

Supplementary Table 1: Allele, genotype and homo- or heterozygote frequencies of VNTR polymorphism in our study groups and Chan *et al.*.

VNTR polymorphism	Beijing populations, No. (%)				Tianjin populations, No. (%)			Hong Kong populations, No. (%) ^b			
	Community patients (<i>n</i> = 339)	Random controls (<i>n</i> = 227)	HCW SARS (<i>n</i> = 42)	HCW controls (<i>n</i> = 40)	Community patients (<i>n</i> = 60)	Random controls (<i>n</i> = 85)	HCW controls (<i>n</i> = 44)	Community patients (<i>n</i> = 218)	Outpatient controls (<i>n</i> = 290)	HCW SARS (<i>n</i> = 67)	HCW controls (<i>n</i> = 172)
Genotypes ^a											
5/5	18 (5.3)	6 (2.6)	3 (7.1)	3 (7.5)	2 (3.3)	5 (5.9)	1 (2.3)	8 (3.7)	14 (4.8)	1 (1.5)	19 (11.0)
5/9	14 (4.1)	10 (4.4)	0 (0.0)	4 (10.0)	1 (1.7)	5 (5.9)	1 (2.3)	7 (3.2)	8 (2.8)	2 (3.0)	3 (1.7)
6/5	7 (2.1)	1 (0.4)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (4.5)	3 (1.4)	2 (0.7)	0 (0.0)	7 (4.1)
6/6	1 (0.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
6/9	1 (0.3)	2 (0.9)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (3.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (1.4)	3 (1.0)	1 (1.5)	1 (0.6)
7/4	1 (0.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
7/5	48 (14.2)	42 (18.5)	5 (11.9)	10 (25.0)	15 (25.0)	19 (22.3)	11 (25.0)	49 (22.5)	50 (17.2)	16 (23.9)	25 (14.5)
7/6	15 (4.4)	13 (5.7)	1 (2.4)	1 (2.5)	3 (5.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (6.8)	12 (5.5)	25 (8.6)	7 (10.4)	6 (3.5)
7/7	175 (51.6)	107 (47.1)	24 (57.1)	18 (45.0)	25 (41.7)	34 (40.0)	14 (31.8)	86 (39.4)	145 (50.0)	27 (40.3)	76 (44.2)
7/8	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.6)
7/9	53 (15.6)	42 (18.5)	8 (19.0)	3 (7.5)	12 (20.0)	21 (24.7)	10 (22.7)	41 (18.8)	39 (13.4)	12 (17.9)	28 (16.3)
9/9	6 (1.8)	4 (1.8)	1 (2.4)	1 (2.5)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.2)	2 (4.6)	8 (3.7)	4 (1.4)	1 (1.5)	6 (3.5)
Alleles ^a											
4	1 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
5	105 (15.5)	65 (14.3)	11 (13.1)	20 (25.0)	20 (16.7)	34 (20.0)	16 (18.2)	75 (17.2)	88 (15.2)	20 (14.9)	73 (21.2)
6	25 (3.7)	16 (3.5)	1 (1.2)	1 (1.3)	5 (4.2)	0 (0.0)	5 (5.7)	20 (4.6)	30 (5.2)	8 (6.0)	14 (4.1)
7	467 (68.9)	311 (68.5)	62 (73.8)	50 (62.5)	80 (66.6)	108 (63.5)	52 (59.1)	274 (62.8)	404 (69.6)	89 (66.4)	212 (61.6)
8	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.3)
9	80 (11.8)	62 (13.7)	10 (11.9)	9 (11.3)	15 (12.5)	28 (16.5)	15 (17.0)	67 (15.4)	58 (10.0)	17 (12.7)	44 (12.8)
Homo- or heterozygosity											
Heterozygotes	139 (41.0)	110 (48.5)	14 (33.3)	18 (45.0)	33 (55.0)	45 (52.9)	27 (61.4)	115 (52.8)	127 (43.8)	38 (56.7)	71 (41.3)
Homozygotes	200 (59.0)	117 (51.5)	28 (66.7)	22 (55.0)	27 (45.0)	40 (47.1)	17 (38.6)	103 (47.2)	163 (56.2)	29 (43.3)	101 (58.7)

All groups except the community patients in our Beijing populations were in Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium. Hardy-Weinberg Exact Test for our Beijing community patients, random controls, HCW SARS, HCW controls, and Tianjin community patients, HCW controls and random controls gave $P = 0.0006$, P

= 0.922, $P = 0.055$, $P = 0.257$, $P = 0.397$, $P = 0.610$ and $P = 0.518$, respectively.

The comparison between groups within Beijing populations: Between community patients and HCW patients, the differences in allele (CLUMP T1 = 2.033, $P = 0.729$ by CLUMP), genotype (CLUMP T1 = 4.275, $P = 0.934$ by CLUMP) and homo- or heterozygote ($\chi^2 = 0.915$, $P = 0.339$ by SPSS) frequencies are not significant. Similarly, between random controls and our HCW controls, the differences in allele (CLUMP T1 = 6.640, $P = 0.0844$ by CLUMP), genotype (CLUMP T1 = 8.926, $P = 0.629$ by CLUMP) and homo- or heterozygote ($\chi^2 = 0.163$, $P = 0.686$ by SPSS) frequencies are also not significant. Between community patients and random controls, the allele (CLUMP T1 = 1.690, $P = 0.792$ by CLUMP) and genotype (CLUMP T1 = 10.357, $P = 0.410$ by CLUMP) frequencies are similar. Similarly, the differences in allele (CLUMP T1 = 3.856, $P = 0.278$ by CLUMP) and genotype (CLUMP T1 = 8.753, $P = 0.188$ by CLUMP) frequencies between HCW patients and HCW controls are also not significant.

