medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.27.20044891; this version posted March 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Evaluating the effectiveness of social distancing interventions against COVID-19

Laura Matrajt and Tiffany Leung

March 27, 2020

Abstract

SARS-CoV-2 has infected over 140,000 people as of March 14, 2020. We use a mathematical model to investigate the effectiveness of social distancing interventions lasting six weeks in a middle-sized city in the US. We explore four social distancing strategies by reducing the contacts of adults over 60 years old, adults over 60 years old and children, all adults (25, 75 or 95% compliance), and everyone in the population. Our results suggest that social distancing interventions can avert cases by 20% and hospitalizations and deaths by 90% even with modest compliance within adults as long as the intervention is kept in place, but the epidemic is set to rebound once the intervention is lifted. Our models suggest that social distancing interventions will buy crucial time but need to occur in conjunction with testing and contact tracing of all suspected cases to mitigate transmission of SARS-CoV-2.

1 Introduction

Since the emergence of the novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 in Wuhan, China in December 2019 [1], the World Health Organization has declared the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) a pandemic [2]. As of March 14, 2020, COVID-19 has spread to over 114 countries, with 142,539 confirmed cases and 5,393 deaths related to COVID-19 globally [3].

On January 21, 2020, the first case of COVID-19 in the United States (US) was identified from a traveler who had recently returned to Snohomish County, Washington from Wuhan, China [4, 5]. As of the afternoon of March 14, there are 642 confirmed cases and 40 deaths associated with COVID-19 in Washington state [6]. In response to the rapid spread of COVID-19, on March 12, 2020 (approximately seven weeks after the first confirmed case in Washington state), the governor of Washington announced a state-wide prohibition of large gatherings (of 250 people or more) [7] and school closures lasting six weeks (from March 17 to April 24, 2020) in three counties [8]. Three days after, on March 15, the governor of Washington further issued a temporary shutdown of restaurants, bars, and entertainment and recreational facilities [9]. Similar interventions have now been enacted in several states in the US [10] and in countries in Europe [11, 12].

In this paper, we use an epidemic mathematical model to quantify the effectiveness of social distancing interventions in a medium-sized city in the US or Europe by taking Seattle, Washington, USA as an example. We provide estimates of the proportion of cases, hospitalizations, and deaths averted in the short term and identify key challenges in evaluating the effectiveness of these interventions.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.27.20044891; this version posted March 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 1: Model diagram illustrating the population divided into ten age groups, and for each age group (represented by subscripts) into compartments susceptible S, exposed E, infectious I, and removed R. Susceptible individuals become exposed at the force of infection $\lambda(t)$, progress to become infectious at rate σ, and are removed from infecting others at rate γ.

2 Methods

We developed an age-structured susceptible-exposed-infectious-removed (SEIR) model to describe the transmission of COVID-19. We divided the population into ten age groups: 0–5, 6–9, 10–19, 20–29, 30–39, 40–49, 50–59, 60–69, 70–79, and > 80 years old (yo). We calibrated the model to the Seattle, WA metropolitan area and the age distribution of the population using census data [13]. Namely, for each age group, the population is divided into compartments: susceptible S, exposed E (those who have been infected but are not yet infectious), infectious I and removed R (Figure 1). Table 1 gives the parameters and ranges used in the model. Based on current estimates [14] that put less than one percent of the infections as asymptomatic, we considered only symptomatic infections. We used the contact matrix for six age groups computed by Wallinga et al. [15] and extend it to ten age groups. A full description of the model can be found in the Supplemental Information.

Using genomic epidemiology of the first two cases identified in the state of Washington, Bedford found that by the time that the second case was identified in Washington state, SARS-CoV-2 had been circulating locally for six weeks [16]. Hence, we considered January 21, 2020 (the day the first case was identified) to be the first day of our simulation.

We assumed that 20% of the cases would be observed, as 80% of the cases are reported to be mild and would probably be missed [19]. Case fatality rates were obtained from [19] and hospitalization rates by age group were obtained from [20]. We modeled social distancing by reducing the contact rates in a given group for six weeks, corresponding to the policy in Washington state in mid-March [8, 21]. We divided the population into three major groups for the purposes of social distancing interventions: children (0–19 yo), adults under 60 yo (20–59 yo), and adults over 60 yo.

