

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

ASSESSMENT OF WORKERS' PERSONAL VULNERABILITY TO COVID-19 USING "COVID-AGE"

David Coggon¹
Peter Croft²
Paul Cullinan³
Anthony Williams⁴

¹ MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton

² School of Primary, Community and Social Care, Keele

³ Imperial College (NHLI) and Royal Brompton Hospital

⁴ Consultant Occupational Physician, Working Fit Ltd, Temple Ewell, Kent

Correspondence to:

Professor David Coggon
MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit
Southampton General Hospital
Southampton
SO16 6YD
UK
Email: dnc@mrc.soton.ac.uk
Phone: 02380 777624

Word count: 2345

References: 16

Abstract

Decisions on fitness for employment that entails a risk of contracting Covid-19 require an assessment of the worker's personal vulnerability should infection occur. Using recently published UK data, we have developed a risk model that provides estimates of personal vulnerability to Covid-19 according to sex, age, ethnicity, and various comorbidities. Vulnerability from each risk factor is quantified in terms of its equivalence to added years of age. Addition of the impact from each risk factor to an individual's true age generates their "Covid-age", a summary measure representing the age of a healthy UK white male with equivalent vulnerability. We discuss important limitations of the model, including current scientific uncertainties and limitations on generalisability beyond the UK setting and its use beyond informing assessments of individual vulnerability in the workplace. As new evidence becomes available, some of these limitations can be addressed. The model does not remove the need for clinical judgement or for other important considerations when managing occupational risks from Covid-19.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

DC contributed to data abstraction, analysis and interpretation, wrote the first draft of the paper, and is its guarantor, PCr contributed to identifying key papers, extraction and interpretation of data, and writing. PCu contributed to the discussions around Covid-age and to the manuscript. AW conceived and organised the project and created the Joint Occupational Health Covid-19 Group to oversee, advise and communicate the results.

Acknowledgements

We thank the members of the Joint Occupational Health Covid-19 Group who stimulated this work and provided valuable constructive comment. Their names are listed on the project website.

Conflicts of Interest

All authors declare no conflict of interests.

56 ASSESSMENT OF WORKERS' PERSONAL VULNERABILITY TO 57 COVID-19 USING "COVID-AGE" 58 59

60 **Background**

61
62 As countries adapt to the longer-term challenges of Covid-19, doctors increasingly will be
63 asked to advise on the fitness for work of patients who might be unusually vulnerable to the
64 disease because of their age, ethnicity and/or comorbidities. The risk of contracting Covid-19
65 through work will depend on the potential for close proximity to people who could be carrying
66 the infection, or for contact with material contaminated by the virus; the effectiveness of any
67 measures to reduce transmission (such as barriers or personal protective equipment); and
68 local prevalence of the disease at the time. More important for the individual, however, is
69 the risk of serious illness as a consequence of Covid-19, which will depend also on his/her
70 personal vulnerability should infection occur.

71
72 Early in the course of the Covid-19 epidemic, the UK government issued guidance on
73 vulnerability from comorbidities^{1,2}. Necessarily, that advice drew on limited empirical
74 evidence from other countries, and extrapolation from experience with other respiratory
75 infections. More recently, others have published guidance on risk reduction for healthcare
76 workers³ and the broader management of return to work in the face of health risks from
77 Covid-19⁴. Neither document attempted to quantify risks from specific comorbidities, but
78 research is now emerging that allows more detailed and reliable assessment of vulnerability
79 to Covid-19. In these circumstances, we judged it timely to analyse evidence on risk factors
80 for mortality from the disease, and apply the findings in a risk model that could be used to
81 estimate personal vulnerability. The model is intended principally to assist decisions on
82 occupational placement of workers in the UK. Over time it can be updated and refined as
83 relevant new data become available.

84
85 The online resource is now operational, and we here summarise the methods that we used,
86 the structure of the risk model, and our initial findings. Further detail can be found on the
87 project website⁵.

