medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.19.20106542; this version posted May 26, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 .

European lockdowns and the consequences of relaxation during the COVID-19 pandemic

David H. Glass
School of Computing, Ulster University, Shore Road,
Newtownabbey, Co. Antrim, BT37 0QB, UK
Email: dh.glass@ulster.ac.uk

19th May, 2020

Abstract

This paper investigates the lockdowns introduced in France, Germany, Italy, Spain and the UK using data on the daily number of confirmed cases, deaths and, in the case of the UK, hospital numbers. The analysis employs a two-stage SEIR model with different reproductive numbers pre- and post-lockdown, which have been estimated from the data for each country. The model is evaluated by considering its predictive accuracy on current data and it is then deployed to explore the potential consequences of partial relaxations of the lockdowns. The results suggest that there is a substantial difference between relaxations of 25% and 50% with respect to the pre-lockdown situation. The latter could lead to second peaks that are higher than the earlier peaks in all of the countries. The former would likely also be serious in the UK, could halt the decline in numbers in most countries and could lead to second peaks in some countries. Calculations also suggest that a relaxation of no more than about 10-15% would be needed if cases of COVID-19 are to continue to decline in all five countries.

1 Introduction

Many countries throughout the world have introduced lockdowns to prevent the rapid spread of COVID-19. How effective have these measures been and how and when should they be relaxed? As many countries now start to relax their lockdowns, this question has become an urgent matter. This paper explores these issues in the context of five European countries: France, Germany, Italy, Spain and the United Kingdom. The approach is to investigate the spread of the virus within these countries both before and after their respective lockdowns took effect and this is achieved by fitting a mathematical model of the spread of infectious disease to data on COVID-19 in each country.

The model in question is a variant of the SEIR model which has been widely used in the modelling of the COVID-19 pandemic [1–8]. This model describes the dynamics of 'susceptible' (S), 'exposed' (E), 'infectious' (I) and 'recovered' (R) groups over time. By including the exposed group to model the latent

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/10.1101/2020.05.19.20106542; this version posted May 26, 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 .

period, it extends the SIR model. SEIR models have been developed in various ways including one that incorporates interactions between different cities in a network [2] and another one that divides the population into different subgroups by age to include differing levels of interaction in society [5].

Here a different approach is adopted since the focus is on using a two-stage SEIR model, with first stage applying to the period before the lockdown and the second afterwards, and using the available data to learn its parameters. By learning the model from the data on the number of cases, this approach is able to determine the the impact of the lockdowns. The approach assumes that the reproductive number only changes at the lockdown. In this respect, the work is similar to another study of the impact of interventions in European countries that assumed the reproductive number only changed with each intervention, though the approaches differ in other respects [9]. Also, in that study the focus was on the number of deaths rather than the number of confirmed cases which are the primary focus here. However, the results here are compared with corresponding results based on the number of deaths as well as the number of hospital patients in the case of the UK. The model for each country is then evaluated by investigating how well it is able to predict the number of cases of COVID-19 recorded on a given day based on parameters learned from previous days. With the models in place, we are able to compare the effectiveness of the lockdowns in the different countries, make projections for the number of cases in the future and explore the effect of relaxing the restrictions in each country.

2 Methodology

Since the goal of the lockdowns is to reduce the transmission rate, β, the two-stage SEIR model proposed here involves different values for β before and after the lockdown came into effect, but to keep the other parameters fixed. The dynamics of various subgroups of the population before and after a lockdown occurring at $t_{lockdown}$ are given by the following ordinary differential equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dS}{dt} &= -\beta(t)\frac{SI^c}{N} - \alpha\beta(t)\frac{SI^u}{N} \\
\frac{dE}{dt} &= \beta(t)\frac{SI^c}{N} + \alpha\beta(t)\frac{SI^u}{N} - \sigma E \\
\frac{dI^c}{dt} &= \rho\sigma E - \gamma I^c \\
\frac{dI^u}{dt} &= (1-\rho)\sigma E - \gamma I^u \\
\frac{dR}{dt} &= \gamma(I^c + I^u)
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $\beta(t)$ is the transmission rate that has the following values before and after the lockdown

$$\beta(t) = \begin{cases} \beta^{Pre} & : t \leq t_{lockdown} \\ \beta^{Post} & : t > t_{lockdown} \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

and N is the population, σ the rate at which those in the exposed group become infectious, γ the recovery rate, and S, E, I^c, I^u and R are the susceptible, exposed, infected (confirmed), infected (unconfirmed) and recovered groups respectively, while ρ represents the proportion of confirmed cases. In dividing the infected group into two subgroups, we adopt a similar approach to other work that allows one subgroup

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.19.20106542; this version posted May 26, 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 .

described as sub-clinical / asymptomatic [5] or undocumented [2] to have a transmission rate reduced by a factor α.