We investigate the effectiveness of four scenarios of social distancing: 1) Adults over 60 yo only, where contacts of adults over 60 yo are reduced by 95%; 2) Adults over 60 and children, where contacts of adults over 60 yo are reduced by 95%, and contacts of children are reduced by 85%; 3) Adults only, where contacts of adults over 60 yo are reduced by 95%, and contacts of adults under

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.27.20044891; this version posted March 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Parameter	Meaning	Value	Range	Reference
$1/\sigma$	mean latent period	5.16 d	4.5–5.8	[17]
$1/\gamma$	mean infectious period	5.02 d	3–9	[18]
β	transmission coefficient	calculated	–	–
$\mathcal{C}$	contact matrix	–	–	[15]
N	Total population	3.5 million	–	[13]

Table 1: Description of parameters used in the SEIR model, including the values used, unless otherwise specified.

60 yo by 25, 75, or 95%; and 4) All, where contacts are reduced for every group (for adults over 60 yo by 95%, for children by 85%, and for adults under 60 yo by 25, 75, or 95%).

To quantify the uncertainty around our results, we performed 1,000 simulations where we varied three parameters: the basic reproduction number R_0, the latent period and the duration of infectiousness while keeping the other parameters fixed. Based on current estimates [1, 22, 23, 24], we sampled values of R_0 from a truncated normal distribution with mean 2.26 ranging from 1.6 to 3. We assumed that the latent period was similar to the incubation period, and assumed a gamma distribution with mean 5.1 days and standard deviation 0.7 [17]. We sampled the duration of infectiousness from a truncated normal distribution with mean 5 days and standard deviation 0.7 ranging from 3 to 9 [18, 25]. For each R_0, infectious period and latent period considered, we used the next-generation matrix approach [26] to calculate the transmission coefficient β. For each statistic presented in the results, we computed the error bars by removing the top and bottom 2.5% of the simulations.

3 Results

Given the current uncertainty surrounding the duration of infectiousness (with estimates ranging from 5.5 days [18] to as long as 20 days [27]), we analyzed its influence on the effectiveness of the social distancing interventions. We considered an epidemic with infectious periods of 5, 6, 7, or 8 days (corresponding to the most plausible values [18, 25], with all other parameters fixed. When the infectious period is shorter (5 days) the epidemic peaks at 85 days after the introduction of the first case. As the infectious period becomes longer, the epidemic takes much longer to take off (Figure 2). This is because we are keeping a fixed R_0, so a longer infectious period implies a smaller infectious rate. Indeed, with the longest infectious period, the epidemic peaks 110 days after the first case was introduced. Hence, interventions occurring early on delay the epidemic, but do not substantially change the pool of susceptible individuals, allowing similar-sized epidemics to occur later (Figure 2).

We then considered the delay of the epidemic under the four social distancing interventions and different infectious periods (Figure 2). As expected, the social distancing strategy applied to *all* delays the epidemic the most, by over 40 days compared to baseline (*do nothing*). Targeting *adults over 60 and children* delays the epidemic by 23 days irrespective of infectious period, and targeting *adults and adults over 60* gives a delay of 16 to 19 days (for infectious period of 8 and 5 days, respectively). Social distancing of *adults over 60 only* delays the epidemic no more than 7 days irrespective of infectious period (Table 4). Overall, social distancing interventions under a shorter infectious period result in a longer delay of epidemic peak. The infectious period did not

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.27.20044891; this version posted March 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 2: Number of ascertained cases over 150 days for varying infectious periods of (A) 5 days, (B) 6 days, (C) 7 days, and (D) 8 days (parameter values used: $R_0 = 2.26$, $\gamma = 1/5.02$, $\sigma = 1/5.16$, and a 75% reduction of contacts in adults). The dotted lines represent the beginning and end of the social distancing intervention.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.27.20044891; this version posted March 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

have significant effect to the peak height of the epidemic relative to baseline.

We examine the effectiveness of the three social distancing interventions in adults. Figure 3, panels A, B, C show the number of ascertained cases when the contact of adults are reduced by 25%, 75%, and 95%, respectively. Further, we consider two dates to start the social distancing interventions, at 50 (Figure 3, panels A–C) and 80 days (Figure 3, panels D–F). The effect of these interventions is dramatically different if started early relative to the epidemic curve (before the exponential phase of the epidemic) or later.

