Estimation of Individual Probabilities of COVID-19 Infection, Hospitalization, and Death From A County-level Contact of Unknown infection Status

Rajiv Bhatia MD, MPH *

Assistant Professor of Medicine (affiliated), Stanford University

Physician, VA Palo Alto Health Care System

drajiv@stanford.edu

Jeffrey Klausner, MD, MPH

Professor of Medicine and Public Health, UCLA

JDKlausner@mednet.ucla.edu

Abstract: - 230 words

Manuscript: 2747 words

References: 822 words

Tables: 3

Figures: 2

* Corresponding Author

Version Date: June 23, 2020

Abstract

Objective: Our objective is to demonstrate a method to estimate the probability of a laboratory confirmed COVID19 infection, hospitalization, and death arising from a contact with an individual of unknown infection status.

Methods: We calculate the probability of a confirmed infection, hospitalization, and death resulting from a county-level person-contact using available data on current case incidence, secondary attack rates, infectious periods, asymptomatic infections, and ratios of confirmed infections to hospitalizations and fatalities.

Results: Among US counties with populations greater than 500,000 people, during the week ending June 13,2020, the median estimate of the county level probability of a confirmed infection is 1 infection in 40,500 person contacts (Range: 10,100 to 586,000). For a 50 to 64 year-old individual, the median estimate of the county level probability of a hospitalization is 1 in 709,000 person contacts (Range: 177,000 to 10,200,000) and the median estimate of the county level probability of a fatality is 1 in 6,670,000 person contacts (Range 1,680,000 to 97,600.000).

Conclusions and Relevance: Estimates of the individual probabilities of COVID19 infection, hospitalization and death vary widely but may not align with public risk perceptions. Systematically collected and publicly reported data on infection incidence by, for example, the setting of exposure, type of residence and occupation would allow more precise estimates of probabilities than possible with currently available public data. Calculation of secondary attack rates by setting and better measures of the prevalence of seropositivity would further improve those estimates.

Introduction

During infectious disease epidemics, human perception of risk modifies disease transmission, and motivates, or not, protective behaviors such as hand hygiene, wearing masks and social distancing at the individual level and quarantine, travel restrictions, and restrictions on gatherings at the societal level. Novel infectious agents such as the COVID-19 virus, with immature understanding of susceptibility, transmission, and lethality, challenge accurate risk estimation.

Predictive models, government surveillance, and epidemiological studies have characterized the risk of COVID-19, in terms of aggregate, and not individual, outcomes, primarily including County-level counts of reported infections, hospitalizations, and deaths. (1) Research has attempted to estimate case fatality rates and identified risk factors for adverse outcomes from COVID-19 disease, such age and chronic disease status. (2, 3) We are not aware of any published research that estimates individual level probabilities of infection, hospitalization, and death from exposure in the general community.

In the United States, publicly accessible data does not yet permit estimating the individual risks of COVID-19 transmission in specific exposure settings, including workplaces, prisons, nursing homes, hospitals and group residential housing settings. However, a starting point for estimation can be the average individual-level probability of acquiring infection across all settings at the level of a county. One can modify those

estimates as data on setting specific infection incidence rates, susceptibility and secondary attack rates permit.

Here, we contribute to COVID-19 risk assessment by demonstrating a method to estimate the individual probabilities of acquiring infection, being hospitalized, and dying in U.S. Counties. We identify areas of available and future knowledge that could make risk assessment more precise and context specific.

Materials and Methods

Our objective is to estimate the probability of acquiring COVID-19 infection from a "contact" with a random individual of unknown infection status. We conceptualize this probability under steady state conditions (e.g. no epidemic growth or decline) as a function of individual susceptibility, the current reported case incidence, accounting for undetected infection, the share of infection transmission occurring without a known contact, the chance of transmission per contact (e.g., the secondary attack rate), and the duration of infectiousness, accounting for pre-symptomatic transmission.

We use the formulae below to compute probabilities of infection, confirmed infection, hospitalization, and death.

