Emilia COVID-19 working group. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2  
627 (COVID-19) in Italians and in Immigrants in Northern Italy. *Epidemiologia e*  
628 *prevenzione*. 2020;44(4):304-7.
- 629 42. Mathur R, Rentsch CT, Morton CE, Hulme WJ, Schultze A, MacKenna B, et al.  
630 Ethnic differences in SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19-related hospitalisation,  
631 intensive care unit admission, and death in 17 million adults in England: an  
632 observational cohort study using the OpenSAFELY platform. *The Lancet*.  
633 2021;397(10286):1711-24.
- 634 43. Adam Y Li TCH, John R Durbin , Nickolas Dreher , Fiona M McAuley , Naoum  
635 Fares Marayati , Zachary Spiera , Muhammad Ali , Alex Gometz , J T Kostman ,  
636 Tanvir F Choudhri Multivariate Analysis of Black Race and Environmental  
637 Temperature on COVID-19 in the US.
- 638 44. Adhikari S, Pantaleo NP, Feldman JM, Ogedegbe O, Thorpe L, Troxel AB.  
639 Assessment of Community-Level Disparities in Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-  
640 19) Infections and Deaths in Large US Metropolitan Areas. *JAMA Netw Open*.  
641 2020;3(7):e2016938.
- 642 45. Helena Temkin-Greener WG, ,Yunjiao Mao, Xueya Cai, ue Li,. COVID-19  
643 Pandemic in Assisted Living Communities: Results from Seven States.
- 644 46. Joana Alves PS, João Victor Rocha, Rui Santana,Carla Nunes. Evolution of  
645 inequalities in the coronavirus pandemics in Portugal: an ecological study.