When interventions start on day 50, there is a delay of the epidemic regardless of the level of compliance in the adult population, with little change in the magnitude of the epidemic peak (a thorough analysis of this scenario is presented below). In comparison, if the intervention begins later (in the exponential phase of the epidemic), all interventions result in a flatter epidemic curve. For all the levels of compliance, the strategy of reducing the contacts of only the older adults results in a moderate reduction in the epidemic peak (7,000 less cases at the epidemic peak compared to baseline). It is the only intervention that does not exhibit a rebound once the intervention is lifted (Figure 3, panels D–F).

The adults over 60 and children strategy strategy results in 16,500 fewer cases (57% less than baseline) at epidemic peak (Figure 3, panels D–F) compared to baseline (29,200 cases). In comparison, the adults-only strategy yields 12,000 fewer (41% less than baseline) ascertained cases at the epidemic peak for 25% compliance in younger adults (adults under 60 yo, Figure 3, panel D). The epidemic curve grows at a slower rate with higher compliance in adults, and the epidemic peak is smaller, with 21,000 fewer cases ascertained at the peak, or 72% less than baseline, at 75% compliance (Figure 3, panel E); and 24,000 fewer cases ascertained at the peak, or 82% less than baseline, at 95% compliance (Figure 3, panel F). At a higher compliance of 75% and 95% in adults, the epidemic peak is reduced even more, with 21,000 and 24,000 fewer cases ascertained at the peak (75 and 85% less) respectively (Figure 3, panels E, F), and the epidemic curve grows at a slower rate. Of the four different interventions, the all-groups strategy, which reduces the contacts in all age groups, decreases the epidemic peak the most and results in the slowest growth rate, as expected. Even with low compliance (25%) in the younger-adult groups, the all-groups strategy yields 20,000 fewer cases ascertained (68% less) at the epidemic peak (Figure 3, panel D). With higher compliance (95%) in adults, the all-groups strategy results in even fewer cases ascertained at the peak (27,000 fewer cases or 92% less; Figure 3, panel F). However, our results suggest that all these interventions can result in new epidemic curves once the interventions are lifted.

For this part of the analysis, we consider the effects of social distancing interventions over the first 100 days of the epidemic and assume that the social distancing interventions started on day 50. This corresponds to the approximate date where social distancing interventions started in Washington state. To investigate the sensitivity of the model to the parameters chosen, we ran 1,000 simulations (as described in the Methods). We obtained curves that varied widely over both the number of cases and the duration and timing of the epidemic (figures S1, S2, S3). We show here results of simulations done with the mean values ($R_0 = 2.26$, an infectious period lasting 5 days and a latent period of 5.1 days). We report cases as well as the proportion of cases, hospitalizations and deaths averted during the first 100 days. While reducing the contacts of *adults over 60 only* only averts a moderate number of cases (21%, Figure 3; and 57% for the adults over 60, Figure S4)), the number of hospitalizations and deaths are reduced by 36% and 47% respectively for the whole population (Figure 4), and by 56% for the adults over 60 yo (Figure S5). Adding a social distancing intervention in children drastically slows down the epidemic curve (Figure 3).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.27.20044891; this version posted March 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Further, hospitalizations and deaths are reduced by 75 and 80% respectively, with the reductions evenly distributed across all age groups (Figures S5 and S6).

When only 25% of adults change their contact habits, all of the interventions are set to rebound as soon as the intervention is lifted (Figure 3A). Surprisingly, cases (and hence hospitalizations and deaths) can be reduced by 94% over the first 100 days if all groups reduce their contacts with others, even when adults do so by only 25% (Figure 4A). Here, the reduction in the number of cases, hospitalizations and deaths is evenly distributed across all age groups (Figures S4A-S6A). When adults' contacts are reduced by 75%, all of the interventions but one (where everyone reduces their contacts) rebound immediately after the end of the intervention (Figure 3B). As expected, adult groups see the greatest reductions in cases, hospitalizations and deaths from this intervention (Figures S5B and S6B). Interestingly, at this rate, the strategy *adults over 60 and children* averts 10% more cases than the strategy *adults only* (87% vs. 77% cases averted) but they yield similar reductions in hospitalizations and deaths (88 and 86% of hospitalizations averted; 91 and 87% of deaths averted, respectively, Figure 4B). When adults further reduce their contacts by 95%, both strategies avert over 90% of the hospitalizations and deaths over the first 100 days (Figure 4C). Further, once adults reduce their contact rates by 75%, the strategy *all* mitigates the outbreak (Figures 3B-C, 4B-C, S4B-C-S6B-C). It is important to note that the error bars are considerably large when adults reduce their contact rates by 25%, and this uncertainty tends to smooth out as the adults further reduce their contact rates.