(1) $P_{infection \mid contact} = S \; I_{confirmed} \; C \, \beta \, [1 + \alpha/(1 - \alpha)] \, [\sigma D_{Infectious} + \eta \, (1 - \sigma) \, D_{Infectious}]$

(2) $P_{confirmed\text{-}infection \mid contact} = P_{infection \mid contact} / (1 - \alpha)$

(3) $P_{hospitalization \mid contact} = CHR \times P_{confirmed\text{-}infection \mid contact}$

90 (4) $P_{death \mid contact} = CFR \times P_{confirmed\text{-}infection \mid contact}$

91

92 We describe the parameters used in Table 1 and explain their sources below.

93 **Table 1. Parameters Used in Formulae**

Symbol	Parameter Description	Value
S	Proportion of the population susceptible	95%
$I_{confirmed}$	Incidence of confirmed (reported) infections per day	County Data
C	Proportion of infections resulting from unknown contacts	100%
α	Proportion of total infections unconfirmed (undetected and unreported)	75%
B	Probability of infection per exposure	10%
$D_{infectious}$	Average days infectious per infection	8
σ	Proportion of infectious period pre-symptomatic [a]	40%
η	Proportion non-compliant with isolation	25%
CHR	Case Hospitalization Ratio, 0 to 49 years [a]	0.026
CHR	Case Hospitalization Ratio, 50 to 64 years [a]	0.057
CHR	Case Hospitalization Ratio, Over 65 years [a]	0.1
CFR	Case Fatality Ratio, 0 to 49 years [a]	0.001
CFR	Case Fatality Ratio, 50 to 64 years [a]	0.006
CFR	Case Fatality Ratio, Over 65 years [a]	0.032

94

95 [a] US CDC COVID-19 Pandemic Planning Scenarios. Scenario 4 Estimates

96

The prevalence of susceptibility to COVID-19 is unknown. Pre-existing immunity due to previous COVID-19-related coronaviral infections is plausible but speculative. Reliable estimates for the proportion of the population who have acquired immunity is unknown but non-zero. We have conservatively estimated the prevalence of susceptibility to be 95%.

We acquired COVID-19 confirmed infection incidence data from publicly reported statistics compiled by The New York Times. (4) Confirmed infection rates underestimate the true incidence of infection in the community because of undetected infections that can be both symptomatic and asymptomatic. Several studies have estimated the asymptomatic fraction. (5-7) In one meta-analytic review, the proportion of asymptomatic infections ranged from 6% to 41%. (8) A weighted mean estimate from those studies suggests that about 1 out of 6 persons, or 16%, may be asymptomatic. On the other hand, seroprevalence studies aim to capture both the confirmed and unconfirmed fractions together without regard to symptoms. Some seroprevalence studies suggest that up to 90% of infections may be unconfirmed. (9) The US CDC gives 50% as their most conservative estimate of the proportion of asymptomatic infections. (10) We estimate 75% of all infections are unconfirmed which includes both symptomatic and asymptomatic unconfirmed infections.

Limited data is available on the share of reported infections arising without a known contact. As of this date, the US CDC has not included any statistics on this attribute of

confirmed infections. The State of Oregon currently publicly reports infections without a known contact a varying between 30 and 50%%. Because of limited national data, we use 100% for this parameter; we leave the parameter in the equation for the purpose of future applications.

The attack rate for an exposure varies by exposure intensity, context, proximity, and duration. For this analysis, contact means any substantive exposures that happen in a community, household, workplaces, or group living situations. Examples of substantive contacts outside households might include dining with a friend or business contact, working in a shared office space or having close or physical contact without the types of precautions now recommended for prevention of infection transmission (e.g. avoiding handshaking, embraces, wearing a mask or indoor ventilation). We do not consider contacts to be short-term events, such as passing by a person on the street. Contact within households involves habitual and typically unprotected close physical. We understand that attack rates will vary across such diverse exposure settings.

