Preprint, Ver. 6 (November 25, 2020) - *the manuscript has not been peer-reviewed yet.*

Title: Behavioral dynamics of COVID-19: estimating under-reporting, multiple waves, and adherence fatigue across 91 nations

Authors: Hazhir Rahmandad[1*], Tse Yang Lim[1], John Sterman[1]

Affiliations:

[1]Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA

*Correspondence to: hazhir@mit.edu

Abstract:

Effective responses to the COVID-19 pandemic require reliable estimates of actual cases and deaths, and models that incorporate behavioral factors including differential priorities for allocating limited testing capacity, heterogeneous risk perceptions and resulting contact reductions, improved treatment, and adherence fatigue. We develop a behavioral dynamic model integrating these factors with asymptomatic transmission, disease acuity, and hospital capacity. Using a hierarchical Bayesian framework we estimate the model parameters with a panel dataset spanning all 91 nations with reliable testing data. Cumulative cases and deaths through 30 October 2020 are estimated to be 8.5 and 1.4 times greater than official reports, yielding an overall infection fatality rate (IFR) of 0.48%, with wide variation across nations and significant decline in IFR over time. Adherence fatigue is estimated to have increased cumulative cases by 61% through October 2020. Scenarios through March 2021 show modest policy interventions and behavior change could reduce cumulative cases ≈18%. The model endogenously generates the multiple waves of infection and mortality observed in many nations as behavioral responses to perceived risk cause the reproduction number to fluctuate around 1, but with death rates that vary by two orders of magnitude depending on responsiveness to perceived risks.

One Sentence Summary: COVID-19 under-reporting is large, varies widely across nations, and strongly conditions projected outbreak dynamics.

Introduction

Effective responses to the COVID-19 pandemic require an understanding of its global magnitude, and how behavioral responses to its risks condition dynamics and outcomes. Yet more than eight months after WHO declared a global pandemic, the true number of cases and infection fatality rate remain uncertain, and the experience of different nations varies widely. As of late October 2020, countries have reported cumulative cases ranging between 5.42 and 4790 per 100,000, and case fatality rates between 0.05% and 9.9%. Asymptomatic infection (Gudbjartsson, Helgason et al. 2020),

variation in testing rates across countries (Roser, Ritchie et al. 2020), and false negatives (Fang, Zhang et al. 2020, Li, Yao et al. 2020, Wang, Xu et al. 2020) complicate assessment of the true magnitude of the pandemic from official data. The inference problem also requires disentangling other explanatory mechanisms: (i) differences in population density and social networks create variations in the effective reproduction number, R_E; (ii) risk perceptions, behavior change, adherence fatigue, and policy responses alter transmission rates endogenously; (iii) testing is prioritized based on symptoms and risk factors, so detection depends on both testing rates and current prevalence (Onder, Rezza et al. 2020); (iv) limited hospital capacity is allocated based on case severity, influencing fatality rates; (v) age, socio-economic status, comorbidities, differential adherence to non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) such as social distancing and masking by at-risk populations, and improvements in treatment affect transmission risk and case severity (Guan, Ni et al. 2020, O'Driscoll, Dos Santos et al. 2020, Wu and McGoogan 2020); (vi) weather may play a role in transmission (Xu, Rahmandad et al. 2020); and (vii) all these vary across nations.

Prior studies have shed light on important parts of the puzzle by estimating basic epidemiological parameters and IFR in well-controlled settings (Russell, Hellewell et al. 2020), assessing the asymptomatic fraction and prevalence in specific populations (Hao, Cheng et al. 2020, Li, Pei et al. 2020, Mizumoto, Kagaya et al. 2020, Salje, Tran Kiem et al. 2020, Sutton, Fuchs et al. 2020), estimating the role of undocumented infections (Ghaffarzadegan and Rahmandad 2020, Li, Pei et al. 2020, Moghadas, Fitzpatrick et al. 2020), illuminating the effects of various NPIs on expected future cases (Chinazzi, Davis et al. 2020, Flaxman, Mishra et al. 2020, Hsiang, Allen et al. 2020, Kissler, Tedijanto et al. 2020, Ruktanonchai, Floyd et al. 2020, Walker, Whittaker et al. 2020, Wu, Leung et al. 2020), and contrasting risks and healthcare demands across countries and populations (Britton, Ball et al. 2020, Gatto, Bertuzzo et al. 2020, Moghadas, Shoukat et al. 2020, Struben 2020, Walker, Whittaker et al. 2020). Yet we lack a global view of the pandemic that is simultaneously consistent with these more focused findings, explains the substantial variation in official case and death rates across countries, and offers projections accounting for endogenous behavioral responses underpinning multiple waves of incidence (Lopez and Rodo 2020) and mortality.

Model and estimation

We use a multi-country modified SEIR model to simultaneously estimate SARS-CoV-2 transmission across 91 countries. For each country, the model tracks the population from susceptible through pre-symptomatic, infected, and recovered or deceased states, with explicit states for those whose cases are detected or undetected, and hospitalized or not (Figure 1).



Figure 1- Expanded SEIR model for each country. Key state variables denoted by boxes.

Besides its multi-country scope, the model includes three novel features. First, tests are allocated to individuals based on symptom severity relative to available testing capacity. Individuals with more severe symptoms, including those with COVID-19 and those without but presenting with similar symptoms or risk factors, e.g., frontline healthcare workers, get priority for testing. We model symptom severity with a zero-inflated Poisson distribution, where zero severity indicates asymptomatic infection (S1 and Figure S3 provide details). Prioritized test allocation determines the ascertainment rate of COVID-positive cases as a function of the current testing rate and prevalence. It also results in different average COVID severity in the tested vs. untested populations (Rahmandad and Hu 2010). We also account for false negatives from tests (Fang, Zhang et al. 2020, Wang, Xu et al. 2020).

Second, hospital capacity is allocated between COVID-positive cases and demand from non-COVID patients. The COVID infection fatality rate therefore depends endogenously on the adequacy of hospital capacity relative to the burden of severe cases, along with the age distribution of the population (Guan, Ni et al. 2020, O'Driscoll, Dos Santos et al. 2020, Wu and McGoogan 2020). Furthermore, we account for reductions in IFR that may result improved treatments, deaths of high-risk populations such as the elderly and those with comorbidities in the first wave of the pandemic, heterogeneous adherence to NPIs as higher-risk subpopulations perceive greater risk than those lacking risk factors, shifting incidence toward younger, lower-risk people, and other factors.

Third, the hazard rate of transmission responds to the perceived risk of COVID. Perceived risk reduces transmission through NPIs, from social distancing and masking to lockdowns. Perceived risk is based on subjective perceptions of the hazard of death, which respond with a lag to both official data (reported in the media) and actual deaths (gleaned from personal experience and word of mouth). Rising mortality eventually increases perceived risk, driving the hazard rate of transmission down, while declining cases and deaths can lead to the erosion of perceived risk, potentially leading to rebound outbreaks. We also account for potential decline in the responsiveness of communities to perceived risk as a result of adherence fatigue.

Model parameters are specified based on prior literature and formal estimation. Parameters specified from the literature include the incubation period (mean $\mu = 5$ days (Guan, Ni et al. 2020, Linton, Kobayashi et al. 2020)), onset-to-detection delay ($\mu = 5$ days (Linton, Kobayashi et al. 2020)), post-onset illness duration ($\mu = 15$ days (Guan, Ni et al. 2020)), and the sensitivity of RT-PCR-based testing (70% (Fang, Zhang et al. 2020, Wang, Xu et al. 2020)). Sensitivity analysis is presented in S7.

We estimate the remaining parameters using a panel of data covering all nations with at least 1000 confirmed COVID-19 cases by 30 October 2020 and sufficient testing data to enable parameter estimation, a total of 91 nations spanning 4.87 billion people. These include all disease hotspots to date, with three notable exceptions, China, Brazil, and Argentina, for which reliable testing data are not available. The panel includes reported daily testing rates, reported COVID cases and deaths, and all-cause mortality (where available), along with population, population density, age distribution, hospital capacity, and daily meteorological data. Estimation is by maximum likelihood, using a negative binomial likelihood function. To avoid overfitting, we do not use any time-varying parameters in the estimation. We also use a hierarchical Bayesian framework (Gelman and Hill 2006) to estimate country-level heterogeneity in each model parameter using informed priors on cross-country parameter variances (see S7 for sensitivity analysis on priors). For example, the asymptomatic fraction of cases and other parameters representing biological processes should have low cross-national variance, whereas parameters specifying risk perceptions and responses are expected to vary more widely. These choices reduce the quality of fit for some nations compared to estimates that allow the parameters for each nation to be independent, but enhance the generalizability of parameter estimates and the robustness of projections. Uncertainties are quantified using a Markov Chain Monte Carlo method designed for high dimensional parameter spaces (Vrugt, Ter Braak et al. 2009) (details in S2).

Building confidence in the model

Estimating parameters for a complex model and assessing its ability to capture important real-world processes are both critical and challenging. Before discussing results we present three sets of analyses addressing these challenges, and later report extensive sensitivity analyses to quantify various uncertainties. First, we validated the estimation framework using synthetic data generated by simulating the model with known parameters and adding auto-correlated noise in infection rates and IFR. Our estimation procedure accurately identifies the vast majority of parameters in the synthetic dataset. The absolute error between the estimated and true values was significantly smaller than the estimated uncertainty (median error 12% of the 95% credible interval (CI), with 92% of the absolute errors less than half the 95% CI (see S3 for details).

Second, we assess in- and out-of-sample accuracy of model projections. Figure 2 compares actual and simulated reported daily new cases and deaths for 18 larger countries. Panel A reports fits for both deaths and cases using data through 30 October 2020. Panel B shows out-of-sample prediction performance for reported infections after fitting the model to data through 10 August 2020. S5 and S6 report the full sample. Over the full set of nations and full sample, Mean Absolute Errors Normalized by the mean of the actual data (MAEN) are 5.6% and 3.8% for cumulative infections and deaths, respectively, and less than 20% for 62 (68.1%) and 69 (75.8%) of the 91 nations, despite wide variation in the size and dynamics of national outbreaks, from those nearly quenched (New Zealand, Thailand), to those still growing (Bulgaria, Poland) to those exhibiting multiple waves (Iran, Israel,

USA). R^2 exceeds 0.9 for 56% of 364 country-specific time series and exceeds 0.5 for 86%. Aggregation of within-nation heterogeneities reduces the quality of fit in a few countries. For example, we do not explicitly model outbreaks concentrated among subpopulations such as migrant workers (important in e.g., Qatar, Singapore) or nursing homes (important in, e.g., Belgium, France). The coupling of parameters across countries also limits fits for outliers. Nevertheless, 94% and 97% of official infection and death rates fall within the 95% uncertainty intervals for in-sample projections.

The model provides reasonable out-of-sample predictions (Figure 2B): across all predictions, 71% and 76% of observations for infections and deaths, respectively, fall within the 95% prediction intervals over the last 80-day period. Out-of-sample projections are limited by the fact that by August 10th the majority of countries had not experienced second waves or significant adherence fatigue, offering few clues in the data for these behavioral feedbacks. Despite these challenges, the model correctly predicts the existence of second waves in the majority of countries, and in many cases correctly predicts the timing and magnitude as well (see S6 for details).



Figure 2-Model projections vs. data. A) Simulated (thick solid) vs. data (dotted and dashed) for reported cases (blue; right axis, thousands/day) and deaths (red; left axis; deaths/day) in countries with more than 40 million population and 300,000 confirmed cases by 30 October 2020 and testing data until at least September 2020. B) Out of sample death predictions for the same countries based on estimates with data until August 10, 2020 (blue vertical line). Numbers on each graph show fraction of predicted data inside the 95% confidence interval.

Finally, we compare model estimates of actual cumulative cases against available national-level estimates from serological surveys. Few national seroprevalence studies include reliably

representative samples . Nevertheless, using the SeroTracker project (Arora, Joseph et al. 2020) we identified nine country-level meta-estimates for actual prevalence. Figure 3 compares those meata-analytic estimates against official data from testing and model estimates. Seroprevalence and official counts vary by an order of magnitude or more. Model estimates are very close for eight of the nine seroprevalence estimates (model estimates are significantly higher than the seroprevalence estimate for Spain). Note that seroprevalence data were not used in model specification or parameter estimation.



Figure 3-Comparison of cumulative percentage of cases based on official data (black circles), seroprevalence estimates (blue circles with 95% CIs), and model estimates (red squares with 95% CIs) for 9 countries at various dates.

Results

Quantifying under-reporting

We find COVID-19 prevalence and deaths are widely under-reported. Across the 91 nations, the estimated ratio of actual to reported cumulative cases (through 30 October 2020) is 8.5, corresponding to 314 million undetected cases (95% CI 295-321 million). Underreporting varies substantially across nations (10th-90th percentile range 3.2-22; Figure 4).

Underreporting is due in part to the large fraction of asymptomatic infections, estimated at 51%, consistent with many other estimates (Oran and Topol 2020). The mean inter-quartile range, MIQR, of the credible intervals in the national estimates is 1.3%. However, the estimated asymptomatic fraction varies little across nations (standard deviation, $\sigma = 0.6\%$) and therefore cannot explain the large cross-national variation in the ratio of estimated to reported cases (Figure 4).

The extent of underestimation depends primarily on testing capacity and how it is utilized. If every person could be tested the estimated ratio of actual to reported cases would be approximately 1.43,

given assumed test sensitivity of ≈70% (Fang, Zhang et al. 2020, Wang, Xu et al. 2020). Testing capacity is limited, however. When testing capacity is small relative to the need, individuals presenting with COVID and COVID-like symptoms are prioritized, along with at-risk groups such as health care providers. Consequently, a larger proportion of those tested will be positive, but many infected individuals will go undetected, increasing the degree of underestimation, as seen in e.g. Mexico. Conversely, when testing capacity is high relative to the population, more of those infected will be identified, as seen in e.g. New Zealand.

COVID-19 deaths are also underreported (Figure 4). We estimate 1.35 (1.30-1.38) million deaths by 30 October 2020 across the 91 countries, 1.4 times larger than reported, with large cross-national variance (10th-90th percentile range 1.2-2.4). Results are consistent with some country-specific estimates (Weinberger, Chen et al. 2020, Woolf, Chapman et al. 2020). Underreporting is significantly less for deaths than cases because deaths are concentrated among severe cases who are more likely to have been tested, and post-mortem testing corrects some of the undercount.



Figure 4-Ratio of estimated to reported cases (blue circles) and deaths (red squares) by country; log scale.

Trends and Fluctuations in Cases and Mortality

National IFR estimates are reported in Figure 5A. IFR across the 91 nations through 30 October 2020 is 0.48% (CI: 0.46%-0.51%), with wide cross-national variation, from 0.04% (CI: 0.04%-0.05%; Singapore) to 1.68% (CI: 1.31%-1.74%; France), a range similar to estimates across counties in the USA (Basu 2020). These variations arise in the model from differences in age distribution (O'Driscoll, Dos Santos et al. 2020, Wu and McGoogan 2020) and the adequacy of health care. Consistent with prior estimates (Walker, Whittaker et al. 2020), we find that hospitalization can reduce the age- and severity-adjusted risk of death to 39% of the rate without treatment, but with large cross-national variation (σ=19%; MIQR: 7%). Simulated IFR varies endogenously over time, exhibiting fluctuations around an overall declining trend (Figure 5B). The fluctuations are due to variations in the adequacy of treatment capacity, with IFR rising when surging caseloads overtake hospital capacity. The peak in global IFR in spring 2020 arose as cases overwhelmed hospital capacity in several nations, including many European countries with older populations. Since then, many—but not all—countries show notable reductions in IFR, due to factors including (i) improvements in treatments and greater availability of ventilators and PPE; (ii) heterogeneity in cases as some in the highest-risk populations were lost in the early waves; and (iii) heterogeneity in risk perceptions and responses as older, high-risk individuals adhere more strongly to NPIs including distancing and masking compared those who perceive less personal risk, resulting in a decline in the average age of new confirmed cases in many nations. We cannot tease apart these different processes, but estimate that their combined effect reduced IFR by 24.8% (σ=20.4%; MIQR=10.9%) for every doubling in cumulative cases. Despite the overall decline in IFR, hospital capacity shortages caused by renewed waves of infection increase IFR above the trend (e.g., India in June and July).

We also find significant heterogeneity across countries in the initial effective reproduction number, R_E (median 2.97, IQR 2.43-4.26), reflecting differences in population density, social networks, and cultural practices (Figure S9 provides details). Importantly, R_E changes over time as people and policymakers respond to perceived risk (Pan, Liu et al. 2020). We find behavioral and policy responses to the perceived risk of death reduce transmission and R_E with a mean lag of 19 days, though with substantial cross-national variation (σ=25.9; MIQR: 5.1). These responses are relaxed as perceived risk falls, though more slowly (mean lag 118 days; σ=100; MIQR: 54). Importantly, we also find that extended periods of contact reduction, and the personal and economic hardship it causes, lead to "adherence fatigue"—a reduction in the impact of perceived risk on behaviors that reduce contacts, with an estimated average elasticity of 1.21 (σ=0.75; MIQR: 0.36). A counter-factual simulation (Figure 6, dotted line) shows that, absent adherence fatigue, total cases and deaths through 30 October 2020 would have been lower by 38% and -71307%, 195 (173-203) million and 964 (895-974) thousand, respectively.

The model endogenously captures the multiple waves observed across many countries through 30 October despite their different magnitudes and timing (Figure 2A). These rebounds are due to lags in perception and responses to the risk of COVID-19: initial reductions in transmission eventually lower deaths, leading to lower adherence to NPIs as perceived risk gradually falls, setting the stage for renewed outbreaks. Rebound outbreaks are larger in nations where adherence fatigue is greater. Rebound waves are also larger where reductions in IFR are larger, because the decline in mortality erodes adherence to NPIs.



Figure 5- Fatality rates. A) Average estimated infection fatality rates (%) across countries. B) IFR trajectories over time across full sample and selected nations.

Testing shapes early trajectories

Testing, treatment, risk perceptions, individual behavior, and government policy all change through several important feedbacks. We find that those receiving a positive test reduce their infectious contacts somewhat (Mean: 13.8% of original contact rate; σ=8.7%; MIQR: 10.7%). These reductions are especially important because symptomatic individuals, who are more likely to get tested, are estimated to be more infectious than asymptomatic ones (Mean asymptomatic infectiousness vs. symptomatic: 28.5%; σ=0.42%; MIQR: 1.3%; consistent with (Li, Pei et al. 2020)).

Testing also regulates the reported rate of deaths, which drives perceived risk. More reported deaths increase perceived risk, triggering behavioral and policy responses that reduce transmission. Plentiful early testing results in high detection rates, greater perceived risk, and stronger responses, slowing transmission. Conversely, insufficient early testing increases underestimation, limiting perceived risk and allowing transmission to further outpace testing. Testing thus reduces future cases, allowing a larger fraction of severe cases to be hospitalized, reducing IFR. The exponential nature of contagion means even small early differences can lead to notable differences in epidemic size (Pei, Kandula et al. 2020), and thus IFR.

Figure 6 (dashed line) shows the impact of these feedbacks by comparing the estimated results to a counterfactual in which all countries increase testing to 0.1% of their population per day, a rate currently achieved by multiple countries. We assume enhanced testing begins when WHO declared COVID-19 a pandemic (11 March 2020). We find enhanced testing would have reduced total cases from 314 million to 249 (CI: 223-255) million, with a reduction in deaths from 1.35 to 1.16 million (CI: 1.07-1.19).



Figure 6- Most likely estimate (solid lines) of cumulative cases (A) and deaths (B) compared with counterfactuals for scenario I, in which testing rises to 0.1% of population per day starting 11 March 2020 (dashed line); and scenario II with no adherence fatigue (dotted line). Thin lines show 95% CIs.

Projections with endogenous responses to risk

We explore two scenarios projecting the pandemic through 20 March 2021 (Figure 7): (I) *Baseline*: assumes country-specific testing rates continue as of 30 October 2020 with country-specific estimated parameters; and (II) *Responsive*: the least responsive countries become more responsive to risk (Supplement S5). Scenario II represents a modest increase in responsiveness given levels of perceived risk: on average, contact rates fall by 13% (σ=22%) on the day of adoption, comparable to the impact of enhanced mask use (Chu, Akl et al. 2020). Note that all scenarios exclude vaccines and new treatments. Despite promising progress and the potential for vaccine approval before March 2021, vaccine administration at scale across the 91 nations is not expected until late 2021 (WHO 2020). Moreover, these scenarios help identify policies that may be effective in future pandemics where vaccine development is likely to again lag disease spread.

Figure 7 contrasts the results. Scenario I yields 0.80 billion cumulative cases by 20 March 2021, with most cases concentrated in a few countries, with Russia (95 million median cumulative cases; 95% CI 88-99 million), USA (71 million; 62-89), Mexico (52 million; 43-59), and Iran (48 million; 22-54) suffering the largest burdens; Figure 7A & B show estimated cumulative actual cases and deaths by 20 March 2021 (Supplement S5 provides Scenario I projections over time). Scenario II reduces cases (Figure 7A) and deaths (Figure 7B) by 18% and 32%, to 657 million (CI: 647-708) and 2.90 million (CI: 2.88-3.47). The largest improvements arise in countries currently estimated to have large potential for new waves enabled by weak responses to renewed risk (Figure 7D), including Russia (42.1 million reduction in cases), Iran (17.1 million), Ukraine (16.4 million), and Mozambique (9.4 million) among others.

The scenarios demonstrate the sensitivity of outcomes to responses to perceived risk, but should not be interpreted as predictions: changes in testing, individual behavior, and government responses to risk not accounted for in the model are possible, perhaps likely, in the coming months. Stronger responses to perceived risk would significantly reduce future cases. Lax responses and greater adherence fatigue would lead to larger rebound outbreaks.



Figure 7- Projections across two scenarios. Estimated true cumulative cases (A) and deaths (B) (with 95% CIs) across 91 countries until Spring 2021 under scenarios I (baseline; solid line) and II (modestly responsive; dotted). C) Median (95% CI) estimated true cumulative cases (blue; bottom axis) and deaths (red; top axis) as % of population, projected by the end of Winter 2021 under baseline Scenario (Logarithmic Scale). D) Median (95% CI) reductions in cumulative cases in Scenario II (modestly stronger response) compared with Scenario I (in % of population) for top 20 countries by the end of Winter 2021 (blue circles; bottom scale); red squares (top scale) represent initial change in contacts (% of contacts on 1 December 2020) required for corresponding case reductions.

A global dilemma: similar behaviors, different outcomes

Across scenarios, a few nations are projected to experience significant growth in incidence before vaccines become widely available, but most are able to stabilize their epidemics through NPIs, albeit with occasional new outbreak waves. Endogenous risk perceptions create an important negative feedback that leads most countries to converge to effective reproduction numbers $R_E \approx 1$: $R_E > 1$ leads to rapid growth in cases and deaths, increasing perceived risk and renewed use of NPIs that bring R_E down; $R_E < 1$ lowers cases and deaths, leading to erosion of perceived risk and reduced adherence to NPIs that then lead to more cases.

Critically, however, R_E fluctuates around 1 at very different quasi-steady state infection and fatality rates across nations. Recall that $R_E \approx 1$ means that, on average, infected individuals infect one new case before they are removed from the infectious pool by recovery or death. That balance can be achieved at a high or low level of prevalence. Those nations with high responsiveness to risk settle at $R_E \approx 1$ with low prevalence and death rates, while those with lower responsiveness to perceived risk achieve that balance only when cases and deaths rise high enough to drive transmission risk and R_E down to approximately 1. The large cross-national variation in the behavioral responses to risk lead to death rates more than two orders of magnitude higher in nations with weak responsiveness and greater adherence fatigue compared to those with stronger, sustained responses (Figure 8). Over the 6 months preceding 30 October 2020, average estimated R_E values have approximately converged to ≈1 (mean=1.13, σ=0.17), indicating comparable levels of contact reduction across nations. In contrast, deaths per million over the same period show a 10-90th percentile range of 0.022 to 6.29.



Figure 8. Effective reproduction number R_E vs. estimated true daily deaths per million in each nation, averaged over the 6 months ending 30 October 2020, with a few countries highlighted. Inset: Oscillation in death rate vs. R_E in the USA caused by lags in the perception of and behavioral responses to the risk of death, and lags between behavioral responses that reduce transmission and subsequent deaths. Data are weekly averages over the six-month period ending 30 October 2020 (darker circles are the more recent weeks).

Robustness and boundary conditions

We conducted several analyses to assess the robustness of the results. (A) We ensured MCMC chains had converged (100% of Gelman-Rubin convergence statistics were below 1.2 and 97% under 1.1). (B) We varied the priors for cross-country parameter variances to 4 and 0.25 times the base values, resulting in <3% change across historical measures, though scenario results for a few countries are more sensitive (S7 provides details). (C) To see if any country disproportionately affects the results we repeated the analysis using three different samples, excluding the top 5 countries by (i) estimated cases, (ii) reported cases, and (iii) population. Only India and USA appear in all three sets. Average outcomes across the remaining countries changed less than 1% (see S7). (D) We assessed the sensitivity of results to the parameters estimated from prior research by calculating the elasticities of key outcomes to these parametric assumptions. Across metrics all elasticities are less than approximately 0.5. The largest (≈0.5) is for the impact of test sensitivity; greater sensitivity reduces underestimation.

These robustness tests do not address a few limitations which should temper the interpretation of the results. Given limits to data availability across nations and computational costs (reported analyses take 2 weeks of parallelized computation on a 48-core server), we make several simplifications. First, we do not represent within-nation heterogeneity that may affect the course of the epidemic. These variations likely matter especially in large, diverse nations (e.g., USA), including differences in transmission risk between rural and urban areas, differences in adherence to NPIs based on political views, and especially differences in the ability of individuals and households to limit transmission risk or receive treatment based on socio-economic status, race and ethnicity, and other factors affecting social justice (Britton, Ball et al. 2020, Laxminarayan, Wahl et al. 2020, Painter and Qiu 2020). Second, we model IFR as depending on age distribution and hospitalization, but do not explicitly model how well different nations are able to protect vulnerable subpopulations (the effect is aggregated into the overall impact of cumulative cases on IFR). Third, the model aggregates behavioral and government policy responses, and does not represent the effectiveness of specific NPIs. Fourth, we assume testing is primarily done to identify new cases, not to confirm those already suspected through clinical diagnosis. The latter approach would lead to very high positivity rates for tests, from which our model would estimate incorrectly large underlying transition rates. Finally, without explicit travel networks our results may under-estimate the risk of re-introduction of the disease where it has been contained.

Discussion

The model we develop integrates the biological and social factors conditioning transmission captured in typical SEIR models with a range of behavioral factors, including endogenous test allocation and hospitalization based on symptom severity relative to capacity; endogenous risk perceptions and responses, including adherence fatigue; and learning and other factors that cause the infection fatality rate to decline on average over time. To estimate model parameters we utilized a cross-national panel of data spanning all nations with more than 1000 reported cases that publish needed data, a total of 91 nations encompassing 4.87 billion people. The model enables us to estimate the likely actual toll of COVID-19 and degree of underestimation relative to reported data on confirmed cases and deaths, explain multiple waves of infection, and assess the likely impact of policies.

Two methodological contributions may inform future work. Our modeling framework captures heterogeneity in disease severity, affecting test and treatment capacity allocation, without the need for explicit disaggregation into subpopulations or to the individual level, making estimation computationally feasible and providing a consistent approach to track the allocation of testing, hospital capacity, and the impact of acuity on mortality. The estimation framework enables us to use the data from all nations to inform the estimated parameters for each, including consistent estimates of the differences across nations. As expected, parameters capturing biological attributes of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19, such as the asymptomatic fraction of cases, have far less cross-national variation than parameters characterizing risk perceptions and behavioral responses to the threat.

Substantively, we find prevalence and mortality are substantially underestimated: across the 91 nations for which data are available, estimated cumulative COVID cases are greater than official reports, with under-reporting across nations spanning three orders of magnitude across nations. Despite underreporting, cumulative cases constitute small fractions of the populations, so herd immunity remains distant in nearly all nations (see S5). We find deaths are times larger than official reports, again with substantial cross-national variation. The overall infection fatality rate to date is ≈0.48%, consistent with growing evidence (Russell, Hellewell et al. 2020, Verity, Okell et al. 2020). Substantial cross-national variation in IFR arises from differences in population age structure and in the burden of severe cases relative to hospital capacity, highlighting the importance of limiting case growth. We also find that IFR has, on average, declined substantially since the onset of the pandemic. The decline is likely due to a combination of better treatments and greater supplies of ventilators and PPE, and heterogeneity in behavioral responses to risk whereby higher-risk individuals adhere more strongly to isolation, distancing, masking and hygiene recommendations compared to those who perceive lower personal risk. Despite the overall declining trend in IFR, mortality spikes upward when renewed outbreaks overwhelm treatment capacity.