- 646 47. Feehan AK, Velasco C, Fort D, Burton JH, Price-Haywood EG, Katzmarzyk  
647 PT, et al. Racial and Workplace Disparities in Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2, Baton  
648 Rouge, Louisiana, USA. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2021;27(1).
- 649 48. Abedi V, Olulana O, Avula V, Chaudhary D, Khan A, Shahjouei S, et al.  
650 Racial, Economic, and Health Inequality and COVID-19 Infection in the United  
651 States. *J Racial Ethn Health Disparities.* 2021;8(3):732-42.
- 652 49. Biggs EN, Maloney PM, Rung AL, Peters ES, Robinson WT. The Relationship  
653 Between Social Vulnerability and COVID-19 Incidence Among Louisiana Census  
654 Tracts. *Front Public Health.* 2020;8:617976.
- 655 50. Chen JT, Krieger N. Revealing the Unequal Burden of COVID-19 by Income,  
656 Race/Ethnicity, and Household Crowding: US County Versus Zip Code Analyses. *J*  
657 *Public Health Manag Pract.* 2021;27 Suppl 1, COVID-19 and Public Health: Looking  
658 Back, Moving Forward:S43-S56.
- 659 51. Daras K, Alexiou A, Rose TC, Buchan I, Taylor-Robinson D, Barr B. How does  
660 vulnerability to COVID-19 vary between communities in England? Developing a  
661 Small Area Vulnerability Index (SAVI). *J Epidemiol Community Health.*  
662 2021;75(8):729-34.
- 663 52. de Souza CDF, Machado MF, do Carmo RF. Human development, social  
664 vulnerability and COVID-19 in Brazil: a study of the social determinants of health.  
665 *Infect Dis Poverty.* 2020;9(1):124.
- 666 53. Demenech LM, Dumith SC, Vieira M, Neiva-Silva L. Income inequality and risk  
667 of infection and death by COVID-19 in Brazil. *Rev Bras Epidemiol.* 2020;23:e200095.
- 668 54. Di Girolamo C, Bartolini L, Caranci N, Moro ML. Socioeconomic inequalities in  
669 overall and COVID-19 mortality during the first outbreak peak in Emilia-Romagna  
670 Region (Northern Italy). *Epidemiol Prev.* 2020;44(5-6 Suppl 2):288-96.
- 671 55. Rodriguez-Villamizar LA, Belalcazar-Ceron LC, Fernandez-Nino JA, Marin-  
672 Pineda DM, Rojas-Sanchez OA, Acuna-Merchan LA, et al. Air pollution,  
673 sociodemographic and health conditions effects on COVID-19 mortality in Colombia:  
674 An ecological study. *Sci Total Environ.* 2021;756:144020.
- 675 56. Sugg MM, Spaulding TJ, Lane SJ, Runkle JD, Harden SR, Hege A, et al.  
676 Mapping community-level determinants of COVID-19 transmission in nursing homes:  
677 A multi-scale approach. *Sci Total Environ.* 2021;752:141946.
- 678 57. Yang B, Wu P, Lau EHY, Wong JY, Ho F, Gao H, et al. Changing Disparities  
679 in Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Burden in the Ethnically Homogeneous  
680 Population of Hong Kong Through Pandemic Waves: An Observational Study. *Clin*  
681 *Infect Dis.* 2021;73(12):2298-305.
- 682 58. Figueroa JF, Wadhera RK, Lee D, Yeh RW, Sommers BD. Community-Level  
683 Factors Associated With Racial And Ethnic Disparities In COVID-19 Rates In  
684 Massachusetts. *Health Aff (Millwood).* 2020;39(11):1984-92.
- 685 59. Figueroa JF, Wadhera RK, Mehtsun WT, Riley K, Phelan J, Jha AK.  
686 Association of race, ethnicity, and community-level factors with COVID-19 cases and  
687 deaths across U.S. counties. *Healthc (Amst).* 2021;9(1):100495.
- 688 60. Garcia CN. Socioeconomic, demographic and healthcare determinants of the  
689 COVID-19 pandemic: an ecological study of Spain. *BMC Public Health.*  
690 2021;21(1):606.
- 691 61. Hawkins D. Social Determinants of COVID-19 in Massachusetts, United  
692 States: An Ecological Study. *J Prev Med Public Health.* 2020;53(4):220-7.
- 693 62. Li Y, Cen X, Cai X, Temkin-Greener H. Racial and Ethnic Disparities in  
694 COVID-19 Infections and Deaths Across U.S. Nursing Homes. *J Am Geriatr Soc.*  
695 2020;68(11):2454-61.

