Coronavirus Fact-Check #5: Infection-Fatality Ratio Update

Kit Knightly

We covered in our third of these brief articles that, actually, the Coronavirus is NOT "20x deadlier" than the flu. That was evident once the early large-scale studies had been done in Germany, Iceland and South Korea. It has only become more so in the weeks since.

Far from the 3.4% predicted by the WHO back February, or the 1% used by the Imperial Model, all the serological studies done to this point average out at about 0.2%.

Here are some recent examples:

- On May 19th Dr John Ioannidis et al published their review of global cases, which found lethality ranging between 0.02% and 0.4%.
- On May 4th Dr Hendrilk Streeck et al published a study done in Germany which found an infection fatality rate (IFR) of <0.36%.
- Another study from Stanford University, published on April 30th and this time focusing on Santa Clara county, found an IFR of 0.17%
- A study done in the Guilan province of Iran, published on May 1st, found an IFR of 0.12%.
- On April 21st, theUniversity of Southern California (USC) published their study on the population of Los Angeles county, which found an IFR of <0.2%.

This list is far from exhaustive, visit SWPRS.org for more examples.

Although the numbers do vary from place to place – as you'd expect given changes in demographics, healthcare, methodology, sampling, population density etc. – it's easy to see that not a single one of them comes anywhere near the 3.4% "officially" listed by the WHO, or even the 1% used in the Imperial model.

Other studies, done all over the world from Boston to the Czech Republic to Japan – have found the level of infection in the general population to be at least 10x higher than expected (and sometimes 100s of times higher).

Regardless of the specifics, ALL of the studies show that the danger of the virus was massively over-estimated.

Compiled with the assistance of Swiss Policy Research, who have done wonderful work putting together fantastic resources.