Importantly, the large differences across nations are explained well without exogenous time-varying parameters and with parameters characterizing COVID-19 that are consistent with prior research and are similar across nations. We estimate that approximately half of infections are asymptomatic, consistent with estimates from smaller samples (Gudbjartsson, Helgason et al. 2020, Lavezzo, Franchin et al. 2020, Mizumoto, Kagaya et al. 2020), with asymptomatic individuals estimated to be about a third as infective as symptomatic patients.

The wide variation across nations arises endogenously. First, the growth rate, timing, and size of outbreak waves depend strongly on the magnitude of behavioral and policy responses to perceived risk, and the lags in forming and eroding those perceptions, which we find vary notably across countries. Projections through 20 March 2021 show that modest reductions in transmission through NPIs can lead to large reductions in cumulative cases and deaths in many countries, even absent effective vaccines. Second, inadequate early testing in some countries has led to greater underestimation of prevalence, and thus later and weaker responses, causing faster epidemic growth, further outstripping testing and treatment capacity. These feedbacks amplify minor differences in testing and responsiveness to perceived risk, generating significant heterogeneity in cases and deaths despite convergence of R_E across nations. Consequently, we find greater testing early in the pandemic would have avoided over 190,000 deaths, more than 14% of the estimated total through 30 October 2020.

A counter-intuitive finding provides important policy implications. After controlling the initial peak, most countries settle into a quasi-steady state with the effective reproduction number R_E fluctuating around 1: lower mortality erodes adherence to NPIs, raising R_E and leading to rebound outbreaks, which then lead to renewed contact reductions that bring R_E back down. However, responsiveness to risk varies widely across nations. Those with strong responses bring R_E to 1 with few cases and deaths, while those with weak responses require much larger death rates to drive R_E toward 1. Consequently, different nations pay widely different prices in lost lives. Although we do not carry out a detailed analysis of the economic costs of NPIs, the behavioral and policy changes that reduce contacts from pre-pandemic levels sufficiently to bring R_E to 1 are a rough measure of the self-isolation, distancing, and other actions that reduce economic activity and employment by cutting travel, dining, shopping, and other activities sustaining commerce and industry. Thus, by increasing responsiveness to risks, communities and nations can bring down death rates at little additional economic cost, a finding consistent with analysis of the 1918 influenza pandemic (Correia, Luck et al. 1918). Although contrary to the intuitions of many policy makers, the results suggest no strong tradeoff between saving lives and saving the economy. Stronger responsiveness to risk and adherence to NPIs offer an opportunity to save lives at limited costs even as vaccines are approved and deployed.

References and notes

Arora, R. K., A. Joseph, J. Van Wyk, S. Rocco, A. Atmaja, E. May, T. Yan, N. Bobrovitz, J. Chevrier, M. P. Cheng, T. Williamson and D. L. Buckeridge (2020). "SeroTracker: a global SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence dashboard." Lancet Infect Dis.

Basu, A. (2020). "Estimating The Infection Fatality Rate Among Symptomatic COVID-19 Cases In The United States." Health Aff (Millwood): 101377hlthaff202000455.

Britton, T., F. Ball and P. Trapman (2020). "A mathematical model reveals the influence of population heterogeneity on herd immunity to SARS-CoV-2." Science.

Chinazzi, M., J. T. Davis, M. Ajelli, C. Gioannini, M. Litvinova, S. Merler, Y. P. A. Pastore, K. Mu, L. Rossi, K. Sun, C. Viboud, X. Xiong, H. Yu, M. E. Halloran, I. M. Longini, Jr. and A. Vespignani (2020). "The effect of travel restrictions on the spread of the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak." Science.

Chu, D. K., E. A. Akl, S. Duda, K. Solo, S. Yaacoub, H. J. Schunemann and C.-S. U. R. G. E. s. authors (2020). "Physical distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis." Lancet **395**(10242): 1973-1987.

Correia, S., S. Luck and E. Verner (1918). "Pandemics depress the economy, public health interventions do not: Evidence from the 1918 flu." Public Health Interventions do not: Evidence from the.

Fang, Y., H. Zhang, J. Xie, M. Lin, L. Ying, P. Pang and W. Ji (2020). "Sensitivity of chest CT for COVID-19: comparison to RT-PCR." Radiology: 200432.

Flaxman, S., S. Mishra, A. Gandy, H. J. T. Unwin, T. A. Mellan, H. Coupland, C. Whittaker, H. Zhu, T. Berah, J. W. Eaton, M. Monod, C.-R. T. Imperial College, A. C. Ghani, C. A. Donnelly, S. Riley, M. A. C. Vollmer, N. M. Ferguson, L. C. Okell and S. Bhatt (2020). "Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in Europe." Nature.

Gatto, M., E. Bertuzzo, L. Mari, S. Miccoli, L. Carraro, R. Casagrandi and A. Rinaldo (2020). "Spread and dynamics of the COVID-19 epidemic in Italy: Effects of emergency containment measures." Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A **117**(19): 10484-10491.

Gelman, A. and J. Hill (2006). Data analysis using regression and multilevel/hierarchical models, Cambridge university press.

Ghaffarzadegan, N. and H. Rahmandad (2020). "Simulation-based estimation of the early spread of COVID-19 in Iran: actual versus confirmed cases." Syst Dyn Rev **36**(1): 101-129.

Guan, W. J., Z. Y. Ni, Y. Hu, W. H. Liang, C. Q. Ou, J. X. He, L. Liu, H. Shan, C. L. Lei, D. S. C. Hui, B. Du, L. J. Li, G. Zeng, K. Y. Yuen, R. C. Chen, C. L. Tang, T. Wang, P. Y. Chen, J. Xiang, S. Y. Li, J. L. Wang, Z. J. Liang, Y. X. Peng, L. Wei, Y. Liu, Y. H. Hu, P. Peng, J. M. Wang, J. Y. Liu, Z. Chen, G. Li, Z. J. Zheng, S. Q. Qiu, J. Luo, C. J. Ye, S. Y. Zhu, N. S. Zhong and C. China Medical Treatment Expert Group for (2020). "Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China." N Engl J Med **382**(18): 1708-1720.

Gudbjartsson, D. F., A. Helgason, H. Jonsson, O. T. Magnusson, P. Melsted, G. L. Norddahl, J. Saemundsdottir, A. Sigurdsson, P. Sulem and A. B. Agustsdottir (2020). "Spread of SARS-CoV-2 in the Icelandic population." New England Journal of Medicine.

Hao, X., S. Cheng, D. Wu, T. Wu, X. Lin and C. Wang (2020). "Reconstruction of the full transmission dynamics of COVID-19 in Wuhan." Nature.

Hsiang, S., D. Allen, S. Annan-Phan, K. Bell, I. Bolliger, T. Chong, H. Druckenmiller, L. Y. Huang, A. Hultgren, E. Krasovich, P. Lau, J. Lee, E. Rolf, J. Tseng and T. Wu (2020). "The effect of large-scale anti-contagion policies on the COVID-19 pandemic." Nature.

Kissler, S. M., C. Tedijanto, E. Goldstein, Y. H. Grad and M. Lipsitch (2020). "Projecting the transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 through the postpandemic period." Science **368**(6493): 860-868.

Lavezzo, E., E. Franchin, C. Ciavarella, G. Cuomo-Dannenburg, L. Barzon, C. Del Vecchio, L. Rossi, R. Manganelli, A. Loregian and N. Navarin (2020). "Suppression of a SARS-CoV-2 outbreak in the Italian municipality of Vo'." Nature **584**(7821): 425-429.

Laxminarayan, R., B. Wahl, S. R. Dudala, K. Gopal, B. C. Mohan, S. Neelima, K. S. Jawahar Reddy, J. Radhakrishnan and J. A. Lewnard (2020). "Epidemiology and transmission dynamics of COVID-19 in two Indian states." Science **370**(6517): 691-697.

Li, R., S. Pei, B. Chen, Y. Song, T. Zhang, W. Yang and J. Shaman (2020). "Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV2)." Science.

Li, Y., L. Yao, J. Li, L. Chen, Y. Song, Z. Cai and C. Yang (2020). "Stability issues of RT-PCR testing of SARS-CoV-2 for hospitalized patients clinically diagnosed with COVID-19." J Med Virol **92**(7): 903-908.

Linton, N. M., T. Kobayashi, Y. Yang, K. Hayashi, A. R. Akhmetzhanov, S. M. Jung, B. Yuan, R. Kinoshita and H. Nishiura (2020). "Incubation Period and Other Epidemiological Characteristics of 2019 Novel Coronavirus Infections with Right Truncation: A Statistical Analysis of Publicly Available Case Data." J Clin Med **9**(2).

Lopez, L. and X. Rodo (2020). "The end of social confinement and COVID-19 re-emergence risk." Nat Hum Behav **4**(7): 746-755.

Mizumoto, K., K. Kagaya, A. Zarebski and G. Chowell (2020). "Estimating the asymptomatic proportion of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases on board the Diamond Princess cruise ship, Yokohama, Japan, 2020." Euro Surveill **25**(10).

Moghadas, S. M., M. C. Fitzpatrick, P. Sah, A. Pandey, A. Shoukat, B. H. Singer and A. P. Galvani (2020). "The implications of silent transmission for the control of COVID-19 outbreaks." Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.

Moghadas, S. M., A. Shoukat, M. C. Fitzpatrick, C. R. Wells, P. Sah, A. Pandey, J. D. Sachs, Z. Wang, L. A. Meyers, B. H. Singer and A. P. Galvani (2020). "Projecting hospital utilization during the COVID-19 outbreaks in the United States." Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A **117**(16): 9122-9126.

O'Driscoll, M., G. R. Dos Santos, L. Wang, D. A. T. Cummings, A. S. Azman, J. Paireau, A. Fontanet, S. Cauchemez and H. Salje (2020). "Age-specific mortality and immunity patterns of SARS-CoV-2." Nature.

Onder, G., G. Rezza and S. Brusaferro (2020). "Case-Fatality Rate and Characteristics of Patients Dying in Relation to COVID-19 in Italy." JAMA.

Oran, D. P. and E. J. Topol (2020). "Prevalence of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection: A Narrative Review." Ann Intern Med.

Painter, M. and T. Qiu (2020). "Political beliefs affect compliance with covid-19 social distancing orders." Available at SSRN 3569098.

Pan, A., L. Liu, C. Wang, H. Guo, X. Hao, Q. Wang, J. Huang, N. He, H. Yu, X. Lin, S. Wei and T. Wu (2020). "Association of Public Health Interventions With the Epidemiology of the COVID-19 Outbreak in Wuhan, China." JAMA.

Pei, S., S. Kandula and J. Shaman (2020). "Differential Effects of Intervention Timing on COVID-19 Spread in the United States." medRxiv.

Rahmandad, H. and K. Hu (2010). "Modeling the rework cycle: capturing multiple defects per task." System Dynamics Review **26**(4): 291-315.

Roser, M., H. Ritchie, E. Ortiz-Ospina and J. Hasell. (2020). "Coronavirus Pandemic (COVID-19)." Our World in Data, from https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus-testing.

Ruktanonchai, N. W., J. R. Floyd, S. Lai, C. W. Ruktanonchai, A. Sadilek, P. Rente-Lourenco, X. Ben, A. Carioli, J. Gwinn, J. E. Steele, O. Prosper, A. Schneider, A. Oplinger, P. Eastham and A. J. Tatem (2020). "Assessing the impact of coordinated COVID-19 exit strategies across Europe." Science.

Russell, T. W., J. Hellewell, C. I. Jarvis, K. van Zandvoort, S. Abbott, R. Ratnayake, G. Cmmid Covid-Working, S. Flasche, R. M. Eggo, W. J. Edmunds and A. J. Kucharski (2020). "Estimating the infection and case fatality ratio for coronavirus disease (COVID-19) using age-adjusted data from the outbreak on the Diamond Princess cruise ship, February 2020." Euro Surveill **25**(12).

Salje, H., C. Tran Kiem, N. Lefrancq, N. Courtejoie, P. Bosetti, J. Paireau, A. Andronico, N. Hoze, J. Richet, C. L. Dubost, Y. Le Strat, J. Lessler, D. Levy-Bruhl, A. Fontanet, L. Opatowski, P. Y. Boelle and S. Cauchemez (2020). "Estimating the burden of SARS-CoV-2 in France." Science **369**(6500): 208-211.

Struben, J. (2020). "The coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic: simulation-based assessment of outbreak responses and postpeak strategies." Syst Dyn Rev.

Sutton, D., K. Fuchs, M. D'Alton and D. Goffman (2020). "Universal Screening for SARS-CoV-2 in Women Admitted for Delivery." N Engl J Med **382**(22): 2163-2164.

Verity, R., L. C. Okell, I. Dorigatti, P. Winskill, C. Whittaker, N. Imai, G. Cuomo-Dannenburg, H. Thompson, P. G. Walker and H. Fu (2020). "Estimates of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based analysis." The Lancet infectious diseases.

Vrugt, J. A., C. Ter Braak, C. Diks, B. A. Robinson, J. M. Hyman and D. Higdon (2009). "Accelerating Markov chain Monte Carlo simulation by differential evolution with self-adaptive randomized subspace sampling." International Journal of Nonlinear Sciences and Numerical Simulation **10**(3): 273-290.

Walker, P. G. T., C. Whittaker, O. J. Watson, M. Baguelin, P. Winskill, A. Hamlet, B. A. Djafaara, Z. Cucunuba, D. Olivera Mesa, W. Green, H. Thompson, S. Nayagam, K. E. C. Ainslie, S. Bhatia, S. Bhatt, A. Boonyasiri, O. Boyd, N. F. Brazeau, L. Cattarino, G. Cuomo-Dannenburg, A. Dighe, C. A. Donnelly, I. Dorigatti, S. L. van Elsland, R. FitzJohn, H. Fu, K. A. M. Gaythorpe, L. Geidelberg, N. Grassly, D. Haw, S. Hayes, W. Hinsley, N. Imai, D. Jorgensen, E. Knock, D. Laydon, S. Mishra, G. Nedjati-Gilani, L. C. Okell, H. J. Unwin, R. Verity, M. Vollmer, C. E. Walters, H. Wang, Y. Wang, X. Xi, D. G. Lalloo, N. M. Ferguson and A. C. Ghani (2020). "The impact of COVID-19 and strategies for mitigation and suppression in low- and middle-income countries." Science.

Wang, W., Y. Xu, R. Gao, R. Lu, K. Han, G. Wu and W. Tan (2020). "Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in different types of clinical specimens." Jama **323**(18): 1843-1844.

Weinberger, D. M., J. Chen, T. Cohen, F. W. Crawford, F. Mostashari, D. Olson, V. E. Pitzer, N. G. Reich, M. Russi, L. Simonsen, A. Watkins and C. Viboud (2020). "Estimation of Excess Deaths Associated With the COVID-19 Pandemic in the United States, March to May 2020." JAMA Intern Med.

WHO (2020). Guidance on developing a national deployment and vaccination plan for COVID-19 vaccines. Geneva, World Health Organization.

Woolf, S. H., D. A. Chapman, R. T. Sabo, D. M. Weinberger and L. Hill (2020). "Excess Deaths From COVID-19 and Other Causes, March-April 2020." JAMA.

Wu, J. T., K. Leung and G. M. Leung (2020). "Nowcasting and forecasting the potential domestic and international spread of the 2019-nCoV outbreak originating in Wuhan, China: a modelling study." Lancet **395**(10225): 689-697.

Wu, Z. and J. M. McGoogan (2020). "Characteristics of and important lessons from the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak in China: summary of a report of 72 314 cases from the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention." Jama **323**(13): 1239-1242.

Xu, R., H. Rahmandad, M. Gupta, C. DiGennaro, N. Ghaffarzadegan, H. Amini and M. S. Jalali (2020). "Weather Conditions and COVID-19 Transmission: Estimates and Projections." medRxiv.

Acknowledgements: We thank Tom Fiddaman and Ventana Systems for access to the Vensim parallel simulation engine; Stephen Eubank, Navid Ghaffarzadegan, and Madhav Marathe for thoughtful comments on an earlier draft; X.H. Chan and K. Jani for sharing clinical insights; and Nezam Jazayeri for assistance with graphs. **Author contributions**: HR designed the study; HR and TYL collected the data; HR and TYL conducted the analysis; HR, JS, TYL revised the model and prepared the manuscript. **Competing interests**: Authors declare no competing interests. **Data and materials availability**: Supplementary materials provide model documentation and full estimates. All data, code, and simulation models are available at: https://github.com/tseyanglim/CovidGlobal

Supplementary Materials for

Behavioral dynamics of COVID-19: estimating under-reporting, multiple waves, and adherence fatigue across across 91 nations

Authors: Hazhir Rahmandad[1*], Tse Yang Lim[1], John Sterman[1]

*Correspondence to: hazhir@mit.edu

This PDF file includes:

S1 MODEL STRUCTURE AND KEY FORMULATIONS 3
Population Groups and Transmission Dynamics 3
Modeling the Severity of Symptoms 5
Testing 6
Hospitalization 9
Infection Fatality Rates 10
Risk Perception, Behavioral Responses, and Adherence Fatigue 11
Summary of Key Equations and Parameters 12
S2 ESTIMATION METHOD 15
Overview of the Approach 15
The Fit to Time Series for Cases and Deaths 15
Incorporating the coherence of parameters across countries 16
Excess mortality penalty 18
Numerical Methods 19
S3 VALIDATION OF ESTIMATION FRAMEWORK 21
S4 DATA PRE-PROCESSING 26
S5 EXTENDED RESULTS 32
Quality of fit measures 32
Estimates for true magnitude of epidemic 36
Excess deaths 37
Maximum reproduction number 38

Time to herd immunity 40
Parameter estimates 41
Future projections 44
S6 OUT OF SAMPLE PREDICTION TEST 45
S7 SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS 49
Impact of Cross-country Parameter Variances 49
Sensitivity to Parametric Assumptions 53
Sensitivity of results to exclusion of major countries 55
S8 COMPLETE MODEL DOCUMENTATION 57
Complete equations and units 57
S9 References 71

List of Figures

FIGURE S1- KEY POPULATION STOCKS AND FLOWS. 3
FIGURE S2- OVERVIEW OF MODEL'S MECHANISMS. 5
FIGURE S3- SCHEMATIC OVERVIEW OF ZERO-INFLATED POISSON PROCESS AND TEST ALLOCATION. 8
FIGURE S4- THEORETICAL VS. ACTUAL FRACTION OF PARAMETERS ENVELOPED BY DIFFERENT CREDIBLE INTERVAL PERCENTILES. 23
FIGURE S5-COUNTRY-LEVEL PARAMETER ESTIMATES AND 95% CREDIBLE INTERVALS FROM SYNTHETIC ESTIMATION EXERCISE 25
FIGURE S6- COMPARISON OF DATA AND SIMULATION. 35
FIGURE S7- ESTIMATES AND 95% CREDIBLE INTERVALS FOR TRUE MAGNITUDE OF EPIDEMIC. 36
FIGURE S8- RATIO OF ESTIMATED EXCESS DEATHS TO REPORTED EXCESS DEATHS. 37
FIGURE S9- MAXIMUM REPRODUCTION NUMBER R_E FOR EACH COUNTRY'S OUTBREAK 39
FIGURE S10- TIME TO 80% CUMULATIVE INFECTION 40
FIGURE S11- PARAMETER ESTIMATES AND 95% CREDIBLE REGIONS FOR COUNTRY-SPECIFIC PARAMETERS. 43
FIGURE S12- COUNTRY LEVEL PROJECTIONS UNTIL SPRING 2021 IN SCENARIO I. 44
FIGURE S13-PREDICTIONS FROM THE MODEL FITTED WITH DATA UNTIL AUGUST 10TH FOR THE AUGUST 10TH TO OCTOBER 30TH INTERVAL. 46

List of Tables

TABLE S1- MAPPING BETWEEN FULL VARIABLE NAMES AND THEIR SHORT FORM 12
TABLE S2- ESTIMATED MODEL PARAMETERS 17
TABLE S3- MEASURES OF FIT BETWEEN DATA AND SIMULATIONS FOR DIFFERENT COUNTRIES. 33
TABLE S4- QUALITY OF FIT FOR FUTURE PROJECTIONS COMPARED TO WHEN DATA IS AVAILABLE. 47
TABLE S5- IMPACT OF DECREASING ASSUMED CROSS-COUNTRY PARAMETER VARIANCES BY A FACTOR OF FOUR 50
TABLE S6- IMPACT OF INCREASING ASSUMED CROSS-COUNTRY PARAMETER VARIANCES BY A FACTOR OF FOUR. 51
TABLE S7- OVERVIEW OF PARAMETRIC SENSITIVITY RESULTS 55
TABLE S8-SENSITIVITY OF OUTCOMES (IN PERCENTAGE CHANGE FROM BASELINE) TO EXCLUSION OF TOP FIVE COUNTRIES 56

S1 MODEL STRUCTURE AND KEY FORMULATIONS

The model simulates the evolution of COVID-19 epidemic, risk perception and response, testing, hospitalization, and fatality at the level of a country. Here we explain key equations and structures in each sector, followed by complete listing of model equations and parameters in S8.

Population Groups and Transmission Dynamics

The model is a derivative of the well-known SEIR (Susceptible, Exposed, Infectious, Recovered) framework for simulating infection dynamics. Figure S1 provides an overview of key population groups and the population movements among them[1].



Figure S1- Key population stocks and flows. Rectangles represent stocks (state variables), while arrows and valves represent the flows between them (state transitions).

The *Susceptible* population (S) transitions to the *Pre-Symptomatic Infected* state (P) based on the *Infection Rate* (r_{SP}). After an average *Incubation Period* (τ_P), these pre-symptomatic infected transition into the *Infected Pre-Detection* (I_P) state. After a further average *Onset to Detection Delay* (τ_T), this group splits among multiple pathways. First, if tested positive for COVID-19, they transition into either *Infectious Confirmed Not Hospitalized* (I_C) or *Hospitalized Infectious Confirmed* (I_{CH}). Anyone not tested positive, whether for lack of testing or erroneous test results, transitions into either *Hospitalized Infectious Unconfirmed* (I_{UH}) or *Infectious Unconfirmed Post-Detection* (I_U). We assume demand for testing and hospitalization are driven by symptoms, so all asymptomatic patients will be in the latter category.

From these Infectious categories, resolution flows ($r_{...}$) take individuals to either Recovered ($R_{...}$) or Dead ($D_{...}$) states, with corresponding subscripts $_U$, $_C$, $_{CH}$, and $_{UH}$ for stocks and $_{UU}$, $_{UHCH}$ etc. for flows. Given the differences in severity and potential survival extension due to hospitalization, we distinguish between resolution delay for those in hospital (*Hospitalized Resolution Time;* τ_H) and those not

[1] In the equations below we use short-hands to simplify mathematical notations. The full model documentation uses full variable names. Table S1 provides the mapping between the short-hands and the full names, as well as the sources and equations for those variables and parameters discussed below.

hospitalized (*Post-Detection Phase Resolution Time*; τ_R). We use first order exponential delays for all lags, though sensitivity analyses showed very little impact of using higher order delays.

The *Infection Rate* (r_{SP}) controls the flow from S to P and depends on *Infectious Contacts* (C_I), fraction of total *Population* (N) that is susceptible, and *Weather Effect on Transmission* (W). The latter is a function of R_W, the country-level projections for impact of weather on COVID-19 transmission risk year-round developed by Xu and colleagues (*1*) and a parameter, *Sensitivity to Weather* (s_W), to be estimated:

$$r_{SP} = C_I W \left(\frac{S}{N}\right) \tag{1}$$

$$W = R_W^{s_W} \tag{2}$$

Infectious contacts depend on the *Reference Force of Infection* (β), various infectious sub-populations (and their relative transmission rates; m_a for asymptomatic and m_T for confirmed), and *Contacts Relative to Normal* (F_C), which captures behavioral and policy responses as a fractional multiplier to baseline infectious contacts:

$$C_I = \beta F_C(m_a(P^a + I_P^a + I_U^a) + I_P^s + I_U^s + P^s + I_{UH} + m_T(I_{CH} + I_C)) \tag{3}$$

In this equation we separate various stocks (of I and P) into asymptomatic (a superscript) and symptomatic (s superscript). That distinction is treated analytically using a zero-inflated Poisson distribution that is discussed in the next section. In light of evidence on the short serial interval for COVID-19, likely below the incubation period (*2, 3*), we do not distinguish the infectivity of pre-symptomatic individuals from those post onset. Contagion dynamics start from *Patient Zero Arrival Time*, T_0, another estimated parameter. The key mechanisms regulating the population flows among these stocks are discussed below, and a schematic of important relationships is provided in Figure S2.

Five parameters are estimated in the equations discussed above. One of them (s_W) is global (i.e. assumed identical across countries; see the estimation section below for details on the distinction between global and country-specific parameters) and the remaining four are country-specific: β, m_T, m_a, and T_0.



Figure S2- Overview of model's mechanisms. Major feedback loops are identified as Balancing (Negative feedback; B) and Reinforcing (Positive feedback; R).

Modeling the Severity of Symptoms

COVID-19 infection varies in acuity, from asymptomatic to life-threatening. Disease acuity affects fatality risk and also testing and hospitalization decisions, which in turn affect official records of infection and fatality rates. Since movement between population groups via testing or hospitalization is itself a function of acuity, to allow for consistent inference of mean acuity across different population groups, we use an analytical framework to track acuity levels. The framework, which we adapted from prior research (*4*), obviates the need to disaggregate the population by different acuity levels (which would prohibitively raise the computational costs for estimation).

Specifically, we represent acuity using a zero-inflated Poisson distribution. This distribution combines two subpopulations – one with Poisson-distributed acuity levels with mean *Covid Acuity* (α_C), and another *Additional Asymptomatic Fraction* with zero acuity, which is the zero-inflated component. The

sum of those with zero acuity from the Poisson part of the population and the second group is the *Total Asymptomatic Fraction* (p_a). We assume this asymptomatic group is not given priority in testing or hospitalization, and is not at risk of death. Thus they will always follow the $S \xrightarrow{r_{SP}} P \xrightarrow{r_{PP}} I_P \xrightarrow{r_{IU}} I_U \xrightarrow{r_{UU}} R_U$ pathway. The pathways for the remaining population depend on acuity and its impacts on testing, hospitalization, and death. Note that the concept of acuity defined here only needs to have a monotonic relationship with tangible symptoms and risk factors and it does not have a one-to-one relationship with any real world measure of acuity, and as such is better seen as a mathematical construct that informs modeling rather than a real-world variable with clinical definition.

From this framework two parameters, a and α_C, are estimated as country specific parameters with limited variability across countries.

Testing

The testing sector reads the *Active Test Rate* (T_t) for each country as exogenous input data (see appendix S3 for pre-processing details for this data). A fraction of the total test rate, typically small, is allocated to post-mortem testing of COVID-19 victims who have not been previously confirmed (*Post Mortem Tests Total*, T_{PM}). Specifically, of the deaths of unconfirmed infectious individuals (whether hospitalized or not), a certain *Fraction of Fatalities Screened Post Mortem* (n_{PM}) will be identified true post-mortem tests. We anchor the n_{PM} to *Fraction Covid Death In Hospitals Previously Tested* (n_{DCH}). The rationale for this anchoring is that on the margin if there are many unidentified COVID patients in hospitals, the chances are that the system lacks enough testing capacity and thus post-mortem testing should also be less thorough:

$$n_{PM} = n_{DCH} \tag{4}$$

We experimented other functional forms with a free parameter connecting the two constructs, but following our conservative estimation principle decided against including that free parameter in the final model. We feared that absent clear observables to identify this additional parameter (e.g. on country-specific policies regulating post-mortem testing) the degree of freedom would improve the fit but potentially for the wrong reason.