- 696 63. Hawkins RB, Charles EJ, Mehaffey JH. Socio-economic status and COVID-19-  
697 related cases and fatalities. *Public Health*. 2020;189:129-34.
- 698 64. Loomba RS, Aggarwal G, Aggarwal S, Flores S, Villarreal EG, Farias JS, et al.  
699 Disparities in case frequency and mortality of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19)  
700 among various states in the United States. *Ann Med*. 2021;53(1):151-9.
- 701 65. Gaudart J, Landier J, Huiart L, Legendre E, Lehot L, Bendiane MK, et al.  
702 Factors associated with the spatial heterogeneity of the first wave of COVID-19 in  
703 France: a nationwide geo-epidemiological study. *The Lancet Public Health*.  
704 2021;6(4):e222-e31.
- 705 66. Gorges RJ, Konezka RT. Factors Associated With Racial Differences in  
706 Deaths Among Nursing Home Residents With COVID-19 Infection in the US. *JAMA*  
707 *Netw Open*. 2021;4(2):e2037431.
- 708 67. Karmakar M, Lantz PM, Tipirneni R. Association of Social and Demographic  
709 Factors With COVID-19 Incidence and Death Rates in the US. *JAMA Netw Open*.  
710 2021;4(1):e2036462.
- 711 68. Khanijahani A, Tomassoni L. Socioeconomic and Racial Segregation and  
712 COVID-19: Concentrated Disadvantage and Black Concentration in Association with  
713 COVID-19 Deaths in the USA. *J Racial Ethn Health Disparities*. 2021.
- 714 69. Khazanchi R, Beiter ER, Gondi S, Beckman AL, Bilinski A, Ganguli I. County-  
715 Level Association of Social Vulnerability with COVID-19 Cases and Deaths in the  
716 USA. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2020;35(9):2784-7.
- 717 70. Macchia A, Ferrante D, Battistella G, Mariani J, Gonzalez Bernaldo de Quiros  
718 F. COVID-19 among the inhabitants of the slums in the city of Buenos Aires: a  
719 population-based study. *BMJ Open*. 2021;11(1):e044592.
- 720 71. Palacio A, Tamariz L. Social Determinants of Health Mediate COVID-19  
721 Disparities in South Florida. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2021;36(2):472-7.
- 722 72. <Do socio-economic indicators associate with COVID-2019 cases.pdf>.
- 723 73. Das A, Ghosh S, Das K, Basu T, Das M, Dutta I. Modeling the effect of area  
724 deprivation on COVID-19 incidences: a study of Chennai megacity, India. *Public*  
725 *Health*. 2020;185:266-9.
- 726 74. Ehlert A. The socio-economic determinants of COVID-19: A spatial analysis of  
727 German county level data. *Socioecon Plann Sci*. 2021;78:101083.
- 728 75. Fielding-Miller RK, Sundaram ME, Brouwer K. Social determinants of COVID-  
729 19 mortality at the county level. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(10):e0240151.
- 730 76. Ginsburgh V, Magerman G, Natali I. COVID-19 and the role of inequality in  
731 French regional departments. *Eur J Health Econ*. 2021;22(2):311-27.
- 732 77. Gross CP, Essien UR, Pasha S, Gross JR, Wang SY, Nunez-Smith M. Racial  
733 and Ethnic Disparities in Population-Level Covid-19 Mortality. *J Gen Intern Med*.  
734 2020;35(10):3097-9.
- 735 78. Karaye IM, Horney JA. The Impact of Social Vulnerability on COVID-19 in the  
736 U.S.: An Analysis of Spatially Varying Relationships. *Am J Prev Med*.  
737 2020;59(3):317-25.
- 738 79. Khanijahani A. Racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic disparities in confirmed  
739 COVID-19 cases and deaths in the United States: a county-level analysis as of  
740 November 2020. *Ethn Health*. 2021;26(1):22-35.
- 741 80. Li Y, Temkin-Greener H, Shan G, Cai X. COVID-19 Infections and Deaths  
742 among Connecticut Nursing Home Residents: Facility Correlates. *J Am Geriatr Soc*.  
743 2020;68(9):1899-906.
- 744 81. Mollalo A, Vahedi B, Rivera KM. GIS-based spatial modeling of COVID-19  
745 incidence rate in the continental United States. *Sci Total Environ*. 2020;728:138884.