4 Discussion

The term 'flatten the curve', originating from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [28], has been used widely to describe the impact of social distancing interventions. Here, we used a mathematical model to quantify this term by measuring the short-term number of cases, hospitalization, and deaths averted over the first 100 days under four different social distancing interventions and assuming different levels of compliance in the adult population. When looking at the short-term impact (here considered to be over the first 100 days) of social distancing interventions started early on in the epidemic, our models suggest that only a social distancing intervention involving all the age groups in the population would considerably decrease the number of cases and delay the epidemic the most. However, with as little as 25% reduction in the contact rates in the adult population, one could reduce the number of hospitalizations and deaths by over 90%, in agreement with what others have found [29]. Furthermore, reducing the contact rates of adults over 60 alone can have a considerable impact, reducing hospitalizations and deaths by over 30%. Quantifying the short-term impact of an intervention is very important since it allows decision makers to estimate the immediate number of resources needed and to plan for further resources in the long term.

However, our simulations suggest that even in the more optimistic scenario, where all the age groups reduce their contact rates over 85%, the epidemic is set to rebound once the social distancing interventions are lifted. Our results suggest that social distancing interventions can "buy us" several weeks that could prove to be essential to strengthen our health systems and restock medical supplies, but will fail to mitigate the current pandemic. This is in agreement with other modeling results which suggested that very long periods of social distancing would be needed to control transmission [20]. Yet, sustaining social distancing interventions over a period of several months might not be feasible, both economically and socially. A combination of social distancing interventions with testing, isolation and contact tracing of new cases is needed to suppress transmission of SARS-CoV-2 [30]. Further, these interventions need to happen in synchrony around the world, as a new

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.27.20044891; this version posted March 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 3: Number of ascertained cases over time with adults reducing their contact by (A) 25%, (B) 75%, and (C) 95% (parameter values used: $R_0 = 2.26$, $\gamma = 1/5.02$, $\sigma = 1/5.16$). The dotted lines represent the beginning and end of the social distancing intervention, for panels A-c, intervention starts at day 50, for panels D-F, intervention starts at day 80. Social distancing interventions last 6 weeks before contact rates return to normal.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.27.20044891; this version posted March 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 4: Proportion of cases (A, D, G), hospitalizations (B, E, H) and deaths (C, F, I) averted at 100 days for all scenarios considered and adults reducing their contact by (A–C) 25%, (D–F) 75%, and (G–I) 95%. (Parameter values used: $R_0 = 2.26$, $\gamma = 1/5.02$, $\sigma = 1/5.16$)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.27.20044891; this version posted March 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

imported case could spark a new outbreak in any given region.

Furthermore, our results highlight the importance of the timing of social distancing interventions relative to the epidemic curve. If the intervention is put in place (and lifted) early on in the epidemic, it results in a delay of the epidemic, but if the intervention occurs later on, then it results in flattening the curve. Indeed, the effectiveness of the intervention will depend on the ratio of the number of susceptible, infected and recovered people in the population at the beginning of the intervention. There is evidence that recovered individuals will have immunity to COVID-19 [31] but it is unclear at this point how long this immunity will last. Recovered individuals would be able to re-enter the work force and help the most vulnerable groups. It is then of paramount importance to have an accurate estimate of the number of current and recovered cases to evaluate possible interventions. As of March 12, 2020, the US had tested fewer than 15,000 CDC samples (in contrast to over 200,000 tests performed in South Korea by mid-March) [32]. It is imperative to expand the testing capabilities in all countries affected.