The remaining *Testing Capacity Net of Post Mortem Tests* ($T_{Net} = T_t - T_{PM}$) is allocated to test demand from two sources. First, symptomatic COVID patients leaving the pre-detection (I_P) phase may seek testing (*Positive Candidates Interested in Testing Poisson Subset*: $M_C = \frac{I_P}{\tau_T}(1 - p_a)$). Second, COVID-negative individuals may seek testing due to various perceived risks and other conditions with overlapping symptoms such as common cold and influenza-like illnesses (M_N, *Potential Test Demand from Susceptible Population*). This "negative" demand includes a *Baseline Daily Fraction Susceptible Seeking Tests* (n_{ST}) of the population not previously tested positively (N_U), and increases with the *Recent Detected Infections* (T_{PIR}), which is an exponentially weighted moving average of *Positive Tests of Infected* (T_{PI}). COVID-positive and COVID-negative sources of demand add up to create the overall *Testing Demand* (M_T):

$$M_N = n_{ST} N_U + m_{IT} T_{PIR} \tag{5}$$

$$M_T = M_N + M_C \quad (6)$$

Where the *Multiplier Recent Infections to Test* (m_{IT}), captures the sensitivity of negative test demand to recent infection reports.

To allocate the available tests (T_{Net}) between these two sources of demand, we use an analytical logic that allocates testing based on symptom severity. Via self-selection and screening by testing centers, people who have more symptoms or other signals that correlate with COVID infection (e.g., high exposure risk) are more likely to be tested. We assume each unit of acuity increases the likelihood that an individual gets tested, based on a variable *Prob Missing Symptom*, p_{MS}. This variable represents the probability that each acuity unit fails to convince the testing decision process to test a given individual, i.e. how selectively and sparingly tests are conducted. Specifically, in this model an individual with k acuity units is tested with probability:

$$p(test|k\ symptoms) = 1 - p(missing\ k\ symptoms) = 1 - p_{MS}^k \quad (7)$$

We assume the negative test demand is coming from a population with a Poisson-distributed, unit average acuity level (α_N=1) for symptoms of non-COVID influenza-like illnesses. The test demand from COVID patients also comes from a Poisson distribution of acuity, but with mean α_C. With the Poisson distribution and given a level of α and p_{MS}, one can calculate the fraction of each demand source that would be tested:

$$p(getting\ test) = 1 - p(not\ being\ tested) = 1 - \sum_{k=0}^{k=\infty} \frac{e^{\alpha}\alpha^k}{k!} p_{MS}^k = 1 - e^{-\alpha(1-p_{MS})} \quad (8)$$

We therefore need to find the p_{MS} that allows test supply to match demand that is satisfied, specifically, by solving the following equation for p_{MS}*:

$$T_{Net} = M_N(1 - e^{-\alpha_N(1-p*_{MS})}) + M_C(1 - e^{-\alpha_C(1-p*_{MS})}) \quad (9)$$

Figure S3 provides a graphical summary of the zero-inflated Poisson symptom and testing framework. In this figure testing outcomes are graphed for a population where 10% are COVID-positive, assuming that *Covid Acuity*, α_C, is 6, and with two different levels of p_{MS} (=0.8 and 0.95). For this figure we also assume a 55% asymptomatic fraction for COVID patients. Even with testing that prioritizes patients with more symptoms, and despite the large difference in symptom frequency between COVID patients and negative cases, the majority of tests are allocated to negative cases with a few symptoms. COVID patients with multiple symptoms are likely to be identified if P_{MS} is not very large, but when total demand for testing (i.e. the sum of all bars with symptoms>0) is large, P_{MS} , found from solving equation 9, may be close to 1, excluding many COVID patients with multiple symptoms and thus higher risks of fatality.



Figure S3- Schematic overview of zero-inflated Poisson process and test allocation. Red bars represent COVID-positive individuals and blue ones are COVID-negative. Asymptomatic fraction is assumed to be 55% for COVID patients with the symptomatic cases following a Poisson distribution with mean 6. Color coded bars signal fraction of tested individuals with different levels of probability of missing symptoms, P_{MS}.

Having solved for p^*_{MS} (numerically), we analytically calculate the average acuity level for those positively tested (α_{CP}: *Average Acuity of Positively Tested*) and those either not tested or having received a false negative result (α_{CN}). Specifically, if test sensitivity was 100%, the average acuity for those not tested would be:

$$\alpha_{Not\ Tested} = \sum_{k=0}^{k=\infty} k \frac{e^{\alpha}\alpha^k}{k!} {p^*_{MS}}^k = \alpha p^*_{MS} e^{-\alpha(1-p*_{MS})} \quad (10)$$

The acuity level for those tested could then be found based on the conservation of total acuity across those positively tested and those not. Starting with this basic specification we further account for the *Sensitivity of Covid Test* (s_T) to calculate the values of α_{CP} and α_{CN}. We parametrize sensitivity at 70%, which is the estimated sensitivity for the PCR-based tests used as the primary diagnosis method of current infections of COVID-19 (*5, 6*).

Overall, the testing rates that are determined by solving for p^*_{MS}, combined with sensitivity of tests, inform the fraction of COVID positive individuals transitioning from pre-detection (I_P) to confirmed

vs. unconfirmed states (I_C or I_{CH} vs. I_U or I_{UH}), while the calculated α values inform the likelihood of hospitalization and fatality rates, as discussed next.

The testing sector includes the following two country level parameters that are estimated: n_{ST}, m_{IT}.

Hospitalization

The hospitalization sector of the model starts with each country's *Nominal Hospital Capacity* (h_N) in total hospital beds. In practice, geographic variation in hospital density and demand creates imperfect matching of available beds with cases of COVID-19 at any point in time, e.g. because some potential capacity is physically distant from current COVID hotspots. This imperfect matching means some of the nominal hospital capacity is effectively unavailable at any time, especially in larger, less densely populated countries. We therefore calculate *Effective Hospital Capacity* (h_E) by considering geographic density of hospital beds (*Bed per Square Kilometer;* d_H):

$$h_E = h_N \left(\frac{d_H}{d_H^*}\right)^{s_{DH}} \tag{11}$$

Where the d_H^* represents a large *Reference Hospital Density* of 6.06 beds per km^2 (which is the value of d_H for South Korea). The parameter s_{DH} (*Impact of Population Density on Hospital Availability*) is estimated.

Effective capacity is allocated between *Potential Hospital Demand* (H_{CD}) from COVID-19 cases and the regular demand for hospital beds from all other conditions (which we assume equals pre-pandemic effective hospital capacity). We assume that COVID-19 patients will have higher priority for hospitalization compared to regular demand. Specifically, we assume that fraction of regular demand allocated (m_{HR}) would be the square of that for COVID demand (m_{HC}), $m_{HR} = m_{HC}^2$, and solve the resulting hospital capacity allocation problem analytically:

$$h_E = h_E m_{HR} + H_{CD} m_{HC} \Rightarrow m_{HC} = \frac{-H_{CD} + \sqrt{H_{CD}^2 + 4h_E^2}}{2h_E} \tag{12}$$

We determine the COVID demand for hospitalization based on a screening process similar to that for testing. Two types of COVID patients may seek hospitalization: those with confirmed test results and those without. The former are more likely to seek hospital treatment. We first calculate a parameter analogous to p_{MS} in the testing sector that informs the demand from confirmed COVID patients for hospitalization. This parameter, the *PMAS Confirmed for Hospital Demand* (p_{MHC}) is determined based on acuity level of confirmed (α_{CT}) and *Reference COVID Hospitalization Fraction Confirmed* (r_H), an estimated parameter capturing the overall need for hospitalization among COVID patients:

$$p_{MHC} = (1 - r_H)^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{CT}}} \tag{13}$$

For unconfirmed COVID patients we scale the analogue of this parameter (p_{MHU}) based on how much priority non-COVID patients generally receive:

$$p_{MHU} = p_{MHC} + (1 - p_{MHC})(1 - m_{HR}) \tag{14}$$

This formulation ensures that: 1) Confirmed COVID patients are more likely to be hospitalized, but also that 2) if there is ample hospital capacity (m_{HR}~1), then confirmed and unconfirmed COVID patients will receive similar priority for the same level of acuity. In short, the $p_{M.}$ values determine hospital demand by confirmed and unconfirmed COVID patients, which add up to H_{CD}. The latter determines the fraction of hospital demand that is met. Analogous to the testing sector, this fraction along with demand determines the flow of individuals from the pre-detection (I_P) state to hospitalized vs. non-hospitalized states (I_{CH} or I_{UH} vs. I_C or I_U). Matching demand to allocated capacity also allows us to calculate the realized *Probability of Missing Acuity Signal at Hospitals* (p^*_M) for confirmed and unconfirmed patients. As in the testing sector, those probabilities let us approximate for the expected acuity levels for COVID patients in and out of hospital, as well as tested vs. not-tested, i.e. α_{CT}, α_{CH}, α_U, and α_{UH}. These average acuity levels in turn inform fatality rates for each group.

The hospital sector includes two country level estimated parameter with limited variation across countries: s_{DH} and r_H.

Infection Fatality Rates

For patients in each of the $_U$, $_C$, $_{CH}$, and $_{UH}$ groups we specify the *Infection Fatality Rate* (f), as:

$$f_{(.)} = f_b \alpha_{(.)}^{s_f} s_{HF}(.) g_{Ag} v_f \tag{15}$$

The parameter *Base Fatality Rate for Unit Acuity* (f_b) sets the baseline for fatality rate. *Sensitivity of Fatality Rate to Acuity* (s_f) determines how fatality changes with estimated acuity levels; more severe cases are expected to have higher fatality rates. Hospitalization reduces fatality rates, expressed as the relative *Impact of Treatment on Fatality Rate* (s_{HF}); Finally, IFR reduction due to heterogenous responses (e.g. high risk groups becoming more cautious as cases accumulate), improved treatment with learning curves, and other drivers is captured in *Time variant change in fatality* (v_f).

The g_{Ag} function incorporates the impact of age distribution on fatality rates. For age effect, we calculate a risk factor for each country. We use data from the World Bank on the age distribution of each country's population in 10-year age strata to calculate an age-weighted average of the IFRs for COVID patients by 10-year age group reported in prior work (*7*). We normalize this age-weighted average IFR against its value for China, where the data on IFRs by age group were originally recorded. Normalizing in this way means the age effect is not sensitive to any systematic over- or under-estimation of the IFR in prior work, only to the relative risk by age group. The resulting normalized age effect ranges from 0.271 (Kenya, median age ~20 years) to 2.368 (Japan, median age ~48 years). Given the well-established impact of age on fatality, this factor is directly multiplied into the infection fatality equations.

Finally, we formulate the v_f factor as a function of cumulative cases to-date in each country using a standard learning curve formulation, bounded by a minimum multiplier that is 10% baseline, and starts to operate after cases reach 0.5% of population. The *Learning and Death Reduction Rate*, l_{IFR}, is estimated for each country. Specifically:

$$v_f = \text{Max}(0.1, \text{Max}\left(1, \frac{\text{Cumulative Cases}}{0.005*\text{Population}}\right)^{-l_{IFR}}) \quad (16)$$

Overall, the fatality sector includes three parameters that are estimated at the country level, with limited variance across countries, those are: f_b, s_{HF}, and s_f. A fourth country-level parameter, l_{IFR}, is allowed to very more widely across different nations.

Note on comorbidities and fatality: We also explored including three comorbidities but found the estimates unreliable and therefore they are not included in the main specification of the model. Those comorbidities include obesity, chronic disease, and liver disease. The effects we explored for each were: $g_{(.)} = d_{(.)}^{s_{(.)f}}$, where we used the following country-level indicators from the World Health Organization (*8*), normalized by the average across all countries ($d_{(.)}$):

For obesity: Prevalence of obesity among adults, BMI ≥30 (age-standardized estimate) (%)

For chronic health issues: Probability (%) of dying between age 30 and exact age 70 from any of cardiovascular disease, cancer, diabetes, or chronic respiratory disease

For liver disease: Liver cirrhosis, age-standardized death rates (15+), per 100,000 population

Risk Perception, Behavioral Responses, and Adherence Fatigue

In equation 3 we noted that *Contacts Relative to Normal* (F_C) regulates infection rates. This factor ranges between a minimum (*Min Contact Fraction*; c_{Min}) and 1 as a function of the relative *Utility from Normal Activities* (U_N) compared to *Utility from Limited Activities* (U_L) in light of additional risks associated with normal activity patterns:

$$F_C = \frac{F}{F(0)}(1 - c_{Min}) + c_{Min} \quad (17)$$

$$F = \frac{U_N}{U_N + U_L} \quad (18)$$

The utilities from normal and limited activities are specified as $U_N = e^{s_C a_f (1 - L_R)}$ and $U_L = e^{0.5 s_C}$. The former depends on the *Perceived Risk of Life Loss* (L_R) while the latter depends only on the *Sensitivity of Contact Reduction to Utility* (s_C) and *Impact of Adherence Fatigue* (a_f) on responsiveness. L_R adjusts to an underlying *Indicated Risk of Life Loss* (L_R^*) with a time constant that is asymmetric, i.e. *Time to Upgrade Risk* (τ_{RU}) could be different from *Time to Downgrade Risk* (τ_{RD}). The L_R^* itself depends on *Perceived Hazard of Death* (Z_{DP}) from pursuing normal activities, the perceived risk of loss of life in case of infection (p_D, for which we use the global ratio of cumulative deaths to cases to date); a discount rate to turn daily costs to life-long ones (γ=0.03/year); and an estimated parameter to capture variations in risk communication, policies, and risk perceptions across countries (*Dread Factor in Risk Perception*, λ) and is further adjusted based on the adherence fatigue factor (a_f):

$$\frac{dL_R}{dt} = \frac{L_R^* - L_R}{\tau_{R.}} \quad (19)$$

$$L_R^* = \frac{Z_{DP}\lambda a_f}{\gamma} \tag{20}$$

The *Perceived Hazard of Death* (Z_{DP}) is an average of reported daily hazard of death (with the weight *Weight on Reported Probability of Infection,* w_R) and true hazard for death which individuals may perceive through word of mouth and their social networks.

Finally, we formulate the *Impact of Adherence Fatigue* based on an 100-day exponential average of relative contacts, *Recent Relative Contacts* (F_R) and a country-specific estimated parameter, *Strength of Adherence Fatigue* (s_a):

$$\frac{dF_R}{dt} = \frac{F_C - F_R}{100} \tag{21}$$

$$a_f = F_R^{s_a} \tag{22}$$

Overall, the risk perception and response sector includes the following six country-specific parameters that are estimated: c_{Min}, τ_{RU}, τ_{RD}, λ, w_R, *and* s_a.

Summary of Key Equations and Parameters

Table S1 summarizes the main equations discussed in S1, providing the mapping between full variable names and the short forms. It also includes all estimated model parameters, as well as those specified based on prior research.

Table S1- Mapping between full variable names and their short form for the subset of variables and parameters discussed in S1. Also included are equations explained above and sources for other variables.

Short form	Full variable name	Equation/Source
T_t	Active Test Rate	Data (See S4 for pre-processing details)
m_{HC}	Allocated Fraction COVID Hospitalized	$\frac{-H_{CD}+\sqrt{H_{CD}^2+4h_E^2}}{2h_E}$
m_{HR}	Allocated Fration NonCOVID Hospitalized	m_{HC}^2
α_{CP}	Average Acuity of Positively Tested	See full documentation
f_b	Base Fatality Rate for Unit Acuity	Estimated
n_{ST}	Baseline Daily Fraction Susceptible Seeking Tests	Estimated
d_H	Bed per Square Kilometer	Data (*8*)
m_T	Confirmation Impact on Contact	Estimated
F_C	Contacts Relative to Normal	$\frac{F}{F(0)}(1 - c_{Min}) + c_{Min}$
α_C	Covid Acuity	Estimated
R_W	CRW	Use estimates from (*1*)
g_{AG}	Demographic Impact on Fatality Relative to China	Use estimates based on (*8, 9*)
γ	Discount Rate per Day	$8.2e^{-5}$ /Day

λ	Dread Factor in Risk Perception	Estimated
h_E	Effective Hospital Capacity	$h_N \left(\frac{d_H}{d_H^*}\right)^{s_{DH}}$
n_{DCH}	Fraction Covid Death In Hospitals Previously Tested	See full documentation
n_{PM}	Fraction of Fatalities Screened Post Mortem	n_{DCH}
I_{CH}	Hospitalized Infectious Confirmed	See full documentation
I_{UH}	Hospitalized Infectious Unconfirmed	See full documentation
τ_H	Hospitalized Resolution Time	20 Days
s_a	*Impact of Adherence Fatigue*	$F_R^{s_a}$
s_{DH}	Impact of Population Density on Hospital Availability	Estimated
s_{HF}	Impact of Treatment on Fatality Rate	Estimated
τ_P	Incubation Period	5 days
L_R^*	Indicated Risk of Life Loss	$L_R^* = \frac{z_{DP}\lambda a_f}{\gamma}$
I_P	Infected pre Detection	See full documentation
I_U	Infected Unconfirmed Post-Detection	See full documentation
f(.)	Infection Fatality Rate (.)	$f_b \alpha_{(.)}^{s_f} s_{HF}(.) g_{Ag} v_f$
r_{SP}	Infection Rate	$C_I W \left(\frac{S}{N}\right)$
I_C	Infectious Confirmed Not Hospitalized	See full documentation
C_I	Infectious Contacts	$\beta F_C(m_a(P^a + I_P^a + I_U^a) + I_P^s + I_U^s + P^s + I_{UH} + m_T(I_{CH} + I_C))$
l_{IFR}	*Learning and Death Reduction Rate*	Estimated
c_{Min}	Min Contact Fraction	Estimated
m_{IT}	Multiplier Recent Infections to Test	Estimated
h_N	Nominal Hospital Capacity	Data
τ_T	Onset to Detection Delay	5 Days
T_0	Patient Zero Arrival Time	Estimated
Z_{IP}	Perceived Hazard of Infection	See full documentation
L_R	Perceived Risk of Life Loss	$\frac{dL_R}{dt} = \frac{L_R^* - L_R}{\tau_R}$
N	Population	Data (*10*)
M_C	Positive Candidates Interested in Testing Poisson Subset	$\frac{I_P}{\tau_T}(1-a)$
T_{PM}	Post Mortem Tests Total	See full documentation
τ_R	Post-Detection Phase Resolution Time	10 Days
H_{CD}	Potential Hospital Demand	See full documentation
M_N	Potential Test Demand from Susceptible Population	$n_{ST} N_U + m_{IT} T_{PIR}$
T_{PI}	Positive Tests of Infected	See full documentation

P	Pre-Symptomatic Infected	See full documentation
p_{MHC}	PMAS Confirmed for Hospital Demand	$(1-r_H)^{\frac{1}{\alpha_C}}$
p_{MHU}	PMAS Unconfirmed for Hospital Demand	$p_{MHC}+(1-p_{MHC})(1-m_{HR})$
p_{MS}	Prob Missing Symptom	From solution to equation 9
T_{PIR}	Recent Detected Infections	See full documentation
r_H	Reference COVID Hospitalization Fraction Confirmed	Estimated
β	Reference Force of Infection	Estimated
d_H^*	Reference Hospital Density	Data (*8*)
m_a	Multiplier Transmission Risk for Asymptomatic	Estimated
F_R	*Recent Relative Contacts*	$\frac{dF_R}{dt}=\frac{F_C-F_R}{100}$
s_T	Sensitivity of Covid Test	0.7
s_f	Sensitivity of Fatality Rate to Acuity	Estimated
s_C	Sensitivity of Contact Reduction to Utility	Estimated
s_W	Sensitivity to Weather	Estimated
s_a	*Strength of Adherence Fatigue*	Estimated
S	Susceptible	See full documentation
T_{Net}	Testing Capacity Net of Post Mortem Tests	T_t-T_{PM}
M_T	Testing Demand	M_N+M_C
τ_{RD}	Time to Downgrade Risk	Estimated
τ_{RU}	Time to Upgrade Risk	Estimated
v_f	Time Variant Change in Fatality	$\mathrm{Max}(0.1,\mathrm{Max}\left(1,\frac{\text{Cumulative Cases}}{0.005*\text{Population}}\right)^{-l_{IFR}})$
p_a	Total Asymptomatic Fraction	Estimated
U_L	Utility from Limited Activities	$e^{0.5s_C}$
U_N	Utility from Normal Activities	$e^{s_C a_f(1-L_R)}$
w_R	Weight on Reported Probability of Infection	Estimated
W	Weather Effect on Transmission	$R_W^{s_W}$

S2 ESTIMATION METHOD

Overview of the Approach

The model we estimate is nonlinear and complex, and any estimation framework is unlikely to have clean analytical solutions or provable bounds on errors and biases. Therefore, in designing our estimation procedure we apply 3 guideposts: 1) Being conservative by incorporating uncertainties. 2) Avoid over-fitting; and 3) Enhance generalizability and robustness of estimates and projections. To these ends: we use a likelihood function that accommodates overdispersion and autocorrelation (negative binomial); we utilize a hierarchical Bayesian framework to couple parameter estimates across different countries which reduces the risk of over-fitting the data; and we use the conceptual definitions of parameters and their expected similarity across countries to inform the priors for the magnitude of that coupling across countries. Compared to more common choices in similar estimation settings (e.g. use of Gaussian likelihood functions), these choices tend to widen the credible regions for our estimates and reduce the quality of the fit between model and data. In return, we think the results may be more reliable for projection, more informative about the underlying processes, and better reflective of uncertainties in such complex estimation settings. We also conduct a validation test of our estimation framework using synthetic data in section S3.

The model is a deterministic system of ordinary differential equations with a set of known and unknown parameters. The known parameters are those specified based on the existing literature and do not play an active role in estimation. The unknown parameters can be categorized into those that vary across different countries and those that are the same across all countries (i.e. "general" parameters). The estimation method is designed to identify both the most likely value and the credible regions for the unknown parameters, given the data on reported cases and deaths (and for a subset of countries, the excess deaths). This is done through a combination of estimating the most likely parameter values in a likelihood based framework, and using Markov Chain Monte Carlo simulations to quantify the uncertainties in parameters and projections.

We first introduce the 3 different components of the likelihood function we use: the fit to time series data, the random effects component coupling country-level parameters, and the penalty for excess mortality. Then we explain the implementation details.

The Fit to Time Series for Cases and Deaths

Define model calculations for expected reported cases and deaths for country i as $\mu_{ij}(t)$ (with index j specifying cases and deaths) and the observed data for those variables as $y_{ij}(t)$; the country-level vector of unknown parameters as $\boldsymbol{\theta_i}$ and the general unknown parameters as $\boldsymbol{\phi}$. Note that $\boldsymbol{\theta_i}$ vector includes several parameters, each specifying an unknown model parameter, such as Impact of Treatment on Fatality, or Total Asymptomatic Fraction, for country i. The model can be summarized as a function f that produces predictions for expected cases and deaths for each country given the general and country-specific parameters:

$$\mu_{ij}(t) = f(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \boldsymbol{\theta_i}) \tag{23}$$

We use a negative binomial distribution to specify the likelihood of observing the y values given $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\phi}$. Specifically, the logarithm of likelihood for observing the data series y given model predictions $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi})$ is:

$$LT(t|\boldsymbol{\phi},\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{ij} L1_{ij}(t) + L2_{ij}(t) + L3_{ij}(t) \tag{24}$$

where (dropping time index for clarity):

$$L1_{ij} = -\sum_{y_{ij}=0} \frac{\ln(1+\varepsilon_i\mu_{ij})}{\varepsilon_{ij}} \tag{25}$$

$$L2_{ij} = \sum_{y_{ij}>0} \sum_{k=0}^{y_{ij}-1} \ln(k + \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{ij}}) \tag{26}$$

$$L3_{ij} = \sum_{y_{ij}>0} [-\ln(y_{ij}!) - \left(y_{ij} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{ij}}\right) \ln(1 + \varepsilon_{ij}\mu_{ij}) + y_{ij} \ln(\varepsilon_{ij}) + y_{ij} \ln(\mu_{ij}) \tag{27}$$

Summing the LT function over time provides the full (log) likelihood for the observed data given a parameterization of the model. The negative binomial likelihood function includes two parameters, μ and ε which determine the mean and the scaling/shape of the observed outcomes. The second parameter, ε, provides the flexibility needed fit outcomes with fat tails and auto-correlation. This parameter could itself be subject to search in the optimization process. Specifically, we assume that:

$$\varepsilon_{ij} = \varepsilon_i \varepsilon_j \tag{28}$$

Thus we create a (set of) country specific parameter(s) (ε_i) and two general parameters (ε_j) which should be estimated along with the conceptual model parameters. The country level scale (ε_i) implicitly assesses the reliability and inherent variability in country level reports, and the general ones inform the variability in case data vs. deaths. We augment the vectors $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ to include these scaling parameters as well.

Incorporating the coherence of parameters across countries

Up to this point we have not included any relationship among country specific parameters, $\boldsymbol{\theta_i}$. This independence assumption would allow parameters representing the same underlying concept to vary widely across different countries. Such treatment, by providing more flexibility, enhances the model's fit to historical data. However, it ignores the conceptual link that exists for a given parameter across countries, potentially allowing the model to fit the data for the wrong reasons (i.e. using parameter values that do not correspond to meaningful real world concepts). The result would likely be less reliable and also not robust for future projections. We therefore define a Hierarchical Bayesian framework to account for the potential dependencies among model parameters. Specifically, we assume the same conceptual parameters (e.g. Impact of Treatment on Fatality), across different countries, are coming from an underlying normal distribution with an unknown mean (to be estimated) and a pre-specified prior for the standard deviation. This assumption is similar to the use of "Random Effect" models common in regression frameworks, though we deviate from canonical random effect models by pre-specifying the standard deviation. In fact it is possible to estimate the standard deviation across countries as well (and to obtain better fits to data by including the additional degrees of freedom), but adding those degrees of freedom ignores qualitatively relevant insights about the level of coupling across different countries for each parameter, and thus results may fit the data better but for the wrong reasons. For example, some parameters, such as Patient Zero Arrival Time, could be very different across countries, whereas parameters reflecting innate properties of the SARS-CoV-2 virus itself (e.g. *Total Asymptomatic Fraction* (*a*)) or those determining fatality (e.g. *Base Fatality*

Rate for Unit Acuity (f_b)) should be very similar across different countries. Allowing the model to determine the variance for the latter will lead to better fits: the model can find baseline fatality rates that easily match fatality variations across countries, and would expand the corresponding variance parameter accordingly. However, as a result the estimation algorithm will have too easy a job: it will not require a precise balancing between hospitalization, impact of acuity on fatality, and post-mortem testing decisions to fit fatality data. Thus, the estimates may well be less informative, or further from true underlying processes and the general characteristics of the disease which we care about. Overall, our implementation of a hierarchical Bayesian estimation framework to account for the coupling among the variables may reduce the apparent quality of fit but offer more robust results better informing the underlying mechanisms.

The implementation of this random effect introduces another element to the overall likelihood function:

$$LC(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = -\sum_{ik} \frac{(\theta_{ik} - \bar{\theta}_k)^2}{2\sigma_k^2} \tag{29}$$

Here θ_{ik} represents the kth parameter for country i, and $\bar{\theta}_k$ is the (estimated) average across countries for the kth parameter. σ_k is the pre-specified allowable variability for the kth parameter across different countries.

In setting these factors we chose small values for factors representing biological and natural processes, while adding more room for variation when human behaviors and perceptions were involved (See Table S2 for those settings). Specifying these standard deviation priors adds a subjective element to the estimation process. We note that subjective elements are ultimately indispensable in any modeling activity: from specifying the model boundary to the level of aggregation, use of various functional forms, and choice of likelihood functions, these choices are built on subjective assessments that experts bring to a modeling project. Absent our conceptually informed variability factors, we would need to make the assumption that country-level parameters are independent, or that our complex estimation process would correctly identify the true dependencies among those parameters. We think both those alternatives are inferior in the chosen method. So here we focus on transparently documenting and explaining those assumptions, and Supplement S3 provides a validation experiment. Table S2 summarizes the estimated model parameters, their estimated values (mean across countries and mean of Inter-Quartile Range) and the assumed variability factor (σ_k) for each.

Table S2- Estimated model parameters, their estimated values (mean and standard deviation (std) across countries and the mean of Inter-Quartile Range (MIQR). Last column reports the variability allowances used to specify the coupling among country-level estimates. See equation 29 and related discussions above.