The basic reproduction number R_0 is given by $\rho\beta/\gamma + (1-\rho)\alpha\beta/\gamma$, so alternatively we can say that different values of R_0 are used before and after the lockdown. We can denote these as R_0^{Pre}, the value before the lockdown, and R_0^{Post}, the value afterwards, corresponding to β^{Pre} and β^{Post} respectively. The approach is then to learn the values of R_0^{Pre} and R_0^{Post} from the daily data on the number of new cases of COVID-19 using the two-stage SEIR model (for details on the data used, see supplementary information). Data are used from the first day on which there were 100 or more reported new cases confirmed in the country. This date is taken to be day zero and the calculations proceed from there. We also carry out the same process with the data on the number of deaths due to COVID-19 with day zero representing the first day on which there were 10 or more deaths reported in a given country. Parameter learning is achieved by integrating the differential equations using the Euler method with a step size of one day and finding parameters that fit the data best in the sense of minimizing the sum of the squared residuals. We set the parameter $\sigma = 1 - e^{-1/3.8}$ representing the daily probability of a transition from exposed to infected. This is based on two factors: the incubation period and pre-symptomatic infection. There have been many studies of the incubation period for COVID-19 (see for example [10–12]). A meta-analysis of relevant literature gives a mean incubation period of 5.8 days [13]. There is also evidence of pre-symptomatic transmission of COVID-19 (see for example [14, 15]) with a pre-symptomatic period of infection of about 2 days [16]. Hence, our value for σ is based on the difference between these two estimates to give a latent period of 3.8 days, which is similar to that used by Li *et al* [2].

The recovery rate γ is based on the infectious period, which presents a challenge since a wide range of values have been estimated in the literature (for discussion see [16]). Here, we set $\gamma = 1 - e^{-1/3.4}$ based on estimates of the infectious period in China before and after travel restrictions were introduced of around 3.4 days [2]. This is at the low end of the estimates found in the literature, but it seems justified in the current context for two reasons. First, it is not the infectious period *per se* that is relevant for SEIR models, but the period during which the infection could contribute to transmission. Isolation measures were in place in all the European countries considered here which would have limited the scope for transmission. Second, there is evidence that transmissibility is highest around the onset of symptoms. In a secondary analysis of published data, Casey *et al* [17] suggest that transmission is most likely in the day before symptom onset and estimate that 56.1% of transmission occurs during the pre-symptomatic period based on a pooling of published results (see also [18, 19]). Furthermore, our values for both the latent and infectious periods are in line with estimates of the generation time and serial interval [20]. We also consider other values of several parameters in supplementary material to see how they affect results.

In order to fit the model to the number of newly confirmed cases, we need to identify the proportion (ρ) of confirmed cases out of the total number of cases (confirmed and unconfirmed) for a given country. The number of confirmed cases is known and for the total number of cases we divide the number of recorded deaths due to COVID-19 in a given country by a mortality rate of 0.66% [21], though once again we consider other values in supplementary material.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.19.20106542; this version posted May 26, 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 .

Intuitively, it might seem easy to include the lockdown in a given country. Since the date of day zero is known from the available data and the date of the lockdown is also known, it might be thought that the number of days between day zero and the lockdown could be used to incorporate it in the model. However, there is a delay between the onset of infection and subsequent confirmation. Lin *et al* report a 14 day delay between two datasets with largely the same group of patients [3]. This delay can depend on the availability of testing and on when people seek medical advice, for example, and so can differ from one country to another. Hence, rather than specifying this delay *a priori*, we learn it from the data by determining the value of $t_{lockdown}$ in equation (2) that gives the best fit (see supplementary material for further details).

In addition to fitting the two-stage model to the data, we also evaluate it by determining its predictive accuracy and comparing it with a simpler SIR model, which excludes the 'exposed' group. This is achieved using time series cross-validation [22] and lets us see how well the two-stage model generalizes to unseen data, which is relevant for the final part of the paper where we explore the consequences of relaxing the lockdowns. In effect, this amounts to extending the two-stage model to a three-stage version. The two-stage component is used first to learn the pre- and post-lockdown parameters (R_0^{Pre} and R_0^{Post}) and the value of $t_{lockdown}$ automatically from the data. After that, the simulation runs until the specified time of the relaxation where R_0^{Post} is the pre-relaxation value of R_0 and a new post-relaxation value is introduced.

