

Does hospital overload increase the risk of death for COVID-19 patients?

Supplementary information

Benjamin Glemain Charles Assaad Walid Ghosn
Paul Moulaire Xavier de Lamballerie Marie Zins
Gianluca Severi Mathilde Touvier Jean-François Deleuze
SAPRIS-SERO study group Nathanaël Lapidus Fabrice Carrat

Table of contents

Flowchart	2
Number of serological samples for each department and age group	3
Departmental estimates and characteristics	6
Incidence, infection fatality rate (IFR) and infection hospitalization rate (IHR)	6
Departmental characteristics (data)	10
Complementary results	13
Univariate analysis	13
Role of the confounders (association between incidence, IFR and IHR)	14
Computation of expectations	15
Expected proportion of persons over 60 in the infected given incidence in the 20-59 in a department with the same age structure as metropolitan France	15
Expected causal effect of incidence on IFR and IHR	15
Posterior predictive checks	17
Stan code	22

Flowchart




Figure 1: Flowchart of the participants of SAPRIS-SERO

Number of serological samples for each department and age group

Table 1: Number of serological samples for each department and age group

Code	Department	Age group	
		Under 60	Over 60
1	Ain	244	120
2	Aisne	66	65
3	Allier	63	62
4	Alpes De Haute Provence	43	59
5	Hautes Alpes	42	46
6	Alpes Maritimes	256	240
7	Ardeche	91	74
8	Ardennes	41	30
9	Ariege	36	33
10	Aube	60	109
11	Aude	67	160
12	Aveyron	64	130
13	Bouches Du Rhone	1265	1381
14	Calvados	648	605
15	Cantal	35	49
16	Charente	623	752
17	Charente Maritime	156	451
18	Cher	68	133
19	Correze	62	93
20	Corse	38	47
21	Cote D Or	213	354
22	Cotes D Armor	890	954
23	Creuse	13	48
24	Dordogne	83	208
25	Doubs	182	279
26	Drome	167	301
27	Eure	91	197
28	Eure Et Loir	88	138
29	Finistere	302	477
30	Gard	633	742
31	Haute Garonne	2147	1585
32	Gers	57	98
33	Gironde	1869	1570

Table 1: Number of serological samples for each department and age group (*continued*)

Code	Department	Age group	
		Under 60	Over 60
34	Herauld	386	664
35	Ille Et Vilaine	1512	988
36	Indre	35	78
37	Indre Et Loire	1162	1198
38	Iserre	639	711
39	Jura	69	121
40	Landes	104	235
41	Loir Et Cher	88	155
42	Loire	199	321
43	Haute Loire	51	68
44	Loire Atlantique	1294	1114
45	Loiret	927	870
46	Lot	50	97
47	Lot Et Garonne	71	143
48	Lozere	24	32
49	Maine Et Loire	240	328
50	Manche	101	196
51	Marne	152	240
52	Haute Marne	26	63
53	Mayenne	52	79
54	Meurthe Et Moselle	1687	1338
55	Meuse	38	85
56	Morbihan	232	441
57	Moselle	249	343
58	Nievre	41	86
59	Nord	1675	1261
60	Oise	142	198
61	Orne	40	80
62	Pas De Calais	479	547
63	Puy De Dome	249	331
64	Pyrenees Atlantiques	1026	948
65	Hautes Pyrenees	60	123
66	Pyrenees Orientales	98	239
67	Bas Rhin	399	421
68	Haut Rhin	905	541

Table 1: Number of serological samples for each department and age group (*continued*)

Code	Depatment	Age group	
		Under 60	Over 60
69	Rhone	2472	1767
70	Haute Saone	42	109
71	Saone Et Loire	137	276
72	Sarthe	553	481
73	Savoie	146	253
74	Haute Savoie	308	315
75	Paris	4799	2834
76	Seine Maritime	292	450
77	Seine Et Marne	338	452
78	Yvelines	670	701
79	Deux Sevres	93	155
80	Somme	98	154
81	Tarn	98	207
82	Tarn Et Garonne	53	101
83	Var	263	529
84	Vaucluse	115	305
85	Vendee	131	253
86	Vienne	785	673
87	Haute Vienne	117	188
88	Vosges	93	153
89	Yonne	331	338
90	Territoire De Belfort	35	72
91	Essonne	490	643
92	Hauts De Seine	1029	766
93	Seine Saint Denis	408	272
94	Val De Marne	650	581
95	Val D Oise	259	342

Departmental estimates and characteristics

Incidence, infection fatality rate (IFR) and infection hospitalization rate (IHR)

Table 2: Departmental incidence, infection fatality rate and infection hospitalization rate.
Mean, q2.5, q97.5: mean of the posterior distribution and bounds of the credible interval.