Parameter Name		Mean	StDev	MIQR	Variability Factor, σk
fb	Base Fatality Rate for Unit Acuity**	5.69E-04	6.97E-06	1.27E-05	1.00E-05
nST	Baseline Daily Fraction Susceptible Seeking Tests	7.32E-04	4.62E-04	1.81E-04	0.0005
mT	Confirmation Impact on Contact	1.38E-01	8.74E-02	1.07E-01	0.1
αC	Covid Acuity**	5.90E+00	1.16E-03	1.26E-02	0.01
λ	Dread Factor in Risk Perception*	2.95E+03	5.40E+03	1.48E+03	$10^{0.8}$

sDH	Impact of Population Density on Hospital Availability	2.87E-01	1.72E-01	1.07E-01	0.1
sHF	Impact of Treatment on Fatality Rate	3.92E-01	1.94E-01	7.19E-02	0.1
lIFR	Learning and Death Reduction Rate	4.88E-01	5.34E-01	1.78E-01	0.5
cMin	Min Contact Fraction	3.28E-02	3.16E-02	2.26E-02	0.03
mIT	Multiplier Recent Infections to Test	4.54E+01	2.39E+01	1.04E+01	30
ma	Multiplier Transmission Risk for Asymptomatic**	2.85E-01	4.22E-03	1.27E-02	0.02
T0	Patient Zero Arrival Time	1.00E+02	2.79E+01	5.61E+00	Uniform
β	Reference Force of Infection	3.79E-01	1.96E-01	3.81E-02	0.2
rH	Reference COVID Hospitalization Fraction Confirmed	6.27E-01	1.17E-01	9.26E-02	0.1
sf	Sensitivity of Fatality Rate to Acuity**	2.10E+00	2.23E-03	6.39E-03	0.005
sC	Sensitivity of Contact Reduction to Utility	1.26E+01	8.30E+00	2.87E+00	6
sa	Strength of Adherence Fatigue	1.21E+00	7.51E-01	3.58E-01	0.5
τRD	Time to Downgrade Risk*	1.18E+02	9.98E+01	5.36E+01	$10^{0.3}$
τRU	Time to Upgrade Risk*	1.86E+01	2.59E+01	5.05E+00	$10^{0.2}$
a	Total Asymptomatic Fraction **	5.12E-01	5.85E-03	1.28E-02	0.03
wR	Weight on Reported Probability of Infection	1.49E-01	1.09E-01	1.90E-01	0.2
sW	Sensitivity to Weather	1.24E+00	(not applicable for global parameter)		

*Given the wide range and potential long tail for these parameters the Log10 transformation is used in specifying the dispersion penalty (equation 27) and variability factors are reported as 10σ , where σ is used in equation 27.
** These parameters are expected to be less variable across countries and thus are assigned small variability allowances compared to their mean.

Excess mortality penalty

Finally, we include a likelihood-based penalty term to allow model predictions be informed by excess mortality data collected by various news agencies and researchers for a subset of countries in our sample. These data provide snapshots of excess mortality (compared to a historical baseline) for a window of time in each country. Subtracting from total excess mortality the COVID-19 deaths officially recorded in that window offers a data point for excess mortality not accounted for in official data (e_i). We can calculate in the model the counter-part for this construct: the simulated mortality that is not included in the simulated reported COVID-19 deaths ($\bar{e}_i$). There is uncertainty in these excess mortality data: the historical baselines used by various sources do not adjust for demographic change, excess mortality may be due to factors other than COVID-19, and some of it may be due to changes in healthcare availability and utilization motivated by COVID-19 but not directly attributable to the disease (for example when surgeries are delayed, hospitalization is avoided, or heart conditions are ignored). Excess mortality may also be reduced due to reduced traffic accidents (in light of physical distancing policies) and pollution related deaths. Given these uncertainties, we use the following penalty function to keep the simulated unaccounted excess mortality close to data:

$$LE = -\sum_i \left(\frac{0.9e_i - \bar{e}_i}{0.2e_i}\right)^4 \quad (30)$$

This penalty could be seen as a likelihood coming from the probability distribution $p(x) = \frac{\exp^{-x^4}}{1.8128}$ defined for all values of *x*. It assumes that in the most likely case for excess mortality, 90% of unaccounted mortality should be attributed to COVID-19 deaths, but that there is significant uncertainty around this, so some 20% variation across this figure is quite plausible (70%-110% of data). However, numbers outside of this range start to impose increasingly large penalties, so that very large deviation becomes unlikely.

Combining these three components, we obtain the full likelihood function used in the analysis:

$$LL = LC + LE + \sum_{t=t_0}^{t=T} LT(t) \quad (31)$$

For each country we include the LT component from the first day they have reached 0.1% of their cumulative cases to-date, or a minimum of 50 cumulative cases. This excludes very early rates that are both unreliable and which, given very small estimated model predictions for infection, could lead to unreasonably large likelihood contributions.

Numerical Methods

The model includes a large number of parameters to be estimated: a general parameter for the impact of weather, 2 general parameters for ε_j, and 22 parameters for each country that are coupled together based on the random effects framework described above. Out of those 1 parameter (per country) is for ε_i and the other 21 are informing various features of disease transmission, testing, hospitalization, and risk perception and response. With a sample of 91 countries, this would lead to 2005 parameters to be estimated. A direct optimization approach to this problem suffers from potential risk of getting stuck in local optima, and direct use of MCMC methods to find the promising regions of parameter space suffers from the curse of dimensionality. We therefore designed the following 4-step procedure to find more reliable solutions to both problems and the synthetic data exercise in S3 provides some evidence on the effectiveness of the method.

1) We estimate the model with the full parameter vector for a smaller number of countries with larger outbreaks (3-5 countries). We use the Powell direction search method implemented in Vensim™ simulation software for this step. The method is a local search approach though it has features that allows it to escape local optima in some cases. We restart the optimization from various random points in the feasible parameter space and track the convergence of those restarts to unique local peaks. We stop this process when we are repeatedly landing on the same local peaks in the parameter space. This procedure showed that local peaks do exist, but they are not many; for example, within 100 restarts we may find 2-4 distinct peaks, with one being distinctly better than others. This quasi-global peak provides a coherent set of starting points for $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ and $\overline{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ for next steps.
2) We go through iterations of the following two steps: A) Conduct country-specific optimizations with 50 restarts to find the vector of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$ given the $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ and $\overline{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ from first optimization or from the step B. B) Conduct a global optimization, including all countries but fixing $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$ and optimizing on $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ (and $\overline{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$; though that is simply the mean across country level parameters from

previous round). We stop when iterations offer little improvement from one round to the next (less than 0.05% improvement in log-likelihood).

3) We conduct a full optimization allowing all parameters ($\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$, $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ and $\overline{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$) to change, starting from the point found in the last iteration of step 2. This step finds the exact peak on the likelihood landscape which is the best-fitting parameter set for the model.
4) For the MCMC, theoretically one should conduct the sampling from all model parameters in the full model. However, our experiments showed that the large dimensionality of the parameter space requires an infeasible number of samples to achieve adequate mixing and ensure reliable credible regions for parameters and projections. To overcome this challenge we note that the parameters of different countries are connected to each other only through $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ and $\overline{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$, and these general parameters are rather insensitive to dynamics in each country. The insensitivity is due to the fact that a single country only contributes about 1% to the general parameters' values, and within a typical MCMC the country-level parameters often can't change more than 10% before the resulting samples become highly unlikely. Therefore, one can conduct an approximate country-level MCMC by fixing the general parameters at those from step 3, and only sampling from the $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$ for each country. The MCMC algorithm used is one designed for exploring high dimensional parameter spaces using differential evolution and self-adaptive randomized subspace sampling (*11*). Using this method we obtain good mixing and stable outcomes (Robin-Brooks-Gelman PSFR convergence statistic remaining under 1.1) after about 600,000 samples (the burn-in period). We continue the MCMC for each country for another 400,000 samples and then randomly take a subsample of those points after the burn-in period for the next step.
5) The resulting subsamples for different countries from step 4 are assembled together to create a final sample of parameters for the full model to conduct projections and sensitivity analysis at the global scale. Uncertainties in the handful of global parameters is not identified in this procedure, but can be quantified by assessing the sensitivity of the global likelihood surface to changes in those parameters.

The process above is automated using a Python script that controls the simulation software (Vensim). We conduct the analysis using a parallel computing feature of Vensim on a Windows server with 48 cores. After compiling the simulation model into C++ code (which speeds up calculations significantly), and using a simulation time step of 0.25 days, it takes about 60 hours to complete the estimation for 91 countries, and almost two weeks to complete the full suite of sensitivity analyses reported in the paper. Full analysis code is available online at https://github.com/tseyanglim/CovidGlobal.

S3 VALIDATION OF ESTIMATION FRAMEWORK

The complexity of model and the large number of parameters involved complicates the assessment of estimation method based on theoretical considerations alone. We therefore use a synthetic data experiment to build confidence in the estimation framework. Specifically, we first simulate the model using known parameters without using historical deaths and cases to provide a 'ground-truthed' set of synthetic data. We then apply the exact estimation framework used on the actual data to infer the parameters of the model from this synthetic dataset. Finally, we assess how well the estimated parameters correspond to the "true" values and how inclusive the estimated credible intervals are of the true parameters. The ability of the estimation framework to find the true parameter values, and consistent credible intervals, would increase our confidence that parameters estimated using actual data are also not particularly biased and that the credible intervals are informative. While repeating this procedure for multiple sets of synthetic data, with various parameterizations, is desirable, the computational costs in our setting make such an approach infeasible. Nevertheless, the large number of parameters estimated in a single full calibration exercise provides ample opportunities to test the precision of the method in the range of parameter values relevant in the actual data. The three steps of the process are discussed below.

Generation of synthetic data

We used the model specified above, with the parameters estimated in the baseline analysis from actual data, to generate the synthetic data. Given the deterministic nature of the model, it would be easy for the estimation process to identify the model parameters should we use the exact outcome of the baseline simulation. To test the model in a more realistic scenario, therefore, we inject two different random noise time series into the model, effectively turning the data generation simulation model into a stochastic one with underlying noise processes not accurately captured in the estimation model (because of the autocorrelation in the driving noise). Specifically, we make the following two modifications to the model equations:

$$r_{SP} = C_I W\left(\frac{S}{N}\right) N_{PI} \tag{1b}$$

Where $\frac{dN_{PI}}{dt} = \frac{N_{PI}{}^{*} - N_{PI}}{t_{Crr}}$

$$N_{PI}{}^{*} = 1 + N_G \sigma_{NI} \sqrt{\frac{2 - \frac{d_t}{t_{Crr}}}{\frac{d_t}{t_{Crr}}}}$$

And

$$f_{(.)} = f_b \alpha_{(.)}^{s_f} s_{HF}(.) g_{Ag} N_{PD} \tag{15b}$$

Where $N_{P.}$ are the noise terms changing infection and IFR rates. N_{PD} is formulated similar to N_{PI}, with parameters t_{Crr} and σ_{ND}. N_G is a standard Gaussian random number generator producing a new independent draw every time step of the simulation (d_t) for each of the two noise streams separately and independently.

These equations specify two first order autocorrelated Normally distributed noise streams. The autocorrelation time constant, t_{Cm}, is set to 10 days for both streams of noise. The σ_{NI} and σ_{ND} parameters are set to 0.1 (i.e. leading to standard deviation of noise around infections and deaths being 10% of the model generated baselines). As in the real world, the substantial correlation time leads to significant swings in the infection and death rates beyond those explained by model mechanisms.

We also add a "measurement" noise to both daily infections and deaths in synthetic data by drawing Negative Binomial random samples from the estimated distributions for each country at any given time and using those (rather than expected values) as the data in this estimation exercise.

To best replicate the features of actual data, the model uses actual country level data for test rates (which are exogenous inputs driving simulations) and various country level statistics such as population, population density, and age structure.

We record the data generated from this simulation for confirmed cases and deaths, corresponding to the data we have available to estimate the actual model. For each country we only record the data for the days in which we have a corresponding actual data point. We also record excess mortality counts for the subset of countries and periods for which we have such data. These three data items (two time series for confirmed infections and deaths and point estimates for excess mortalities in a subset of countries) are the inputs into the estimation process.

Estimation using synthetic data

The synthetic data generated in the previous step is available on the project's GitHub repository. This data is then used, following the estimation process discussed in S2, to find the model parameters. This step requires no other assumptions and follows the exact process used in the main analysis. Note that we start the estimation with uninformed (uniform with large ranges) priors on all parameters.

Results and comparisons

Figure S5 reports the estimated parameters, their 95% credible intervals, and the true parameters across all 1911 (91 countries x 21 parameters each) country-level parameters of the model that impact outcomes. Overall, the estimation process successfully identifies the vast majority of parameters. For example the median distance between estimated and true values, as a percentage of the length of estimated 95% credible interval, is 12%. Moreover, the credible intervals envelope the true values rather consistently. Specifically, the 50% CI includes the true value in 44% of cases and this measure increases to 64%, 70%, 79%, and 87% for 80%, 90%, 95%, and 98% CIs respectively. The theoretical vs. actual intervals are showed in Figure S4.



Figure S4- Theoretical vs. actual fraction of parameters enveloped by different Credible Interval percentiles.

While not identical to the expected theoretical values, these coverage levels are close, especially in the context of very large parameter spaces and complex estimation exercises where finding reliable CIs is often harder than estimating the parameters. Figure S5 also shows that some parameters are more likely to have imprecise confidence intervals than others. More interestingly, for several parameters (e.g. f_b, T_0 and β) the baseline estimated values also fall outside the 95% confidence intervals and are closer to the true values. These instances point to asymmetric likelihood surfaces and the possibility that the MCMC chains may require larger samples for getting at true confidence intervals. Overall these results add to our confidence that the estimated credible intervals are in the right range, though some may be somewhat tighter than they should be.


Base Fatality Rate for Unit Acuity (f_b)
0.46
Baseline Daily Fraction Susceptible Seeking Tests (n_{ST})
0.69
Confirmation Impact on Contact (m_T)
0.87
Covid Acuity Relative to Flu (α_C)
1
Dread Factor in Risk Perception (λ)
0.63
Impact of Population Density on Hospital Availability (s_{DH})
0.77
Impact of Treatment on Fatality Rate (s_{HF})
0.71
Reference COVID Hospitalization Fraction Confirmed (r_H)
0.84
Learning and Death Reduction Rate (l_{IFR})
0.75
Min Contact Fraction (c_{Min})
0.79



Figure S5-Country-level parameter estimates and 95% credible intervals from synthetic estimation exercise (blue circles and bars) compared with true values (red cross signs) across all parameters. Numbers on the right represent the fraction of true values enveloped by the interval.

S4 DATA PRE-PROCESSING

Getting contemporaneous, comprehensive, national-level data on Covid-19 is a challenge. The most widely-cited data aggregators, such as the Johns Hopkins Center for Systems Science and Engineering's COVID-19 database (*12*), OurWorldInData portal (*13*), and the US-focused COVID Tracking Project (*14*), get their data from the same few official sources, such as the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the European CDC (ECDC), and the World Health Organization (WHO). These official agencies in turn get their data from national and subnational public health authorities, which ultimately rely on reports from hospitals, clinics, and private and public health labs.

As a result, idiosyncrasies in the ground-level data collection processes permeate virtually all sources of aggregate data. Most notably, data collection involves time lags, which can differ from source to source. Daily death counts could reflect the date of actual death or the date a death is registered or reported; different UK government sources, for instance, use each of these metrics.[2] Daily infection or case counts could include the total new cases reported *on* a given date, or the total cases confirmed *from* that date; the latter would result in some 'backfill' whereby case counts for previous days can continue to increase for some time as delayed confirmations come in. Daily counts of tests conducted could report samples collected, samples processed, results reported, or a mix of these; the US CDC, for instance, reports a mix of testing by date of sample collection and date of sample delivery to the CDC.[3] Aside from differences in unit of measure (people vs. tests vs. samples), there may be different time lags involved as well. In addition to these idiosyncrasies, testing data in particular is also patchy for many countries, even as testing has become more widespread. The WHO does not report country-by-country testing, nor does the JHU Covid map outside the US. Furthermore, there are sometimes irregular delays in the reporting of test results, which can create occasional unexpected spikes in reported numbers of tests, infections, or both.[4]

Depending on the specifics of how daily infection and test counts are reported, there can in some cases be a disjunction between the two. Because confirmed case counts largely depend on positive test results, test and infection counts should be correlated – *ceteris paribus*, a day with a lot of samples collected for testing should see more confirmed cases attributed to it, while a day with no sample collection should see no cases. But since cases may not be reported by the date of the test, and tests may not be reported by the date of sample collection, officially reported numbers can get out of sync in either direction.

This problem is most salient when there are clear weekly cycles in daily rates. In most of the world, particularly western countries, daily test rates are far lower on weekends than during the week. As a result, infection numbers show a clear weekly cyclical component as well. But the weekly cycles in testing and infection numbers for a given country do not always line up. Our model explicitly accounts for the effect of testing on reported infections, but we do not explicitly model the country-level

---

[2] https://blog.ons.gov.uk/2020/03/31/counting-deaths-involving-the-coronavirus-covid-19/

[3] https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/cases-updates/previous-testing-in-us.html

[4] See e.g. https://www.wcvb.com/article/massachusetts-coronavirus-reporting-delay-due-to-quest-lab-it-glitch/32288903#

idiosyncrasies of reporting and how they vary between test data and infections. Instead we account for any such lags in pre-processing of the data to align testing and case data.

The weekly cycle occurs in many countries' death rate data as well, where it presents a different problem. A weekly cycle in testing is a behaviourally realistic part of the data-generation process, as many labs, clinics, or other testing sites for instance may be closed on weekends. As testing provides the window on the state of confirmed infections, a comparable cycle in confirmed cases is to be expected as well. By linking case confirmations to testing, our model explicitly accounts for this limited visibility on the true state of the epidemic. However, a weekly cycle in death rates almost certainly reflects different limitations of the data-generation process, typically to do with hospital staffing,[5] which we do not explicitly model. As such we need to address any weekly cycle in death rates through data pre-processing as well.

To deal with these challenges, we developed a multi-step algorithm to pre-process our data before feeding it into the model for calibration. The algorithm is described below. It was implemented in Python, largely using the Pandas and NumPy packages, and the code is available in full at: https://github.com/tseyanglim/CovidGlobal.

The algorithm proceeds country-by-country, following these steps on each country.

1) Examine daily cumulative test data; if data are insufficient (6 or fewer data points), drop country from the dataset.

2) Interpolate any missing daily cumulative test data points using a piecewise cubic Hermite interpolating polynomial (PCHIP) spline. If the first reported infection is before the first reported cumulative test, also extrapolate cumulative tests back to the date of first reported infection.
    a. Extrapolation to the date of first reported infection is necessary since both in the model and, to a large extent, in reality, reported infections require testing for confirmation.
    b. PCHIP spline interpolation yields a continuous monotonic function with a continuous first derivative, thus avoiding generating any anomalous rapid change in daily test rate.
    c. We used the implementation of PCHIP interpolation from the widely used SciPy package for Python.[6]

3) Calculate daily test rate as daily cumulative tests less the preceding day's cumulative test total:

---

[5] It may be argued that there are weekly cycles in large-scale human behaviour that may drive some true weekly cyclicality in the true rates of infection and death, and as such it may be wrong to consider such cycles to be artefacts of the data-generation process. However, we find this unlikely for a few reasons. First, weekly cycles in human interactions, largely driven by the work and school week and weekend, will have been significantly attenuated by widespread adoption of social distancing measures around the world. Second and more importantly, variation in incubation period and time before development of symptoms means that any true cyclicality in the timing of initial infection will be further attenuated in the timing of symptom development. By the same logic, wide variability in the delay from symptom development to death means there should be minimal cyclicality, if any, in the timing of deaths, meaning any such cycles visible in the data are due to measurement and reporting lags.

[6] https://docs.scipy.org/doc/scipy/reference/generated/scipy.interpolate.PchipInterpolator.html

$$TestRate_t = CmltTest_t - CmltTest_{t-1} \quad (32)$$

4) Examine the original daily cumulative test data to estimate how much of the calculated daily test rate is based on interpolated vs. original data.
    a. Daily test rates calculated based on mostly original data should be expected to include any weekly cycles or occasional irregularities that would also be reflected in daily infection counts. Conversely, daily test rates calculated from cumulative test counts that are largely interpolated would not be expected to fully reproduce any such cycles or irregularities, since the interpolation produces a relatively smooth function.
    b. As a rule of thumb, we examine the cumulative test data for the second half of the time from the first test to the latest test. If fewer than half the days in that window have original cumulative test data, we consider the test data to be 'sparse', requiring further processing.

5) If the test data are not sparse, account for any potential lag or other reporting delay differences between daily test rate and daily infection rate using a time-shift algorithm to estimate any such lags or delays from the data and shift the test rate time series accordingly. The time-shift algorithm ensures that any weekly cycles present in the daily infection rate data are reflected in the daily test rate data and aligned as best as possible on date, thereby accounting for the fact that model-generated reported infections depends on testing but with no time lag between test and result.
    a. First, identify the weekly component of the time series of daily infection rate and daily test rate using a seasonal-trend decomposition based on LOESS (STL) procedure.[7]
        i. STL deconstructs time series data into several components, including a trend and a seasonal component over a specified period (weekly, in this case) as well as a residual. STL is an additive decomposition, and has the advantage of allowing the seasonal component to change over time (rather than being a fixed pattern repeated exactly across the whole time series).
        ii. We used the STL implementation from the Statsmodels package for Python.[8]
    b. Shift the time series over a one-week range (from -2 to +4 days of lag between test and infection reporting), calculating the cross-correlation between the weekly seasonal component of the daily infection rate data and the daily test rate data for each time shift.
    c. Identify the time shift within this range that maximizes the cross-correlation between the infection rate and test rate data, and shift the test rate data accordingly.

6) If the test data are sparse, the spline interpolation will generally cut out some of any weekly cyclicality that may be present. Visual inspection of daily test rates for countries with sparse test data also shows large, irregular spikes in reported tests are not uncommon, without necessarily having concomitant irregular spikes in reported daily infection rates. As such, rather than attempting to eliminate differences in reporting lags through the time-shift algorithm described above, we instead apply a data-smoothing algorithm to both daily test rate and daily infection rate,

---

[7] Cleveland R.B., Cleveland W.S., McRae J.E., Terpenning I. (1990) STL: A seasonal-trend decomposition procedure based on Loess. *J Off Stat* 6: 3-73

[8] https://www.statsmodels.org/stable/generated/statsmodels.tsa.seasonal.STL.html

in order to reduce any cyclicality and irregular spikes. This smoothing allows the calibration of the main model to focus on matching the underlying trends in the data.

7) In all cases, whether daily cumulative test data are sparse or not and whether infection and test rate data are smoothed or not, since weekly cycles in death data are reflective of reporting lags not captured in the model, daily death rate data is smoothed using the same algorithm.

8) The smoothing algorithm used is designed first to conserve the total number of reported cases (tests, infections, or deaths), and second to preserve some degree of variation in the time series, as some noise may be informative and retaining some is important to the calibration of the model.
   a. Starting from when the time series of daily rate (test or infection) exceeds a specified minimum value (5/day), calculate the rolling mean of the daily rate, using a centred moving window of 11 days.
   b. Calculate the residual between each day's data point and the rolling mean for that day, and divide by the square root of the rolling mean, to get an adjusted deviation value:

$$AdjDev_t = \frac{Value_t - RollMean_t}{\sqrt{RollMean_t}} \tag{33}$$

      i. Dividing by the square root of the rolling mean reflects a heuristic assumption that each daily rate (of infections, deaths, or tests) behaves as a Poisson process (StDev of Pois(λ) = $\lambda^{0.5}$).
      ii. The functional result of this adjustment is that both *absolute* and *relative* magnitudes of deviations from the rolling mean are given some weight – large relative deviations when absolute values are small (and data are noisier) are not ignored, but neither do they outweigh larger absolute (but smaller relative) deviations that occur when the mean is large, which is important since most of the time series data are growing significantly over the time horizon of the model.
   c. Calculate thresholds for identifying dips and peaks in the data based on the median of the adjusted deviations, ± one median absolute deviation (MAD) of the adjusted deviations:

$$Threshold = \widetilde{AdjDev} \pm Med\left(\left|AdjDev_i - \widetilde{AdjDev}\right|\right) \tag{34}$$

      i. Using the median absolute deviation to determine thresholds for peaks and dips is robust to outliers in the deviations, which do arise occasionally in the data.
      ii. A threshold width of one MAD is relatively narrow for outlier detection, but by inspection of the data, is about right for identifying most of the peaks and dips caused by weekly cycles in test, infection, and death rates, as well as larger outliers.
   d. Once thresholds are calculated, iterate through the data points in the time series first forward in time from oldest to newest, filling in any 'dips' (data points with adjusted deviations below the lower threshold), then backward in time from newest to oldest, smoothing out any 'peaks' (data points with adjusted deviations above the upper threshold) that remain. Repeat the process until all data points' adjusted deviations are within the originally calculated thresholds for the time series.

i. We infer that the underlying processes generating dips and peaks are somewhat different. Dips are generally the result of weekly cycles in the data, e.g. lower rates of testing or longer lags in death reporting that occur on weekends. Peaks arise to some extent due to the same weekly processes, e.g. some deaths that occur on weekends only being recorded at the start of the next week. However, some peaks, especially larger ones, may result from irregular random delays in reporting, such as large batches of tests being held up due to logistical issues and then getting processed all at once. As such the smoothing procedure for dips vs. peaks is slightly different.

e. The dip-filling step fills a fraction of each dip (specified as a *smoothing factor*) by redistributing data counts based on a multinomial draw from the subsequent few days following each dip.
   i. First, calculate the amount to fill based on the deviation and the smoothing factor specified, in this case 0.67:

$$FillAmt_t = SmFactor \times (RollMean_t - Value_t) \quad (35)$$

   ii. Calculate the amount redistributed from each of the following few (7) days $X_{t+1}, X_{t+2}, \dots X_{t+k}, k = 7$, based on a multinomial distribution as follows:

$$X_{t+1}, X_{t+2}, \dots X_{t+7} = Multinomial(FillAmt_t; p_{t+1}, p_{t+2}, \dots\ p_{t+7}) \quad (36)$$

Where $p_{t+1}, p_{t+2}, \dots\ p_{t+7}$ are calculated as:

$$p_{t+i} = \frac{AdjDev_{t+i} - AdjDev_t, min.0}{\sum_1^7 (AdjDev_{t+i} - AdjDev_t, min.0)} \quad (37)$$

   iii. This formulation allows some redistribution from any of the subsequent few days whose adjusted deviations exceed the focal day's adjusted deviation, but with more redistribution from days with higher adjusted deviations.

f. The peak-smoothing step similarly redistributes a fraction of each peak, specified by the smoothing factor, to the *preceding* several days based on another multinomial draw.
   i. First, calculate the amount to redistribute similarly to the dip-filling step:

$$DistAmt_t = SmFactor \times (Value_t - RollMean_t) \quad (38)$$

   ii. Calculate the amount redistributed *to* each of the preceding several (14) days $Y_{t-1}, Y_{t-2}, \dots Y_{t-k}, k = 14$, based on a multinomial distribution as follows:

$$Y_{t-1}, Y_{t-2}, \dots Y_{t-14} = Multinomial(DistAmt_t; p_{t-1}, p_{t-2}, \dots\ p_{t-14}) \quad (36)$$

Where $p_{t-1}, p_{t-2}, \dots\ p_{t-14}$ are calculated as:

$$p_{t-i} = \frac{RollMean_{t-i}}{\sum_1^{14} RollMean_{t-i}} \tag{39}$$

iii. This formulation redistributes peaks to preceding days based on the calculated rolling mean counts of those days, on the assumption that the irregular delays that generate random spikes in counts are essentially random and equally likely to affect any given unit of data over a several-day span. As such, the probability that a unit showing up in a spike due to such delays comes from a given preceding day is simply proportional to the expected count for that day, as approximated by the rolling mean.

g. By filling dips first before smoothing peaks, the combined algorithm largely addresses any peaks that are due primarily to weekly cycles during the dip-filling stage, such that remaining peaks that get smoothed tend to be the larger, irregular ones.

S5 EXTENDED RESULTS

Quality of fit measures

Table S3 reports two quality of fit metrics for different countries and different time series. The first four columns report Mean Absolute Error Normalized by Mean (MAEN) and the last four report the R-Squared measures. Errors for cumulative infection and deaths are followed by those for the new cases and deaths (flow variables).