88 89 **Methods and sources of evidence**

90 Our aim was to assess and compare risks of fatality in people who contract SARSCov-2
91 infection, according to their age, sex, ethnicity, smoking habits, and various comorbidities. In
92 preliminary searches of the published literature, no evidence could be found on risks of

93 fatality in representative samples of people infected by the virus (including those with
94 asymptomatic infection). However, analyses of mortality from Covid-19 in the general
95 population could be expected to provide good proxy measures of relative risk, provided the
96 likelihood of contracting infection did not vary importantly according to the risk factors under
97 consideration (as might occur, for example, because of selective shielding by people with
98 certain comorbidities). In addition, estimates of risk might be possible if data could be found
99 on fatality rates by comorbidity in patients admitted to hospital because of Covid-19, and
100 then combined with information about the prevalence of the same comorbidities in
101 hospitalised Covid-19 patients as compared with the general population.

102

103 Because of the urgency to improve on earlier advice, we initially sought reports that would
104 provide the strongest evidence relevant to the UK, and did not attempt systematically to
105 search for, and review, all published evidence that might bear on the risks that we were
106 trying to characterise. In this respect, one paper stood out as particularly suited to our
107 purpose.

108

109 That report, from the OpenSAFELY (OS) collaborative, presented first results from a cohort
110 study of more than 17 million adults registered with English general practices and followed
111 up from 1 February 2020 to the earlier of death or 25 April 2020⁶. It used multivariate Cox
112 regression to estimate mutually adjusted hazard ratios (HRs) with 95% confidence intervals
113 (CIs) for death in hospital with confirmed Covid-19 (ascertained by linkage to a national
114 notification system) in relation to risk factors determined from pseudonymised individual
115 primary care records. Data on other deaths in the cohort (needed for censoring of follow-up)
116 had been obtained by linkage to records held by the Office for National Statistics (ONS).
117 The report contained a secondary analysis, which censored follow-up at 6 April 2020,
118 allowing exploration of the possibility that HRs for some comorbidities were underestimated
119 in the main analysis because, in response to advice from the UK government at the end of
120 March, people with those diseases had selectively shielded themselves from exposure to
121 infection. As well as sex, age, ethnicity, smoking habits and multiple comorbidities, analyses
122 in the paper adjusted for deprivation (using an index graded to five levels) and for the
123 administrative region of the patient's general practice (to allow for varying rates of infection in
124 different parts of the country).

125

126 This study had unique strengths. It included a substantial proportion of the adult population
127 of England, and was based on more than 5000 deaths attributed to Covid-19. Moreover,
128 information about risk factors came from data recorded before the onset of infection, which
129 reduced the possibility that ascertainment would be biased in relation to the outcome.

130 Nevertheless, we sought to check the plausibility of its findings, using data from other
131 studies. This was done using four independent sources of information.

132

133 1. Published ONS data on mortality from Covid-19 (as the underlying cause of death)
134 by sex and age in England and Wales during March 2020⁷. The death rates make no
135 allowance for effects of comorbidities, the prevalence of which may vary by age, and
136 between men and women. However, they provided a benchmark against which more
137 fully adjusted estimates of relative risk by sex and age could be compared.

138

139 2. Published ONS estimates of sex-specific odds ratios for coronavirus-related deaths
140 by ethnic group in England and Wales⁸. These were adjusted for age, geographical
141 region and various other potential confounders, although not for comorbidities.

142

143 3. A report from the International Severe Acute Respiratory and Emerging Infection
144 Consortium (ISARIC) study on outcomes, including mortality, in a cohort of 16,749
145 patients with Covid-19 admitted to hospitals in England, Wales and Scotland during 6
146 February 2020 to 18 April 2020 (28% of all such admissions nationally during that
147 period)⁹. Within the cohort, 49% had been discharged, 33% had died, and 17%
148 continued to receive care at the date of reporting. The study reported the prevalence
149 of various pre-existing comorbidities in the cohort, and used multivariate Cox
150 regression to estimate risk of in-hospital death according to age, sex and selected
151 comorbidities.