		Incidence (%)			IFR (%)			IHR (%)		
		Mean	q2.5	q97.5	Mean	q2.5	q97.5	Mean	q2.5	q97.5
1	Ain	7.14	5.98	8.44	0.77	0.63	0.94	1.85	1.52	2.22
2	Aisne	8.94	7.63	10.33	1.39	1.17	1.63	4.21	3.61	4.91
3	Allier	4.25	3.34	5.27	0.51	0.37	0.67	2.32	1.81	2.97
4	Alpes De Haute Provence	4.73	3.71	5.90	0.44	0.31	0.60	2.53	1.96	3.26
5	Hautes Alpes	5.11	4.01	6.39	0.43	0.29	0.59	2.54	1.95	3.25
6	Alpes Maritimes	4.97	4.05	5.97	0.57	0.46	0.70	2.34	1.91	2.88
7	Ardeche	7.76	6.51	9.15	1.33	1.09	1.60	3.33	2.78	3.98
8	Ardennes	6.43	5.22	7.75	0.76	0.60	0.96	2.79	2.26	3.46
9	Ariege	2.53	1.78	3.41	0.30	0.18	0.45	1.48	1.01	2.13
10	Aube	8.28	7.06	9.69	0.77	0.62	0.94	4.93	4.15	5.78
11	Aude	5.28	4.28	6.36	0.76	0.60	0.96	2.90	2.34	3.56
12	Aveyron	4.35	3.44	5.36	0.67	0.51	0.88	1.85	1.43	2.37
13	Bouches Du Rhone	5.99	5.19	6.84	0.71	0.61	0.83	4.73	4.11	5.44
14	Calvados	4.99	4.17	5.88	0.39	0.31	0.49	1.80	1.49	2.17
15	Cantal	3.39	2.55	4.33	0.39	0.25	0.55	1.84	1.34	2.48
16	Charente	3.41	2.73	4.16	0.44	0.32	0.58	1.19	0.91	1.53
17	Charente Maritime	3.78	2.99	4.66	0.47	0.36	0.61	1.59	1.24	2.01
18	Cher	6.10	4.99	7.32	1.10	0.88	1.35	2.21	1.79	2.72
19	Correze	4.54	3.61	5.55	0.68	0.51	0.89	2.53	1.99	3.21
20	Corse	5.47	4.42	6.63	0.51	0.39	0.66	2.73	2.20	3.37
21	Cote D Or	8.46	7.30	9.76	1.06	0.90	1.25	3.84	3.28	4.45
22	Cotes D Armor	3.54	2.85	4.32	0.46	0.35	0.60	1.70	1.34	2.14
23	Creuse	4.32	3.34	5.42	0.64	0.44	0.88	2.69	2.02	3.55
24	Dordogne	3.13	2.41	3.93	0.43	0.31	0.58	1.75	1.33	2.29
25	Doubs	8.69	7.42	10.12	1.25	1.05	1.48	2.25	1.90	2.66
26	Drome	6.92	5.84	8.12	0.76	0.63	0.92	2.67	2.24	3.17
27	Eure	5.83	4.76	6.93	0.84	0.68	1.03	1.42	1.16	1.75
28	Eure Et Loir	7.49	6.37	8.71	0.99	0.83	1.18	3.15	2.65	3.71

Table 2: Departmental incidence, infection fatality rate and infection hospitalization rate.
Mean, q2.5, q97.5: mean of the posterior distribution and bounds of the credible interval. (*continued*)

		Incidence (%)			IFR (%)			IHR (%)		
		Mean	q2.5	q97.5	Mean	q2.5	q97.5	Mean	q2.5	q97.5
29	Finistere	3.04	2.32	3.86	0.32	0.24	0.43	1.12	0.84	1.46
30	Gard	4.35	3.59	5.16	0.73	0.59	0.90	1.84	1.51	2.23
31	Haute Garonne	3.94	3.32	4.58	0.27	0.21	0.33	1.77	1.49	2.11
32	Gers	4.71	3.71	5.82	0.79	0.59	1.04	2.02	1.55	2.59
33	Gironde	4.74	4.07	5.43	0.42	0.35	0.50	2.27	1.95	2.65
34	Herault	4.77	3.91	5.68	0.52	0.42	0.65	2.01	1.65	2.44
35	Ille Et Vilaine	4.58	3.88	5.32	0.38	0.30	0.47	1.63	1.37	1.96
36	Indre	7.10	5.80	8.50	1.48	1.20	1.83	2.32	1.87	2.87
37	Indre Et Loire	5.34	4.59	6.13	0.59	0.48	0.71	2.01	1.70	2.36
38	Isere	5.60	4.74	6.50	0.64	0.53	0.76	1.78	1.50	2.10
39	Jura	7.36	6.17	8.70	0.90	0.72	1.10	2.72	2.24	3.28
40	Landes	2.89	2.15	3.74	0.36	0.25	0.49	1.06	0.77	1.43
41	Loir Et Cher	5.92	4.94	6.97	0.81	0.65	1.00	2.80	2.32	3.38
42	Loire	7.33	6.24	8.49	1.17	0.99	1.38	3.24	2.75	3.79
43	Haute Loire	4.22	3.31	5.27	0.44	0.31	0.60	2.13	1.64	2.76
44	Loire Atlantique	5.55	4.74	6.39	0.50	0.42	0.60	1.55	1.32	1.82
45	Loiret	5.95	5.11	6.82	0.55	0.45	0.66	2.80	2.39	3.28
46	Lot	4.34	3.39	5.43	0.56	0.41	0.76	3.19	2.47	4.10
47	Lot Et Garonne	2.75	2.05	3.52	0.34	0.23	0.48	1.40	1.03	1.89
48	Lozere	3.20	2.28	4.22	0.30	0.18	0.47	1.31	0.87	1.90
49	Maine Et Loire	5.88	4.91	6.89	0.67	0.56	0.82	2.26	1.89	2.69
50	Manche	4.21	3.34	5.20	0.48	0.36	0.62	1.54	1.20	1.96
51	Marne	9.08	7.87	10.42	1.16	0.98	1.35	3.70	3.19	4.26
52	Haute Marne	9.00	7.69	10.57	1.39	1.14	1.67	3.83	3.19	4.54
53	Mayenne	5.24	4.18	6.43	0.52	0.39	0.68	2.00	1.58	2.53
54	Meurthe Et Moselle	8.02	7.17	8.94	0.99	0.86	1.13	3.93	3.49	4.42
55	Meuse	10.06	8.70	11.62	1.29	1.06	1.54	5.20	4.44	6.01
56	Morbihan	4.60	3.70	5.60	0.47	0.36	0.59	1.86	1.50	2.32
57	Moselle	10.48	9.16	12.00	1.41	1.22	1.61	4.23	3.67	4.83
58	Nievre	4.68	3.62	5.87	0.86	0.64	1.14	1.87	1.41	2.45
59	Nord	6.00	5.18	6.83	0.80	0.69	0.94	3.02	2.63	3.49
60	Oise	8.93	7.66	10.31	1.21	1.03	1.42	3.14	2.68	3.66