- 746 82. Ramirez-Aldana R, Gomez-Verjan JC, Bello-Chavolla OY. Spatial analysis of  
747 COVID-19 spread in Iran: Insights into geographical and structural transmission  
748 determinants at a province level. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2020;14(11):e0008875.
- 749 83. White EM, Kosar CM, Feifer RA, Blackman C, Gravenstein S, Ouslander J, et  
750 al. Variation in SARS-CoV-2 Prevalence in U.S. Skilled Nursing Facilities. *J Am*  
751 *Geriatr Soc*. 2020;68(10):2167-73.
- 752 84. Zhang CH, Schwartz GG. Spatial Disparities in Coronavirus Incidence and  
753 Mortality in the United States: An Ecological Analysis as of May 2020. *J Rural Health*.  
754 2020;36(3):433-45.
- 755 85. Argoty-Pantoja AD, Robles-Rivera K, Rivera-Paredes B, Salmeron J. COVID-  
756 19 fatality in Mexico's indigenous populations. *Public Health*. 2021;193:69-75.
- 757 86. Azar KMJ, Shen Z, Romanelli RJ, Lockhart SH, Smits K, Robinson S, et al.  
758 Disparities In Outcomes Among COVID-19 Patients In A Large Health Care System  
759 In California. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2020;39(7):1253-62.
- 760 87. Baqui P, Bica I, Marra V, Ercole A, van der Schaar M. Ethnic and regional  
761 variations in hospital mortality from COVID-19 in Brazil: a cross-sectional  
762 observational study. *The Lancet Global Health*. 2020;8(8):e1018-e26.
- 763 88. Cifuentes MP, Rodriguez-Villamizar LA, Rojas-Botero ML, Alvarez-Moreno  
764 CA, Fernandez-Nino JA. Socioeconomic inequalities associated with mortality for  
765 COVID-19 in Colombia: a cohort nationwide study. *J Epidemiol Community Health*.  
766 2021.
- 767 89. Fabiani M, Mateo-Urdiales A, Andrianou X, Bella A, Del Manso M, Bellino S, et  
768 al. Epidemiological characteristics of COVID-19 cases in non-Italian nationals notified  
769 to the Italian surveillance system. *Eur J Public Health*. 2021;31(1):37-44.
- 770 90. Ferrando-Vivas P, Doidge J, Thomas K, Gould DW, Mouncey P, Shankar-Hari  
771 M, et al. Prognostic Factors for 30-Day Mortality in Critically Ill Patients With  
772 Coronavirus Disease 2019: An Observational Cohort Study. *Crit Care Med*.  
773 2021;49(1):102-11.
- 774 91. Peres IT, Bastos LSL, Gelli JGM, Marchesi JF, Dantas LF, Antunes BBP, et al.  
775 Sociodemographic factors associated with COVID-19 in-hospital mortality in Brazil.  
776 *Public Health*. 2021;192:15-20.
- 777 92. Rosenthal N, Cao Z, Gundrum J, Sianis J, Safo S. Risk Factors Associated  
778 With In-Hospital Mortality in a US National Sample of Patients With COVID-19. *JAMA*  
779 *Netw Open*. 2020;3(12):e2029058.
- 780 93. Santos MM, Lucena EES, Bonfada D, Santos AC, Vechi HT, Lima KC.  
781 Brazilian Older People Hospitalized by COVID-19: Characteristics and Prognostic  
782 Factors in a Retrospective Cohort Study. *J Appl Gerontol*. 2021;40(6):571-81.
- 783 94. Santos MM, Lucena EES, Lima KC, Brito AAC, Bay MB, Bonfada D. Survival  
784 and predictors of deaths of patients hospitalised due to COVID-19 from a  
785 retrospective and multicentre cohort study in Brazil. *Epidemiol Infect*. 2020;148:e198.
- 786 95. Telle KE, Grosland M, Helgeland J, Haberg SE. Factors associated with  
787 hospitalization, invasive mechanical ventilation treatment and death among all  
788 confirmed COVID-19 cases in Norway: Prospective cohort study. *Scand J Public*  
789 *Health*. 2021;49(1):41-7.
- 790 96. Wollenstein-Betech S, Silva AAB, Fleck JL, Cassandras CG, Paschalidis IC.  
791 Physiological and socioeconomic characteristics predict COVID-19 mortality and  
792 resource utilization in Brazil. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(10):e0240346.
- 793 97. Kim DW, Byeon KH, Kim J, Cho KD, Lee N. The Correlation of Comorbidities  
794 on the Mortality in Patients with COVID-19: an Observational Study Based on the  
795 Korean National Health Insurance Big Data. *J Korean Med Sci*. 2020;35(26):e243.