3 Results

This section presents results for each of the five countries. Information about day zero, the date the lockdowns were introduced and the proportion of deaths in each country is presented in table 1.

Table 1: Dates for day zero (the first day on which at least 100 confirmed new cases were reported), the lockdowns (see [23] and references therein), and the number of deaths as a percentage of the total number of confirmed cases.

	Day zero	Lockdown	% deaths
France	5/03/20	17/03/20	19.2
Germany	5/03/20	22/03/20	4.5
Italy	27/02/20	9/03/20	14.0
Spain	6/03/20	14/03/20	11.8
UK	12/03/20	23/03/20	14.4

3.1 Fitting the two-stage SEIR model to the data

Figure 1 presents the two-stage SEIR model that gives the best fit to the daily number of confirmed cases following day zero for each country. In all cases, the model fits the data reasonably well and this is

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.19.20106542; this version posted May 26, 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 .

quantified by the R^2 values which highlight that the model fits the Italian data best, whereas the fit for France is poorest. For each country, the impact of lockdown is evident and the two-stage model captures the resulting effect on the number of confirmed cases.



a) France, $R^2 = 0.68$

b) Germany, $R^2 = 0.80$

c) Italy, $R^2 = 0.92$

d) Spain, $R^2 = 0.87$

e) UK, $R^2 = 0.84$

Figure 1: Two-stage SEIR models fitted to the daily confirmed cases for each of the five countries.

The two-stage model enables the time delay between the onset of infection (i.e. when a person becomes

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.19.20106542; this version posted May 26, 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 .

infectious) and subsequent confirmation to be identified. This is achieved by determining $t_{lockdown}$, the number of days after day zero on which the best-fitting model makes the transition from the pre- to post-lockdown R_0 values. The time delay is given by the difference between $t_{lockdown}$ and the actual date of the lockdown. Similarly, when the two-stage model is fitted to the number of deaths in a given country it is able to identify the time delay between the onset of infection and death (see supplementary material). We expect this latter delay to be similar between different countries whereas the time delay between onset of infection and confirmation could vary depending on testing strategy, medical advice, etc. Results are presented for both quantities in table 2. Since these results depend on identifying the actual date of the lockdown (see table 1) there could be some variation due to ambiguity in identifying this date and time taken to implement the lockdown. Nevertheless, the general picture seems clear. The time between onset of infection and death is similar for all countries, ranging from 13 to 17 days. For the time between onset of infection and confirmation, the results indicate a delay of around 12 ways, with the exception of Germany, where it is just four days. This finding is consistent with the intensive testing strategy adopted by Germany during the early stages of the outbreak.

Table 2: The time delay between onset of infection and subsequent confirmation t_c as well as that between onset of infection and death t_d.

	t_c	t_d
France	13	17
Germany	4	16
Italy	11	15
Spain	12	13
UK	11	15

It is clear from figure 1 that in terms of number of confirmations, the UK is in a very different position from the other four countries. In France, Germany, Italy and Spain there is an evident peak with the numbers falling sharply afterwards, whereas for the UK the number reach more of a plateau. Does this reflect the actual number of cases in the UK or could this be explained by the substantial increase in testing carried in the UK in April after the lockdown, so that the real impact of the lockdown is masked by increased testing? To answer this question, the two-stage model was also applied to UK hospital data on the number of patients with COVID-19 on a given day. The results are shown in figure 2 and were achieved with a goodness of fit value of $R^2 = 0.98$. This result strongly indicates that increased testing in the UK does indeed explain the result in figure 1.

The pre- and post-lockdown reproductive numbers as given by R_0^{Pre} and R_0^{Post} are presented in table 3, together with R^2 values (and RMSE and MAE which will be important later). In light of the above discussion, the result for the UK is based on the hospital data. The corresponding values for the UK based on the number of confirmed cases are 2.37 (95% CI: 1.95-2.79) for R_0^{Pre} and 1.02 (95% CI: 0.98-1.05) for R_0^{Post}. The pre-lockdown values in table 3 are consistent with other results found in the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.19.20106542; this version posted May 26, 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: Two-stage SEIR model fitted to UK hospital data.