Table 2: Departmental incidence, infection fatality rate and infection hospitalization rate.
Mean, q2.5, q97.5: mean of the posterior distribution and bounds of the credible interval. (*continued*)

		Incidence (%)			IFR (%)			IHR (%)		
		Mean	q2.5	q97.5	Mean	q2.5	q97.5	Mean	q2.5	q97.5
61	Orne	5.38	4.36	6.49	0.60	0.46	0.77	2.73	2.21	3.38
62	Pas De Calais	6.09	5.09	7.14	0.79	0.66	0.95	2.97	2.51	3.53
63	Puy De Dome	4.02	3.22	4.90	0.46	0.36	0.59	1.30	1.02	1.62
64	Pyrenees Atlantiques	3.86	3.18	4.61	0.36	0.27	0.46	1.31	1.06	1.62
65	Hautes Pyrenees	5.07	4.01	6.25	0.78	0.60	1.00	2.15	1.67	2.72
66	Pyrenees Orientales	3.66	2.78	4.62	0.42	0.31	0.57	2.68	2.06	3.49
67	Bas Rhin	10.67	9.34	12.26	1.17	1.00	1.34	3.78	3.27	4.31
68	Haut Rhin	13.60	12.12	15.22	1.97	1.74	2.22	5.20	4.60	5.84
69	Rhone	7.57	6.73	8.42	1.14	1.01	1.29	4.11	3.68	4.62
70	Haute Saone	8.42	7.13	9.89	1.27	1.04	1.53	2.50	2.05	2.99
71	Saone Et Loire	6.90	5.84	8.03	1.05	0.87	1.25	3.85	3.26	4.54
72	Sarthe	5.31	4.44	6.20	0.64	0.51	0.78	2.42	2.02	2.90
73	Savoie	6.43	5.31	7.67	0.53	0.42	0.66	2.33	1.92	2.83
74	Haute Savoie	7.49	6.28	8.82	0.77	0.64	0.93	2.29	1.91	2.73
75	Paris	10.12	9.34	10.97	1.10	1.00	1.20	5.15	4.73	5.60
76	Seine Maritime	5.17	4.24	6.13	0.59	0.48	0.72	2.24	1.86	2.73
77	Seine Et Marne	9.82	8.62	11.17	1.04	0.90	1.19	3.60	3.15	4.10
78	Yvelines	9.43	8.28	10.68	1.13	0.99	1.30	3.19	2.79	3.62
79	Deux Sevres	3.51	2.71	4.39	0.42	0.30	0.57	1.20	0.90	1.58
80	Somme	8.03	6.82	9.34	1.24	1.05	1.48	3.16	2.67	3.72
81	Tarn	3.76	2.92	4.68	0.46	0.34	0.61	1.39	1.06	1.80
82	Tarn Et Garonne	2.96	2.20	3.80	0.36	0.24	0.51	1.02	0.72	1.42
83	Var	5.12	4.24	6.07	0.63	0.51	0.77	2.58	2.14	3.10
84	Vaucluse	4.65	3.76	5.62	0.40	0.30	0.51	1.79	1.44	2.22
85	Vendee	4.19	3.35	5.13	0.49	0.38	0.62	1.61	1.28	2.02
86	Vienne	4.47	3.72	5.28	0.42	0.32	0.54	1.38	1.12	1.70
87	Haute Vienne	3.75	2.85	4.73	0.47	0.34	0.64	1.61	1.21	2.13
88	Vosges	10.85	9.35	12.68	1.63	1.37	1.91	3.28	2.77	3.83
89	Yonne	6.66	5.64	7.77	1.05	0.87	1.28	2.82	2.35	3.36
90	Territoire De Belfort	11.49	10.05	13.25	1.37	1.12	1.63	5.92	5.09	6.79
91	Essonne	9.70	8.52	10.98	1.20	1.04	1.37	3.66	3.21	4.16
92	Hauts De Seine	10.98	9.85	12.21	1.18	1.05	1.33	4.82	4.30	5.37

Table 2: Departmental incidence, infection fatality rate and infection hospitalization rate.
Mean, q2.5, q97.5: mean of the posterior distribution and bounds of the credible interval. (*continued*)

		Incidence (%)			IFR (%)			IHR (%)		
		Mean	q2.5	q97.5	Mean	q2.5	q97.5	Mean	q2.5	q97.5
93	Seine Saint Denis	10.76	9.31	12.36	1.23	1.06	1.42	4.52	3.92	5.21
94	Val De Marne	11.75	10.48	13.15	1.27	1.12	1.43	5.18	4.60	5.80
95	Val D Oise	10.44	9.10	11.94	1.41	1.22	1.62	3.99	3.46	4.57

Departmental characteristics (data)

Table 3: Departmental characteristics (data). Pop.: Size of the adult population. ICU beds: Number of intensive care beds per 1,000 inhabitant. Diabetes: Prevalence of diabetes. Pop. 60: Proportion of the population over 60. Deaths: Number of deaths attributed to COVID-19. Hospit.: Number of hospitalization attributed to COVID-19.