- 796 98. Hamadah H, Alahmad B, Behbehani M, Al-Youha S, Almazeedi S, Al-Haddad  
797 M, et al. COVID-19 clinical outcomes and nationality: results from a Nationwide  
798 registry in Kuwait. *BMC Public Health*. 2020;20(1):1384.
- 799 99. Patel AP, Paranjpe MD, Kathiresan NP, Rivas MA, Khera AV. Race,  
800 socioeconomic deprivation, and hospitalization for COVID-19 in English participants  
801 of a national biobank. *Int J Equity Health*. 2020;19(1):114.
- 802 100. Fisman DN, Greer AL, Hillmer M, Tuite R. Derivation and Validation of Clinical  
803 Prediction Rules for COVID-19 Mortality in Ontario, Canada. *Open Forum Infect Dis*.  
804 2020;7(11):ofaa463.
- 805 101. Guo Y, Liu X, Deng M, Liu P, Li F, Xie N, et al. Epidemiology of COVID-19 in  
806 older persons, Wuhan, China. *Age Ageing*. 2020;49(5):706-12.
- 807 102. Ibarra-Nava I, Flores-Rodriguez KG, Ruiz-Herrera V, Ochoa-Bayona HC,  
808 Salinas-Zertuche A, Padilla-Orozco M, et al. Ethnic disparities in COVID-19 mortality  
809 in Mexico: A cross-sectional study based on national data. *PLoS One*.  
810 2021;16(3):e0239168.
- 811 103. Navaratnam AV, Gray WK, Day J, Wendon J, Briggs TWR. Patient factors and  
812 temporal trends associated with COVID-19 in-hospital mortality in England: an  
813 observational study using administrative data. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine*.  
814 2021;9(4):397-406.
- 815 104. Ortiz-Prado E, Simbana-Rivera K, Barreno LG, Diaz AM, Barreto A, Moyano  
816 C, et al. Epidemiological, socio-demographic and clinical features of the early phase  
817 of the COVID-19 epidemic in Ecuador. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2021;15(1):e0008958.
- 818 105. Poulson M, Geary A, Annesi C, Allee L, Kenzik K, Sanchez S, et al. National  
819 Disparities in COVID-19 Outcomes between Black and White Americans. *J Natl Med*  
820 *Assoc*. 2021;113(2):125-32.
- 821 106. Loomba RS, Villarreal EG, Farias JS, Bronicki RA, Flores S. Pediatric  
822 Intensive Care Unit Admissions for COVID-19: Insights Using State-Level Data. *Int J*  
823 *Pediatr*. 2020;2020:9680905.
- 824 107. Millan-Guerrero RO, Caballero-Hoyos R, Monarrez-Espino J. Poverty and  
825 survival from COVID-19 in Mexico. *J Public Health (Oxf)*. 2021;43(3):437-44.
- 826 108. Ojinnaka CO, Adepoju OE, Burgess AV, Woodard L. Factors Associated with  
827 COVID-Related Mortality: the Case of Texas. *J Racial Ethn Health Disparities*.  
828 2021;8(6):1505-10.
- 829 109. Wu R, Ai S, Cai J, Zhang S, Qian ZM, Zhang Y, et al. Predictive Model and  
830 Risk Factors for Case Fatality of COVID-19: A Cohort of 21,392 Cases in Hubei,  
831 China. *Innovation (Camb)*. 2020;1(2):100022.
- 832 110. Akanbi MO, Rivera AS, Akanbi FO, Shoyinka A. An Ecologic Study of  
833 Disparities in COVID-19 Incidence and Case Fatality in Oakland County, MI, USA,  
834 During a State-Mandated Shutdown. *J Racial Ethn Health Disparities*.  
835 2021;8(6):1467-74.
- 836 111. Bergman J, Ballin M, Nordstrom A, Nordstrom P. Risk factors for COVID-19  
837 diagnosis, hospitalization, and subsequent all-cause mortality in Sweden: a  
838 nationwide study. *Eur J Epidemiol*. 2021;36(3):287-98.
- 839 112. Elimian KO, Ochu CL, Ebhodaghe B, Myles P, Crawford EE, Igumbor E, et al.  
840 Patient characteristics associated with COVID-19 positivity and fatality in Nigeria:  
841 retrospective cohort study. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10(12):e044079.
- 842 113. Mak JKL, Kuja-Halkola R, Wang Y, Hagg S, Jylhava J. Frailty and comorbidity  
843 in predicting community COVID-19 mortality in the U.K. Biobank: The effect of  
844 sampling. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2021;69(5):1128-39.