Table 3: Estimates for the pre- and post-lockdown reproduction numbers with 95% confidence intervals. †The UK result is based on hospital data rather than the number of confirmed cases.

	R_0^{Pre}	R_0^{Post}	R^2	RMSE	MAE
France	2.08 (1.71-2.46)	0.67 (0.58-0.75)	0.68	923	546
Germany	2.50 (2.05-2.95)	0.67 (0.62-0.73)	0.80	850	598
Italy	2.35 (2.15-2.56)	0.82 (0.80-0.84)	0.92	466	377
Spain	2.82 (2.38-3.26)	0.68 (0.63-0.73)	0.87	933	632
UK†	2.27 (2.18-2.36)	0.91 (0.90-0.92)	0.98	698	535

literature [2, 4, 7, 11]. The results are somewhat lower than those found in an earlier study of European countries by Flaxman *et al* [9], though their results were for initial values whereas ours are for the whole pre-lockdown period. Furthermore, it also needs to be noted that the results for the R_0^{Pre} and R_0^{Post} values depend to some extent on the choice of parameters used. We explore this issue in supplementary material. The earlier study found initial evidence that the interventions had a substantial impact on transmission, though at that stage it was too early to say just how effective they had been [9]. The picture has now become clearer with all the reproductive numbers below one. We also present corresponding results for R_0^{Pre} and R_0^{Post} values obtained by fitting the two-stage model to the number of recorded deaths. While there are some differences, particularly where the R^2 value is low, these results are similar to those based on the number of deaths, especially for R_0^{Post}. This confirms the general picture that all the post-lockdown values are not only lower, but less than one and so provides further confirmation of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.19.20106542; this version posted May 26, 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 .

the earlier explanation of the UK results. Hence, in that sense all the lockdowns have been successful, though at 0.91 the estimate for the UK value of R_0^{Post} is higher than would have been hoped.

3.2 Predictive accuracy

So far we have only considered the fit of the models to the datasets, but we have not yet evaluated their predictive accuracy. In machine learning, a portion of data is held back for testing while the model is trained on the rest of the data. This can help to address issues of overfitting whereby the model may fit the training data well, but fail to generalize well to the unseen test data. Assessing predictive accuracy is relevant here since we will use the two-stage model in section 4 to explore the consequences of relaxing the lockdowns.

As noted earlier, the approach adopted here is that of time series cross-validation. In each case the last 10 data points are used for testing and k-step ahead prediction is used. For $k = 1$, if a dataset included 50 points, the first 40 would be used to learn the parameters of the two-stage SEIR model as described in section 2 and hence to predict the 41st. Then the first 41 would be used train the model to predict the 42nd, and so on. For $k = 2$, the first 39 would be used to train the model and predict the 41st, the first 40 to train the model and predict the 42nd, and so on. The two-stage model is evaluated using the metrics RMSE and MAE, which provide different ways of quantifying the difference between the predictions and the data (see supplementary material for definitions). It is also compared with a simpler two-stage SIR model. This has been implemented with two infectious groups and pre- and post-lockdown reproductive numbers just as for the SEIR model, but it excludes the exposed group. For comparative purposes, we can combine the latent and infection periods used earlier to give an average duration of infection of 7.2 days and so set the parameter γ to $1 - e^{-1/7.2}$ in the SIR model.

Table 4 presents results for k-step prediction with values of 1, 5, 10 and 20 for k. Note that the results are for the confirmed number of cases for each country except for the UK where the results are for the number of hospital patients since there are reasons to think that the hospital data provide a better picture of what is going on in the UK, as we saw earlier. In general the accuracy of the two-stage SEIR model is greater than that of the corresponding two-stage SIR model. In most cases, the SEIR predictions are better than those for SIR according to both the RMSE and MAE measures, the one exception being France where there is very little difference between the SEIR and SIR results, which is not surprising in light of the lower R^2 value for the French data compared to other countries (see table 3). In general the results between SEIR and SIR are quite similar, especially for one step ahead prediction, but the advantage of SEIR becomes more apparent for 10 and 20 step ahead prediction.