Table S3- Measures of fit between data and simulations for different countries. Mean Absolute Error Normalized by Mean (MAEN) and R-Squared are reported for cumulative and new cases and deaths.

	MAEN				**R-Squared**			
	Cumulative		**Flow**		**Cumulative**		**Flow**	
Country	**Infection**	**Death**	**Infection**	**Death**	**Infection**	**Death**	**Infection**	**Death**
Australia	0.101	0.277	0.409	0.546	0.991	0.968	0.768	0.735
Austria	0.0681	0.352	0.319	0.445	0.993	0.965	0.855	0.831
Bahrain	0.0473	0.0822	0.286	0.724	0.996	0.991	0.621	0.227
Bangladesh	0.0642	0.0245	0.169	0.135	0.997	0.999	0.833	0.85
Belarus	0.0372	0.179	0.154	0.484	0.999	0.94	0.894	0.179
Belgium	1.06	0.393	0.676	0.397	0.697	0.985	0.634	0.931
Bolivia	0.0877	0.0306	0.328	0.321	0.99	0.998	0.677	0.749
Bulgaria	0.148	0.0536	0.561	0.443	0.965	0.992	0.626	0.531
Canada	0.529	0.0151	0.583	0.17	0.937	1	0.341	0.947
Chile	0.0848	0.0331	0.281	0.223	0.996	0.999	0.609	0.818
Colombia	0.0432	0.0362	0.139	0.124	0.999	0.999	0.941	0.946
CostaRica	0.0605	0.0898	0.411	0.261	0.999	0.996	0.463	0.878
Croatia	0.0907	0.0619	0.427	0.5	0.979	0.991	0.772	0.77
Cuba	0.0331	0.113	0.351	1.09	0.999	0.959	0.558	0.352
Cyprus	0.282	0.12	0.446	1.66	0.966	0.959	0.74	0.0824
CzechRepublic	0.22	0.139	0.32	0.213	0.993	0.992	0.915	0.986
Denmark	0.0642	0.19	0.319	0.4	0.994	0.977	0.769	0.861
DominicanRepublic	0.317	0.127	0.478	0.358	0.996	0.995	0.558	0.683
Ecuador	0.0906	0.084	0.66	0.652	0.989	0.982	0.0873	0.255
ElSalvador	0.0397	0.0458	0.3	0.258	0.998	0.998	0.722	0.845
Estonia	0.0298	0.0958	0.448	1.23	0.996	0.947	0.604	0.291
Ethiopia	0.0861	0.0413	0.246	0.257	0.999	0.998	0.856	0.829
Finland	0.571	0.0361	0.51	0.488	0.939	0.999	0.515	0.82
France	0.189	0.224	0.628	0.919	0.867	0.701	0.16	0.364
Germany	0.398	0.0352	0.431	0.167	0.912	0.999	0.664	0.965
Ghana	0.0325	0.0595	0.588	1.26	0.998	0.995	0.442	0.115
Greece	0.0725	0.034	0.331	0.42	0.995	0.998	0.815	0.696
Hungary	0.29	0.0412	0.446	0.292	0.979	0.992	0.728	0.872
Iceland	0.185	0.135	0.428	1.85	0.987	0.787	0.723	0.0879
India	0.0749	0.0235	0.121	0.11	0.999	1	0.957	0.947
Indonesia	0.0973	0.037	0.256	0.157	0.999	0.999	0.808	0.88
Iran	0.103	0.0159	0.306	0.117	0.993	0.999	0.475	0.888
Iraq	0.158	0.0969	0.309	0.228	0.979	0.996	0.762	0.76
Ireland	0.426	0.0635	0.47	0.222	0.924	0.998	0.583	0.962
Israel	0.0729	0.0515	0.561	0.321	0.986	0.997	0.368	0.669
Italy	0.616	0.0181	0.579	0.2	0.851	0.998	0.546	0.946
Jamaica	0.134	0.192	0.465	0.7	0.995	0.991	0.51	0.537
Japan	0.399	0.291	0.531	0.466	0.966	0.986	0.427	0.581
Kazakhstan	0.0715	0.0183	0.595	0.457	0.992	1	0.176	0.712
Kenya	0.0483	0.0621	0.33	0.36	0.997	0.997	0.722	0.71
Kuwait	0.035	0.0672	0.182	0.326	1	0.99	0.748	0.547
Latvia	0.223	0.218	0.469	1.24	0.966	0.968	0.824	0.261
Lithuania	0.0675	0.151	0.358	1	0.988	0.919	0.856	0.343
Luxembourg	0.291	0.259	0.67	1.05	0.958	0.878	0.212	0.336
Madagascar	0.201	0.0708	0.53	0.753	0.991	0.999	0.515	0.466
Malawi	0.416	0.0979	0.848	0.57	0.998	0.994	0.393	0.714
Malaysia	0.215	0.131	0.388	0.692	0.993	0.96	0.84	0.55
Maldives	0.0807	0.204	0.449	1.52	0.991	0.945	0.346	0.00203
Malta	0.113	0.452	0.393	1.18	0.995	0.935	0.729	0.339
Mexico	0.137	0.0304	0.361	0.172	0.999	0.998	0.329	0.806
Morocco	0.0218	0.0537	0.191	0.104	0.999	0.999	0.933	0.976
Mozambique	0.064	0.0949	0.477	0.987	0.991	0.992	0.438	0.268

Nepal	0.0964	0.0508	0.321	0.279	0.985	0.998	0.748	0.838
Netherlands	0.387	0.114	0.659	0.216	0.786	0.998	0.523	0.953
NewZealand	0.266	0.0995	0.474	1.64	0.975	0.91	0.899	0.207
Nigeria	0.275	0.0253	0.555	0.312	0.999	0.998	0.29	0.719
NorthMacedonia	0.0587	0.0921	0.399	0.402	0.991	0.985	0.706	0.454
Norway	0.057	0.0696	0.324	0.652	0.996	0.992	0.733	0.746
Pakistan	0.0372	0.0891	0.317	0.217	0.998	0.999	0.745	0.917
Panama	0.103	0.0338	0.344	0.188	0.99	0.998	0.549	0.857
Paraguay	0.0935	0.0769	0.276	0.201	0.998	0.997	0.805	0.929
Peru	0.397	0.033	0.505	0.334	0.991	0.997	0.251	0.637
Philippines	0.0943	0.0741	0.366	0.313	0.99	0.994	0.623	0.674
Poland	0.127	0.0641	0.352	0.23	0.978	0.996	0.953	0.902
Portugal	0.527	0.597	0.493	0.549	0.924	0.966	0.55	0.785
Qatar	0.0761	0.325	0.149	0.927	0.998	0.96	0.943	0.254
Romania	0.0355	0.0638	0.212	0.132	0.998	0.999	0.914	0.93
Russia	0.0483	0.0154	0.103	0.112	0.999	0.999	0.904	0.909
Rwanda	0.0685	0.303	0.639	1.54	0.99	0.976	0.359	0.128
SaudiArabia	0.0573	0.0425	0.299	0.205	0.99	0.996	0.754	0.817
Senegal	0.0605	0.0946	0.339	0.668	0.995	0.984	0.524	0.333
Serbia	0.1	0.107	0.651	0.691	0.971	0.954	0.221	0.0103
Singapore	0.0733	1.6	0.445	2.72	0.982	0.931	0.615	0.106
Slovakia	0.178	0.203	0.394	0.817	0.99	0.96	0.849	0.598
Slovenia	0.341	0.0825	0.449	0.629	0.952	0.971	0.833	0.728
SouthAfrica	0.193	0.0905	0.317	0.197	0.992	0.999	0.862	0.927
SouthKorea	0.226	0.201	0.443	0.57	0.993	0.991	0.675	0.42
Spain	0.201	0.0633	0.435	0.257	0.94	0.997	0.64	0.92
SriLanka	0.128	1.47	0.663	2.68	0.951	0.807	0.572	0.0404
Sweden	0.0971	0.0935	0.42	0.279	0.983	0.982	0.217	0.951
Switzerland	0.229	0.42	0.781	0.487	0.936	0.977	0.142	0.895
Thailand	3.86	4.52	3.77	4.68	0.957	0.985	0.794	0.509
Togo	0.0503	0.226	0.617	1.46	0.994	0.928	0.14	0.00363
Tunisia	0.389	0.291	0.844	0.554	0.973	0.989	0.377	0.886
Turkey	0.0568	0.0326	0.247	0.177	0.987	0.994	0.694	0.883
UAE	0.05	0.234	0.205	0.388	0.997	0.982	0.806	0.64
UK	0.766	0.273	0.612	0.269	0.802	0.996	0.517	0.948
Ukraine	0.0462	0.0444	0.149	0.121	0.998	0.999	0.953	0.968
Uruguay	0.0327	0.097	0.433	1.5	0.996	0.958	0.546	0.016
USA	0.0369	0.0332	0.193	0.119	0.996	1	0.703	0.904
Zambia	0.245	0.135	0.812	0.674	0.982	0.987	0.223	0.47

Figure S6 shows the visualization of fit between data and simulations for all the countries in our sample. These graphs include data and model outputs for reported new cases (blue; left axis in thousands per day) and deaths (red; right axis in thousands per day) starting from the beginning of the epidemic in each country until 30 October 2020.



Figure S6- Comparison of data and simulation. New cases in blue (left axis, in thousands per day) and new deaths (red, right axis).

Estimates for true magnitude of epidemic

Estimates for true cumulative cases (blue; left axis in millions) and deaths (red; right axis in thousands) across different countries up to 30 October 2020 are reported in Figure S7.



Figure S7- Estimates and 95% credible intervals for true magnitude of epidemic. Cumulative cases (blue, left axis in millions) and cumulative deaths (red, right axis, in thousands)

Excess deaths

Figure S8 shows the ratio of estimated excess deaths, i.e. COVID-19 fatalities not reported as such, to reported excess deaths, i.e. deaths over historical baseline not accounted for by reported COVID-19 deaths, for the countries for which such data are available.



Figure S8- Ratio of estimated excess deaths to reported excess deaths.

Maximum reproduction number

Figure S9 shows the initial reproduction number (R_E) occurring in each country. Reproduction numbers are changing dynamically and transient dynamics may lead to larger than equilibrium numbers if maximum R_E values were used. We therefore use the 90th percentile of simulated reproduction number in this graph. Also note the large credible intervals for these estimates. This range is partly driven by what exact point of the curve is represented by the 90th percentile. It is also due to the inherent uncertainty when both reproduction number and behavioral and policy responses are estimated: one can have smaller initial R_E and smaller response functions, or larger values for both, and stay consistent with the data, specially because early in the epidemic ascertainment rates are very low and data is not very informative about the true magnitude. Moreover, given the recording of R_E values at their (often initial) high values, they may reflect non-representative subpopulations or events. For example the large maximum R_E value estimated for Iran may be partially explained by the fact that the start of epidemic in the country coincided with the major official ceremonies and rallies at the anniversary of 1979 revolution. Those rallies probably seeded the epidemic in thousands people, and are picked up by the model to inform the maximum R_E.



Figure S9- Maximum reproduction number R_E for each country's outbreak

Time to herd immunity

Figure S10 shows estimated time to herd immunity across nations. These estimates are based on time it takes before 60% of population has been infected by COVID-19. Depending on the basic reproduction number in each location and the heterogeneity in contacts, the 60% threshold will not be an exact value for most countries, but offers a reasonable intuition for the ranges of time involved and could be adjusted with a linear scaling to other thresholds. Two estimates are offered, one for the estimated number based on current true infection rates, and another based on the peak infection rates experienced in that country. The two may be the same if the current rates are the peak rates.



Figure S10- Time to 80% cumulative infection based on current infection rates (blue circles) and peak infection rates to-date (red squares) in days (log scale).

Parameter estimates

Figure S11 reports most likely estimates for the vector of country-specific parameters ($\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$). The figure also includes 95% credible intervals for these parameter estimates.


Base Fatality Rate for Unit Acuity (f_b)
Baseline Daily Fraction Susceptible Seeking Tests (n_{ST})
Confirmation Impact on Contact (m_T)
Covid Acuity Relative to Flu (α_C)
Dread Factor in Risk Perception (λ)
Impact of Population Density on Hospital Availability (s_{DH})
Impact of Treatment on Fatality Rate (s_{HF})
Reference COVID Hospitalization Fraction Confirmed (r_H)
Learning and Death Reduction Rate (l_{IFR})
Min Contact Fraction (c_{Min})
Multiplier Recent Infections to Test (m_{IT})



Figure S11- Parameter estimates and 95% credible regions for country-specific parameters.

Future projections

Figure S12 reports country-level projections for new cases and deaths based on the scenario I (no changes in estimated parameters; testing fixed at values observed for 30 October 2020; consistent with those reported in Figure 7 in the main paper). Note that in scenario II in the main paper (not shown here) we shift contact sensitivity to perceived risks (s_C) to represent some improvement in behavioral and policy responses to infection risk, without completely changing how each country behaves. Specifically, on 30 November 2020 we shift s_C to a value 20% between the one estimated for the country and 18 (80 percentile of estimated value across countries; which strengthens response in most countries and weakens it in a few).



Figure S12- Country level projections until Spring 2021 in scenario I. Daily cases (in thousands, blue, left axis) and daily deaths (red, right axis) are graphed.

S6 OUT OF SAMPLE PREDICTION TEST

We conducted an out of sample prediction test of the model by comparing the quality of fit for model projections for future data not used in model estimation against the version of the model using that data. We calculate the quality of fit for projections of that model (the "early model") for data later released for the period 10 August 2020-30 October 2020. Those projections are reported in Figure S13 and are directly comparable with Figure S6. Note that we use the actual testing rates to drive the model for this prediction interval. Inspection of this graph points to various outcomes across countries, ranging from close fit for the prediction interval to a few with major discrepancies. For example, the model was able to predict the emergence of a second wave, before it was detectable in the infection data, for Austria, Canada, Russia, Poland, and the Czech Republic, and the model predicts the third waves in Iran and USA well.

The discrepancies arise from both the baseline gaps between the model and data and emerging features of the epidemic in the prediction interval. The baseline gaps typically appear because our method enforces a strong coupling among countries. For instance, keeping IFR parameters similar across countries, the model cannot explain the unexpectedly low fatality rates in Qatar and Singapore. Moreover, the model is unable to accommodate changes in responses that are not detectable in the historical data (e.g. missing the magnitude of the "second wave" when first wave is not yet complete and thus the parameters for risk perception and response are not fully identifiable).



Figure S13-Predictions from the model fitted with data until August 10th for the August 10th to October 30th interval. The start of prediction interval is marked with a horizonal blue line. Red numbers represent the fraction of data falling within the 95% prediction intervals.

Assessing the quality of fit requires some benchmark to compare against. Defining external benchmarks in the case of current model is complicated because no other model has attempted to simultaneously match infection and fatality data across this large set of nations. Therefore, we focus on an internal benchmark using quality of fit for the version of the model using the data from the prediction interval for estimation. Specifically, we compare the fit measures from the early model (MAEN scores for reported infection rates and death rates) against the same fit measures coming from the model estimated until October 30th. The updated version uses the data in the prediction interval and thus is likely to have a better fit than the early version of the model. The ratio of MAEN values between these two models informs the speed with which fit quality deteriorates, with values closer to one suggesting robust long-term predictions. Table S4 reports those values across different nations.

Table S4- Quality of fit for future projections compared to when data is available. Mean Absolute Error Normalized by Mean (MAEN) for daily infection rates in the early model, current model (which uses data from prediction interval of June 17-July 10), and the ratio of current model's MAEN to the early one. Note that a few countries (Cyprus, Rwanda) are included in the current model but did not meet the inclusion threshold at the time of the early model.

Mean fit ratio: 0.678

Infection MAEN between days 301 and 381 for different countries:							
Country	**Current**	**Early**	**Ratio**	**Country**	**Current**	**Early**	**Ratio**
Australia	0.263	0.781	0.337	Malaysia	0.272	0.477	0.57
Austria	0.267	0.712	0.375	Maldives	0.346	0.817	0.423
Bahrain	0.286	0.305	0.938	Malta	0.293	0.314	0.931
Bangladesh	0.174	0.528	0.329	Mexico	0.402	0.365	1.1
Belarus	0.218	0.503	0.433	Morocco	0.167	0.167	0.998
Belgium	0.46	0.45	1.02	Mozambique	0.443	0.416	1.06
Bolivia	0.406	0.658	0.616	Nepal	0.287	0.668	0.429
Bulgaria	0.631	0.719	0.877	Netherlands	0.681	0.754	0.904
Canada	0.354	0.609	0.582	NewZealand	0.663	1.44	0.461
Chile	0.16	0.165	0.967	Nigeria	0.604	1.5	0.404
Colombia	0.134	0.248	0.539	NorthMacedonia	0.414	0.466	0.888
CostaRica	0.432	0.638	0.678	Norway	0.304	0.409	0.744
Croatia	0.468	0.645	0.725	Pakistan	0.371	0.473	0.784
Cuba	0.338	0.349	0.969	Panama	0.482	1.01	0.476
Cyprus	0.362	0.799	0.453	Paraguay	0.205	0.703	0.291
CzechRepublic	0.293	0.237	1.24	Peru	0.474	0.491	0.966
Denmark	0.282	0.524	0.538	Philippines	0.317	1.13	0.281
DominicanRepublic	0.646	0.958	0.675	Poland	0.342	0.276	1.24
Ecuador	0.677	0.738	0.917	Portugal	0.367	0.632	0.581
ElSalvador	0.456	1.78	0.256	Qatar	0.0946	0.124	0.761
Estonia	0.352	0.507	0.694	Romania	0.226	0.256	0.881
Ethiopia	0.196	0.241	0.813	Russia	0.121	0.141	0.855

Finland	0.256	0.302	0.85	Rwanda	0.66	0.713	0.927
France	0.666	0.678	0.982	SaudiArabia	0.621	0.636	0.975
Germany	0.291	0.472	0.616	Senegal	0.442	0.981	0.451
Ghana	0.661	4.37	0.151	Serbia	0.704	0.961	0.732
Greece	0.285	0.34	0.838	Singapore	0.267	4.8	0.0557
Hungary	0.392	0.54	0.727	Slovakia	0.387	0.394	0.981
Iceland	0.429	0.872	0.491	Slovenia	0.417	0.779	0.535
India	0.0972	0.598	0.163	SouthAfrica	0.393	2.16	0.182
Indonesia	0.223	0.228	0.978	SouthKorea	0.471	0.635	0.742
Iran	0.309	0.344	0.897	Spain	0.318	0.496	0.642
Iraq	0.281	0.397	0.709	SriLanka	0.63	0.84	0.749
Ireland	0.31	0.736	0.421	Sweden	0.57	0.571	0.998
Israel	0.612	0.64	0.956	Switzerland	0.658	1.01	0.652
Italy	0.447	0.608	0.735	Thailand	2.65	78.4	0.0338
Jamaica	0.384	0.441	0.87	Togo	0.536	1.74	0.308
Japan	0.338	0.404	0.836	Tunisia	0.854	0.887	0.962
Kazakhstan	0.275	3.33	0.0827	Turkey	0.364	0.853	0.427
Kenya	0.356	0.376	0.946	UAE	0.167	0.617	0.271
Kuwait	0.181	0.261	0.694	UK	0.351	0.62	0.567
Latvia	0.409	0.53	0.773	Ukraine	0.147	0.166	0.883
Lithuania	0.304	0.321	0.949	Uruguay	0.381	0.391	0.975
Luxembourg	0.709	0.717	0.989	USA	0.139	0.162	0.858
Madagascar	0.689	1.71	0.404	Zambia	0.488	1.45	0.335
Malawi	0.743	1.81	0.411				

S7 SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

Impact of Cross-country Parameter Variances

Setup- Our estimation method uses a random effects framework, which couples the parameters across different countries, specifying them as instances of some underlying distribution with a given variance. Those variance factors, explained in S2, were specified to incorporate the authors' judgement on how different each parameter may be across different countries, based on the nature of those parameters. For instance, parameters representing physiological or virological constructs should generally vary less than those representing socio-cultural and behavioral responses. In principle, one could propose other variance factors. Assuming very large variances would essentially decouple the models for different countries, while shrinking variances towards zero will force all parameters to be the same across countries. In this section we assess the sensitivity of results to changes in those variance factors. Specifically, we re-do the analysis when all variance factors are scaled by a factor of 4, or 0.25. We re-estimate the model in each case and measure how much the following 12 outcome measures (organized into 3 groups) change compared to the baseline estimates as a result:

a) Country level projections for 1) Actual to reported case ratio; 2) Actual to reported death ratio; 3) Projected infection rate at the end of Winter 2021; 4) Projected death rate at the end of winter 2021;
b) Country level MAEN values for daily infection rates and death rates;
c) Aggregate (across all countries) cumulative infections, deaths, and IFR, both on 30 October 2020 and at the end of Winter 2021.

The first two groups of measures are country specific, so we report them for all countries, followed by their averages, and then the aggregate outcomes.

Results- In Table S5 and Table S6 results from these two experiments are reported. As expected, increasing allowed variances enables the model to offer a better fit to data (i.e. reduces MAEN values, thus negative values for fit statistics in the second experiment). Other sensitivities remain relatively small for most countries, showing few systematic changes in model's predictions as in response to changes in the cross-country parameter variances. However, trajectories for a handful of countries are sensitive to these variance factors: Bangladesh, Columbia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Hungry, Kuwait, Madagascar, Mozambique, Singapore, Tunisia and USA. In these cases one would expect a separate country-specific estimation to give results that may be qualitatively different from those we find, and thus caution should be exercised.

Table S5- Impact of decreasing assumed cross-country parameter variances by a factor of four. All reported outcomes measure percentage change in the given metric from baseline analysis.

Sensitivities to 4x change in variances						
Country	**Case Undercount Ratio**	**Death Undercount Ratio**	**Final Infection Rate**	**Final Death Rate**	**MAEN Infection**	**MAEN Death**
Australia	7.68	1.05	-6.57	-19.9	17.8	-5.42
Austria	6.18	10.8	-32.3	11.2	14.8	-24.9
Bahrain	-1.52	0.777	-5.84	5.04	-0.706	-0.348
Bangladesh	-22.3	-30.4	-47.5	-51.1	41.3	121
Belarus	0.307	-0.834	1.38	-1.04	-0.408	-1.08
Belgium	8.32	3.2	-8.54	-18	2.77	-7.85
Bolivia	-9.19	-3.02	16	79	3.85	-3.89
Bulgaria	-4.35	21.4	30.8	98.9	1.03	3.85
Canada	2.62	1.93	-3.26	-5.47	-5.73	-4.7
Chile	-0.857	0.896	15.3	15.5	-2.38	-0.545
Colombia	34.7	14	-59	-60.7	0.685	-3.57
CostaRica	69.2	49.8	-99.4	-99.1	9.61	93.4
Croatia	34.5	8.8	-23.7	-34.9	0.322	-2.89
Cuba	15.1	8.44	25.4	-2.52	-0.767	-1.92
Cyprus	8.88	-2.21	-5.29	1.45	-9.5	-2.38
CzechRepublic	1.64	1.25	-1.29	1.11	-0.238	-3.9
Denmark	-8.53	4.49	-16.8	-15.2	-1.51	-11.7
DominicanRepublic	2.18	-7.01	-16.9	-22	-18.8	-29.2
Ecuador	-44	-0.252	-20.1	99.6	-8.63	-9.26
ElSalvador	6.67	2.45	25.2	-21.8	0.644	-4.24
Estonia	4.07	1.55	18.7	30.9	-2.86	-1.01
Ethiopia	8.21	3.82	24.6	38.9	-5.9	-3.05
Finland	-2.9	-0.319	9.76	4.31	-14	-2.04
France	-3.46	-3.93	22.1	70.5	1.06	-10.8
Germany	10.3	9.74	-8.6	-4.92	-4.08	-3.53
Ghana	-2.16	-0.188	97.3	94.3	0.499	-0.138
Greece	2.51	-1.07	-0.289	-8.16	-0.201	0.125
Hungary	58.3	8.68	12.6	44.9	13.2	-16
Iceland	18.9	12.2	371	942	-4.68	7.59
India	-7.42	1.23	33	27.9	-4.66	-3.93
Indonesia	14.4	2.06	59	1.53	-0.491	-1.87
Iran	20.3	13.3	-13.9	-13.7	-5.02	-6.8
Iraq	24.5	15.1	-11.5	-8.8	2.89	-4.18
Ireland	4.1	1.18	16.3	9.01	0.645	-3.28
Israel	11.3	3.25	19.2	-4.2	-5.73	-3.13
Italy	9.25	0.0962	-5.99	-14.4	-2.52	-9.51
Jamaica	1.32	1.55	-20.2	-8.03	-5.03	-2.66
Japan	4.73	4.86	69.6	24.8	-8.93	-5.77
Kazakhstan	1.85	0.357	16.1	0.0772	1.28	0.79
Kenya	-8.04	-4.2	-11.9	31.1	-1.24	0.768
Kuwait	-1.21	0.783	15	4.88	-1.37	-0.0935
Latvia	7.42	-5.8	19.5	6.52	-12.5	-3.05
Lithuania	3.06	0.355	-15.7	-13.3	0.959	-0.671
Luxembourg	3.03	0.558	-9.35	-17.2	3.88	-0.924
Madagascar	-9.29	-11.9	-12.9	19	-0.653	-1.48
Malawi	-11	-4.65	68.9	119	-6.17	-5.55
Malaysia	-2.9	-2.11	3.24	-5.25	1.34	-6.75
Maldives	7.93	9.93	-7.9	-7.1	-2.4	3.15
Malta	23.4	29.1	-80.1	2.77	-2.32	5.29
Mexico	-2.56	-1.24	16.3	29.3	2.9	-1.45
Morocco	-0.584	-0.082	-14.2	-4.87	-2.4	-1.61

Mozambique	6.57	-3.09	-3.5	5.98	0.5	-3.71
Nepal	14.9	0.705	-2.99	12.2	-2.26	-2.29
Netherlands	3.99	1.28	-12	-18.4	-2.67	-5.07
NewZealand	7.56	-2.83	57.6	37.8	-9.16	-1.67
Nigeria	24.6	8.84	41.5	6.04	-0.0854	-1.88
NorthMacedonia	-8.47	0.315	-21.4	0.746	-3.38	-6.01
Norway	0.929	0.852	-6.43	-7.24	0.326	-1.28
Pakistan	-13.3	-5	-32	-19.8	-3.57	0.933
Panama	1.29	9.76	17.2	28.4	-12.5	-3.16
Paraguay	21.2	3.86	19.6	-0.495	0.631	-2.53
Peru	0.542	-0.0394	-21.1	-17.8	-0.199	0.259
Philippines	15	5.05	27.8	-5.9	1.29	-2.52
Poland	-3.19	0.39	-1.07	-30	-2.85	-3.18
Portugal	21.1	-5.42	29.3	-18.9	-9.43	-38.9
Qatar	0.496	0.287	-15.8	-15.3	1.56	-0.59
Romania	0.558	0.914	-6.9	-21.4	-2.71	-3.22
Russia	-0.0513	0.116	-0.247	2.88	-0.00574	-0.564
Rwanda	-3.99	-2.51	33.6	12.1	-1.86	-1.23
SaudiArabia	-6.69	4.07	-13.7	6.08	-0.998	-4.77
Senegal	6.66	2.63	20.1	23.6	-7.4E-05	-0.703
Serbia	-0.989	0.586	-12.6	-20.7	-1.7	-0.518
Singapore	-21.1	-30.1	59600	34800	-3.57	-18.4
Slovakia	17.1	2.24	-15.4	-26.9	-3.09	0.307
Slovenia	77.9	6.08	14.7	36.1	-10.1	-17.5
SouthAfrica	11.9	3.2	21.1	17	4.59	-10.3
SouthKorea	12.5	4.14	123	73.7	-10.6	-8.21
Spain	6.74	0.165	-10	-19.6	1.21	-3.46
SriLanka	-10.6	-15.9	-32.1	-28.9	-3.32	-6.24
Sweden	-4.51	0.209	67.1	49.3	6.61	-11.5
Switzerland	9.28	1.82	-14	1.58	-1.28	-5.4
Thailand	21.4	-1.1	-81.2	-84.1	-20.9	-36.9
Togo	-2.07	11	-25.2	-17.3	-1.94	3.55
Tunisia	20.1	61.5	-21.9	250	-0.503	-33.4
Turkey	-2.02	0.779	-3.27	4.86	-1.58	-3.29
UAE	-0.153	3.8	-16.7	-5.29	-9.64	-6.94
UK	4.19	4.51	7.34	2.93	0.4	-15.8
Ukraine	0.0768	0.115	0.165	-0.369	0.0301	0.0107
Uruguay	-0.0759	0.512	11.2	-20.6	-0.612	0.0145
USA	42.6	5.2	24.3	-18.9	-0.223	-4.22
Zambia	-5.65	-2.57	-58.5	-27.4	-5.5	0.866
Average	**6.16**	**2.71**	**661**	**398**	**-1.42**	**-2.64**
Global Percentage Changes and Elasticities						
	Cases Early	**Deaths Early**	**IFR Early**	**Cases Proj.**	**Deaths Proj.**	**IFR Proj.**
Global	12.2	2.65	-8.6	7.15	3.85	-3.46

Table S6- Impact of increasing assumed cross-country parameter variances by a factor of four. All reported outcomes measure percentage change in the given metric from baseline analysis.