- 845 114. Mehta HB, Li S, Goodwin JS. Risk Factors Associated With SARS-CoV-2  
846 Infections, Hospitalization, and Mortality Among US Nursing Home Residents. *JAMA*  
847 *Netw Open*. 2021;4(3):e216315.
- 848 115. Mendez-Dominguez N, Alvarez-Baeza A, Carrillo G. Demographic and Health  
849 Indicators in Correlation to Interstate Variability of Incidence, Confirmation,  
850 Hospitalization, and Lethality in Mexico: Preliminary Analysis from Imported and  
851 Community Acquired Cases during COVID-19 Outbreak. *Int J Environ Res Public*  
852 *Health*. 2020;17(12).
- 853 116. Lewis NM FM, Wagstaff S, et al. . Disparities in COVID-19 Incidence,  
854 Hospitalizations, and Testing, by Area-Level Deprivation — Utah, March 3–July 9,  
855 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020.69:1369–73.
- 856 117. Zelner J, Trangucci R, Naraharisetti R, Cao A, Malosh R, Broen K, et al. Racial  
857 Disparities in Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Mortality Are Driven by Unequal  
858 Infection Risks. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2021;72(5):e88-e95.
- 859 118. ICD-11 International Classification of Diseases 11th Revision - The global  
860 standard for diagnostic health information: World Health Organisation; [Available  
861 from: <https://icd.who.int/en>.
- 862 119. Raisi-Estabragh Z, McCracken C, Bethell MS, Cooper J, Cooper C, Caulfield  
863 MJ, et al. Greater risk of severe COVID-19 in Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic  
864 populations is not explained by cardiometabolic, socioeconomic or behavioural  
865 factors, or by 25(OH)-vitamin D status: study of 1326 cases from the UK Biobank. *J*  
866 *Public Health (Oxf)*. 2020;42(3):451-60.
- 867 120. Bassett MT, Chen JT, Krieger N. Correction: Variation in racial/ethnic  
868 disparities in COVID-19 mortality by age in the United States: A cross-sectional  
869 study. *PLoS Med*. 2021;18(2):e1003541.
- 870 121. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality R, MD. Defining Health Systems  
871 2023 [Available from: <https://www.ahrq.gov/chsp/defining-health-systems/index.html>
- 872 122. Angelici L, Sorge C, Di Martino M, Cappai G, Stafoggia M, Agabiti N, et al.  
873 Incidence of SARS-CoV-2 Infection and Related Mortality by Education Level during  
874 Three Phases of the 2020 Pandemic: A Population-Based Cohort Study in Rome. *J*  
875 *Clin Med*. 2022;11(3).
- 876 123. Backer S, Rezene A, Kahar P, Khanna D. Socioeconomic Determinants of  
877 COVID-19 Incidence and Mortality in Florida. *Cureus*. 2022;14(2):e22491.
- 878 124. Hallak J, Teixeira TA, Barrozo LV, Singer J, Kallas EG, Saldiva PH. Male sex  
879 rather than socioeconomic vulnerability as a determinant for COVID-19 death in Sao  
880 Paulo: A population-based study. *SAGE Open Med*. 2022;10:20503121221105583.
- 881 125. Pereira FAC, Filho F, de Azevedo AR, de Oliveira GL, Flores-Ortiz R, Valencia  
882 LIO, et al. Profile of COVID-19 in Brazil-risk factors and socioeconomic vulnerability  
883 associated with disease outcome: retrospective analysis of population-based  
884 registers. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2022;7(12).
- 885 126. Ribeiro KB, Ribeiro AF, Veras M, de Castro MC. Social inequalities and  
886 COVID-19 mortality in the city of Sao Paulo, Brazil. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2021;50(3):732-  
887 42.
- 888 127. Riou J, Panczak R, Althaus CL, Junker C, Perisa D, Schneider K, et al.  
889 Socioeconomic position and the COVID-19 care cascade from testing to mortality in  
890 Switzerland: a population-based analysis. *Lancet Public Health*. 2021;6(9):e683-e91.
- 891 128. Stordal K, Ruiz PL, Greve-Isdahl M, Suren P, Knudsen PK, Gulseth HL, et al.  
892 Risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 infection and hospitalisation in children and adolescents  
893 in Norway: a nationwide population-based study. *BMJ Open*. 2022;12(3):e056549.