It is also useful to compare evaluation metrics on the test data with those on the training data. If the results are much poorer on the former than on the latter, that would highlight a potential concern with overfitting and hence for using the model for prediction. While we have not presented all the RMSE and MAE values on the training data, it is instructive to note that the values of these metrics for the SEIR model in table 4 are in most cases not too dissimilar to those for all the data for a given country (see table 3). A notable exception to this is found in the UK results for 20 (and to a lesser extent, 10) step ahead prediction where, for example, the fact that RMSE has a value of 8873 on the test data

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.19.20106542; this version posted May 26, 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 .

Table 4: Results for k-step ahead prediction for the number of confirmed cases on the last 10 days. The best result for each measure for a given country is in bold. †UK results are based on hospital data.

	k-step	SEIR		SIR	
	prediction	RMSE	MAE	RMSE	MAE
France	1	1126	626	**1119**	**623**
	5	1108	574	**1102**	**587**
	10	1119	**603**	**1105**	609
	20	1080	815	**1012**	**624**
Germany	1	**338**	**270**	369	281
	5	**348**	**268**	383	284
	10	**399**	**298**	450	338
	20	**475**	**374**	646	543
Italy	1	**538**	**490**	564	514
	5	**596**	**549**	634	589
	10	**672**	**628**	717	676
	20	**687**	**655**	760	730
Spain	1	**778**	**509**	797	598
	5	**811**	**566**	824	633
	10	**839**	**642**	883	718
	20	**1006**	**877**	1120	1024
UK†	1	**551**	**517**	815	792
	5	**882**	**837**	1147	1134
	10	**1667**	**1601**	2143	2088
	20	**8873**	**7224**	10918	8942

compared to 698 on all the UK hospital data does indeed highlight a problem. However, there is also a straightforward explanation for it. Day zero occurred in the UK later than in other countries (see table 1) and the hospital data are not available for as long a period as the number of confirmed cases, so for 20-step ahead prediction on the earliest of the test data, this means only 25 data points are available for training. Furthermore, this only includes about one week of post-lockdown data, which is insufficient to model the post-lockdown situation. Hence, the results for 1- and 5-step ahead prediction give a more realistic picture of the performance of the model for the UK data.

The main focus here is not simply on maximizing predictive accuracy since it may well be possible to do that by ignoring the pre-lockdown phase altogether and just fitting models to the post-lockdown data. Instead, the goal is to evaluate the two-stage SEIR model, which can then provide a basis for exploring the consequences of relaxing the lockdowns. The results presented so far give us confidence that it captures the lockdown transition and can be used to make reasonable predictions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.19.20106542; this version posted May 26, 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 .

4 Effect of relaxing the lockdowns

Having evaluated the two-stage SEIR model, we now use it to explore the potential effects of partially relaxing the lockdowns in the different countries. Just as the lockdowns were represented as a change in the reproductive number at a single point in time, the same assumption is made for relaxing the lockdowns. The idea is to model relaxations by increasing the reproductive number by a percentage of the difference between the pre- and post-lockdown values. This translates into a corresponding change in the average number of interactions in society, so it is straightforward to interpret. No doubt, there are limitations to this approach since, for example, it does not take into account different measures that could be put in place for different groups within society. However, these limitations are also relevant to the lockdowns in the first place and yet the model represents the lockdowns quite well. Three scenarios are considered:

i) no relaxation - keeping the lockdown fully in place, which is modelled by leaving the R_0 value unchanged at its post-lockdown value, R_0^{Post},

ii) 25% relaxation - relaxing the lockdown by one quarter so that R_0 increases by 25% of the way back up to the pre-lockdown value, i.e. to a value $0.75 \times R_0^{Post} + 0.25 \times R_0^{Pre}$, and

iii) 50% relaxation - relaxing the lockdown by one half so that R_0 increases by 50% of the way back up to the pre-lockdown value, i.e. to a value $0.5 \times R_0^{Post} + 0.5 \times R_0^{Pre}$.

Needless to say, a lot of caution is required with such attempts to model the future course of COVID-19. Many assumptions have been made about the model. For example, the values of several parameters and the use of a two-stage SEIR model with a single reproductive number before the lockdown and another one afterwards. Also, given the simplicity of the two-stage SEIR model, it cannot be used to model specific relaxations such as allowing schools to re-open. Hence, this approach would need to be complemented by other work that provides more detailed models of society, which could be used to identify what changes would lead to relaxations of a specified percentage and how this might relate to vulnerable groups within society. Nevertheless, the simplicity of the model can also have an advantage because it requires relatively few model assumptions and yet can model the lockdowns and hence plausibly relaxations of them too.