152

153 4. The prevalence of comorbidities by sex and age in samples of people (intended to be
154 nationally representative) from recent rounds of the Health Survey for England¹⁰⁻¹³.

155

156 Although the Health Survey for England data predated the ISARIC study, were only from
157 England, and did not apply the same diagnostic criteria and methods of ascertainment as
158 ISARIC, we could use them to calculate an approximate predicted prevalence of
159 comorbidities in the ISARIC cohort. Comparison of the observed and expected prevalence
160 then gave an indication, albeit approximate, of the age- and sex-adjusted relative risks of
161 being hospitalised with Covid-19 according to comorbidities. When combined with HRs for
162 death following admission to hospital in the ISARIC study, this allowed approximate
163 estimation of relative risks of mortality from Covid-19 among people with the comorbidity in
164 the general population.

165

166 We abstracted HRs for risk factors of interest from the OS report, and where possible
 167 checked their plausibility against data from the other sources mentioned above. The relative
 168 risks that we then adopted for our risk model are shown in Table 1, together with our
 169 qualitative assessments of the strength of evidence (“robustness”) on which estimates for
 170 each risk factor are based. In the main, these estimates were the HRs from the full follow-up
 171 period in the OS analysis, since they were statistically the most precise. However, in a few
 172 instances, where they were lower than the corresponding HR in the OS study from shorter
 173 follow-up, and it seemed probable that this might reflect selective shielding, we made
 174 appropriate adjustments. Also, findings from the ISARIC study suggested that the HR for
 175 chronic heart disease in the OS study might be too low, and that was therefore adjusted up
 176 slightly. Two previously suggested determinants of vulnerability (smoking and hypertension)
 177 were omitted from the risk model because after allowance for other factors, they appeared
 178 not to carry any material increase in risk. Further details of the calculations, rationale, and
 179 qualitative estimation of robustness of the relative risks shown in Table 1 are available as a
 180 supplementary online file and on the project website⁵.

181
 182 **Table 1: Vulnerability from risk factors expressed as equivalence to added years of**
 183 **age**

184
 185 Please note section on Limitations

Risk factor	Relative risk	Equivalent added years of age	Robustness of risk estimate
Sex			
Male	1	0	
Female	0.5	-8	Robust
Ethnicity			
White	1	0	
Asian or Asian British	1.6	5	Moderately robust
Black	1.7	6	Provisional
Mixed	1.6	5	Provisional
Other non-white	1.3	3	Provisional
Body mass index (Kg/m ²)			
<30	1	0	
30-34.9	1.4	4	Provisional
35-39.9	1.6	5	Provisional
≥40	2.4	10	Provisional

Asthma			
Mild (no requirement for oral corticosteroids in past year)	1.1	1	Moderately robust
Severe (requiring oral corticosteroids in past year)	1.4	4	Moderately robust
Diabetes			
Controlled (HbA1c<58 mmol/mol)	1.5	4	Moderately robust
Uncontrolled (HbA1c≥58 mmol/mol)	2.4	10	Moderately robust
No HbA1c measure in last 15 months	1.9	7	Moderately robust
Chronic heart disease	1.4	4	Provisional
Chronic respiratory disease (excluding asthma)	1.9	7	Moderately robust
Chronic kidney disease*	1.7	6	Moderately robust
Non-haematological cancer			
Diagnosed <1 year ago	1.6	5	Provisional
Diagnosed 1-4.9 years ago	1.2	2	Provisional
Diagnosed ≥5 years ago	1	0	Provisional
Haematological malignancy			
Diagnosed <1 year ago	3.5	14	Provisional
Diagnosed 1-4.9 years ago	3.1	13	Provisional
Diagnosed ≥5 years ago	1.9	7	Provisional
Liver disease	1.6	5	Provisional
Chronic neurological disease other than stroke or dementia**	2.5	10	Provisional
Organ transplant	4.3	16	Provisional
Spleen diseases†	1.4	4	Provisional
Rheumatoid/lupus/psoriasis	1.2	2	Provisional
Other immunosuppressive condition‡	1.8	7	Provisional

186

187 *Glomerular filtration rate <60mL/min/1.73m², as estimated from the most recent serum creatinine
188 measurement.