Code	Depatment	Pop.	ICU beds	Diabetes	Pop. 60	Deaths	Hospit.
1	Ain	487636	0.13	4.33 %	32 %	268	635
2	Aisne	398119	0.31	6.72 %	37 %	494	1492
3	Allier	266989	0.29	6.85 %	44 %	53	261
4	Alpes De Haute Provence	130747	0.12	5.42 %	43 %	23	158
5	Hautes Alpes	110923	0.24	4.32 %	42 %	21	146
6	Alpes Maritimes	865545	0.52	5.42 %	39 %	243	997
7	Ardeche	257083	0.20	5.43 %	42 %	271	662
8	Ardennes	206499	0.22	6.72 %	38 %	98	367
9	Ariege	122112	0.18	5.6 %	43 %	5	45
10	Aube	235127	0.29	5.95 %	37 %	143	963
11	Aude	295187	0.24	6.34 %	43 %	119	450
12	Aveyron	223024	0.22	5.08 %	44 %	69	177
13	Bouches Du Rhone	1567212	0.60	5.78 %	35 %	668	4428
14	Calvados	533685	0.50	4.88 %	37 %	100	474
15	Cantal	116890	0.38	5.76 %	45 %	12	72
16	Charente	277989	0.23	5.72 %	42 %	40	108
17	Charente Maritime	522684	0.22	5.61 %	45 %	91	309
18	Cher	237185	0.30	6.68 %	42 %	162	314
19	Correze	191475	0.37	6.11 %	44 %	60	219
20	Corse	274777	0.23	5.04 %	38 %	74	409
21	Cote D Or	413687	0.63	5.07 %	36 %	371	1339
22	Cotes D Armor	468624	0.18	4.29 %	43 %	78	280
23	Creuse	94918	0.29	7.37 %	48 %	24	111
24	Dordogne	334270	0.21	6.29 %	46 %	42	181
25	Doubs	410960	0.67	4.96 %	34 %	448	791
26	Drome	393336	0.25	5.26 %	38 %	206	722
27	Eure	446217	0.11	5.3 %	35 %	220	361
28	Eure Et Loir	322625	0.26	5.62 %	36 %	240	757
29	Finistere	713244	0.32	3.89 %	39 %	69	236
30	Gard	579457	0.31	5.69 %	39 %	188	458
31	Haute Garonne	1081415	0.62	3.93 %	29 %	108	748

Table 3: Departmental characteristics (data). Pop.: Size of the adult population. ICU beds: Number of intensive care beds per 1,000 inhabitant. Diabetes: Prevalence of diabetes. Pop. 60: Proportion of the population over 60. Deaths: Number of deaths attributed to COVID-19. Hospit.: Number of hospitalization attributed to COVID-19. (*continued*)

Code	Deatpment	Pop.	ICU beds	Diabetes	Pop. 60	Deaths	Hospit.
32	Gers	152962	0.13	5.41 %	45 %	62	144
33	Gironde	1259223	0.47	4.53 %	33 %	249	1349
34	Herault	918558	0.57	5.15 %	36 %	227	870
35	Ille Et Vilaine	815134	0.38	3.07 %	32 %	141	607
36	Indre	174947	0.23	6.95 %	45 %	191	281
37	Indre Et Loire	469886	0.59	5.06 %	37 %	147	498
38	Iserre	953296	0.27	4.75 %	33 %	340	940
39	Jura	200336	0.14	5.3 %	40 %	132	399
40	Landes	330021	0.18	5.62 %	42 %	31	96
41	Loir Et Cher	254990	0.22	6.21 %	42 %	122	421
42	Loire	581757	0.38	5.53 %	38 %	503	1373
43	Haute Loire	176577	0.18	5.36 %	41 %	30	159
44	Loire Atlantique	1082428	0.34	3.61 %	33 %	299	923
45	Loiret	510770	0.47	5.54 %	35 %	161	847
46	Lot	141616	0.16	5.76 %	47 %	34	202
47	Lot Et Garonne	260024	0.25	5.75 %	43 %	21	97
48	Lozere	60607	0.10	4.76 %	41 %	2	24
49	Maine Et Loire	613033	0.39	4.29 %	36 %	244	808
50	Manche	386850	0.23	4.89 %	41 %	77	247
51	Marne	430280	0.39	5.78 %	34 %	449	1436
52	Haute Marne	135508	0.37	6.72 %	42 %	170	463
53	Mayenne	230099	0.13	3.9 %	38 %	63	240
54	Meurthe Et Moselle	562144	0.62	5.54 %	34 %	445	1769
55	Meuse	141967	0.21	6.12 %	40 %	181	745
56	Morbihan	594042	0.21	4.21 %	41 %	126	505
57	Moselle	814411	0.29	6.18 %	35 %	1194	3589
58	Nievre	163421	0.29	7.94 %	47 %	66	137
59	Nord	1926717	0.50	5.76 %	31 %	928	3478
60	Oise	610459	0.21	5.5 %	32 %	661	1699
61	Orne	217351	0.23	5.82 %	43 %	68	319
62	Pas De Calais	1089833	0.36	6.36 %	35 %	522	1959
63	Puy De Dome	512938	0.44	5.14 %	37 %	95	260
64	Pyrenees Atlantiques	542011	0.34	4.74 %	40 %	72	269