The different levels of relaxation have been implemented on the assumption that they would take effect in terms of daily confirmed cases (or number of hospital patients for the UK) on 31st May, 2020 in each of the countries. Based on our earlier results, this corresponds to the introduction of partial relaxation of the lockdowns from about 20th May, 2020. It must be noted that this means the number of days from day zero at which the relaxation is introduced is different in the different countries. Results are then presented for six weeks from the end of May, i.e. the middle of July.

Results are shown for numbers of daily confirmed cases in France, Germany, Italy and Spain and for hospital numbers in the UK in figure 3. There is a clear difference between the three scenarios in all countries. In all countries apart from France, the results show that a 25% relaxation brings an end to the decline in numbers of confirmed cases with numbers remaining constant or only increasing slightly

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.19.20106542; this version posted May 26, 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 .



a) France



b) Germany



c) Italy



d) Spain



e) UK

Figure 3: The effect on the daily number of confirmed cases (hospital numbers for the UK) of keeping the lockdown fully in place (—), relaxing it by 25% (– – –) and relaxing it by 50% (– · –). In each case the relaxation is assumed to take effect by 15/05/20, which corresponds to the implementation of the relaxation around 3/05/20. Note that the results for the UK are on a different scale.

in Germany, Italy and Spain, while in the UK the numbers of hospital patients increase by about 60% during the six week period. 50% relaxation results in an increase in numbers of cases in all five countries and on an upward trajectory at the end of the six week period. In France, the numbers increase by more than a factor of three during the six weeks, though this is still small in absolute terms compared

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.19.20106542; this version posted May 26, 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 .

to the earlier peak in France. In Germany, Italy and Spain, the numbers increase to approximately half, two-thirds and one-third of the numbers at the previous peaks in those countries respectively, while in the UK they are about twice the numbers at the earlier peak.

Why are the results so much lower for France compared to the other countries? One factor is the lower pre-lockdown value of $R_0^{Pre} = 2.08$ compared to the other countries, though it must be remembered that the goodness of fit was worse for France than for other countries, so caution is needed in this case. The relatively low value R_0^{Pre} results in a post-relaxation R_0 value of just above one, but due to the decreasing proportion of susceptible people, the effective reproduction number is just below one. Another factor is that by the time of the relaxation, the projected number of cases in France is very small. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the number of deaths as a percentage of confirmed cases is lower in France compared to the other countries, which in turn suggests that the number of confirmed cases is lower as a proportion of the total number of cases in France. This is reflected in the results, since we are modelling the number of confirmed cases. Had the same proportion of cases been confirmed as in Germany, for example, the results for France would be higher.

Why are the results so much higher for the UK compared to the other countries? The relaxation is modelled to occur earlier relative to day zero in the UK, but simulations of relaxations occurring at different times suggest this is not the most important factor. More relevant is that the estimated post-lockdown value of $R_0^{Post} = 0.91$ is higher than the other countries and related to this, the number of cases at the time of the relaxation is still high.

Sensitivity analysis of these results involved considering different values for the parameters for the latent period, infectious period and mortality rate and results are presented in supplementary material. These results confirm the general picture presented here. Results are also presented in supplementary material for a longer period up to 400 days after day zero for two different parameter settings. In all of the countries, a 50% relaxation would lead to a second peak significantly greater than the first peak in the absence of further interventions.

A key feature of the results presented here is the very substantial difference between a 25% relaxation and a 50% relaxation. The latter would be disastrous. The former would still be very serious in the UK, but might be more manageable in the other countries, though depending on the parameters it could lead to a lower second peak in some countries (see supplementary material), and one that could last for longer. Even if 25% did not result in substantial increases in numbers, it would probably halt the decline in numbers, thus leaving no room for further relaxations. And given the uncertainty involved in these models, a much lower value than 25% would be desirable, particularly in UK. Further calculations suggest that a relaxation of 10-15% should be adequate to enable the numbers to continue to decline (see supplementary material).

5 Conclusion

A two-stage SEIR model has been fitted to data on the daily numbers of confirmed cases of COVID-19 in France, Germany, Italy, Spain and the UK. This approach enables the date at which the lockdown

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.19.20106542; this version posted May 26, 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 .

became effective and the reproduction number before and after the lockdown to be estimated from the data. This enables the effectiveness of the lockdowns to be evaluated. According to these estimates, Spain saw the greatest reduction in the reproductive number.