Our results suggest that the infectious period is a key parameter that has an extraordinary influence in the modeled speed of an epidemic and hence in the effectiveness of the interventions considered. However, current estimates of the infectious period range from 5.5 days [18] to as long as 20 days [27]. We urgently need to perform studies to have a better understanding of the duration of infectiousness of SARS-CoV-2.

Our work has several limitations. First, deterministic mathematical models tend to overestimate the final size of an epidemic. Further, deterministic models will always predict a rebound in the epidemic once the intervention is lifted provided that the number of infected people (exposed or infectious) is positive. To avoid that problem, we forced our infected compartments to be zero if they had less than one person infected at any given time. Second, we considered the latent period to be equal to the incubation period, but it has been suggested that pre-symptomatic transmission is occurring [22], and the virus SARS-CoV-2 is shed for a prolonged time after symptoms end [33]. It is unclear at this point however, if virus shed by convalescent individuals can infect others. Further, we considered that mild and severe cases would be equally infectious. In this sense, our results are conservative. New information about the epidemiological characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 is continuously arising, and incorporating such information in mathematical models such as ours is key to provide public health officials with the best tools to make decisions in uncertain times.

Taken together, our results suggest that more aggressive approaches need to be taken to mitigate the transmission of SARS-CoV-2. Social distancing interventions need to occur in tandem with testing and contact tracing to minimize the burden of COVID-19.

References

[1] Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, Wang X, Zhou L, Tong Y, et al. Early transmission dynamics in Wuhan, China, of novel coronavirus-infected pneumonia. The New England Journal of Medicine. 2020;p. 1–9.

[2] Organization WH. WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 11 March 2020; 2020. [Online; accessed 15-March-2020]. https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020.

[3] Organization WH. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): Situation Report - 54 (14 March 2020); 2020. [Online; accessed 15-March-2020]. https://www.who.int/docs/

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.27.20044891; this version posted March 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200314-sitrep-54-covid-19.pdf?sfvrsn=dcd46351_6.

[4] Holshue ML, DeBolt C, Lindquist S, Lofy KH, Wiesman J, Bruce H, et al. First case of 2019 novel coronavirus in the United States. The New England Journal of Medicine. 2020;382(10):929–936.

[5] Washington SC. Local Declaration of Emergency Snohomish County; 2020. [Online; accessed 15-March-2020]. https://snohomishcountywa.gov/CivicAlerts.aspx?AID=1771.

[6] of Health WSD. 2019 Novel Coronavirus Outbreak (COVID-19); 2020. [Online; accessed 15-March-2020]. https://www.doh.wa.gov/emergencies/coronavirus.

[7] Inslee WGJ. Proclamation by the governor: Amending proclamations 20-05 and 20-06; 2020. [Online; accessed 15-March-2020]. https://www.governor.wa.gov/sites/default/files/20-07%20Coronavirus%20%28tmp%29.pdf.

[8] Office WG. Inslee announces school closures in King, Snohomish and Pierce counties; 2020. [Online; accessed 15-March-2020]. https://medium.com/wagovernor/inslee-announces-school-closures-in-king-snohomish-and-pierce-counties-1f62d9f0ef47.

[9] Inslee WGJ. Inslee statement on statewide shutdown of restaurants, bars and limits on size of gatherings expanded; 2020. [Online; accessed 15-March-2020]. https://www.governor.wa.gov/news-media/inslee-statement-statewide-shutdown-restaurants-bars-and-limits-size-gatherings-expanded.

[10] News C. Coronavirus updates from March 20, 2020; 2020. [Online; accessed 20-March-2020]. https://www.cbsnews.com/live-updates/coronavirus-disease-covid-19-latest-news-2020-03-20/.

[11] News C. France orders lockdown to slow COVID-19 spread; 2020. [Online; accessed 16-March-2020]. http://www.cidrap.umn.edu/news-perspective/2020/03/france-orders-lockdown-slow-covid-19-spread.

[12] Times TNY. Spain, on lockdown, weighs liberties against containing coronavirus; 2020. [Online; accessed 16-March-2020]. https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/15/world/europe/spain-coronavirus.html.

[13] Bureau AFC. American FactFinder - Census Bureau; 2020. [Online; accessed 15-March-2020]. https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml.

[14] Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and important lessons from the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak in China: Summary of a report of 72,314 cases from the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. JAMA. 2020;2019:3–6. Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32091533.