Overall, secondary attack rates from contact tracing studies on COVID-19 range from 0.7% to 16.3%. One study in Taiwan estimated a mean attack rate of 0.7% with an attack rate of ~5% among household and non-household family contacts. (11) A Hong Kong study of the quarantined contacts of visitors from China estimated a secondary attack rate of 11.7%. (12) Two published study within China found a household attack rate of 16.3% and 11.2% respectively. (13-14)

143 We assume an average plausible attack rate across all settings of exposure based on
144 these range of estimates to be 10% in the absence of more setting and activity specific
145 data. We acknowledge that this estimate may overestimate the attack rate for a non-
146 household contact and underestimate it for a household contact.
147
148 We estimate the total duration of infectiousness as 8 days. Research suggests that
149 individuals who develop symptoms may be infectious two to three days before the onset
150 of symptoms. (15) We apply the US CDC's estimates that the proportion of
151 infectiousness before symptom onset is 40% of the total duration. (10) Conservatively,
152 we treat infections in the unreported fraction as being infectious for the same duration
153 as those with reported infections.
154
155 Compliance with self-isolation affects the number of infectious people circulating with
156 infection after symptoms develop. Current research within the context of the COVID-19
157 pandemic finds that compliance with isolation ranges from 57% without financial
158 compensation to 94% with compensation. (16) Given the current US context and the
159 availability of sick leave compensation, we assume that 75% of individuals with
160 confirmed infection will voluntarily self-isolate after symptoms develop. We do not alter
161 the duration of infectiousness for the unconfirmed fraction of infections.
162
163 We estimate the probabilities per contact of reported infections, hospitalizations and
164 deaths as fixed ratios of the estimated but unobserved probability of infection. The

relationship between total infections and confirmed infections is fixed and defined by the parameter alpha above.

We estimate the probability of hospitalizations and deaths per contact using US CDC estimates of case hospitalization ratios and case fatality ratios from their pandemic planning scenario four, which is their most conservative current estimate of disease severity and transmissibility. (10) (Table 1) Based on these fixed ratios, we expect 18 reported infections and 70 total infections for every hospitalization in an individual in the 50-64 year old age group. And we expect 167 reported infections, and 667 total infections for every death in the 50-64 year old age group.

These estimated case fatality ratios are within the range of published values in the United States. One study of deaths through the early part of the epidemic estimated the case fatality ratio for symptomatic cases to be 1.3% (95% CI: 0.6% to 2.1%). (2)

We compared estimated weekly hospitalization incidence rates produced using the estimated probabilities per contact against observed incidence rates of laboratory confirmed COVID-19 hospitalization in several US multi-county regions where the US CDC conducts active hospital case surveillance. (17) To estimate weekly hospitalizations, we multiplied our estimates of age specific probabilities of hospitalization per contact and a modest number of daily contacts equal to the number of other household members plus one.

188 **Results**

189

190 Among US Counties with populations greater than 500,000 people (N= 1224), for the
191 week ending June 13, 2020, the median observed county-level daily case incidence is
192 6.78 per 100,000 (Range, 0.41- 24). In those counties, the median estimate of the
193 county-level probability of a confirmed COVID-19 infection is 1 infection in 40,500
194 person-contacts (Range: 10,100 - 586,000). These estimates reflect the probability per
195 contact at a single point in time averaged across all types of contacts and settings,
196 within and outside households.

197

198 In the same counties, for a 50 to 64 year old individual, , the median estimate of the
199 county-level probability of a hospitalization is 1 in 709,000 person-contacts (Range:
200 177,000 – 10,200,000) and the median estimate of the county-level probability of a
201 fatality is 1 in 6,670,000 person-contacts (Range 1,680,000 – 97,600.000). Table 2 lists
202 probabilities for other age groups.