Sensitivities to 0.25x change in variances						
Country	**Case Undercount Ratio**	**Death Undercount Ratio**	**Final Infection Rate**	**Final Death Rate**	**MAEN Infection**	**MAEN Death**
Australia	-4.81	-3.7	-35.8	5.76	-8.69	15.5
Austria	14.9	6.48	-14.1	15.4	14.4	-14.3
Bahrain	0.509	-0.221	5.96	-0.103	1.24	0.549
Bangladesh	-2.01	-0.404	20.3	24.1	2.21	-0.467

Belarus	-0.366	3.23	22.7	8.62	-11.2	5.28
Belgium	-14.1	-8.1	-1.34	-5.77	-10.8	15.5
Bolivia	19.6	8.91	109	58.5	-0.433	4.43
Bulgaria	-16.2	-1.74	18.5	22.7	0.315	4.6
Canada	-2.46	-1.3	-4.67	3.6	3.44	13.7
Chile	1.49	-1.85	-22.9	-32.3	7.4	5.15
Colombia	-18.1	-6.04	30.7	44.9	1.9	-1.39
CostaRica	30.5	50.8	-95.3	-80	30.6	238
Croatia	-29.5	-3.9	97.8	187	2.58	7.57
Cuba	-15.4	-3.62	-44.4	-21.7	7.79	0.0785
Cyprus	-15	17	-29.8	-46.2	18.4	13.1
CzechRepublic	-3.02	-0.55	-5.98	-2.17	0.142	5.89
Denmark	27.7	11.4	-23.3	-42.2	53.3	-1.65
DominicanRepublic	1.08	0.555	464	227	17.7	-21.6
Ecuador	-7.67	1.6	62	56.8	3.12	2.23
ElSalvador	-2.12	-1.94	6.55	-5.72	9.81	-0.542
Estonia	-4.89	6.12	-50.2	-59.9	4.98	3.64
Ethiopia	-14.2	-4.99	-12.2	89	24.3	1.37
Finland	2.77	5.09	32.2	39.7	16.8	10.9
France	-12.7	-18.5	-29.3	-42.1	7.77	-28.5
Germany	-9.16	-10.4	61.7	-10.7	5.25	10.9
Ghana	22.6	11.9	-24.8	-38.9	2.42	1.37
Greece	-7.19	1.36	14.9	14.8	2.64	1.18
Hungary	-32.2	-6.63	-24.1	-23.8	-0.19	18
Iceland	16.7	16.3	395	86.1	-5.5	9.76
India	10.8	0.334	7.19	-9.58	-0.723	0.948
Indonesia	-6.92	3.02	-34.2	12.4	4.9	13.7
Iran	-15.5	-9.25	-2.08	17.4	3.39	15.8
Iraq	-5.99	-3.19	-26.7	-30.2	-5.54	14.5
Ireland	-22.2	-7.72	-25.2	4.38	-4.86	16.5
Israel	-20.8	0.651	10.9	32	3.46	9.54
Italy	-11.4	-1.28	12.8	21.5	2.84	11.2
Jamaica	-22.5	-4.8	42.7	72.6	10.4	7.18
Japan	-8.41	-3.38	-43.3	-23.9	-4.87	-1.96
Kazakhstan	-4.53	-3.27	19.9	29.5	-1.37	-0.49
Kenya	3.26	-4.43	3.75	22	-3.15	3.21
Kuwait	41.4	-0.544	38.2	-13.2	20.5	1.26
Latvia	-10.5	14.3	-50.7	-21.2	24.4	6.47
Lithuania	-7.53	-0.347	43.2	40.4	3.53	1.12
Luxembourg	0.628	-0.0726	35.9	22.2	-3.28	-1.47
Madagascar	-36.9	-18.1	105	35.4	5.5	5.91
Malawi	-24.8	-15.2	-53.3	-63.9	-6.38	12.1
Malaysia	-9.65	5.48	-2.34	32.4	-13.3	12.5
Maldives	6.4	2.58	65	33.4	12.1	0.762
Malta	-9.48	-3.28	145	19.8	13	6.21
Mexico	2	8.73	-0.646	-5.67	5.1	1.03
Morocco	-9.65	5.36	82.7	95.8	17.8	19.6
Mozambique	-41.4	-9.37	15.1	78.2	-6.39	12.3
Nepal	-14.9	3.1	-16.2	-24.2	4.05	4.88
Netherlands	-9.94	-1.71	85.1	93.5	3.5	8.65
NewZealand	-12.3	2.63	-36.9	-18.8	22.5	2.11
Nigeria	-23.4	-6.43	-4.03	48.1	-1.28	2.7
NorthMacedonia	-14.5	-2.35	82.5	161	3.15	5.64
Norway	-2.69	2.91	8.1	-1.31	5.65	8.85
Pakistan	7.86	2.55	9.55	-6.9	1.46	7.28
Panama	-2.01	-11.4	7.66	-15.4	34.7	10.8
Paraguay	-11.4	-2.42	-14.6	-0.274	-3.1	0.367
Peru	-2.32	7.13	250	184	9.81	-0.623
Philippines	-5.93	1.07	-28.9	4.47	-3.84	1.18
Poland	-16.2	-0.701	80.9	101	10.3	4.94

Portugal	-0.139	23.8	112	318	22.7	83.4
Qatar	-1.82	0.354	47.4	42.8	13.3	3.93
Romania	-1.44	-1.67	15.5	34	8.25	14.5
Russia	0.665	0.0539	0.838	0.403	-0.0129	0.962
Rwanda	2.4	4.9	-33.8	-16	3.73	2.5
SaudiArabia	3.6	-1.04	307	178	-2.33	9.08
Senegal	-7.04	-2.62	-53.9	-39.6	0.78	0.903
Serbia	2.86	0.439	1	10	0.764	0.00813
Singapore	-17.5	-2.97	68300	53800	-5.64	-3.59
Slovakia	-22.7	2.86	20.7	141	8.2	6.29
Slovenia	4.96	-7.61	54.1	57.5	-2.51	1.65
SouthAfrica	-14.6	-1.75	-15.4	-9.72	-1.81	26.7
SouthKorea	-7.66	-1.48	-33	-27.6	11.7	11.3
Spain	-13	0.59	41.5	55.8	-0.297	5.2
SriLanka	-0.888	19.7	-37.8	5.68	5.9	8.13
Sweden	-6.05	-7.94	-62.3	-59.6	10.3	-2.81
Switzerland	-10.6	-4.47	26.5	-1.24	-1.86	7.09
Thailand	-14.5	10.5	-78.4	-66.2	24	52.1
Togo	-15.4	-26.1	-24.4	-22.4	5.4	-6.56
Tunisia	-51.4	-38.4	485	243	2.7	33
Turkey	5.76	-0.217	31.3	37	22.6	14.4
UAE	3.94	3	44.8	61	27.5	-0.32
UK	-13.3	-8.83	-12.4	-11	-4.27	32.7
Ukraine	0.426	-0.125	-13.5	-4.24	3.71	0.9
Uruguay	-0.463	3.71	-4.28	17.5	4.16	1.25
USA	-25.4	-1.33	-12.1	26.4	0.569	6.73
Zambia	-1.1	0.419	-91.9	-73.2	5.33	0.5
Average	**-6.43**	**-0.208**	**778**	**616**	**5.81**	**9.4**
Global Percentage Changes and Elasticities						
	Cases Early	**Deaths Early**	**IFR Early**	**Cases Proj.**	**Deaths Proj.**	**IFR Proj.**
Global	-5.61	-0.577	4.99	-4.15	3.85	8.99

Sensitivity to Parametric Assumptions

Setup- We conducted sensitivity analysis changing all the major pre-specified (i.e. not estimated) model parameters to assess 1) How sensitive key results are to those parametric assumptions. 2) How overall model fit to data changes with changing those general parameters. In this analysis we changed each parameter by +/- 5%, and calculated the elasticities of the 12 outcome measures discussed in the previous section with respect to each parameter. Those elasticities are calculated as fractional change in the outcome measure divided by fractional change in the input parameter. As such, they are dimensionless, with values below one indicating minor to modest sensitivities.

Table S7 reports the parameters over which we conducted the sensitivity analysis, their base values, and an overview of the results where averages over country-level outcomes and fit measures are reported (first row) along with aggregate outcomes (second row; for a total of 12 outcomes per parameter in two rows). We report full country-level sensitivity results for the reported outcomes online, in the GitHub repository for the research. All reported numbers are elasticity values.

Results- Overall elasticities remain modest, under 1 in all cases and under 0.1 in half of the reported aggregates outcomes. Note that the mechanisms generating these elasticities are complex, as they

emerge from new calibration of the model and thus incorporate various compensatory mechanisms and feedback effects. With that caveat in mind, we provide an overview of the results here and tables provide more in-depth outcomes.

The average residence time in hospitals has a small impact on death rates and IFR, as increasing the residence time reduces available beds and exacerbates hospital shortages. Increasing incubation period may modestly increase death under-count ratio and projected death rates, but slightly reduce projected infection rates. Impact of Onset-to-detection delay is somewhat similar. Post-detection resolution time slightly increases cases and deaths as people spend more time in infectious states. Relative risk of transmission by presymptomatics would increase undercounts, infections and deaths, with a stronger impact on case under-count (thus reducing IFR). Increasing this parameter would also slightly increase the gap between the model and case data (MAEN). Finally, increasing the sensitivity of COVID test would reduce undercounts in cases and deaths and thus bring down total cases and deaths by stronger behavioral responses.

Table S7- Overview of parametric sensitivity results, reported as elasticities. Each parameter is followed by its base value, and two rows of outcomes identified on the top. First row includes averages of 4 outcomes and 2 fit measures across 91 countries. Second row includes measures calculated over all simulated populations on October 30th 2020 and March 20th 2021.

Parameter	**Ave Case Undercount Ratio**	**Ave Death Undercount Ratio**	**Ave 3/20/21 Infection Rate**	**Ave 3/20/21 Death Rate**	**Ave MAEN Infection Rate**	**Ave MAEN Death Rate**
	Oct 30 Cml. Cases	**Oct 30 Cml. Deaths**	**Historical IFR**	**3/20/21 Cml. Cases**	**3/20/21 Cml. Deaths**	**3/20/21 Cml. IFR**
Hospitalized Resolution Time (20 days)	0.0011	-0.0141	0.0153	0.0393	0.00744	0.0132
	0.0349	-0.0139	-0.0612	-0.0475	0.0801	0.123
Incubation Period (5 days)	0.0861	-0.00401	-0.128	0.0352	-0.00137	-0.00566
	0.208	0.02	-0.152	0.299	0.37	0.0698
Onset to Detection Delay (5 days)	0.145	0.000807	-0.0361	-0.0323	-0.00589	0.00775
	0.19	-0.0101	-0.176	0.249	0.162	-0.0866
Post-Detection Phase Resolution Time (10 days)	0.00689	-0.0147	-0.0148	-0.0705	-0.000127	0.00131
	0.281	0.168	-0.162	0.101	0.0163	-0.0894
Relative Risk of Transmission by Presymptomatic (1)	0.317	0.0472	-0.576	-0.213	-0.000311	-0.00979
	0.279	0.0271	-0.253	0.371	0.331	-0.141
Sensitivity of COVID Test (0.7)	-0.576	-0.567	-0.232	-0.419	0.0433	0.00945
	-0.284	-0.327	-0.0376	-0.19	-0.132	0.0881

Country level outcome elasticities for model parameters

See the online Github repository at https://github.com/tseyanglim/CovidGlobal for country-level outcome tables.

Sensitivity of results to exclusion of major countries

We repeated the analysis in three additional setups, excluding the top five countries by population (India, USA, Indonesia, Pakistan, Nigeria), by true infections to date (USA, Mexico, Peru, India, Colombia), and by reported infections to date (USA, India, France, Russia, Spain) from the estimation and analysis. These analyses inform the sensitivity of overall findings to data from specific countries.

In each case we report the percentage of change in the country level and aggregate outcome measures (those defined and discussed above). Table S*8* summarizes the results; full country-level outcome tables are available on the online Github repository at https://github.com/tseyanglim/CovidGlobal.

Results- Overall, the impact of excluding the top countries from analysis on historical fit and outcome measures is modest: fit quality does not change by more than 3% in 95% of country-outcome combinations. Moreover, the historical under-reporting ratios remain largely unchanged (changing by no more than 5% overall for 95% of country-outcome combinations). Cases and deaths summed up over the sample naturally change when excluding the larger countries or those with more infections (the bottom rows for each analysis). Long-term country level projections (items 3 and 4 in odd rows) change little for most countries, although a few show notable variations, suggesting high sensitivity to their response functions such that minor changes in parameters could significantly alter future outcomes. Those countries with significant sensitivity include: Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Iceland, Maldives, and Singapore. Singapore proves an outlier: given the small size of the

outbreak there so far, a major outbreak, which may materialize under some of these sensitivity cases, would lead to many times more cases and deaths compared to the baseline.

Table S8-Sensitivity of outcomes (in percentage change from baseline) to exclusion of top five countries by true infection, population, and reported infection. Each analysis is specified by the removed countries and followed by two rows of outcomes identified on the top. First row includes averages of 4 outcomes and 2 fit measures across 91 countries. Second row includes measures calculated over all simulated populations on 30 October 2020 and 20 March 2021.

Removed Countries	**Ave Case Undercount Ratio**	**Ave Death Undercount Ratio**	**Ave 3/20/21 Infection Rate**	**Ave 3/20/21 Death Rate**	**Ave MAEN Infection Rate**	**Ave MAEN Death Rate**
	Oct 30 Cml. Cases	**Oct 30 Cml. Deaths**	**Historical IFR**	**3/20/21 Cml. Cases**	**3/20/21 Cml. Deaths**	**3/20/21 Cml. IFR**
Top True Infections: USA, Mexico, Peru, India, Colombia	0.0449	-0.0017	0.201	0.085	-0.0911	0.0372
	-54.9	-51.6	11	-27.5	-21	10.9
Top Populations: India, USA, Indonesia, Pakistan, Nigeria	-0.00196	0.0468	-0.0934	0.324	-0.15	0.0862
	-29.8	-32.9	-4.36	-17.9	-14.8	4.33
Top Reported Infections: USA, India, France, Russia, Spain	0.0412	-0.0186	0.383	0.129	0.0158	-0.0233
	-32.7	-43.6	-16.5	-32.5	-52.4	-29.4

S8 COMPLETE MODEL DOCUMENTATION

Below we provide complete model equations and units. The model, in the .mdl format, which can be opened using the Vensim simulation software, or the free Vensim model reader) is available with this appendix as well, and online at https://github.com/tseyanglim/CovidGlobal. Most of the equations are self-explanatory. The "[…]" notation is used to subscript variables over a set of members. For example, the subscript "Rgn" is used to identify different countries. Therefore [Rgn] indicates that a variable is defined separately for each member of the set "Rgn". Other subscript ranges used in the equations are:

expnt: Used for numerically solving the probability of missing symptoms equation.

pdim: Used for setting policy levels for a few variables.

Priors: Used for implementing the random effects estimation components. Each estimated parameter is mapped into an element of this subscript to simplify vector-based calculations.

Series: The data series (Infection, Death, Recovery).

TstSts: The test status including those confirmed ('Tested') and those unconfirmed ('Notest').

Complete equations and units

1) a[Rgn] = XIDZ (Potential Test Demand from Susceptible Population[Rgn] , Positive Candidates Interested in Testing Poisson Subset Adj[Rgn] , 1) Units: dmnl
2) AbsPrcErr[Rgn,Series] = if then else (DataIncluded[Rgn] = 0, :NA:, ZIDZ (abs (FlowResiduals[Rgn,Series]) , DataFlowOverTime[Rgn,Series])) Units: dmnl
3) AbsStd[Priors] = 0.2, 0.3, 0.1, 0.2, 0.0002, 0.2, 10, 0.03, 6, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.8, 0.1, 1e-05, 10, 0.01, 0.005, 0.01, 10, 10, 10, 0.01, 0.5, 0.5 Units: **undefined**
4) Active Test Rate[Rgn] = if then else (Time < New Testing Time , DataTestRate[Rgn] , External Test Rate[Rgn]) Units: Person/Day
5) ActiveAve[PriorEndoAve] = INITIAL(InputAve[PriorEndoAve] * (1 - SW EndoAve) + SW EndoAve * CalcAve[PriorEndoAve])
6) ActiveAve[PMT] = InputAve[PMT] Units: **undefined**
7) Activities Allowed by Government[Rgn] = 1 Units: dmnl
8) Additional Asymptomatic Post Detection[Rgn] = Weighted Infected Post Detection Gate[Rgn] * Additional Asymptomatic Relative to Symptomatic[Rgn] / (1 + Additional Asymptomatic Relative to Symptomatic[Rgn]) Units: Person
9) Additional Asymptomatic Relative to Symptomatic[Rgn] = ZIDZ (Total Asymptomatic Fraction Net[Rgn] - exp (- Covid Acuity[Rgn]) , 1 - Total Asymptomatic Fraction Net[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
10) Adherence Fatigue Time = 100 Units: Day
11) AdvCntrs[Rgn] = 1 Units: dmnl
12) All Recovery[Rgn] = Recovery of Confirmed[Rgn] + Recovery of Untested[Rgn] + sum (Hospital Discharges[Rgn,TstSts!]) Units: Person/Day
13) Allocated Fraction COVID Hospitalized[Rgn] = min (1, (- Expected Positive Poisson Covid Patients[Rgn] + Sqrt (Expected Positive Poisson Covid Patients[Rgn] ^ 2 + 4 * Effective Hospital Capacity[Rgn] * Effective Hospital Capacity[Rgn])) / (2 * Effective Hospital Capacity[Rgn]))Units: dmnl
14) Allocated Fration NonCOVID Hospitalized[Rgn] = SMOOTHI (Allocated Fraction COVID Hospitalized[Rgn] ^ 2, Hospital Adj T , 1) Units: dmnl
15) alp[Rgn,Infection] = min (maxAlp , ialp * alpR[Rgn])
16) alp[Rgn,Death] = min (1, dalp * alpR[Rgn])
17) alp[Rgn,Test] = min (1, talp * alpR[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
18) alpR[Rgn] = 1 Units: dmnl

19) Area of Region[Rgn] = GET VDF CONSTANTS(Constant Data File , 'DataConstants[Rgn]', 5) Units: Km*Km
20) Average Acuity Hospitalized[Rgn,Tested] = Average Acuity of Positively Tested[Rgn] * XIDZ ((1 - Probability of Missing Acuity Signal at Hospitals[Rgn,Tested] * Fraction Poisson not Hospitalized[Rgn,Tested] ^ 2) , 1 - Fraction Poisson not Hospitalized[Rgn,Tested] , 2 * Probability of Missing Acuity Signal at Hospitals[Rgn,Tested])
21) Average Acuity Hospitalized[Rgn,Notest] = ZIDZ (Average Acuity of Untested Poisson Subset[Rgn] * (1 - Probability of Missing Acuity Signal at Hospitals[Rgn,Notest] * Fraction Poisson not Hospitalized[Rgn,Notest] ^ 2) , 1 - Fraction Poisson not Hospitalized[Rgn,Notest]) Units: dmnl
22) Average Acuity Not Hospitalized[Rgn,Notest] = ZIDZ (Average Acuity Not Hospitalized Poisson[Rgn,Notest] * Infectious not Tested or in Hospitals Poisson[Rgn] , "Infected Unconfirmed Post-Detection"[Rgn])
23) Average Acuity Not Hospitalized[Rgn,Tested] = Average Acuity Not Hospitalized Poisson[Rgn,Tested] Units: dmnl
24) Average Acuity Not Hospitalized Poisson[Rgn,Tested] = Max (0, Probability of Missing Acuity Signal at Hospitals[Rgn,Tested] * Average Acuity of Positively Tested[Rgn] * Fraction Poisson not Hospitalized[Rgn,Tested])
25) Average Acuity Not Hospitalized Poisson[Rgn,Notest] = Max (0, Probability of Missing Acuity Signal at Hospitals[Rgn,Notest] * Average Acuity of Untested Poisson Subset[Rgn] * Fraction Poisson not Hospitalized[Rgn,Notest]) Units: dmnl
26) Average Acuity of Positively Tested[Rgn] = Covid Acuity[Rgn] * XIDZ ((1 - Prob Missing Symptom[Rgn] * Fraction Interested not Tested[Rgn] ^ 2) , 1 - Fraction Interested not Tested[Rgn] , 2 * Prob Missing Symptom[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
27) Average Acuity of Untested Poisson Subset[Rgn] = ZIDZ (Poisson Subset Reaching Test Gate[Rgn] * Covid Acuity[Rgn] - Positive Tests of Infected[Rgn] * Average Acuity of Positively Tested[Rgn] , Poisson Subset Not Tested Passing Gate[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
28) b[Rgn] = ZIDZ (Testing on Living[Rgn] - Positive Candidates Interested in Testing Poisson Subset Adj[Rgn] - Potential Test Demand from Susceptible Population[Rgn] , Positive Candidates Interested in Testing Poisson Subset Adj[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
29) Base Fatality Rate for Unit Acuity[Rgn] = 0.0006 Units: dmnl
30) Base Fatality Rate for Unit Acuity Net[Rgn] = INITIAL(Base Fatality Rate for Unit Acuity[Rgn] * (1 - SW Gen[BsFtRt]) + SW Gen[BsFtRt] * InputAve[BsFtRt]) Units: dmnl
31) BaseError = 5 Units: Person
32) Baseline Cumulative Cases for Learning = 0.005 Units: dmnl
33) Baseline Daily Fraction Susceptible Seeking Tests[Rgn] = 0.001 Units: 1/Day
34) Baseline Fatality Multiplier[Rgn] = INITIAL(Demographic Impact on Fatality Relative to China[Rgn] * Base Fatality Rate for Unit Acuity Net[Rgn] * Liver Disease Impact on Fatality[Rgn] * Obesity Impact on Fatality[Rgn] * Chronic Impact on Fatality[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
35) Baseline Risk of Transmission by Asymptomatic[Rgn] = INITIAL(Baseline Transmission Multiplier for Untested Symptomatic * Multiplier Transmission Risk for Asymptomatic Net[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
36) Baseline Transmission Multiplier for Untested Symptomatic = 1 Units: dmnl
37) Bed per Square Kilometer[Rgn] = INITIAL(Nominal Hospital Capacity[Rgn] / Area of Region[Rgn]) Units: Person/(Km*Km)
38) Beds per Thousand Population[Rgn] = GET VDF CONSTANTS(Constant Data File , 'DataConstants[Rgn]', 11) Units: dmnl
39) CalcAve[Priors] = INITIAL(sum (RegionalInputs[Priors,Rgn!]) / ELMCOUNT(Rgn)) Units: **undefined**
40) cft[Rgn,p2] = lnymix[Rgn,p2]
41) cft[Rgn,p3] = lnymix[Rgn,p3] - lnymix[Rgn,p2]
42) cft[Rgn,p4] = (ln (min (100, Max (1e-06, ZIDZ (lnymix[Rgn,p4] - lnymix[Rgn,p2] , lnymix[Rgn,p3] - lnymix[Rgn,p2]) / ln (2))))) Units: dmnl
43) Chng Cml Dth Untst Untrt[Rgn] = Deaths of Symptomatic Untested[Rgn] - Post Mortem Test Rate[Rgn] * Frac Post Mortem from Untreated[Rgn] Units: Person/Day
44) Chronic Death Rate[Rgn] = GET VDF CONSTANTS(Constant Data File , 'DataConstants[Rgn]', 17) Units: dmnl

45) Chronic Impact on Fatality[Rgn] = INITIAL((Chronic Death Rate[Rgn] / MeanChronic) ^ Sens Chronic Impact Net[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
46) Cml Death Frac In Hosp[Rgn] = XIDZ (Cumulative Deaths at Hospital[Rgn,Tested] + Cumulative Deaths at Hospital[Rgn,Notest] , Cumulative Deaths[Rgn] , 1) Units: dmnl
47) Cml Death fraction in hospitals large enough = sum (if then else (Cml Death Frac In Hosp[Rgn!] < MinHspDTresh , 1, 0)) Units: dmnl
48) Cml Death Hsp Inc[Rgn,Tested] = Hospitalized Infectious Deaths[Rgn,Tested] + PostMortemCorrection[Rgn]
49) Cml Death Hsp Inc[Rgn,Notest] = Hospitalized Infectious Deaths[Rgn,Notest] - PostMortemCorrection[Rgn] Units: Person/Day
50) Cml Known Death Frac Hosp[Rgn] = XIDZ (Cumulative Deaths at Hospital[Rgn,Tested] , Cumulative Deaths[Rgn] , 1) Units: dmnl
51) CmltErrPW = 2 Units: dmnl
52) CmltPenaltyScl = 0 Units: dmnl
53) CmltToInclude[Series] = 0, 0, 0 Units: dmnl
54) Confirmation Impact on Contact[Rgn] = 0.002 Units: dmnl
55) Confirmed Recovered[Rgn] = INTEG(Recovery of Confirmed[Rgn] , 0) Units: Person
56) Constant Data File :IS: 'CovidModelInputs - ConstantData.vdf'
57) Contacts Relative to Normal[Rgn] = min (Voluntary Reduction in Contacts[Rgn] , Activities Allowed by Government[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
58) Continue without Testing[Rgn] = Reaching Testing Gate[Rgn] - Symptomatic Infected to Testing[Rgn] - Untested symptomatic Infected to Hospital[Rgn] Units: Person/Day
59) Count Missed Death[Rgn] = if then else (Excess Death Start Count[Rgn] = :NA:, 0, if then else (Time >= Excess Death Start Count[Rgn] :AND: Time <= Excess Death End Count[Rgn] , Cml Death Hsp Inc[Rgn,Notest] + Chng Cml Dth Untst Untrt[Rgn] , 0)) Units: Person/Day
60) Covid Acuity[Rgn] = Flu Acuity * Covid Acuity Relative to Flu Net[Rgn] Units: dmnl
61) Covid Acuity Relative to Flu[Rgn] = 6 Units: dmnl
62) Covid Acuity Relative to Flu Net[Rgn] = INITIAL(Covid Acuity Relative to Flu[Rgn] * (1 - SW Gen[Acty]) + SW Gen[Acty] * InputAve[Acty]) Units: dmnl
63) Covid Poisson Fraction in Hospital[Rgn] = ZIDZ (Total Covid Hospitalized[Rgn] , Infectious not Tested or in Hospitals Poisson[Rgn] + Infectious Confirmed Not Hospitalized[Rgn] + Total Covid Hospitalized[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
64) CRW[Rgn] Units: dmnl
65) Cumulative Cases[Rgn] = INTEG(New Cases[Rgn] , 0) Units: Person
66) Cumulative Confirmed Cases[Rgn] = INTEG(SimFlowOverTime[Rgn,Infection] , 0) Units: Person
67) Cumulative Confirmed Recovered[Rgn] = Confirmed Recovered[Rgn] + Cumulative Recovered at Hospitals[Rgn,Tested] Units: Person
68) Cumulative Death Fraction[Rgn] = ZIDZ (Cumulative Deaths[Rgn] , Cumulative Deaths[Rgn] + Cumulative Recoveries[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
69) Cumulative Deaths[Rgn] = INTEG(Death Rate[Rgn] , 0) Units: Person
70) Cumulative Deaths at Hospital[Rgn,TstSts] = INTEG(Cml Death Hsp Inc[Rgn,TstSts] , 0) Units: Person
71) Cumulative Deaths of Confirmed[Rgn] = INTEG(SimFlowOverTime[Rgn,Death] , 0) Units: Person
72) Cumulative Deaths of Confirmed Untreated[Rgn] = INTEG(Deaths of Confirmed[Rgn] + Post Mortem Test Untreated[Rgn] , 0) Units: Person
73) Cumulative Deaths Untested Untreated[Rgn] = INTEG(Chng Cml Dth Untst Untrt[Rgn] , 0) Units: Person
74) Cumulative Fraction Total Cases Hospitalized[Rgn] = ZIDZ (sum (Cumulative Deaths at Hospital[Rgn,TstSts!] + Cumulative Recovered at Hospitals[Rgn,TstSts!] + Hospitalized Infectious[Rgn,TstSts!]) , Cumulative Cases[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
75) Cumulative Missed Death[Rgn] = INTEG(Count Missed Death[Rgn] , 0) Units: Person
76) Cumulative Negative Tests[Rgn] = INTEG(Negative Test Results[Rgn] , 0) Units: Person
77) Cumulative Recovered at Hospitals[Rgn,TstSts] = INTEG(Hospital Discharges[Rgn,TstSts] , 0) Units: Person
78) Cumulative Recoveries[Rgn] = INTEG(All Recovery[Rgn] , 0) Units: Person
79) Cumulative Tests Conducted[Rgn] = INTEG(SimTestRate[Rgn] , 0) Units: Person
80) Cumulative Tests Data[Rgn] = INTEG(TstInc[Rgn] , 0) Units: Person