The comparison between groups within Tianjin populations: Between community patients and controls (containing the HCW controls and Random controls), the differences in allele (CLUMP T1 = 3.069, $P = 0.689$ by CLUMP), genotype (CLUMP T1 = 9.257, $P = 0.598$ by CLUMP) and homo- or heterozygote ($\chi^2 = 0.011$, $P = 0.916$ by SPSS) frequencies are not significant. Between random controls and HCW controls, the differences in allele (CLUMP T1 = 9.954, $P = 0.0768$ by CLUMP), genotype (CLUMP T1 = 13.355, $P = 0.271$ by CLUMP) and homo- or heterozygote ($\chi^2 = 0.834$, $P = 0.361$ by SPSS) frequencies are also not significant. Between community patients and random controls, the allele (CLUMP T1 = 8.358, $P = 0.138$ by CLUMP) and genotype (CLUMP T1 = 10.245, $P = 0.509$ by CLUMP) frequencies are similar. Similarly, the differences in allele (CLUMP T1 = 1.496, $P = 0.913$ by CLUMP) and genotype (CLUMP T1 = 7.960, $P = 0.717$ by CLUMP) frequencies between community patients and HCW controls are also not significant.

The comparison between Beijing and Tianjin populations: Between Beijing community patients and Tianjin community patients, there are no significant differences in allele (CLUMP T1 = 0.445, $P = 0.994$ by CLUMP), genotype (CLUMP T1 = 15.570, $P = 0.158$ by CLUMP) and homo- or heterozygote ($\chi^2 = 3.261$, $P = 0.071$ by SPSS) frequencies. Similarly, the comparison between Beijing HCW controls and Tianjin HCW controls is not significant for allele (CLUMP T1 = 4.279, $P = 0.510$ by CLUMP), genotype (CLUMP T1 = 10.283, $P = 0.505$ by CLUMP) and homo- or heterozygote ($\chi^2 = 2.256$, $P = 0.133$ by SPSS) frequencies. Between Beijing random controls and Tianjin random controls, the differences in allele (CLUMP T1 = 9.644, $P = 0.086$ by CLUMP) and genotype (CLUMP T1 = 10.589, $P = 0.478$ by CLUMP) and homo- or heterozygote ($\chi^2 = 0.497$, $P = 0.481$ by SPSS) frequencies were also not significant.

The comparison between Hong Kong and Beijing populations: Between Hong Kong outpatient controls and Beijing random controls, there are no

significant differences in allele (CLUMP T1 = 4.664, $P = 0.198$ by CLUMP), genotype (CLUMP T1 = 6.705, $P = 0.822$ by CLUMP) and homo- or heterozygote ($\chi^2 = 1.116$, $P = 0.291$ by SPSS) frequencies. Similarly, the comparison between Hong Kong HCW controls and Beijing HCW controls is not significant for allele (CLUMP T1 = 2.245, $P = 0.691$ by CLUMP), genotype (CLUMP T1 = 13.246, $P = 0.278$ by CLUMP) and homo- or heterozygote ($\chi^2 = 0.184$, $P = 0.668$ by SPSS) frequencies. Between Hong Kong community patients and Beijing community patients, the differences in allele (CLUMP T1 = 5.670, $P = 0.225$ by CLUMP) and genotype (CLUMP T1 = 16.797, $P = 0.114$ by CLUMP) frequencies were not significant; however, the differences in homo- or heterozygote ($\chi^2 = 7.384$, $P = 0.0066$ by SPSS) frequencies differed significantly. Between Hong Kong HCW patients and Beijing HCW patients, the differences in allele (CLUMP T1 = 3.412, $P = 0.333$ by CLUMP) and genotype (CLUMP T1 = 10.032, $P = 0.528$ by CLUMP) frequencies were not significant; however, the differences in homo- or heterozygote ($\chi^2 = 5.658$, $P = 0.017$ by SPSS) frequencies differed significantly.

The comparison between Hong Kong and Tianjin populations: Between Hong Kong outpatient controls and Tianjin random controls, there are no significant differences in genotype (CLUMP T1 = 18.325, $P = 0.0747$ by CLUMP) and homo- or heterozygote ($\chi^2 = 2.216$, $P = 0.137$ by SPSS) frequencies; however, the difference in allele (CLUMP T1 = 16.199, $P = 0.00635$ by CLUMP) frequency differed significantly. The comparison between Hong Kong HCW controls and Tianjin HCW controls is not significant for allele (CLUMP T1 = 1.987, $P = 0.851$ by CLUMP) and genotype (CLUMP T1 = 8.951, $P = 0.626$ by CLUMP) frequencies; however, the differences in homo- or heterozygote ($\chi^2 = 5.702$, $P = 0.0169$ by SPSS) frequencies differed significantly. Between Hong Kong community patients and Tianjin community patients, the differences in allele (CLUMP T1 = 0.793, $P = 0.977$ by CLUMP), genotype (CLUMP T1 = 4.955, $P = 0.933$ by CLUMP) and homo- or heterozygote ($\chi^2 = 0.095$, $P = 0.757$ by SPSS) frequencies were not significant. Similarly, between Hong Kong HCW patients and Tianjin community patients, the differences in allele (CLUMP T1 = 0.527, $P = 0.991$ by CLUMP), genotype (CLUMP T1 = 3.333, $P = 0.986$ by CLUMP) and homo- or heterozygote ($\chi^2 = 0.038$, $P = 0.846$ by SPSS) frequencies were not significant.

^aNumbers of the tandem repeats at exon 4.

^bThe data of Hong Kong populations are derived from Chan *et al.*¹.

Reference

1. Chan, V.S. *et al. Nat. Genet.* **38**, 38-46 (2006).