Table 2. Estimated County-level Probabilities for the Week Ending June 13, 2020 of COVID-19 Events in Counties with Populations Greater Than 500,000 (N = 1224)

Event	Age Group	Average	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Confirmed Case	All	0.002833%	0.002470%	0.000171%	0.009892%
Hospitalization	Under 49 yr	0.000074%	0.000064%	0.000004%	0.000257%
	50- 64 yr	0.000162%	0.000141%	0.000010%	0.000564%
	Over 65 yr	0.000283%	0.000247%	0.000017%	0.000989%
Fatality	Under 49 yr	0.000003%	0.000002%	0.000000%	0.000010%
	50- 64 yr	0.000017%	0.000015%	0.000001%	0.000059%
	Over 65 yr	0.000091%	0.000079%	0.000005%	0.000317%

Figure 1 illustrates the average estimated probabilities of confirmed infection, hospitalization and fatality per contact as a function of daily case incidence. Figure 2 Illustrates the estimated number of hospitalizations and fatalities per 1 million contacts in a subset of analyzed US counties with populations greater than 1.5 million.

We found good concordance between the estimated weekly hospitalization rates and rates from US CDC hospitalization surveillance data in most of our comparison regions under the assumption that average daily contacts equaled the average number of other household members plus one. (Table 3) CDC acknowledges that more recent data values are subject to revision.

Table 3. Estimated weekly hospitalization rates per 100,000 people for the week ending June 13, 2020 compared to weekly laboratory confirmed hospitalization rates observed by US CDC regional surveillance.

County	Alameda, CA	Denver CO	Fulton GA	Montgomery, MD	Wayne, MI
Assumption of Contacts Per Day	2.8	2.3	2.47	2.79	2.52
Estimated Weekly New Cases per 100,000	32.94	37.55	28.2	127.4	53.8
Estimated Weekly Hospitalization Rate (per 100,0000 people)					
18-49 years	0.86	0.98	0.7	3.3	1.4
50-64 years	1.88	2.14	1.6	7.3	3.1
Over 65 years	3.29	3.76	2.8	12.7	5.4
COVID-NET Observed Regional Weekly Hospitalization Rates					
18-49 years	1	1.1	1	5.3	0.4
50-64 years	1	3.2	2	6.6	0.8
Over 65 years	3.3	2.2	1.7	13.5	0.5

Discussion

We demonstrate a method to estimate the average county-level probabilities of COVID-19 confirmed infections, hospitalizations, and deaths in the U.S resulting from a contact with a random person in the population. Those estimates reflect current reported COVID-19 confirmed infection incidence in US counties with more than 500,000 people for the week ending June 6, 2020. Probabilities vary across a wide range reflecting the varying case incidences in different counties.

229

230 Our method is limited by the availability of publicly available data on infection
231 transmission on COVID-19, including setting and occupational specific case incidence
232 rates, data on antibody seroprevalence, the share of infection with known contacts, and
233 activity-specific attack rates. The estimates therefore reflect the average probability
234 across a wide range of exposure contexts. Nevertheless, observed rates of
235 hospitalization for laboratory confirmed COVID-19 disease in several US CDC active
236 surveillance areas generally corroborate our estimates under the assumption of a
237 modest level of social contact.

238

239 Our estimates of the average probabilities per contact do not accurately estimate risks
240 for specific subsets of people. Infections occur within geographically and socially
241 constrained chains of transmission, for example, within clusters of related or socially
242 connected individuals or among those living in congregate living facilities such as
243 nursing homes. Clusters of COVID-19 infections have been reported associated with
244 prisons, workers dormitories, religious services, nightclubs, schools, cruise ships,
245 sporting events, and professional conferences. (18) Disaggregating confirmed infection
246 incidence rates into fractions representing those with and without known contacts and
247 those within and without congregate living settings would allow for more setting and
248 population specific risk estimates. This requires the systematic public reporting of
249 confirmed infection exposure factors.

250

As mentioned above, systematic data on the share of confirmed infections arising without a known contact is not currently available. Appling this fraction to the model would reduce our estimates based on the assumption of a 100% share.

Available estimates of the secondary attack rate come from observations outside the US and at an earlier time period in the pandemic, prior to normalization of behaviors that reduce the risk of infection transmission, such as increased hand washing, observing physical distance, forgoing physical greetings, and wearing masks.