189 **Includes motor neurone disease, myasthenia gravis, multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease,
190 cerebral palsy, quadriplegia, hemiplegia, malignant primary brain tumour and progressive cerebellar
191 disease.

192 †Includes splenectomy, or spleen dysfunction (e.g. from sickle cell disease).

193 ‡Includes HIV, conditions inducing permanent immunodeficiency (ever diagnosed), aplastic anaemia,
194 and temporary immunodeficiency recorded within the past year.

195

196 **Covid-age**

197 A notable feature of Covid-19 is that mortality rates, whether or not they are adjusted for
198 comorbidities, increase exponentially with age. Thus, in the OS report, there were adjusted
199 relative risks of approximately 1.0945 and $(1.0945)^{10} = 2.5$ for increases in age of one and
200 10 years respectively⁶. In these circumstances, vulnerability from other risk factors can
201 conveniently be expressed in terms of the added years of age that would give an equivalent
202 increase in risk¹⁴. Table 1 sets out vulnerabilities associated with demographic variables
203 and comorbidities in our risk model, quantified as age equivalents as well as relative risks.
204 If it is assumed that when risk factors are present in combination, their relative risks multiply
205 (this is the normal default assumption in regression analyses such as those described in the
206 OS report), then combined effects can be estimated by summing the age equivalent for
207 each. Moreover, by adding the summed age equivalents to the person's true age, it is
208 possible to generate a summary measure of personal vulnerability. We have termed this
209 summary measure a person's "Covid-age". It represents the age of a healthy white male
210 with equivalent vulnerability (white males being the largest demographic group in the UK
211 workforce). Here are some examples:

- 212 • A healthy white woman, aged 40, has a Covid-age of $(40-8) = 32$ years.
- 213 • A white man, aged 45, BMI 36, with COPD has a Covid-age of $(45+5+7) = 57$ years
- 214 • An Asian woman aged 50 with uncontrolled diabetes has a Covid-age of $(50 - 8 + 5$
215 $+ 10) = 57$ years.

216

217 Absolute risks can be obtained by translating Covid-ages into estimated case-fatality rates.
218 The process is complicated by current uncertainties about the prevalence of asymptomatic
219 infection (for a given fatality rate in diagnosed symptomatic cases, a higher relative
220 prevalence of asymptomatic cases will imply lower overall case-fatality). However, in a
221 report by Ferguson and colleagues¹⁵, which drew on findings from a study by Verity and
222 colleagues¹⁶, the case-fatality rate at 40-49 years of age in men and women combined was
223 estimated to be 1.5 per 1000. Assuming a relative risk of 0.5 in women as compared with
224 men (see Table 1), this would imply a case fatality rate in men of $1.5 \times 2 / 1.5 = 2$ per thousand
225 in men aged 40-49 years. Given that some men in this age band will have comorbidities and
226 other risk factors that increase their vulnerability, this fatality rate might correspond to an
227 average Covid-age in the region of 47 years.

228

229 **Limitations**

230 Our analysis and risk model have important limitations.

231 *Scientific uncertainties*

232 Currently, all our assessments of risk are derived from a single study, albeit with checks on
233 plausibility using other sources. The outcome in that investigation was death in hospital from
234 Covid-19, and did not extend to deaths elsewhere. Data on some risk factors were
235 incomplete (although the extent of missing information was generally small). Although the
236 study was large, its findings, in particular for rarer comorbidities, are liable to statistical
237 uncertainties (confidence intervals for HRs from the OS report are presented in the
238 documentation that accompanies the vulnerability assessments⁵). Risks associated with
239 some comorbidities may have been attenuated by adjustment for deprivation. We have
240 assumed as a first approximation that relative risks from different factors multiply, but that
241 may not always be true. Also, some risk factors may have been associated with differences
242 in exposure to infection, as well as with differences in vulnerability once infection occurred.
243 The scope for such bias should have been reduced by adjustment of HRs for region, and by
244 our taking into account findings from the earlier OS analysis time-point, when little impact
245 would have been expected from selective shielding of patients with comorbidities. However,
246 we cannot rule out a residual bias, which would have tended towards slight underestimation
247 of the effects of some comorbidities.