As well as fitting the two-stage SEIR model to the data, its predictive performance was evaluated using time series cross-validation. It was shown to give reasonable predictions of existing data based only on results from earlier data and it also outperformed the simpler SIR model. Based on this evaluation, the model was used to investigate potential consequences of relaxing the lockdowns towards the end of May. The results indicate that there is a substantial difference between 25% and 50% relaxations. The results suggest that the latter would be disastrous and could lead to a second peak significantly higher than the earlier peak in each country, if no further measures were put in place. The former would still be very serious in the UK, but less so in the other countries, though it could halt the decline in numbers and potentially lead to a lower second peak, spread out over a longer period of time. A relaxation of no more than about 10-15%, which translates into the level of interactions within society, would be needed if numbers are to continue to decline in all five countries. Of course, this only applies to society as a whole and particular measures would need to be put in place to protect more vulnerable groups.

Since the two-stage model has been shown to model the lockdowns reasonably well, it can also be used to model relaxations. Hence, as data starts to become available as a result of relaxations being introduced it should be possible to analyze them using the model. However, as indicated earlier, a lot of caution is needed with the results on relaxing the lockdowns as they stand at present. Inevitably various assumptions have to be made in the modelling and while the two-stage SEIR model has merits, it is also limited in certain respects. As such, this work could be extended in various ways and used to complement models that take into account age-stratification, for example [5, 24]. Nevertheless, the SEIR model is widely used in the literature to study the spread of infectious disease and it has been evaluated here using the COVID-19 data available so far in five European countries. So, arguably even more caution is needed with any relaxation of lockdowns on the timescales considered in this paper.

References

[1] Y. Fang, Y. Nie, and M. Penny, "Transmission dynamics of the COVID-19 outbreak and effectiveness of government interventions: A data-driven analysis," *Journal of Medical Virology*, vol. 92, no. 6, pp. 645–659, 2020.

[2] R. Li, S. Pei, B. Chen, Y. Song, T. Zhang, W. Yang, and J. Shaman, "Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (sars-cov-2)," *Science*, vol. 368, no. 6490, pp. 489–493, 2020.

[3] Q. Lin, S. Zhao, D. Gao, Y. Lou, S. Yang, S. S. Musa, M. H. Wang, Y. Cai, W. Wang, L. Yang, and D. He, "A conceptual model for the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak in Wuhan, China with individual reaction and governmental action," *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*, vol. 93, pp. 211 – 216, 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.19.20106542; this version posted May 26, 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 .

[4] A. J. Kucharski, T. W. Russell, C. Diamond, Y. Liu, J. Edmunds, S. Funk, R. M. Eggo, F. Sun, M. Jit, J. D. Munday, *et al.*, "Early dynamics of transmission and control of COVID-19: a mathematical modelling study," *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 2020.

[5] K. Prem, Y. Liu, T. W. Russell, A. J. Kucharski, R. M. Eggo, N. Davies, S. Flasche, S. Clifford, C. A. B. Pearson, J. D. Munday, *et al.*, "The effect of control strategies to reduce social mixing on outcomes of the COVID-19 epidemic in Wuhan, China: a modelling study," *The Lancet Public Health*, 2020. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30073-6.

[6] B. Tang, X. Wang, Q. Li, N. L. Bragazzi, S. Tang, Y. Xiao, and J. Wu, "Estimation of the transmission risk of the 2019-ncov and its implication for public health interventions," *Journal of Clinical Medicine*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2020.

[7] J. T. Wu, K. Leung, and G. M. Leung, "Nowcasting and forecasting the potential domestic and international spread of the 2019-ncov outbreak originating in wuhan, china: a modelling study," *The Lancet*, vol. 395, no. 10225, pp. 689 – 697, 2020.

[8] Z. Yang, Z. Zeng, K. Wang, S.-S. Wong, W. Liang, M. Zanin, P. Liu, X. Cao, Z. Gao, Z. Mai, *et al.*, "Modified SEIR and AI prediction of the epidemics trend of COVID-19 in China under public health interventions," *Journal of Thoracic Disease*, vol. 12, no. 3, 2020.

[9] S. Flaxman, S. Mishra, A. Gandy, *et al.*, "Estimating the number of infections and the impact of nonpharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in 11 European countries," 2020. Imperial College London (30-03-2020), doi: https://doi.org/10.25561/77731.