[15] Wallinga J, Teunis P, Kretzschmar M. Using data on social contacts to estimate age-specific transmission parameters for respiratory-spread infectious agents. American Journal of Epidemiology. 2006;164(10):936–944.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.27.20044891; this version posted March 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[16] Lab B. Cryptic transmission of novel coronavirus revealed by genomic epidemiology; 2020. [Online; accessed 15-March-2020]. https://bedford.io/blog/.

[17] Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, Jones FK, Zheng Q, Meredith HR, et al. The incubation period of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) from publicly reported confirmed cases: Estimation and application. Annals of Internal Medicine. 2020;Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32150748.

[18] Bi Q, Wu Y, Mei S, Ye C, Zou X, Zhang Z, et al. Epidemiology and transmission of COVID-19 in Shenzhen China: Analysis of 391 cases and 1,286 of their close contacts. medRxiv. 2020;Available from: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.03.20028423.

[19] Novel Coronavirus Pneumonia Emergency Response Epidemiology Team. The epidemiological characteristics of an outbreak of 2019 novel coronavirus diseases (COVID-19) – China, 2020. China CDC Weekly. 2020;2(8):113–122. Available from: http://weekly.chinacdc.cn/en/article/id/e53946e2-c6c4-41e9-9a9b-fea8db1a8f51.

[20] Ferguson NM, Laydon D, Nedjati-Gilani G, Imai N, Ainslie K, Baguelin M, et al. Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand. 2020;Available from: https://doi.org/10.25561/77482.

[21] Inslee WGJ. Inslee announces statewide shutdown of restaurants, bars and expanded social gathering limits; 2020. [Online; accessed 18-March-2020]. https://medium.com/wagovernor/inslee-announces-statewide-shutdown-of-restaurants-bars-and-expanded-social-gathering-limits-bl

[22] Tindale LC, Coombe M, Stockdale JE, Garlock ES, Lau WYV, Saraswat M, et al. Transmission interval estimates suggest pre-symptomatic spread of COVID-19. medRxiv. 2020;Available from: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.03.20029983.

[23] Wu JT, Leung K, Leung GM. Nowcasting and forecasting the potential domestic and international spread of the 2019-nCoV outbreak originating in Wuhan, China: a modelling study. Lancet. 2020;395(10225):689–697. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30260-9.

[24] Zhao S, Lin Q, Ran J, Musa SS, Yang G, Wang W, et al. Preliminary estimation of the basic reproduction number of novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in China, from 2019 to 2020: A data-driven analysis in the early phase of the outbreak. International Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2020;92:214–217. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.01.050.

[25] Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, Liang L, Huang H, Hong Z, et al. SARS-CoV-2 viral load in upper respiratory specimens of infected patients. The New England Journal of Medicine. 2020;p. 1–3.

[26] van den Driessche P, Watmough J. Reproduction numbers and sub-threshold endemic equilibria for compartmental models of disease transmission. Mathematical Biosciences. 2002;180(1-2):29–48.

[27] Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, Fan G, Liu Y, Liu Z, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. Lancet. 2020;6736(20):1–9. Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32171076.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.27.20044891; this version posted March 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[28] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Interim pre-pandemic planning guidance: community strategy for pandemic influenza mitigation in the United States: early, targeted, layered use of nonpharmaceutical interventions. 2007;Available from: https://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/11425.

[29] Klein D, Hagedorn B, Kerr C, Hu H, Bedford T, Famulare M, et al. Working paper – model-based estimates of COVID-19 burden in King and Snohomish counties through April 7, 2020. 2020;Available from: https://institutefordiseasemodeling.github.io/COVID-public/reports/Workingpaper\OT1\textendashmodel-basedestimatesofCOVID-19burdeninKingandSnohomishcountiesthroughApril7.pdf.

[30] Organization WH. WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 16 March 2020; 2020. [Online; accessed 18-March-2020]. https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---16-march-2020.

[31] Zhao J, Yuan Q, Wang H, Liu W, Liao X, Su Y, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients of novel coronavirus disease 2019 (February 25, 2020). The Lancet;Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3546052.

[32] in Data OW. How many tests for COVID-19 are being performed around the world?; 2020. [Online; accessed 16-March-2020]. https://ourworldindata.org/covid-testing.