Table 3: Departmental characteristics (data). Pop.: Size of the adult population. ICU beds: Number of intensive care beds per 1,000 inhabitant. Diabetes: Prevalence of diabetes. Pop. 60: Proportion of the population over 60. Deaths: Number of deaths attributed to COVID-19. Hospit.: Number of hospitalization attributed to COVID-19. (*continued*)

Code	Depatment	Pop.	ICU beds	Diabetes	Pop. 60	Deaths	Hospit.
65	Hautes Pyrenees	183708	0.39	5.6 %	43 %	76	197
66	Pyrenees Orientales	377631	0.28	5.93 %	42 %	55	370
67	Bas Rhin	886074	0.52	5.71 %	33 %	1092	3556
68	Haut Rhin	589919	0.42	5.74 %	35 %	1573	4153
69	Rhone	1407653	0.51	4.55 %	30 %	1218	4379
70	Haute Saone	180375	0.27	6.04 %	39 %	194	372
71	Saone Et Loire	431699	0.26	6.44 %	43 %	312	1144
72	Sarthe	429348	0.22	5.25 %	38 %	145	549
73	Savoie	338016	0.25	4.22 %	35 %	111	502
74	Haute Savoie	628526	0.26	3.67 %	30 %	364	1067
75	Paris	1740626	0.83	4.04 %	28 %	1929	9071
76	Seine Maritime	949467	0.46	5.54 %	35 %	286	1091
77	Seine Et Marne	1037205	0.25	4.96 %	28 %	1050	3651
78	Yvelines	1062664	0.28	4.23 %	30 %	1131	3179
79	Deux Sevres	288272	0.17	5.32 %	40 %	41	117
80	Somme	431476	0.57	6.2 %	35 %	432	1085
81	Tarn	305490	0.33	5.12 %	42 %	53	155
82	Tarn Et Garonne	198708	0.28	5.21 %	38 %	20	55
83	Var	859946	0.25	5.69 %	42 %	275	1127
84	Vaucluse	429524	0.31	5.87 %	38 %	73	352
85	Vendee	533161	0.21	5.08 %	42 %	108	355
86	Vienne	337739	0.49	4.87 %	37 %	61	203
87	Haute Vienne	293360	0.75	5.96 %	40 %	50	171
88	Vosges	283485	0.21	5.95 %	41 %	500	999
89	Yonne	258366	0.26	6.56 %	41 %	183	481
90	Territoire De Belfort	106390	0.54	5.31 %	35 %	163	728
91	Essonne	952194	0.33	4.62 %	29 %	1104	3367
92	Hauts De Seine	1224112	0.54	3.99 %	27 %	1584	6454
93	Seine Saint Denis	1174096	0.30	5.87 %	24 %	1542	5685
94	Val De Marne	1048359	0.48	4.74 %	28 %	1554	6357
95	Val D Oise	894870	0.20	5.32 %	27 %	1312	3710

Complementary results

Univariate analysis

In univariate analysis, a departmental incidence of 3% was associated with an IFR of 0.41% (95% CI: 0.33-0.49%), and an incidence of 9% was associated with an IFR of 1.09% (95% CI: 0.94-1.28%). The absolute difference was 0.69% (95% CI: 0.52-0.89%).

An incidence of 3% was associated with an IHR of 1.57% (95% CI: 1.27-1.89%), and an incidence of 9% was associated with an IHR of 3.55% (95% CI: 3.08-4.08%). The absolute difference was 1.98% (95% CI: 1.43-2.60%).

Role of the confounders (association between incidence, IFR and IHR)

Table 4: Posterior mean and 95% CI of the parameters of equation 14 (main manuscript, Methods section). Covariates are considered at the departmental scale. Age: Proportion of the population over 60. Diabetes: Prevalence of diabetes. Beds: Number of intensive care beds per 1,000 inhabitant.

Outcome	Covariate	Parameter	mean	q2.5	q97.5
IFR	Age	c_{age}	0.452	-2.790	3.869
IFR	Beds	c_{beds}	-0.054	-0.710	0.619
IFR	Diabetes	c_{diab}	16.402	1.255	31.260
IHR	Age	d_{age}	0.061	-3.584	3.880
IHR	Beds	d_{beds}	0.501	-0.230	1.244
IHR	Diabetes	d_{diab}	12.381	-4.701	28.482

Computation of expectations

Expected proportion of persons over 60 in the infected given incidence in the 20-59 in a department with the same age structure as metropolitan France

On the logit scale, the distribution of incidence in persons over 60 (logit U_1) is normal given an incidence u_0 in the 20-59 (following equation 7 of the article):

$$\text{logit } U_1|u_0 \sim N(\text{logit } u_0 + \mu_{\text{age}} + (\text{logit } u_0) \times b_{\text{age}}, \sigma_{\text{age}})$$

Thus, the expectation of logit U_1 given u_0 is:

$$E[\text{logit } U_1|u_0] = \text{logit } u_0 + \mu_{\text{age}} + (\text{logit } u_0) \times b_{\text{age}}$$

As the logistic transformation is non-linear, in general the expectation of the transformed variable is not the transformation of the expectation:

$$E[U_1|u_0] \neq \text{logit}^{-1} E[\text{logit } U_1|u_0] \quad (\text{in general})$$