81) Current Test Rate per Capita[Rgn] = INITIAL(if then else (DataLastTestRate[Rgn] = :NA:, 0, DataLastTestRate[Rgn] / Population[Rgn])) Units: 1/Day
82) dalp = 0.1 Units: dmnl
83) Data Excess Deaths[Rgn] = GET VDF CONSTANTS(Constant Data File , 'DataConstants[Rgn]', 15) Units: Person
84) Data Pseudo Case Fatality[Rgn] = ZIDZ (DataCmltDeath[Rgn] , DataCmltInfection[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
85) DataAttentionTime[Rgn] = GET VDF CONSTANTS(Constant Data File , 'DataConstants[Rgn]', 9) Units: Day
86) DataCmltDeath[Rgn] Units: Person
87) DataCmltInfection[Rgn] Units: Person
88) DataCmltOverTime[Rgn,Infection] :RAW: := DataCmltInfection[Rgn]
89) DataCmltOverTime[Rgn,Death] :RAW: := DataCmltDeath[Rgn]
90) DataCmltOverTime[Rgn,Test] = DataCmltTest[Rgn] Units: Person
91) DataCmltTest[Rgn] Units: Person
92) DataFlowDeath[Rgn] Units: Person/Day
93) DataFlowInfection[Rgn] Units: Person/Day
94) DataFlowOverTime[Rgn,Infection] :RAW: := DataFlowInfection[Rgn]
95) DataFlowOverTime[Rgn,Death] :RAW: := DataFlowDeath[Rgn]
96) DataFlowOverTime[Rgn,Test] :RAW: := DataTestRate[Rgn] Units: Person/Day
97) DataFlowRecovery[Rgn] :RAW: Units: Person/Day
98) DataIncluded[Rgn] = if then else (Max (Cumulative Deaths[Rgn] , Max (Cumulative Confirmed Cases[Rgn] , DataCmltInfection[Rgn])) > ThrsInc[Rgn] , 1, 0) * DataLimitFromTime[Rgn] Units: dmnl
99) DataLastTestRate[Rgn] = INITIAL(GET DATA AT TIME (DataTestRate[Rgn] , min (LastTestDate[Rgn] , New Testing Time))) Units: Person/Day
100) DataLimitFromTime[Rgn] = if then else (Time > StopDataUseTime[Rgn] , 0, 1) Units: dmnl
101) DataTestCapacity[Rgn]Units: Person/Day
102) DataTestRate[Rgn] Units: Person/Day
103) Day of First Case Report in JHU Database = 99 Units: Day
104) Days per Year = 365 Units: Day/Year
105) Death Rate[Rgn] = Deaths of Confirmed[Rgn] + Deaths of Symptomatic Untested[Rgn] + sum (Hospitalized Infectious Deaths[Rgn,TstSts!]) Units: Person/Day
106) DeathFractionCounted[Rgn] = ZIDZ (DataCmltDeath[Rgn] , Cumulative Deaths[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
107) Deaths of Confirmed[Rgn] = Tested Untreated Resolution[Rgn] * Fatality Rate Untreated[Rgn,Tested] Units: Person/Day
108) Deaths of Symptomatic Untested[Rgn] = Infectious not Tested or in Hospitals Poisson[Rgn] / "Post-Detection Phase Resolution Time" * Fatality Rate Untreated[Rgn,Notest] Units: Person/Day
109) Delay Order = 1 Units: dmnl
110) Demographic Impact on Fatality Relative to China[Rgn] = GET VDF CONSTANTS(Constant Data File , 'DataConstants[Rgn]', 12) Units: dmnl
111) Di[Rgn,Series] = DataFlowOverTime[Rgn,Series] Units: Person/Day
112) Different Infectious Counted[Rgn] = "Pre-Symptomatic Infected"[Rgn] + Infected pre Detection[Rgn] + (Additional Asymptomatic Post Detection[Rgn] + "Poisson Not-tested Asymptomatic"[Rgn]) + (Infectious not Tested or in Hospitals Poisson[Rgn] - "Poisson Not-tested Asymptomatic"[Rgn]) + Infectious Confirmed Not Hospitalized[Rgn] + sum (Hospitalized Infectious[Rgn,TstSts!]) Units: Person
113) Discount Rate Annual = 0.03 Units: 1/Year
114) Discount Rate per Day = INITIAL(Discount Rate Annual / Days per Year) Units: 1/Day
115) Dread Factor in Risk Perception[Rgn] = 25 Units: dmnl
116) Dread Factor in Risk Perception Net[Rgn] = if then else (Response Policy Time On < Time , Dread Factor Policy * Response Policy Weight[dfcP] + (1 - Response Policy Weight[dfcP]) * Dread Factor in Risk Perception[Rgn] , Dread Factor in Risk Perception[Rgn]) * Impact of Adherence Fatigue[Rgn] Units: dmnl
117) Dread Factor Policy = 3000 Units: dmnl
118) Effective Hospital Capacity[Rgn] = Nominal Hospital Capacity[Rgn] * Normalized Hospital density[Rgn] ^ Impact of Population Density on Hospital Availability[Rgn] Units: Person

119) eps = 0.001 Units: Person/Day
120) Excess Death End Count[Rgn] = GET VDF CONSTANTS(Constant Data File , 'DataConstants[Rgn]', 14) Units: Day
121) Excess Death Mean Frac = 0.9 Units: dmnl
122) Excess Death Range Frac = 0.2 Units: dmnl
123) Excess Death Rate Error[Rgn] = if then else (Data Excess Deaths[Rgn] < 50, 0, ZIDZ (Cumulative Missed Death[Rgn] - Excess Death Mean Frac * Data Excess Deaths[Rgn] , Excess Death Range Frac * Data Excess Deaths[Rgn]) ^ 4) Units: dmnl
124) Excess Death Start Count[Rgn] = GET VDF CONSTANTS(Constant Data File , 'DataConstants[Rgn]', 13) Units: Day
125) Expected Positive Poisson Covid Patients[Rgn] = sum (Potential Hospital Demand[Rgn,TstSts!]) * "Post-Detection Phase Resolution Time" Units: Person
126) expnt : (p2-p4)
127) External Test Rate[Rgn] = Population[Rgn] * Policy Test Rate[Rgn] Units: Person/Day
128) Extrapolated Estimator[Rgn] = if then else (Covid Acuity Relative to Flu Net[Rgn] > 1, cft[Rgn,p2] + cft[Rgn,p3] * (Covid Acuity Relative to Flu Net[Rgn] - 1) ^ cft[Rgn,p4] , lnymix[Rgn,p2]) Units: dmnl
129) F[Rgn] = Utility from Normal Activities[Rgn] / (Utility from Limited Activities[Rgn] + Utility from Normal Activities[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
130) F0[Rgn] = INITIAL(F[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
131) Fatality Rate Treated[Rgn,TstSts] = min (1, Baseline Fatality Multiplier[Rgn] * TimeVar Impact of Treatment on Fatality[Rgn] * Average Acuity Hospitalized[Rgn,TstSts] ^ Sensitivity of Fatality Rate to Acuity Net[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
132) Fatality Rate Untreated[Rgn,TstSts] = min (1, Baseline Fatality Multiplier[Rgn] * Average Acuity Not Hospitalized Poisson[Rgn,TstSts] ^ Sensitivity of Fatality Rate to Acuity Net[Rgn] * Time variant change in fatality[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
133) Final Test Rate Per Capita[Rgn] = INITIAL(Current Test Rate per Capita[Rgn] + Weight Max in Test Goal * (Max Test Rate per Capita - Current Test Rate per Capita[Rgn])) Units: 1/Day
134) FINAL TIME = 380 Units: Day
135) FlowResiduals[Rgn,Series] = if then else (DataFlowOverTime[Rgn,Series] = :NA:, :NA:, DataFlowOverTime[Rgn,Series] - MeanFlowOverTime[Rgn,Series]) Units: Person/Day
136) FlowToInclude[Series] = 1, 1, 0 Units: dmnl
137) Flu Acuity = 1 Units: dmnl
138) Flu Acuity Relative to Covid[Rgn] = Flu Acuity / Covid Acuity[Rgn] Units: dmnl
139) Frac Post Mortem from Untreated[Rgn] = SMOOTHI (ZIDZ (Deaths of Symptomatic Untested[Rgn] , Deaths of Symptomatic Untested[Rgn] + Hospitalized Infectious Deaths[Rgn,Notest]) , Post Mortem Test Delay , 1) Units: dmnl
140) FracThresh = 0.001 Units: dmnl
141) Fraction Covid Death In Hospitals Previously Tested[Rgn] = ZIDZ (Hospitalized Infectious Deaths[Rgn,Tested] , sum (Hospitalized Infectious Deaths[Rgn,TstSts!])) Units: dmnl
142) Fraction Covid Hospitalized Positively Tested[Rgn] = ZIDZ (Hospitalized Infectious[Rgn,Tested] , Total Covid Hospitalized[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
143) Fraction Infected[Rgn] = Cumulative Cases[Rgn] / Initial Population[Rgn] Units: dmnl
144) Fraction Interested not Tested[Rgn] = 1 - ZIDZ (Total Test on Covid Patients[Rgn] , Positive Candidates Interested in Testing Poisson Subset[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
145) Fraction Interseted not Correctly Tested[Rgn] = 1 - (1 - Fraction Interested not Tested[Rgn]) * Sensitivity of COVID Test Units: dmnl
146) Fraction of Additional Symptomatic[Rgn] = Additional Asymptomatic Relative to Symptomatic[Rgn] / (1 + Additional Asymptomatic Relative to Symptomatic[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
147) Fraction of Fatalities Screened Post Mortem[Rgn] = Indicated Fraction Post Mortem Testing[Rgn] * Switch for Government Response[Rgn] Units: dmnl
148) Fraction of Population Hospitalized for Covid[Rgn] = Total Covid Hospitalized[Rgn] / Population[Rgn] Units: dmnl

149) Fraction Poisson not Hospitalized[Rgn,Tested] = exp (- Average Acuity of Positively Tested[Rgn] * (1 - Probability of Missing Acuity Signal at Hospitals[Rgn,Tested]))
150) Fraction Poisson not Hospitalized[Rgn,Notest] = exp (- Average Acuity of Untested Poisson Subset[Rgn] * (1 - Probability of Missing Acuity Signal at Hospitals[Rgn,Notest])) Units: dmnl
151) Fraction Seeking Test[Rgn] = 1 Units: dmnl
152) Fraction Tests Positive[Rgn] = ZIDZ (Positive Tests of Infected[Rgn] , Testing on Living[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
153) Fraction Tests Positive Data[Rgn] = min (1, ZIDZ (DataFlowInfection[Rgn] , Active Test Rate[Rgn])) Units: dmnl
154) Fractional Value of Limited Activities = 0.5 Units: dmnl
155) Global Cases = sum (Cumulative Cases[Rgn!]) Units: Person
156) Global Deaths = sum (Cumulative Deaths[Rgn!]) Units: Person
157) Global IFR = ZIDZ (Global Deaths , Global Cases - sum (Different Infectious Counted[Rgn!])) Units: dmnl
158) Government Response Start Time[Rgn] = INITIAL(DataAttentionTime[Rgn] + Day of First Case Report in JHU Database) Units: Day
159) Herd Immunity Fraction = 0.6 Units: dmnl
160) Hospital Adj T = 1 Units: Day
161) Hospital Admission Infectious[Rgn,TstSts] = Hospital Admits All[Rgn,TstSts] Units: Person/Day
162) Hospital Admit Ratio[Rgn,TstSts] = XIDZ (Hospital Admits All[Rgn,TstSts] , Potential Hospital Demand[Rgn,TstSts] , 1) Units: dmnl
163) Hospital Admits All[Rgn,Tested] = Hospital Demand from Tested[Rgn] * Allocated Fraction COVID Hospitalized[Rgn]
164) Hospital Admits All[Rgn,Notest] = Hospital Demand from Not Tested[Rgn] * Allocated Fraction COVID Hospitalized[Rgn] Units: Person/Day
165) Hospital Demand from Not Tested[Rgn] = Poisson Subset Not Tested Passing Gate[Rgn] * (1 - exp (- Average Acuity of Untested Poisson Subset[Rgn] * (1 - PMAS Unconfirmed for Hospital Demand[Rgn]))) Units: Person/Day
166) Hospital Demand from Tested[Rgn] = Positive Tests of Infected[Rgn] * (1 - exp (- Average Acuity of Positively Tested[Rgn] * (1 - PMAS Confirmed for Hospital Demand[Rgn]))) Units: Person/Day
167) Hospital Discharges[Rgn,TstSts] = (1 - Fatality Rate Treated[Rgn,TstSts]) * Hospital Outflow Covid Positive[Rgn,TstSts] Units: Person/Day
168) Hospital Outflow Covid Positive[Rgn,TstSts] = Hospitalized Infectious[Rgn,TstSts] / Hospitalized Resolution Time Units: Person/Day
169) Hospitalized CFR Cumulative[Rgn,TstSts] = ZIDZ (Cumulative Deaths at Hospital[Rgn,TstSts] , Cumulative Deaths at Hospital[Rgn,TstSts] + Cumulative Recovered at Hospitals[Rgn,TstSts]) Units: dmnl
170) Hospitalized Infectious[Rgn,TstSts] = INTEG(Hospital Admission Infectious[Rgn,TstSts] - Hospitalized Infectious Deaths[Rgn,TstSts] - Hospital Discharges[Rgn,TstSts] , 0) Units: Person
171) Hospitalized Infectious Deaths[Rgn,TstSts] = Fatality Rate Treated[Rgn,TstSts] * Hospital Outflow Covid Positive[Rgn,TstSts] Units: Person/Day
172) Hospitalized Resolution Time = 20 Units: Day
173) Hospitalized True CFR[Rgn] = ZIDZ (sum (Hospitalized Infectious Deaths[Rgn,TstSts!]) , sum (Hospital Outflow Covid Positive[Rgn,TstSts!])) Units: dmnl
174) Hospitalized True CFR Cumulative[Rgn] = ZIDZ (sum (Cumulative Deaths at Hospital[Rgn,TstSts!]) , sum (Cumulative Deaths at Hospital[Rgn,TstSts!] + Cumulative Recovered at Hospitals[Rgn,TstSts!])) Units: dmnl
175) ialp = 0.1 Units: dmnl
176) Impact of Adherence Fatigue[Rgn] = Recent Relative Contacts[Rgn] ^ (Strength of Adherence Fatigue[Rgn] * if then else (Time to Stop Adherence Fatigue > Time , 1, SWadhFtg)) Units: dmnl
177) Impact of Population Density on Hospital Availability[Rgn] = 0.72 Units: dmnl
178) Impact of Treatment on Fatality Rate[Rgn] = 0.32 Units: dmnl
179) Incubation Period = 5.6 Units: Day
180) Indicated fraction negative demand tested[Rgn] = 1 - exp (Flu Acuity * (Prob Missing Symptom[Rgn] - 1)) Units: dmnl

181) Indicated fraction positive demand tested[Rgn] = 1 - exp (Covid Acuity[Rgn] * (Prob Missing Symptom[Rgn] - 1)) Units: dmnl
182) Indicated Fraction Post Mortem Testing[Rgn] = Fraction Covid Death In Hospitals Previously Tested[Rgn] ^ Sensitivity Post Mortem Testing to Capacity[Rgn] Units: dmnl
183) Indicated Risk of Life Loss[Rgn] = min (1, Switch for Government Response[Rgn] * Perceived Hazard of Death[Rgn] * Dread Factor in Risk Perception Net[Rgn] / Discount Rate per Day) Units: dmnl
184) Infected pre Detection[Rgn] = INTEG(Onset of Symptoms[Rgn] - Continue without Testing[Rgn] - Symptomatic Infected to Testing[Rgn] - Untested symptomatic Infected to Hospital[Rgn] , 0) Units: Person
185) "Infected Unconfirmed Post-Detection"[Rgn] = INTEG(Continue without Testing[Rgn] - Deaths of Symptomatic Untested[Rgn] - Recovery of Untested[Rgn] , 0) Units: Person
186) Infection Rate[Rgn] = Infectious Contacts[Rgn] * (Susceptible[Rgn] / Population[Rgn]) * Weather Effect on Transmission[Rgn] Units: Person/Day
187) InfectionUFractionCounted[Rgn] = ZIDZ (DataCmltInfection[Rgn] , Cumulative Cases[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
188) Infectious Confirmed Not Hospitalized[Rgn] = INTEG(Positive Testing of Infected Untreated[Rgn] - Deaths of Confirmed[Rgn] - Recovery of Confirmed[Rgn] , 0) Units: Person
189) Infectious Contacts[Rgn] = ("Pre-Symptomatic Infected"[Rgn] * Transmission Multiplier Presymptomatic[Rgn] + Infected pre Detection[Rgn] * Transmission Multiplier Pre Detection[Rgn] + (Additional Asymptomatic Post Detection[Rgn] + "Poisson Not-tested Asymptomatic"[Rgn]) * Baseline Risk of Transmission by Asymptomatic[Rgn] + (Infectious not Tested or in Hospitals Poisson[Rgn] - "Poisson Not-tested Asymptomatic"[Rgn]) * Baseline Transmission Multiplier for Untested Symptomatic + Infectious Confirmed Not Hospitalized[Rgn] * Transmission Multiplier for Confirmed[Rgn] + sum (Hospitalized Infectious[Rgn,TstSts!] * Transmission Multiplier for Hospitalized[Rgn,TstSts!])) * Reference Force of Infection[Rgn] * Contacts Relative to Normal[Rgn] Units: Person/Day
190) Infectious not Tested or in Hospitals Poisson[Rgn] = "Infected Unconfirmed Post-Detection"[Rgn] - Additional Asymptomatic Post Detection[Rgn] Units: Person
191) Initial Population[Rgn] = GET VDF CONSTANTS(Constant Data File , 'DataConstants[Rgn]', 1) Units: Person
192) INITIAL TIME = 30 Units: Day
193) InpAveErr = INITIAL(sum (InpAveErrCmp[PriorEndoAve!] * PriorCounts[PriorEndoAve!])) Units: **undefined**
194) InpAveErrCmp[PriorEndoAve] = INITIAL((abs (CalcAve[PriorEndoAve] - InputAve[PriorEndoAve]) / Max (1e-06, CalcAve[PriorEndoAve]) * SW EndoAve)) Units: **undefined**
195) InputAve[Priors] = 1, 1.8, 0.47, 1, 0.0009, 0.81, 58, 0.017, 6.2, 0.1, 0.24, 0.4, 2.27, 0.52, 0.00055, 0.76, 5.9, 2.07, 0.55, 1e-06, 1e-06, 1e-06, 0.28, 0, 0 Units: **undefined**
196) IrD : Travel,InformalDeath
197) Known death fraction in hospitals large enough = sum (if then else (Cml Known Death Frac Hosp[Rgn!] < MinHspDTreshAdv , 1, 0) * AdvCntrs[Rgn!]) Units: dmnl
198) lastTestData[Rgn] = INITIAL(GET DATA Last TIME (DataTestRate[Rgn])) Units: Day
199) LastTestDate[Rgn] = INITIAL(GET DATA Last TIME (DataTestRate[Rgn])) Units: Day
200) Learning and Death Reduction Rate[Rgn1] = 0 Units: dmnl
201) Liver Disease Impact on Fatality[Rgn] = INITIAL((Liver Disease Rate[Rgn] / MeanLiver) ^ Sens Liver Impact Net[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
202) Liver Disease Rate[Rgn] = GET VDF CONSTANTS(Constant Data File , 'DataConstants[Rgn]', 18) Units: dmnl
203) lnymix[Rgn,expnt] = - ln (Max (1e-06, 1 - Ymix[Rgn,expnt])) Units: dmnl
204) lnymix 0[Rgn,expnt] = - ln (Max (1e-06, 1 - Ymix[Rgn,expnt])) Units: dmnl
205) Max Test Rate per Capita = 0.001 Units: 1/Day
206) Max Time Data Used = 380 Units: Day
207) maxAlp = 1 Units: dmnl
208) MaxData[Rgn] = INITIAL(GET DATA MAX (DataCmltInfection[Rgn] , 0, 500)) Units: Person
209) MaxRTresh = 8 Units: dmnl
210) MeanChronic = GET VDF CONSTANTS(Constant Data File , 'MeanChronic', 1) Units: dmnl
211) MeanFlowOverTime[Rgn,Infection] = Post Mortem Test Rate[Rgn] + Positive Tests of Infected[Rgn]

212) MeanFlowOverTime[Rgn,Death] = Recorded Deaths[Rgn]
213) MeanFlowOverTime[Rgn,Test] = Total Simulated Tests[Rgn] Units: Person/Day
214) MeanLiver = GET VDF CONSTANTS(Constant Data File , 'MeanLiver', 1) Units: dmnl
215) MeanObesity = GET VDF CONSTANTS(Constant Data File , 'MeanObesity', 1) Units: dmnl
216) Min Contact Fraction[Rgn] = 0.04 Units: dmnl
217) Min Excess Death Attributable to COVID = 0.5 Units: dmnl
218) Min Fatality Multiplier = 0.1 Units: dmnl
219) MinAdjT = 1 Units: Day
220) MinHspDTresh = 0.2 Units: dmnl
221) MinHspDTreshAdv = 0.8 Units: dmnl
222) MinSuscTresh = 0.7 Units: dmnl
223) Mu[Rgn,Series] = Max (eps , MeanFlowOverTime[Rgn,Series]) Units: Person/Day
224) Multiplier Recent Infections to Test[Rgn] = 45 Units: dmnl
225) Multiplier Transmission Risk for Asymptomatic[Rgn] = 0.3 Units: dmnl
226) Multiplier Transmission Risk for Asymptomatic Net[Rgn] = INITIAL(Multiplier Transmission Risk for Asymptomatic[Rgn] * (1 - SW Gen[MTrAsym]) + SW Gen[MTrAsym] * InputAve[MTrAsym]) Units: dmnl
227) NBL1[Rgn,Series] = if then else (DataFlowOverTime[Rgn,Series] = 0, - ln (1 + alp[Rgn,Series] * Mu[Rgn,Series]) / alp[Rgn,Series] , 0) Units: dmnl
228) NBL2[Rgn,Series] = if then else (DataFlowOverTime[Rgn,Series] > 0, GAMMA LN (Di[Rgn,Series] + 1 / alp[Rgn,Series]) - GAMMA LN (1 / alp[Rgn,Series]) - GAMMA LN (Di[Rgn,Series] + 1) - (Di[Rgn,Series] + 1 / alp[Rgn,Series]) * ln (1 + alp[Rgn,Series] * Mu[Rgn,Series]) + Di[Rgn,Series] * (ln (alp[Rgn,Series]) + ln (Mu[Rgn,Series])) , 0) Units: dmnl
229) NBL3[Rgn,Series] = if then else (Di[Rgn,Series] > 0, - GAMMA LN (Di[Rgn,Series] + 1) - (Di[Rgn,Series] + 1 / alp[Rgn,Series]) * ln (1 + alp[Rgn,Series] * Mu[Rgn,Series]) + Di[Rgn,Series] * (ln (alp[Rgn,Series]) + ln (Mu[Rgn,Series])) , 0) Units: dmnl
230) NBLLFlow[Rgn,Series] = (NBL1[Rgn,Series] + NBL2[Rgn,Series]) * FlowToInclude[Series] * DataIncluded[Rgn] Units: dmnl
231) Negative Test Results[Rgn] = Testing on Living[Rgn] - Positive Tests of Infected[Rgn] Units: Person/Day
232) New Cases[Rgn] = Infection Rate[Rgn] + Patient Zero Arrival[Rgn] Units: Person/Day
233) New Testing Time = 1000 Units: Day
234) Nominal Hospital Capacity[Rgn] = INITIAL(Initial Population[Rgn] * Beds per Thousand Population[Rgn] / 1000) Units: Person
235) Normalized Hospital density[Rgn] = INITIAL(Bed per Square Kilometer[Rgn] / Reference Hospital Density) Units: dmnl
236) Not too few susceptibles = sum (if then else (SuscFrac[Rgn!] < MinSuscTresh , 1, 0)) Units: dmnl
237) NSeed = 1 Units: dmnl
238) numTrial[Rgn,UsedSeries] = INITIAL(Max (1.01, 1 / alp[Rgn,UsedSeries])) Units: dmnl
239) Obesity Impact on Fatality[Rgn] = INITIAL((Obesity Rates[Rgn] / MeanObesity) ^ Sens Obesity Impact Net[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
240) Obesity Rates[Rgn] = GET VDF CONSTANTS(Constant Data File , 'DataConstants[Rgn]', 16) Units: dmnl
241) Onset of Symptoms[Rgn] = DELAY N (Infection Rate[Rgn] , Incubation Period ,0, Delay Order) Units: Person/Day
242) Onset to Detection Delay = 5 Units: Day
243) Overall Death Fraction[Rgn] = ZIDZ (Death Rate[Rgn] , All Recovery[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
244) Patient Zero Arrival[Rgn] = if then else (Time < Patient Zero Arrival Time[Rgn] :AND: Time + TIME STEP >= Patient Zero Arrival Time[Rgn] , PatientZero / TIME STEP , 0) Units: Person/Day
245) Patient Zero Arrival Time[Rgn] = 1 Units: Day
246) PatientZero = 1 Units: Person
247) payoff = 0 Units: dmnl
248) pdim : tstP,dfcP,dgtP,scuP
249) Perceived Hazard of Death[Rgn] = (Weight on Reported Probability of Infection[Rgn] * Reported Hazard of Death[Rgn] + (1 - Weight on Reported Probability of Infection[Rgn]) * True Hazard of death[Rgn]) Units: 1/Day