[10] S. A. Lauer, K. H. Grantz, Q. Bi, F. K. Jones, Q. Zheng, H. R. Meredith, A. S. Azman, N. G. Reich, and J. Lessler, "The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and Application," *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 2020. doi: https://doi.org/10.7326/M20-0504.

[11] Q. Li, X. Guan, P. Wu, X. Wang, L. Zhou, Y. Tong, R. Ren, K. S. Leung, E. H. Lau, J. Y. Wong, *et al.*, "Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel Coronavirus–Infected Pneumonia," *New England Journal of Medicine*, vol. 382, no. 13, pp. 1199–1207, 2020.

[12] N. Linton, T. Kobayashi, Y. Yang, K. Hayashi, A. Akhmetzhanov, S.-M. Jung, B. Yuan, R. Kinoshita, and H. Nishiura, "Incubation period and other epidemiological characteristics of 2019 novel coronavirus infections with right truncation: A statistical analysis of publicly available case data," *Journal of Clinical Medicine*, vol. 9, no. 2, p. 538, 2020.

[13] C. G. McAloon, A. Collins, K. Hunt, A. Barber, A. Byrne, F. Butler, M. Casey, J. M. Griffin, E. Lane, D. McEvoy, *et al.*, "The incubation period of covid-19: A rapid systematic review and meta-analysis of observational research," *medRxiv*, 2020.

[14] P. Yu, J. Zhu, Z. Zhang, and Y. Han, "A Familial Cluster of Infection Associated With the 2019 Novel Coronavirus Indicating Possible Person-to-Person Transmission During the Incubation Period," *The Journal of Infectious Diseases*, vol. 221, pp. 1757–1761, 02 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.19.20106542; this version posted May 26, 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 .

[15] G. Qian, N. Yang, A. H. Y. Ma, L. Wang, G. Li, X. Chen, and X. Chen, "COVID-19 Transmission Within a Family Cluster by Presymptomatic Carriers in China," *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 03 2020. ciaa316.

[16] A. W. Byrne, D. McEvoy, A. Collins, K. Hunt, M. Casey, A. Barber, F. Butler, J. Griffin, E. Lane, C. McAloon, K. O'Brien, P. Wall, K. Walsh, and S. More, "Inferred duration of infectious period of sars-cov-2: rapid scoping review and analysis of available evidence for asymptomatic and symptomatic covid-19 cases," *medRxiv*, 2020.

[17] M. Casey, J. Griffin, C. G. McAloon, A. W. Byrne, J. M. Madden, D. McEvoy, A. B. Collins, K. Hunt, A. Barber, F. Butler, *et al.*, "Estimating pre-symptomatic transmission of covid-19: a secondary analysis using published data," *medRxiv*, 2020.

[18] X. He, E. Lau, P. Wu, X. Deng, J. Wang, X. Hao, Y. Lau, J. Y. Wong, Y. Guan, X. Tan, X. Mo, Y. Chen, B. Liao, W. Chen, F. Hu, Q. Zhang, M. Zhong, Y. Wu, L. Zhao, and G. Leung, "Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of covid-19," *Nature Medicine*, vol. 26, pp. 672–675, 2020.

[19] H.-Y. Cheng, S.-W. Jian, D.-P. Liu, T.-C. Ng, W.-T. Huang, , and H.-H. Lin, "High transmissibility of covid-19 near symptom onset," *medRxiv*, 2020.

[20] J. M. Griffin, A. B. Collins, K. Hunt, D. McEvoy, M. Casey, A. W. Byrne, C. G. McAloon, A. Barber, E. A. Lane, and S. J. More, "A rapid review of available evidence on the serial interval and generation time of covid-19," *medRxiv*, 2020.

[21] R. Verity, L. C. Okell, I. Dorigatti, P. Winskill, C. Whittaker, N. Imai, G. Cuomo-Dannenburg, H. Thompson, P. G. T. Walker, H. Fu, *et al.*, "Estimates of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based analysis," *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 2020.

[22] R. Hyndman and G. Athanasopoulos, *Forecasting: principles and practice*. OTexts: Melbourne, Australia, 3rd ed., 2019. OTexts.com/fpp3. Accessed on 25/04/20.

[23] Wikipedia, "National responses to the COVID-19 pandemic," 2020. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_responses_to_the_COVID-19_pandemic, Last accessed: 18/05/2020.

[24] N. M. Ferguson, D. Laydon, G. Nedjati-Gilani, *et al.*, "Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand," 2020. Imperial College London (16-03-2020), doi: https://doi.org/10.25561/77482.