To overcome this limitation, the expectation $E[U_1|u_0]$ was approximated for each MCMC iteration by drawing 10,000 random values $u_1^*(u_0)$ from $P(\text{logit } U_1|u_0)$, then for each of these values, applying the logistic transformation and computing $\text{age}_{\text{infected}}^*(u_0)$, the proportion of persons over 60 among those infected given u_0 for a department with the same age structure as metropolitan France ($\text{age}_{\text{pop, France}}$):

$$\text{age}_{\text{infected}}^*(u_0) = \frac{u_1^*(u_0) \times \text{age}_{\text{pop, France}}}{u_1^*(u_0) \times \text{age}_{\text{pop, France}} + u_0 \times (1 - \text{age}_{\text{pop, France}})}$$

The 10,000 $\text{age}_{\text{infected}}^*(u_0)$ were averaged to obtain $E[U_1|u_0]$.

Expected causal effect of incidence on IFR and IHR

The linear predictor of IFR given incidence x and given the covariates has a normal distribution (following equation 14 of the manuscript):

$$g_{\text{IFR}}|x, \text{diab}, \text{age}_{\text{pop}}, \text{beds} \sim N(m_{\text{IFR}} + x \times c_p + \text{diab} \times c_{\text{diab}} + \text{age}_{\text{pop}} \times c_{\text{age}} + \text{beds} \times c_{\text{beds}}, \sigma_{\text{IFR}})$$

Thus, the conditional expectation of this linear predictor is:

$$E[g_{\text{IFR}}|x, \text{diab}, \text{age}_{\text{pop}}, \text{beds}] = m_{\text{IFR}} + x \times c_p + \text{diab} \times c_{\text{diab}} + \text{age}_{\text{pop}} \times c_{\text{age}} + \text{beds} \times c_{\text{beds}}$$

The conditional expectation after logistic transformation was computed according to the same sampling procedure as for the proportion of persons over 60 among the infected, providing $E[\text{IFR}|x, \text{diab}, \text{age}_{\text{pop}}, \text{beds}]$ for any x , diab , age_{pop} , and beds .

Following equation 15 of the manuscript, using the linearity of expectation, and using j as an index for departments,

$$E[\text{IFR}|do(x)] = \frac{1}{95} \sum_{j=1}^{95} E[\text{IFR}|x, \text{diab}_j, \text{age}_{\text{pop},j}, \text{beds}_j]$$

The same procedure was used to compute the expected adjusted IHR given incidence.

Posterior predictive checks

Synthetic serological data, hospitalization counts, and death counts were drawn from the posterior predictive distribution to:

- Check the model versus the actual data
- Illustrate the importance of the Bayesian statistical framework in this study

The number of synthetic serological samples in each department is identical to the one in the actual data.

Figure 2, Figure 3, and Figure 4 consist in the comparison of the actual data against three randomly chosen HMC iterations in plots mimicking those presented in the article (but solely based on data). Naive linear regressions (naive in that they consider each department as a data point) were performed to show the linear relation between the two variables of each plot.

In Figure 2, Figure 3, and Figure 4, sampling variation leads to a spurious negative association between the quantity represented on the x-axis and the quantity represented on the y-axis. Indeed, the quantity represented on the x-axis is in the denominator of the quantity on the y-axis. Thus, when the quantity represented on the x-axis varies, the quantity represented on the y-axis tends to vary in the opposite direction. In the article, accounting for the variability of the latent variables used in the regressions highlighted a positive relationship between the variables, as observed below for the departments with the most serological data (the large points in Figure 2, Figure 3, and Figure 4).

Figure 5 shows that the value of the regression slope based on the actual data falls between the 2.5% and 97.5% quantiles of the distribution of regression slopes based on 1,000 posterior predictive draws, which satisfies the posterior predictive checks.




Figure 2: Posterior predictive check for the association between the proportion of positive serological samples in persons under 60 and the proportion of persons above 60 in the seropositive (mimicks Figure 3 of the article). The size of the points is proportional to the number of serological samples in the department. A naive linear regression (one department being one observation) illustrates this association. The y-axis is cut at 60% for readability (some points may not appear).




Figure 3: Posterior predictive check for the association between the proportion of positive serological samples and the number of COVID-19-related deaths divided by the number of positive serological samples. The size of the points is proportional to the number of serological samples in the department. A naive linear regression (one department being one observation) illustrates this association. The y-axis is cut at 6% for readability (some points may not appear).




Figure 4: Posterior predictive check for the association between the proportion of positive serological samples and the number of COVID-19-related hospitalizations divided by the number of positive serological samples. The size of the points is proportional to the number of serological samples in the department. A naive linear regression (one department being one observation) illustrates this association. The y-axis is cut at 20% for readability (some points may not appear).




Figure 5: Quantitative posterior predictive check for: (A) the association between the proportion of positive serological samples in persons under 60 and the proportion of persons above 60 in the seropositive, (B) the association between the proportion of positive serological samples and the number of COVID-19-related deaths divided by the number of positive serological samples, and (C) the association between the proportion of positive serological samples and the number of COVID-19-related hospitalizations divided by the number of positive serological samples. The blue histogram represents the distribution of 1,000 regression slopes based on the posterior predictive draws (quantiles 2.5% and 97.5% are represented with the two blue dashed vertical lines). The black line corresponds to the regression slope based on the actual data.