[33] Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Müller MA, et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized cases of coronavirus disease 2019. medRxiv. 2020;Available from: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.05.20030502.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.27.20044891; this version posted March 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

	5 days (Figure 2A)	**6 days (Figure 2B)**	**7 days (Figure 2C)**	**8 days (Figure 2D)**
Do nothing	86	94	102	110
> 60	93 (+7)	100 (+6)	107 (+5)	115 (+5)
> 60 and Children	109 (+23)	117 (+23)	125 (+23)	133 (+23)
> 60 and Adults	105 (+19)	111 (+17)	118 (+16)	126 (+16)
All	136 (+50)	145 (+51)	> 150 (> 48)	> 150 (> 40)

Table S1: The delay in epidemic peak under different social distancing measures for varying infectious periods of 5, 6, 7, and 8 days. This table corresponds to Figure 2.

Supporting Information (SI)

Description of the model

We considered an age-structured SEIR model with 10 discrete age groups. The equations for the model are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dS_i}{dt} &= -\lambda S_i \,, \\
\frac{dE_i}{dt} &= \lambda S_i - \sigma E_i \,, \\
\frac{dI_i}{dt} &= \sigma E_i - \gamma I_i \,, \\
\frac{dR_i}{dt} &= \gamma I_i
\end{aligned}$$

where the state variables S_i, E_i, I_i, and R_i represent the numbers of susceptible, latent, infectious, and removed individuals in each age group i. Removed individuals are those who can no longer infect others. The force of infection is represented by $\lambda = \sum_{j=1}^{10} \beta \frac{c_{ij}}{N_j} I_j$, where c_{ij} corresponds to the estimated number of contacts per day between age class i and j in a total population size N. Based on current estimates [14] that put less than one percent of the infections as asymptomatic, we considered only symptomatic infections. Details of parameters values can be found in Table 1 of the main text.

Additional figures and tables

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.27.20044891; this version posted March 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure S1: Number of ascertained cases for five scenarios of social distancing: (A) none, (B) > 60 only, (C) > 60 and children, (D) > 60 and adults, and (E) all. Thin lines show 1000 realizations of varying parameters for R_0, σ and γ (see Methods). Thick lines show the median simulation, corresponding to $R_0 = 2.26, \gamma = 1/5.015$ and $\sigma = 1/5.159$. Here, we assumed that adults over 60 will reduce their contact by 95%, children by 85% and adults by 25%. The dotted lines represent the beginning and end of the social distancing intervention.



Figure S2: Number of ascertained cases for five scenarios of social distancing: (A) none, (B) > 60 only, (C) > 60 and children, (D) > 60 and adults, and (E) all. Thin lines show 1000 realizations of varying parameters for R_0, σ and γ (see Methods). Thick lines show the median simulation, corresponding to $R_0 = 2.26, \gamma = 1/5.015$ and $\sigma = 1/5.159$. Here, we assumed that adults over 60 will reduce their contact by 95%, children by 85% and adults by 75%. The dotted lines represent the beginning and end of the social distancing intervention.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.27.20044891; this version posted March 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure S3: Number of ascertained cases for five scenarios of social distancing: (A) none, (B) > 60 only, (C) > 60 and children, (D) > 60 and adults, and (E) all. Thin lines show 1000 realizations of varying parameters for R_0, σ and γ (see Methods). Thick lines show the median simulation, corresponding to $R_0 = 2.26, \gamma = 1/5.015$ and $\sigma = 1/5.159$. Here, we assumed that adults over 60 will reduce their contacts by 95%, children by 85% and adults by 95%. The dotted lines represent the beginning and end of the social distancing intervention.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.27.20044891; this version posted March 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure S4: Proportion of cases averted at 100 days under four scenarios of adults reducing their contact by (A) 25%, (B) 75%, and (C) 95%. The dotted lines represent the beginning and end of the social distancing intervention.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.27.20044891; this version posted March 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure S5: Proportion of hospitalizations averted at 100 days under four scenarios of adults reducing their contact by (A) 25%, (B) 75%, and (C) 95%.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.27.20044891; this version posted March 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure S6: Proportion of deaths averted at 100 days under four scenarios of adults reducing their contact by (A) 25%, (B) 75%, and (C) 95%.