248

249 *Heterogeneity of comorbidities*

250 A further limitation is the heterogeneity of some categories of comorbidity for which risk
251 estimates are available. For example, chronic pulmonary disease aggregates various
252 disorders, each with a range of severity. In the future, data should emerge that allow
253 evidence-based risk assessments for more specific sub-categories of disease. Meanwhile,
254 clinical judgement should be applied when considering how risks might vary within a
255 broader, aggregated category of comorbidity, taking as a starting point the estimated risk for
256 the category as a whole.

257

258 *Fatality as an outcome*

259 Our assessment of vulnerability uses fatality as an outcome, and does not take into account
260 loss of life-years. An avoidable death in a young person will normally result in much greater
261 loss of life-years than one occurring at older ages.

262

263 *Generalisability*

264 Although the methods that we have employed may be relevant to development of similar
265 models for other populations, our risk model is designed for application specifically to adults
266 in the UK. It was developed to assist decisions on occupational placement of workers in the
267 UK, and, although some of its findings might be of utility for other purposes, it is not intended
268 to inform decisions in clinical care.

269 **Conclusion**

270 We expect that some of these limitations can be addressed as further evidence becomes
271 available. Meanwhile, we believe that our assessment of vulnerability offers an improvement
272 on what previously has been available. We caution against simplistic rules for decisions
273 based only on the impacts that it estimates. It does not remove the need for clinical
274 judgement, and there are other important considerations when managing occupational risks
275 from Covid-19 – for example, the practicability of different possible control measures, the
276 personal value judgements of the individual worker, and prevailing advice from government
277 (which may be driven by a need to control demands on healthcare services as well as
278 individual risk). With these caveats, we hope that it will prove a useful contribution to
279 decisions about fitness for work during the Covid-9 pandemic in the UK adult population.

280

281 **References**

282

283 1. [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/guidance-on-shielding-and-protecting-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/guidance-on-shielding-and-protecting-extremely-vulnerable-persons-from-covid-19/guidance-on-shielding-and-protecting-extremely-vulnerable-persons-from-covid-19)
284 [extremely-vulnerable-persons-from-covid-19/guidance-on-shielding-and-protecting-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/guidance-on-shielding-and-protecting-extremely-vulnerable-persons-from-covid-19/guidance-on-shielding-and-protecting-extremely-vulnerable-persons-from-covid-19)
285 [extremely-vulnerable-persons-from-covid-19](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/guidance-on-shielding-and-protecting-extremely-vulnerable-persons-from-covid-19/guidance-on-shielding-and-protecting-extremely-vulnerable-persons-from-covid-19)

286 Accessed 20 May 20

287 2. [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/staying-alert-and-safe-social-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/staying-alert-and-safe-social-distancing/staying-alert-and-safe-social-distancing)
288 [distancing/staying-alert-and-safe-social-distancing](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/staying-alert-and-safe-social-distancing/staying-alert-and-safe-social-distancing)

289 Accessed 20 May20

290 3. Khunti K, de Bono A, Browne I, et al. Risk reduction framework for NHS staff at risk of
291 COVID-19 infection. Faculty of Occupational Medicine. 2020

292 [https://www.fom.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Risk-Reduction-Framework-for-NHS-staff-at-](https://www.fom.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Risk-Reduction-Framework-for-NHS-staff-at-risk-of-COVID-19-infection-12-05-20.pdf)
293 [risk-of-COVID-19-infection-12-05-20.pdf](https://www.fom.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Risk-Reduction-Framework-for-NHS-staff-at-risk-of-COVID-19-infection-12-05-20.pdf)

294 Accessed 19 May 2020.

295 4. Lalloo D, Roy M, Macdonald E. COVID-19 return to work guide for health professionals
296 advising patients and employers. Society of Occupational Medicine. 2020

297 https://www.som.org.uk/SOM_RTW_guide_health_professionals_COVID-19_FINAL.pdf

298 Accessed 19 May 2020.

299 5. Coggon D, Croft P, Cullinan P on behalf of the Joint Occupational Health COVID-19
300 Group. Covid-19 Medical Risk Assessment. Association of Local Authority medical
301 Advisers. 2020.