Stan code

```
functions {
  // Custom distribution function icar_normal_lpdf for an ICAR random
  // variable phi (see Morris et al., 2019)
  real icar_normal_lpdf(
    vector phi, int N_dept, array[] int node1, array[] int node2
  ) {
    return -0.5 * dot_self(phi[node1] - phi[node2])
      + normal_lpdf(sum(phi) | 0, 0.001 * N_dept);
  }
}

data {
  int<lower=0> N_edges;
  array[N_edges] int<lower=1> node1;
  array[N_edges] int<lower=1> node2;

  int<lower=0> N_age;
  int<lower=0> N_dept;

  int<lower=0> N_pos_incid;
  array[N_pos_incid] int<lower=0> age_pos_incid;
  array[N_pos_incid] int<lower=0> dept_pos_incid;

  int<lower=0> N_sens_sapris;
  int<lower=0> y_sens_sapris;

  array[N_age, N_dept] int<lower=0> mat_N_age_dept;
  array[N_age, N_dept] int<lower=0> mat_y_age_dept;

  vector<lower=0, upper=1>[N_dept] prop_dept;
  vector<lower=0, upper=1>[N_age] prop_age;
  matrix<lower=0, upper=1>[N_dept, N_age] mat_dept_age;
  matrix<lower=0, upper=1>[N_age, N_dept] mat_age_dept;

  int<lower=0> N_grid_Y;
  vector<lower=0, upper=1>[N_grid_Y] grid_Y;
}
```

```

vector<lower=0>[N_dept] pop_dept;
array[N_dept] int<lower=0> hospit_dept;
array[N_dept] int<lower=0> deces_dept;

vector<lower=0, upper=1>[N_dept] age_pop;
vector<lower=0, upper=1>[N_dept] beds;
vector<lower=0, upper=1>[N_dept] diabetes;

int<lower=0> N_draws;
}

parameters {

  vector[N_dept] phi_raw; // Corresponds to the parameter phi of the manuscript
  real<lower=0> sigma_phi;

  real<lower=0, upper=1> sens;
  real<lower=0, upper=1> spe;

  real mu_dept;
  vector[N_dept] beta_age_raw;
  real intercept_beta_age;
  real<lower=0> sigma_beta_age;
  real slope_beta_age;

  vector[N_dept] ihr_dept_raw;
  real intercept_ihr;
  real beta_ihr_age;
  real beta_ihr_beds;
  real beta_ihr_diabetes;
  real slope_ihr;
  real<lower=0> sigma_ihr_dept;

  vector[N_dept] ifr_dept_raw;
  real intercept_ifr;
  real beta_ifr_age;
  real beta_ifr_beds;
  real beta_ifr_diabetes;
  real slope_ifr;
  real<lower=0> sigma_ifr_dept;

```

```

}

transformed parameters {

  vector[N_dept] phi = sigma_phi * phi_raw;
  vector[N_dept] alpha_dept = mu_dept + phi;

  vector[N_dept] beta_age = beta_age_raw * sigma_beta_age +
  intercept_beta_age + slope_beta_age * alpha_dept;

  matrix<lower=0, upper=1>[N_age, N_dept] cuminc_age_dept;
  for (i in 1:N_age) {
    for (j in 1:N_dept) {
      cuminc_age_dept[i, j] = inv_logit(
        alpha_dept[j] + beta_age[j] * (i - 1)
      );
    }
  }

  matrix<lower=0, upper=1>[N_age, N_dept] seroprev_age_dept;
  for (i in 1:N_age) {
    for (j in 1:N_dept) {
      seroprev_age_dept[i, j] =
        sens * cuminc_age_dept[i, j] +
        (1 - spe) * (1 - cuminc_age_dept[i, j]);
    }
  }

  vector<lower=0, upper=1>[N_dept] seroprev_dept;
  for (i in 1:N_dept) {
    seroprev_dept[i] = mat_age_dept[, i]' * seroprev_age_dept[, i];
  }

  real seroprev_global_via_dept;
  seroprev_global_via_dept = seroprev_dept' * prop_dept;

  vector<lower=0, upper=1>[N_dept] cuminc_dept;
  for (i in 1:N_dept) {
    cuminc_dept[i] = mat_age_dept[, i]' * cuminc_age_dept[, i];
  }
}

```



```

vector[N_dept] logit_ihr_dept;
for (j in 1:N_dept) {
  logit_ihr_dept[j] =
    ihr_dept_raw[j] * sigma_ihr_dept +
    intercept_ihr +
    beta_ihr_age * age_pop[j] + beta_ihr_beds * beds[j] +
    beta_ihr_diabetes * diabetes[j] +
    slope_ihr * cuminc_dept[j];
}

vector[N_dept] logit_ifr_dept;
for (j in 1:N_dept) {
  logit_ifr_dept[j] =
    ifr_dept_raw[j] * sigma_ifr_dept +
    intercept_ifr +
    beta_ifr_age * age_pop[j] + beta_ifr_beds * beds[j] +
    beta_ifr_diabetes * diabetes[j] +
    slope_ifr * cuminc_dept[j];
}

vector<lower=0, upper=1>[N_dept] ihr_dept = inv_logit(logit_ihr_dept) / 10;
vector<lower=0, upper=1>[N_dept] ifr_dept = inv_logit(logit_ifr_dept) / 20;
}

model {

  phi_raw ~ icar_normal(N_dept, node1, node2);

  sens ~ beta(585, 56);
  spe ~ beta(953, 15);

  y_sens_sapris ~ binomial(N_sens_sapris, sens);

  seroprev_global_via_dept ~ beta(101, 1948);
  seroprev_global_via_dept ~ beta(1147, 17212);

  sigma_phi ~ exponential(1);
  sigma_ifr_dept ~ exponential(1);
  sigma_ihr_dept ~ exponential(1);
  beta_age_raw ~ normal(0, 1);
}