- 894 129. Surendra H, Salama N, Lestari KD, Adrian V, Widyastuti W, Oktavia D, et al.  
895 Pandemic inequity in a megacity: a multilevel analysis of individual, community and  
896 healthcare vulnerability risks for COVID-19 mortality in Jakarta, Indonesia. *BMJ Glob*  
897 *Health*. 2022;7(6).
- 898 130. Vandentorren S, Smaili S, Chatignoux E, Maurel M, Alleaume C, Neufcourt L,  
899 et al. The effect of social deprivation on the dynamic of SARS-CoV-2 infection in  
900 France: a population-based analysis. *Lancet Public Health*. 2022;7(3):e240-e9.
- 901 131. Wang L, Calzavara A, Baral S, Smylie J, Chan AK, Sander B, et al. Differential  
902 Patterns by Area-Level Social Determinants of Health in Coronavirus Disease 2019  
903 (COVID-19)-Related Mortality and Non-COVID-19 Mortality: A Population-Based  
904 Study of 11.8 Million People in Ontario, Canada. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2023;76(6):1110-20.
- 905 132. Victora CG, Vaughan JP, Barros FC, Silva AC, Tomasi E. Explaining trends in  
906 inequities: evidence from Brazilian child health studies. *The Lancet*.  
907 2000;356(9235):1093-8.
- 908 133. Mackey K, Ayers CK, Kondo KK, Saha S, Advani SM, Young S, et al. Racial  
909 and Ethnic Disparities in COVID-19-Related Infections, Hospitalizations, and Deaths :  
910 A Systematic Review. *Ann Intern Med*. 2021;174(3):362-73.
- 911 134. Magesh S, John D, Li WT, Li Y, Mattingly-App A, Jain S, et al. Disparities in  
912 COVID-19 Outcomes by Race, Ethnicity, and Socioeconomic Status: A Systematic-  
913 Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4(11):e2134147.
- 914 135. Shokraneh F. Reproducibility and replicability of systematic reviews. *World J*  
915 *Meta-Anal* 2019;7(3):66-71.
- 916 136. Schisterman EF, Cole SR, Platt RW. Overadjustment bias and unnecessary  
917 adjustment in epidemiologic studies. *Epidemiology*. 2009;20(4):488-95.
- 918 137. Shabnam S, Razieh C, Dambha-Miller H, Yates T, Gillies C, Chudasama YV,  
919 et al. Socioeconomic inequalities of Long COVID: a retrospective population-based  
920 cohort study in the United Kingdom. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*.  
921 2023;116(8):263-73.

922



PRISMA 2020 flow diagram (adjusted)



## Geographical distribution of population-based studies





**Study Design**

- Case Control\_Individual level
- Cohort\_Area level
- Cohort\_Individual level
- Cross-Sectional\_Area level
- Cross-sectional\_Individual level
- Individual Cross-sectional

**Count**

- 5
- 10
- 15
- 20



#### Study Design

- Case Control\_Individual level
- Cohort\_Area level
- Cohort\_Individual level
- Cross-Sectional\_Area level
- Cross-sectional\_Individual level

#### Count

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7