302 <https://alama.org.uk/covid-19-medical-risk-management/>

303 Accessed 19 May 2020.

304 6. The OpenSAFELY Collaborative, Williamson E, Walker AJ et al. OpenSAFELY: factors
305 associated with COVID-19-related hospital death in the linked electronic records of 17

- 306 million adult NHS patients. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.06.20092999> Accessed 13
307 May 2020.
- 308 7. Office for National Statistics. Deaths involving COVID-19, England and Wales: deaths
309 occurring in March 2020.
310 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deat](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deaths/bulletins/deathsinvolvingcovid19englandandwales/deathsoccurringinmarch2020)
311 [hs/bulletins/deathsinvolvingcovid19englandandwales/deathsoccurringinmarch2020](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deaths/bulletins/deathsinvolvingcovid19englandandwales/deathsoccurringinmarch2020)
312 Accessed 13 May 2020
- 313 8. Office for National Statistics. Odds ratios for risk of coronavirus-related deaths by ethnic
314 group, England and Wales.
315 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deat](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deaths/datasets/oddsratiosforriskofcoronavirusrelateddeathsbyethnicgroupenglandandwales)
316 [hs/datasets/oddsratiosforriskofcoronavirusrelateddeathsbyethnicgroupenglandandwales](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deaths/datasets/oddsratiosforriskofcoronavirusrelateddeathsbyethnicgroupenglandandwales)
317 Accessed 13 May 2020
- 318 9. Docherty AB, Harrison EM, Green CA et al. Features of 16,749 hospitalised patients
319 with COVID-19 using the ISARIC WHO clinical characterisation protocol.
320 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20076042> Accessed 13 May 2020.
- 321 10. NHS Digital. Health Survey for England, 2018.
322 [https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/health-survey-for-](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/health-survey-for-england/2018)
323 [england/2018](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/health-survey-for-england/2018)
324 Accessed 13 May 2020.
- 325 11. NHS Digital. Health Survey for England, 2017.
326 [https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/health-survey-for-](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/health-survey-for-england/2017)
327 [england/2017](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/health-survey-for-england/2017)
328 Accessed 13 May 2020
- 329 12. NHS Digital. Health Survey for England, 2016
330 [https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/health-survey-for-](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/health-survey-for-england/health-survey-for-england-2016)
331 [england/health-survey-for-england-2016](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/health-survey-for-england/health-survey-for-england-2016)
332 Accessed 13 May 2020.
- 333 13. NHS Digital. Health Survey for England – 2010, respiratory health
334 [https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/health-survey-for-](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/health-survey-for-england/health-survey-for-england-2010-respiratory-health)
335 [england/health-survey-for-england-2010-respiratory-health](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/health-survey-for-england/health-survey-for-england-2010-respiratory-health)
336 Accessed 13 May 2020
- 337 14. Spiegelhalter D. How old are you really? Communicating chronic risk through “effective
338 age” of your body and organs. BMC Med Informatics and Decision Making
339 2016;16:104.
- 340 15. Ferguson NM, Laydon D, Nedjati-Gilani G et al. Impact of non-pharmaceutical
341 interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand.

342 <https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/medicine/sph/ide/gida->

343 [fellowships/Imperial-College-COVID19-NPI-modelling-16-03-2020.pdf](https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/medicine/sph/ide/gida-fellowships/Imperial-College-COVID19-NPI-modelling-16-03-2020.pdf)

344 Accessed 1 May 2020.

345 16. Verity R, Okell LC, Dorigatti I, et al. Estimates of the severity of COVID-19 disease.

346 medRxiv 2020; Available from

347 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.09.20033357v1>.

348