```

```

for (k in 1:N_pos_incid) {
  1 ~ bernoulli(cuminc_age_dept[age_pos_incid[k] + 1, dept_pos_incid[k]]);
}

for (i in 1:N_age) {
  for (j in 1:N_dept) {
    mat_y_age_dept[i, j] ~ binomial(
      mat_N_age_dept[i, j], seroprev_age_dept[i, j]
    );
  }
}

ihr_dept_raw ~ normal(0, 1);
ifr_dept_raw ~ normal(0, 1);

for (j in 1:N_dept) {
  hospit_dept[j] ~ poisson(pop_dept[j] * cuminc_dept[j] * ihr_dept[j]);
  deces_dept[j] ~ poisson(pop_dept[j] * cuminc_dept[j] * ifr_dept[j]);
}

}

generated quantities {

  // Association between incidence in persons under 60
  // and the proportion of persons above 60 among those infected

  vector<lower=0, upper=1>[N_dept] age_infected;
  for (j in 1:N_dept) {
    age_infected[j] =
      (cuminc_age_dept[2, j] * mat_age_dept[2, j]) /
      (cuminc_age_dept[2, j] * mat_age_dept[2, j] +
       cuminc_age_dept[1, j] * mat_age_dept[1, j]);
  }

  vector[N_grid_Y] g_cuminc_60_logit;
  for (i in 1:N_grid_Y) {
    g_cuminc_60_logit[i] =
      logit(grid_Y[i]) + intercept_beta_age +
      slope_beta_age * logit(grid_Y[i]);
  }
}

```

```

vector<lower=0, upper=1>[N_grid_Y] g_cuminc_60;
for (i in 1:N_grid_Y) {
  g_cuminc_60[i] = mean(inv_logit(normal_rng(
    rep_vector(g_cuminc_60_logit[i], N_draws),
    sigma_beta_age
  )));
}

vector<lower=0, upper=1>[N_grid_Y] g_age_infected;
for (i in 1:N_grid_Y) {
  g_age_infected[i] =
    (g_cuminc_60[i] * prop_age[2]) /
    (g_cuminc_60[i] * prop_age[2] + grid_Y[i] * prop_age[1]);
}

real douze_moins_six_age_infected = g_age_infected[41] - g_age_infected[17];

// Causal effects (incidence on IFR and IHR)

vector<lower=0, upper=1>[N_grid_Y] g_ihr_backdoor;
g_ihr_backdoor = rep_vector(0, N_grid_Y);

vector<lower=0, upper=1>[N_grid_Y] g_ifr_backdoor;
g_ifr_backdoor = rep_vector(0, N_grid_Y);

for (i in 1:N_dept) {
  for (s in 1:N_grid_Y) {

    real g_ihr_logit =
      intercept_ihr +
      beta_ihr_age * age_pop[i] + beta_ihr_beds * beds[i] +
      beta_ihr_diabetes * diabetes[i] +
      slope_ihr * grid_Y[s];

    real g_ifr_logit =
      intercept_ifr +
      beta_ifr_age * age_pop[i] + beta_ifr_beds * beds[i] +
      beta_ifr_diabetes * diabetes[i] +
      slope_ifr * grid_Y[s];

    real g_ihr = mean(inv_logit(to_vector(normal_rng(

```

```

    rep_vector(g_ihr_logit, N_draws), sigma_ihr_dept
  )))) / 10;

  real g_ifr = mean(inv_logit(to_vector(normal_rng(
    rep_vector(g_ifr_logit, N_draws), sigma_ifr_dept
  )))) / 20;

  g_ihr_backdoor[s] +=
    g_ihr / N_dept;

  g_ifr_backdoor[s] +=
    g_ifr / N_dept;

}
}

real nine_minus_three_backdoor_ifr =
  g_ifr_backdoor[29] - g_ifr_backdoor[5];

real nine_minus_three_backdoor_ihr =
  g_ihr_backdoor[29] - g_ihr_backdoor[5];

// Global estimates for metropolitan France (incidence, IFR, IHR)

real cuminc_global_via_dept;
cuminc_global_via_dept = cuminc_dept' * prop_dept;

vector<lower=0>[N_dept] n_infected_dept;
for (j in 1:N_dept) {
  n_infected_dept[j] = cuminc_dept[j] * pop_dept[j];
}

real ifr_global;
ifr_global = (ifr_dept' * n_infected_dept) / sum(n_infected_dept);

real ihr_global;
ihr_global = (ihr_dept' * n_infected_dept) / sum(n_infected_dept);

// Posterior predictive samples

```

```

array[N_age, N_dept] int<lower=0> y_rep_age_dept;
for (i in 1:N_age) {
  for (j in 1:N_dept) {
    y_rep_age_dept[i ,j] = binomial_rng(
      mat_N_age_dept[i ,j], seroprev_age_dept[i ,j]
    );
  }
}

vector<lower=0>[N_dept] hospit_rep_dept;
vector<lower=0>[N_dept] deces_rep_dept;

for (j in 1:N_dept) {
  hospit_rep_dept[j] = poisson_rng(
    pop_dept[j] * cuminc_dept[j] * ihr_dept[j]
  );

  deces_rep_dept[j] = poisson_rng(
    pop_dept[j] * cuminc_dept[j] * ifr_dept[j]
  );
}
}

```