The limitations of published secondary attack rates and the lack of disaggregated data on confirmed infection incidence also do not allow our estimates to differentiate between community and household transmission. Most studies indicate that household attack rates are higher than for contacts in the community. Systematic public reporting of anonymized contact tracing data would provide information to assess context specific attack rates.

We also cannot account for intra-individual variation in the secondary attack rate within a setting. With respiratory viruses, the number of secondary cases generated by each index case can vary significantly. (19-20) One recent estimate suggests that 80% of COVID-19 infections are due to a small fraction (10%) of particularly infectious individuals. (21)

273 We have assumed a high fraction of the population remains susceptible as the
274 prevalence and significance of antibodies to COVID-19 is not known. However, there
275 may well be factors conferring protection to infection or responsible for differences in
276 susceptibility. For example, cross immunity due to infection with other coronaviruses
277 may be occurring. (22) Researchers have also observed cellular immune system
278 responses to COVID-19 among unexposed individuals likely due to prior exposure to
279 related coronaviruses. (23) More data will be required before adjusting risk assessment
280 for population susceptibility or immunity.
281
282 We estimated probabilities of hospitalization and death based on CDC estimates of
283 disease severity. We chose conservative scenarios but acknowledge that estimates of
284 confirmed infection fatality ratios may further evolve over the course of the pandemic.
285 Furthermore, individual states may have different criteria for recording a death from
286 COVID-19. The risk of hospitalization and death varies with other risk factors including
287 race/ethnicity, level of deprivation, and chronic diseases such as lung disease and
288 diabetes, that are not reflected in our analysis.
289
290 Better data to address the above limitations would likely reduce estimated probabilities
291 of adverse events for a large fraction of the population; still, the estimated probabilities
292 reported here may appear considerably lower than those reflected in public opinion
293 surveys. Scientific uncertainties, media attention, dramatic governmental action and a
294 subjective perceived lack of control over exposure all may be influencing risk
295 perception. Exploring methods to communicate risk and the concordance of perceived
296 risk and risk probabilities would be an appropriate subject for further work.

297

298 Avoiding human contact in the setting of an uncertain and lethal epidemic threat is an
299 expected and self-protective human behavior. Prevalent beliefs today about the sources
300 of COVID-19 infection include ‘contact with infected persons’, ‘people coming from
301 abroad’ or ‘foreign nationals.’ (24) Notably, many people assume that contact with a
302 family member has a lower risk of infection transmission than contact with a stranger.
303 This may not be true for all subgroups in the population.

304

305 In the US, policy makers have taken dramatic and unprecedented steps to control
306 COVID-19, applying universal contact reductions through home confinement, limits on
307 travel, closures of schools and businesses and limits on gatherings. While heightened
308 perception of risk (e.g., fear) motivated these restrictions at the outset of the epidemic,
309 ongoing restrictions on community activity may be mediating risk perceptions. (25)

310

311 Notably, in Wuhan, the government limited exponential growth of the COVID-19
312 epidemic using isolation and quarantine, mandatory mask wearing, canceled New
313 Year’s celebrations, the curtailment of intra-city and intercity transportation and
314 extension of the New Year’s holiday period. (26) South Korea achieved epidemic control
315 with scaled up testing, strong contact notification practices, case isolation and strict
316 quarantine of those exposed and public awareness. (27) The lack of understanding of
317 how various countries have brought their epidemics under control maybe another
318 important factor influencing the perception of risk to COVID-19 infection in community
319 settings in the US.

320

Return to community workplace and social life will require individuals to be comfortable with their personal risk of acquiring COVID-19 infection. Estimates on the individual probabilities of infection, hospitalization and death may contribute to a more accurate risk perception. Systematically collected and publicly reported data on infection incidence by, for example, the geographic setting of exposure, residence type, whether a case had a known exposure, and would allow more precise estimation than those possible with currently available public data. Calculation of secondary attack rates by setting and prevalence of seropositivity would further improve these estimates.

Contributions: Rajiv Bhatia and Jeffrey Klausner equally contributed to the design of the study and writing of the manuscript. Rajiv Bhatia conducted the analysis.

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: None

335 **References**

336 1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Covid-19 Forecasts. URL:
337 https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/covid-data/forecasting-us.html Accessed
338 May 24, 2020.

339 2. Basu A. Estimating The Infection Fatality Rate Among Symptomatic COVID-19
340 Cases In The United States [published online ahead of print, 2020 May 7]. *Health Aff*
341 (*Millwood).* 2020. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2020.00455

342 3. Zheng Z, Peng F, Xu B, et al. Risk factors of critical & mortal COVID-19 cases: A
343 systematic literature review and meta-analysis [published online ahead of print, 2020
344 Apr 23]. J Infect. 2020; S0163-4453(20)30234-6. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2020.04.021

345 4. On ongoing repository of data on coronavirus cases and deaths in the U.S. New
346 York Times. https://github.com/nytimes/covid-19-data Accessed: June 1, 2020.

347 5. Furukawa NW, Brooks JT, Sobel J. Evidence supporting transmission of severe
348 acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 while pre-symptomatic or asymptomatic.
349 Emerg Infect Dis. 2020 Jul. https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2607.201595

350 6. He, X., Lau, E.H.Y., Wu, P. et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and
351 transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat Med* 26, 672–675 (2020). doi.org/10.1038/s41591-
352 020-0869-

353 7. Wei WE, Li Z, Chiew CJ, Yong SE, Toh MP, Lee VJ. Presymptomatic
354 Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 - Singapore, January 23-March 16, 2020. MMWR Morb
355 Mortal Wkly Rep. 2020;69(14):411-415. Published 2020 Apr 10.
356 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6914e1

357 8. Byambasuren O, Cardona M, Bell K, Clark J, McLaws ML, Glasziou P.
358 Estimating the extent of true asymptomatic COVID-19 and its potential for community
359 transmission: systematic review and meta-analysis. medRxiv.
360 doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.10.20097543
361 9. Sood N, Simon P, Ebner P, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2-Specific
362 Antibodies Among Adults in Los Angeles County, California, on April 10-11, 2020
363 [published online ahead of print, 2020 May 18]. . 2020;e208279.
364 doi:10.1001/jama.2020.8279US
365 10. Centers for Disease Control. Covid-19 Pandemic Planning Scenarios. URL:
366 https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/planning-scenarios.html Accessed
367 May 29, 2020.
368 11. Cheng HY, Jian SW, Liu DP, et al. Contact Tracing Assessment of COVID-19
369 Transmission Dynamics in Taiwan and Risk at Different Exposure Periods Before and
370 After Symptom Onset [published online ahead of print, 2020 May 1]. *JAMA Intern Med*.
371 2020;e202020. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.2020
372 12. Kwok KO, Wong VWY, Wei WI, Wong SYS, Tang JW. Epidemiological
373 characteristics of the first 53 laboratory-confirmed cases of COVID-19 epidemic in Hong
374 Kong, 13 February 2020. *Euro Surveill*. 2020;25(16). doi:10.2807/1560-
375 7917.ES.2020.25.16.2000155
376 13. Wei Li, Bo Zhang, Jianhua Lu, Shihua Liu, Zhiqiang Chang, Peng Cao, Xinhua
377 Liu, Peng Zhang, Yan Ling, Kaixiong Tao, Jianying Chen, The characteristics of
378 household transmission of COVID-19, Clinical Infectious Diseases.
379 doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa450

380 14. Bi Q, Wu Y, Mei S, et al. Epidemiology and transmission of COVID-19 in 391
381 cases and 1286 of their close contacts in Shenzhen, China: a retrospective cohort study
382 [published online ahead of print, 2020 Apr 27]. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020;S1473-
383 3099(20)30287-5. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30287-5
384 15. Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, et al. The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease
385 2019 (COVID-19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and
386 Application. *Ann Intern Med*. 2020;172(9):577-582. doi:10.7326/M20-0504
387 16. Bodas M, Peleg K. Self-Isolation Compliance In The COVID-19 Era Influenced
388 By Compensation: Findings From A Recent Survey In Israel [published online ahead of
389 print, 2020 Apr 9]. *Health Aff* (Millwood). 2020;101377hlthaff202000382.
390 doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2020.00382
391 17. US CDC. Laboratory-confirmed Covid-19- Associated Hospitalizations. URL:
392 https://gis.cdc.gov/grasp/COVIDNet/COVID19_3.html Accessed June 2, 2020.
393 18. Leclerc QJ, Fuller NM, Knight LE et al. What settings have been linked to SARS-
394 CoV-2 transmission clusters? Wellcome Open Res 2020, 5:83
395 doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15889.1
396 19. Lipsitch M, Cohen T, Cooper B, et al. Transmission dynamics and control of
397 severe acute respiratory syndrome. *Science*. 2003;300(5627):1966-1970.
398 doi:10.1126/science.1086616
399 20. Lloyd-Smith, J., Schreiber, S., Kopp, P. et al. Superspreading and the effect of
400 individual variation on disease emergence. *Nature* 438, 355–359 (2005).
401 https://doi.org/10.1038/nature04153

402 21. Endo A, Centre for the Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases COVID-19
403 Working Group, Abbott S et al. Estimating the overdispersion in COVID-19 transmission
404 using outbreak sizes outside China [version 1; peer review: 1 approved]. Wellcome
405 Open Res 2020, 5:67 doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15842.1
406 22. Kissler SM, Tedijanto C, Goldstein E, Grad YH, Lipsitch M. Projecting the
407 transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 through the postpandemic period. Science.
408 2020;368(6493):860-868. doi:10.1126/science.abb5793
409 23. Grifoni, A., Weiskopf, D., Ramirez, S.I., Mateus, J., Dan, J.M., Moderbacher,
410 C.R., Rawlings, S.A., Sutherland, A., Premkumar, L., Jadi, R.S., Marrama, D., de Silva,
411 A.M., Frazier, A., Carlin, A., Greenbaum, J.A., Peters, B., Krammer, F., Smith, D.M.,
412 Crotty, S., Sette, A., Targets of T cell responses to SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus in humans
413 with COVID-19 disease and unexposed individuals, *Cell* (2020).
414 doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2020.05.015.
415 24. Lohiniva AL, Sane J, Sibenberg K, Puumalainen T, Salminen M. Understanding
416 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) risk perceptions among the public to enhance risk
417 communication efforts: a practical approach for outbreaks, Finland, February
418 2020. *Euro Surveill.* 2020;25(13):2000317. doi:10.2807/1560-
419 7917.ES.2020.25.13.2000317
420 25. Economic Attitudes as the Country Starts to Re-open. The Associated Press-
421 NORC Center for Public Affairs Research. URL:
422 http://www.apnorc.org/projects/Pages/Economic-Attitudes-as-the-Country-Starts-to-
423 Reopen.aspx Accessed: May 25, 2020.

424 26. Pan A, Liu L, Wang C, et al. Association of Public Health Interventions With the
425 Epidemiology of the COVID-19 Outbreak in Wuhan, China [published online ahead of
426 print, 2020 Apr 10]. *JAMA*. 2020;323(19):1-9. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.6130
427 **27.** Ryu S, Ali ST, Jang C, Kim B, Cowling BJ. Effect of non-pharmaceutical
428 interventions on transmission of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2,
429 South Korea, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020 Oct. doi.org/10.3201/eid2610.201886



Figure 1. Estimated county-level probabilities of confirmed infection, hospitalization and death per contact as a function of daily case incidence.



Figure 2. Estimated current number of predicted COVID-19 hospitalizations per 1 million contacts in counties with populations greater than 1.5 million.