250) Perceived Risk of Life Loss[Rgn] = INTEG((Indicated Risk of Life Loss[Rgn] - Perceived Risk of Life Loss[Rgn]) / if then else (Indicated Risk of Life Loss[Rgn] > Perceived Risk of Life Loss[Rgn] , Time to Upgrade Risk[Rgn] , Time to Downgrade Risk Net[Rgn]) , 0) Units: dmnl
251) PG1 : PG
252) PMAS Confirmed for Hospital Demand[Rgn] = (1 - Reference COVID Hospitalization Fraction Confirmed[Rgn]) ^ (1 / Average Acuity of Positively Tested[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
253) PMAS Unconfirmed for Hospital Demand[Rgn] = PMAS Confirmed for Hospital Demand[Rgn] + (1 - PMAS Confirmed for Hospital Demand[Rgn]) * Untested PMAS Gap with Tested[Rgn] Units: dmnl
254) "Poisson Not-tested Asymptomatic"[Rgn] = Infectious not Tested or in Hospitals Poisson[Rgn] * exp (- Average Acuity Not Hospitalized Poisson[Rgn,Notest]) Units: Person
255) Poisson Subset Not Tested Passing Gate[Rgn] = Poisson Subset Reaching Test Gate[Rgn] - Positive Tests of Infected[Rgn]Units: Person/Day
256) Poisson Subset Reaching Test Gate[Rgn] = Reaching Testing Gate[Rgn] / (1 + Additional Asymptomatic Relative to Symptomatic[Rgn]) Units: Person/Day
257) Policy Test Rate[Rgn] = if then else (Time < New Testing Time , Current Test Rate per Capita[Rgn] , Final Test Rate Per Capita[Rgn]) Units: 1/Day
258) Population[Rgn] = Infected pre Detection[Rgn] + "Infected Unconfirmed Post-Detection"[Rgn] + Susceptible[Rgn] + Recovered Unconfirmed[Rgn] + Confirmed Recovered[Rgn] + Infectious Confirmed Not Hospitalized[Rgn] + "Pre-Symptomatic Infected"[Rgn] + sum (Hospitalized Infectious[Rgn,TstSts!]) + sum (Cumulative Recovered at Hospitals[Rgn,TstSts!]) Units: Person
259) PopulationCheck[Rgn] = Recovered Unconfirmed[Rgn] + Confirmed Recovered[Rgn] + sum (Cumulative Recovered at Hospitals[Rgn,TstSts!]) + Different Infectious Counted[Rgn] + Susceptible[Rgn] Units: Person
260) Positive Candidates Interested in Testing Poisson Subset[Rgn] = Poisson Subset Reaching Test Gate[Rgn] * Fraction Seeking Test[Rgn] Units: Person/Day
261) Positive Candidates Interested in Testing Poisson Subset Adj[Rgn] = Max (0.001 * Potential Test Demand from Susceptible Population[Rgn] , Positive Candidates Interested in Testing Poisson Subset[Rgn]) Units: Person/Day
262) Positive Testing of Infected Untreated[Rgn] = Positive Tests of Infected[Rgn] * Fraction Poisson not Hospitalized[Rgn,Tested] Units: Person/Day
263) Positive Tests of Infected[Rgn] = Positive Candidates Interested in Testing Poisson Subset[Rgn] * (1 - Fraction Interseted not Correctly Tested[Rgn]) Units: Person/Day
264) Post Mortem Test Delay = 1 Units: Day
265) Post Mortem Test Rate[Rgn] = Post Mortem Tests Total[Rgn] * Sensitivity of COVID Test Units: Person/Day
266) Post Mortem Test Untreated[Rgn] = Post Mortem Test Rate[Rgn] * Frac Post Mortem from Untreated[Rgn] Units: Person/Day
267) Post Mortem Testing Need[Rgn] = SMOOTHI ((Deaths of Symptomatic Untested[Rgn] + Hospitalized Infectious Deaths[Rgn,Notest]) * Fraction of Fatalities Screened Post Mortem[Rgn] , Post Mortem Test Delay , 0) Units: Person/Day
268) Post Mortem Tests Total[Rgn] = min (Post Mortem Testing Need[Rgn] , Active Test Rate[Rgn]) Units: Person/Day
269) "Post-Detection Phase Resolution Time" = 10 Units: Day
270) PostMortemCorrection[Rgn] = min (Hospitalized Infectious[Rgn,Notest] / MinAdjT , Post Mortem Test Rate[Rgn] * (1 - Frac Post Mortem from Untreated[Rgn])) Units: Person/Day
271) Potential Hospital Demand[Rgn,Notest] = Hospital Demand from Not Tested[Rgn]
272) Potential Hospital Demand[Rgn,Tested] = Hospital Demand from Tested[Rgn] Units: Person/Day
273) Potential Test Demand from Susceptible Population[Rgn] = (Susceptible[Rgn] + Recovered Unconfirmed[Rgn] + Cumulative Recovered at Hospitals[Rgn,Notest]) * (Baseline Daily Fraction Susceptible Seeking Tests[Rgn] * Fraction Seeking Test[Rgn] + Multiplier Recent Infections to Test[Rgn] / Population[Rgn] * Recent Detected Infections[Rgn]) Units: Person/Day
274) "Pre-Symptomatic Infected"[Rgn] = INTEG(Infection Rate[Rgn] + Patient Zero Arrival[Rgn] - Onset of Symptoms[Rgn] , 0) Units: Person
275) PriorCounts[PriorEndoAve] = INITIAL(if then else (PriorEndoAve < 26, 1, 0)) Units: dmnl

276) PriorEndoAve : UpAdj,DwnAdj,RFI,RfSkTs,WRpPIn,MInfTs,MnCnFrc,SnCnRdUt,CfImCn,ImPDnHs,ImTrFt,DrdFac,MxHsFr,BsFtRt,SnsWth,Acty,SnFtAc,TtAsyFr,ObsImp,ChrImp,LivImp,MTrAsym,HspLrng,AdhrFtg
277) PriorErrs[Rgn,Priors] = INITIAL(ZIDZ (ActiveAve[Priors] - RegionalInputs[Priors,Rgn] , (AbsStd[Priors] * StdScale)) ^ 2 / 2) Units: **undefined**
278) PriorGen : BsFtRt,SnsWth,Acty,SnFtAc,TtAsyFr,ObsImp,ChrImp,LivImp,MTrAsym
279) Priors : UpAdj,DwnAdj,RFI,PMT,RfSkTs,WRpPIn,MInfTs,MnCnFrc,SnCnRdUt,CfImCn,ImPDnHs,ImTrFt,DrdFac,MxHsFr,BsFtRt,SnsWth,Acty,SnFtAc,TtAsyFr,ObsImp,ChrImp,LivImp,MTrAsym,HspLrng,AdhrFtg
280) Prob Missing Symptom[Rgn] = Max (0, ln (Y[Rgn]) / Flu Acuity + 1) Units: dmnl
281) Probability of Missing Acuity Signal at Hospitals[Rgn,Tested] = ZIDZ (ln (Max (1e-06, 1 - ZIDZ (Hospital Admits All[Rgn,Tested] , Positive Tests of Infected[Rgn]))) , Average Acuity of Positively Tested[Rgn]) + 1
282) Probability of Missing Acuity Signal at Hospitals[Rgn,Notest] = ZIDZ (ln (Max (1e-06, 1 - ZIDZ (Hospital Admits All[Rgn,Notest] , Poisson Subset Not Tested Passing Gate[Rgn]))) , Average Acuity of Untested Poisson Subset[Rgn]) + 1 Units: dmnl
283) PseudoCFR Units: dmnl
284) R Effective Reproduction Rate[Rgn] = ZIDZ (Infection Rate[Rgn] , Total Weighted Infected Population[Rgn]) * Total Disease Duration Units: dmnl
285) RandFlowTime = 1000 Units: Day
286) Reaching Testing Gate[Rgn] = Infected pre Detection[Rgn] / Onset to Detection Delay Units: Person/Day
287) Realistic R0 = sum (if then else (R Effective Reproduction Rate[Rgn!] > MaxRTresh , 1, 0)) Units: dmnl
288) Recent Detected Infections[Rgn] = SMOOTHI (Positive Tests of Infected[Rgn] , Time to Respond with Tests , 0) Units: Person/Day
289) Recent Relative Contacts[Rgn] = SMOOTHI (Contacts Relative to Normal[Rgn] , Adherence Fatigue Time , 1) Units: dmnl
290) Recorded Deaths[Rgn] = Post Mortem Test Rate[Rgn] + Deaths of Confirmed[Rgn] + Hospitalized Infectious Deaths[Rgn,Tested] Units: Person/Day
291) Recovered Unconfirmed[Rgn] = INTEG(Recovery of Untested[Rgn] , 0) Units: Person
292) Recovery of Confirmed[Rgn] = Tested Untreated Resolution[Rgn] * (1 - Fatality Rate Untreated[Rgn,Tested]) Units: Person/Day
293) Recovery of Untested[Rgn] = ("Infected Unconfirmed Post-Detection"[Rgn] / "Post-Detection Phase Resolution Time") - Deaths of Symptomatic Untested[Rgn] Units: Person/Day
294) Reference COVID Hospitalization Fraction Confirmed[Rgn] = 0.7 Units: dmnl
295) Reference Force of Infection[Rgn] = 0.6 Units: 1/Day
296) Reference Hospital Density = 6.06 Units: Person/(Km*Km)
297) RegionalInputs[UpAdj,Rgn] = Log (Time to Upgrade Risk[Rgn] , 10)
298) RegionalInputs[DwnAdj,Rgn] = Log (Time to Downgrade Risk[Rgn] , 10)
299) RegionalInputs[RFI,Rgn] = Reference Force of Infection[Rgn]
300) RegionalInputs[PMT,Rgn] = Sensitivity Post Mortem Testing to Capacity[Rgn]
301) RegionalInputs[RfSkTs,Rgn] = Baseline Daily Fraction Susceptible Seeking Tests[Rgn]
302) RegionalInputs[WRpPIn,Rgn] = Weight on Reported Probability of Infection[Rgn]
303) RegionalInputs[MInfTs,Rgn] = Multiplier Recent Infections to Test[Rgn]
304) RegionalInputs[MnCnFrc,Rgn] = Min Contact Fraction[Rgn]
305) RegionalInputs[SnCnRdUt,Rgn] = Sensitivity of Contact Reduction to Utility[Rgn]
306) RegionalInputs[CfImCn,Rgn] = Confirmation Impact on Contact[Rgn]
307) RegionalInputs[ImPDnHs,Rgn] = Impact of Population Density on Hospital Availability[Rgn]
308) RegionalInputs[ImTrFt,Rgn] = Impact of Treatment on Fatality Rate[Rgn]
309) RegionalInputs[DrdFac,Rgn] = Log (Dread Factor in Risk Perception[Rgn] , 10)
310) RegionalInputs[MxHsFr,Rgn] = Reference COVID Hospitalization Fraction Confirmed[Rgn]
311) RegionalInputs[BsFtRt,Rgn] = Base Fatality Rate for Unit Acuity Net[Rgn]
312) RegionalInputs[SnsWth,Rgn] = Sensitivity to Weather Net[Rgn]
313) RegionalInputs[Acty,Rgn] = Covid Acuity Relative to Flu Net[Rgn]
314) RegionalInputs[SnFtAc,Rgn] = Sensitivity of Fatality Rate to Acuity Net[Rgn]

315) RegionalInputs[TtAsyFr,Rgn] = Total Asymptomatic Fraction Net[Rgn]
316) RegionalInputs[ObsImp,Rgn] = Sens Obesity Impact Net[Rgn]
317) RegionalInputs[ChrImp,Rgn] = Sens Chronic Impact Net[Rgn]
318) RegionalInputs[LivImp,Rgn] = Sens Liver Impact Net[Rgn]
319) RegionalInputs[MTrAsym,Rgn] = Multiplier Transmission Risk for Asymptomatic Net[Rgn]
320) RegionalInputs[HspLrng,Rgn] = Learning and Death Reduction Rate[Rgn]
321) RegionalInputs[AdhrFtg,Rgn] = Strength of Adherence Fatigue[Rgn] Units: **undefined**
322) Relative Risk of Transmission by Hospitalized = 1 Units: dmnl
323) Relative Risk of Transmission by Presymptomatic = 1 Units: dmnl
324) Reported Hazard of Death[Rgn] = SimFlowOverTime[Rgn,Death] / Susceptible[Rgn] Units: 1/Day
325) Response Policy Time On = 1000 Units: Day
326) Response Policy Weight[pdim] = 0 Units: dmnl
327) Rgn:
Australia,Austria,Bahrain,Bangladesh,Belarus,Belgium,Bolivia,Bulgaria,Canada,Chile,Colombia,CostaRica,Croatia,Cuba,Cyprus,CzechRepublic,Denmark,DominicanRepublic,Ecuador,ElSalvador,Estonia,Ethiopia,Finland,France,Germany,Ghana,Greece,Hungary,Iceland,India,Indonesia,Iran,Iraq,Ireland,Israel,Italy,Jamaica,Japan,Kazakhstan,Kenya,Kuwait,Latvia,Lithuania,Luxembourg,Madagascar,Malawi,Malaysia,Maldives,Malta,Mexico,Morocco,Mozambique,Nepal,Netherlands,NewZealand,Nigeria,NorthMacedonia,Norway,Pakistan,Panama,Paraguay,Peru,Philippines,Poland,Portugal,Qatar,Romania,Russia,Rwanda,SaudiArabia,Senegal,Serbia,Singapore,Slovakia,Slovenia,SouthAfrica,South Korea,Spain,SriLanka,Sweden,Switzerland,Thailand,Togo,Tunisia,Turkey,UAE,UK,Ukraine,Uruguay,USA,Zambia
328) Rgn1 : Rgn
329) SAVEPER = 1 Units: Day
330) Sens Chronic Impact = 1e-06 Units: dmnl
331) Sens Chronic Impact Net[Rgn] = INITIAL(Sens Chronic Impact * (1 - SW Gen[ChrImp]) + SW Gen[ChrImp] * InputAve[ChrImp]) Units: dmnl
332) Sens Liver Impact = 1e-06 Units: dmnl
333) Sens Liver Impact Net[Rgn] = INITIAL(Sens Liver Impact * (1 - SW Gen[LivImp]) + SW Gen[LivImp] * InputAve[LivImp]) Units: dmnl
334) Sens Obesity Impact = 1e-06 Units: dmnl
335) Sens Obesity Impact Net[Rgn] = INITIAL(Sens Obesity Impact * (1 - SW Gen[ObsImp]) + SW Gen[ObsImp] * InputAve[ObsImp]) Units: dmnl
336) SensCovidUntestedAdmission = 1 Units: dmnl
337) Sensitivity of Contact Reduction to Utility[Rgn] = 15 Units: dmnl
338) Sensitivity of Contact Reduction to Utility Net[Rgn] = if then else (Response Policy Time On < Time , Sensitivity of Contact Reduction to Utility Policy * Response Policy Weight[scuP] + (1 - Response Policy Weight[scuP]) * Sensitivity of Contact Reduction to Utility[Rgn] , Sensitivity of Contact Reduction to Utility[Rgn]) * Impact of Adherence Fatigue[Rgn] Units: dmnl
339) Sensitivity of Contact Reduction to Utility Policy = 10 Units: dmnl
340) Sensitivity of COVID Test = 0.7 Units: dmnl
341) Sensitivity of Fatality Rate to Acuity[Rgn] = 2 Units: dmnl
342) Sensitivity of Fatality Rate to Acuity Net[Rgn] = INITIAL(Sensitivity of Fatality Rate to Acuity[Rgn] * (1 - SW Gen[SnFtAc]) + SW Gen[SnFtAc] * InputAve[SnFtAc]) Units: dmnl
343) Sensitivity Post Mortem Testing to Capacity[Rgn] = 1 Units: dmnl
344) Sensitivity to Weather = 0.76 Units: dmnl
345) Sensitivity to Weather Net[Rgn] = INITIAL(Sensitivity to Weather * (1 - SW Gen[SnsWth]) + SW Gen[SnsWth] * InputAve[SnsWth]) Units: dmnl
346) Series : Infection,Death,Test
347) SeriesErrorTerm[Rgn,Series] = if then else (DataCmltOverTime[Rgn,Series] = :NA:, 0, (abs (DataCmltOverTime[Rgn,Series] - SimCmltOverTime[Rgn,Series])) ^ CmltErrPW) / (BaseError + DataCmltOverTime[Rgn,Series]) * CmltPenaltyScl * CmltToInclude[Series] * DataIncluded[Rgn]Units: dmnl
348) Sim Pseudo Case Fatality[Rgn] = ZIDZ (Cumulative Deaths of Confirmed[Rgn] , Cumulative Confirmed Cases[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
349) SimCmltOverTime[Rgn,Infection] = Cumulative Confirmed Cases[Rgn]

350) SimCmltOverTime[Rgn,Death] = Cumulative Deaths of Confirmed[Rgn]
351) SimCmltOverTime[Rgn,Test] = Cumulative Tests Conducted[Rgn] Units: Person
352) SimFlowOverTime[Rgn,UsedSeries] = if then else (SwitchRandFlowTime < Time , RANDOM NEGATIVE BINOMIAL (-1, 1e+06, successP[Rgn,UsedSeries] , numTrial[Rgn,UsedSeries] , 0, 1, NSeed) , Mu[Rgn,UsedSeries]) Units: Day/Person
353) SimTestRate[Rgn] = Total Simulated Tests[Rgn] Units: Person/Day
354) SqrdErr[Rgn,Series] = if then else (FlowResiduals[Rgn,Series] = :NA:, :NA:, FlowResiduals[Rgn,Series] ^ 2) Units: Person*Person/(Day*Day)
355) StdScale = 1 Units: dmnl
356) StopDataUseTime[Rgn] = INITIAL(min (lastTestData[Rgn] , Max Time Data Used)) Units: Day
357) Strength of Adherence Fatigue[Rgn] = 0 Units: dmnl
358) successP[Rgn,UsedSeries] = 1 / (1 + alp[Rgn,UsedSeries] * Mu[Rgn,UsedSeries]) Units: dmnl
359) Susceptible[Rgn] = INTEG(- Infection Rate[Rgn] , Initial Population[Rgn]) Units: Person
360) SuscFrac[Rgn] = Susceptible[Rgn] / Population[Rgn] Units: dmnl
361) SW EndoAve = INITIAL(if then else (ELMCOUNT(Rgn) > 1, 1, 0)) Units: dmnl
362) SW Gen[PriorGen] = 0 Units: dmnl
363) SWadhFtg = 0 Units: dmnl
364) Switch for Government Response[Rgn] = if then else (Time > Government Response Start Time[Rgn] , 1, 0) Units: dmnl
365) SwitchRandFlow = 1 Units: dmnl
366) SwitchRandFlowTime = if then else (SwitchRandFlow = 1, min (Max Time Data Used , RandFlowTime) , 1000) Units: Day
367) Symptomatic Fraction in Poisson[Rgn] = INITIAL(1 - exp (- Covid Acuity[Rgn])) Units: dmnl
368) Symptomatic Fraction Negative[Rgn] = INITIAL(1 - exp (- Flu Acuity)) Units: dmnl
369) Symptomatic Infected to Testing[Rgn] = Positive Testing of Infected Untreated[Rgn] + Hospital Admission Infectious[Rgn,Tested] Units: Person/Day
370) t3[Rgn] = (-9 * b[Rgn] + 1.7321 * Sqrt (4 * a[Rgn] ^ 3 + 27 * b[Rgn] ^ 2)) ^ (1 / 3) Units: dmnl
371) talp = 5 Units: dmnl
372) Tested Untreated Resolution[Rgn] = Infectious Confirmed Not Hospitalized[Rgn] / "Post-Detection Phase Resolution Time" Units: Person/Day
373) TestErrorFrac = 0.0001 Units: dmnl
374) TestFlowErr[Rgn] = ((DataFlowOverTime[Rgn,Test] - MeanFlowOverTime[Rgn,Test]) * WTestFlowErr[Rgn]) ^ 2 Units: dmnl
375) Testing Capacity Net of Post Mortem Tests[Rgn] = Active Test Rate[Rgn] - Post Mortem Tests Total[Rgn] Units: Person/Day
376) Testing Demand[Rgn] = Positive Candidates Interested in Testing Poisson Subset[Rgn] * Symptomatic Fraction in Poisson[Rgn] + Potential Test Demand from Susceptible Population[Rgn] * Symptomatic Fraction Negative[Rgn] Units: Person/Day
377) Testing on Living[Rgn] = min (Testing Capacity Net of Post Mortem Tests[Rgn] , Testing Demand[Rgn])Units: Person/Day
378) Tests on Negative Patients[Rgn] = Testing on Living[Rgn] * ZIDZ (Indicated fraction negative demand tested[Rgn] * Potential Test Demand from Susceptible Population[Rgn] , Indicated fraction negative demand tested[Rgn] * Potential Test Demand from Susceptible Population[Rgn] + Indicated fraction positive demand tested[Rgn] * Positive Candidates Interested in Testing Poisson Subset[Rgn]) Units: Person/Day
379) Tests Per Million[Rgn] = Cumulative Tests Data[Rgn] / Initial Population[Rgn] * 1e+06Units: dmnl
380) ThrsInc[Rgn] = Max (FracThresh * MaxData[Rgn] , 50) Units: Person
381) TIME STEP = 0.25 Units: Day
382) Time to Adjust Testing = 30 Units: Day
383) Time to Downgrade Risk[Rgn] = 60 Units: Day
384) Time to Downgrade Risk Net[Rgn] = if then else (Response Policy Time On < Time , Time to Downgrade Risk Policy * Response Policy Weight[dgtP] + (1 - Response Policy Weight[dgtP]) * Time to Downgrade Risk[Rgn] , Time to Downgrade Risk[Rgn]) Units: Day
385) Time to Downgrade Risk Policy = 300 Units: Day

386) Time to Herd Immunity[Rgn] = XIDZ (Herd Immunity Fraction * Susceptible[Rgn] , Total Weighted Infected Population[Rgn] / Total Disease Duration , 0) Units: Day
387) Time to Respond with Tests = 5 Units: Day
388) Time to Stop Adherence Fatigue = 1000 Units: Day
389) Time to Upgrade Risk[Rgn] = 10 Units: Day
390) Time variant change in fatality[Rgn] = Max (Min Fatality Multiplier , (Max (Baseline Cumulative Cases for Learning , Cumulative Cases[Rgn] / Initial Population[Rgn]) / Baseline Cumulative Cases for Learning) ^ (-Learning and Death Reduction Rate[Rgn])) Units: dmnl
391) TimeVar Impact of Treatment on Fatality[Rgn] = Impact of Treatment on Fatality Rate[Rgn] * Time variant change in fatality[Rgn] Units: dmnl
392) Total Asymptomatic Fraction[Rgn] = 0.5 Units: dmnl
393) Total Asymptomatic Fraction Net[Rgn] = INITIAL(Total Asymptomatic Fraction[Rgn] * (1 - SW Gen[TtAsyFr]) + SW Gen[TtAsyFr] * InputAve[TtAsyFr]) Units: dmnl
394) Total Covid Hospitalized[Rgn] = sum (Hospitalized Infectious[Rgn,TstSts!]) Units: Person
395) Total Disease Duration = Onset to Detection Delay + "Post-Detection Phase Resolution Time" + Incubation Period Units: Day
396) Total Simulated Tests[Rgn] = Post Mortem Tests Total[Rgn] + Testing on Living[Rgn] Units: Person/Day
397) Total Test on Covid Patients[Rgn] = Max (0, min (Positive Candidates Interested in Testing Poisson Subset[Rgn] , Testing on Living[Rgn] - Tests on Negative Patients[Rgn]))Units: Person/Day
398) Total to Official Cases Simulated[Rgn] = ZIDZ (Cumulative Cases[Rgn] , SimCmltOverTime[Rgn,Infection]) Units: dmnl
399) Total Weighted Infected Population[Rgn] = Infected pre Detection[Rgn] + "Pre-Symptomatic Infected"[Rgn] + Weighted Infected Post Detection Gate[Rgn] Units: Person
400) Transmission Multiplier for Confirmed[Rgn] = INITIAL(Baseline Transmission Multiplier for Untested Symptomatic * Confirmation Impact on Contact[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
401) Transmission Multiplier for Hospitalized[Rgn,TstSts] = INITIAL(Baseline Transmission Multiplier for Untested Symptomatic * Relative Risk of Transmission by Hospitalized * if then else (TstSts = 1, Confirmation Impact on Contact[Rgn] , 1)) Units: dmnl
402) Transmission Multiplier Pre Detection[Rgn] = INITIAL(Baseline Transmission Multiplier for Untested Symptomatic * (1 - Total Asymptomatic Fraction Net[Rgn]) + Total Asymptomatic Fraction Net[Rgn] * Baseline Risk of Transmission by Asymptomatic[Rgn]) Units: dmnl
403) Transmission Multiplier Presymptomatic[Rgn] = INITIAL((Baseline Transmission Multiplier for Untested Symptomatic * Relative Risk of Transmission by Presymptomatic) * (1 - Total Asymptomatic Fraction Net[Rgn]) + Total Asymptomatic Fraction Net[Rgn] * Baseline Risk of Transmission by Asymptomatic[Rgn] * Relative Risk of Transmission by Presymptomatic) Units: dmnl
404) True Hazard of death[Rgn] = Death Rate[Rgn] / Susceptible[Rgn] Units: 1/Day
405) TstInc[Rgn] = Active Test Rate[Rgn] Units: Person/Day
406) TstSts : Tested,Notest
407) Untested PMAS Gap with Tested[Rgn] = (1 - Allocated Fration NonCOVID Hospitalized[Rgn]) ^ SensCovidUntestedAdmission Units: dmnl
408) Untested symptomatic Infected to Hospital[Rgn] = Hospital Admission Infectious[Rgn,Notest] Units: Person/Day
409) UsedSeries : Infection,Death
410) Utility from Limited Activities[Rgn] = exp (Sensitivity of Contact Reduction to Utility Net[Rgn] * Fractional Value of Limited Activities) Units: dmnl
411) Utility from Normal Activities[Rgn] = exp (Sensitivity of Contact Reduction to Utility Net[Rgn] * (1 - Perceived Risk of Life Loss[Rgn])) Units: dmnl
412) Voluntary Reduction in Contacts[Rgn] = F[Rgn] / F0[Rgn] * (1 - Min Contact Fraction[Rgn]) + Min Contact Fraction[Rgn]Units: dmnl
413) W Ave Acuity Hospitalized[Rgn] = ZIDZ (sum (Average Acuity Hospitalized[Rgn,TstSts!] * Hospitalized Infectious[Rgn,TstSts!]) , sum (Hospitalized Infectious[Rgn,TstSts!])) Units: dmnl
414) Weather Effect on Transmission[Rgn] = CRW[Rgn] ^ Sensitivity to Weather Net[Rgn] Units: dmnl
415) Weight Max in Test Goal = 0 Units: dmnl

416) Weight on Reported Probability of Infection[Rgn] = 0.78 Units: dmnl
417) Weighted Infected Post Detection Gate[Rgn] = "Infected Unconfirmed Post-Detection"[Rgn] + Infectious Confirmed Not Hospitalized[Rgn] + sum (Hospitalized Infectious[Rgn,TstSts!]) * "Post-Detection Phase Resolution Time" / Hospitalized Resolution Time Units: Person
418) WTestFlowErr[Rgn] = if then else (DataFlowOverTime[Rgn,Test] = :NA:, 0, 1 / Max (10, DataFlowOverTime[Rgn,Test] * TestErrorFrac)) Units: Day/Person
419) Y[Rgn] = min (1, Max (1e-06, 1 - exp (- Extrapolated Estimator[Rgn]))) Units: dmnl
420) Ymix[Rgn,p2] = - b[Rgn] / (1 + a[Rgn])
421) Ymix[Rgn,p3] = (Sqrt (a[Rgn] ^ 2 - 4 * b[Rgn]) - a[Rgn]) / 2
422) Ymix[Rgn,p4] = (-0.87358 * a[Rgn]) / t3[Rgn] + 0.38157 * t3[Rgn] Units: dmnl

S9 References

1. R. Xu *et al.*, Weather Conditions and COVID-19 Transmission: Estimates and Projections. *medRxiv*, (2020).

2. Z. Du *et al.*, Serial interval of COVID-19 among publicly reported confirmed cases. *Emerging infectious diseases* **26**, 1341 (2020).

3. H. Nishiura, N. M. Linton, A. R. Akhmetzhanov, Serial interval of novel coronavirus (COVID-19) infections. *International journal of infectious diseases*, (2020).

4. H. Rahmandad, K. Hu, Modeling the rework cycle: capturing multiple defects per task. *Syst Dynam Rev* **26**, 291-315 (2010).

5. W. Wang *et al.*, Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in different types of clinical specimens. *Jama* **323**, 1843-1844 (2020).

6. Y. Fang *et al.*, Sensitivity of chest CT for COVID-19: comparison to RT-PCR. *Radiology*, 200432 (2020).

7. R. Verity *et al.*, Estimates of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based analysis. *The Lancet infectious diseases*, (2020).

8. WHO. (2020).

9. Z. Wu, J. M. McGoogan, Characteristics of and important lessons from the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak in China: summary of a report of 72 314 cases from the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *Jama* **323**, 1239-1242 (2020).

10. W. Bank. (2020).

11. J. A. Vrugt *et al.*, Accelerating Markov chain Monte Carlo simulation by differential evolution with self-adaptive randomized subspace sampling. *International Journal of Nonlinear Sciences and Numerical Simulation* **10**, 273-290 (2009).

12. E. Dong, H. Du, L. Gardner, An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real time. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*.

13. M. Roser, H. Ritchie, E. Ortiz-Ospina, J. Hasell, in *Our World in Data*. (2020).

14. Z. Lipton, J. Ellignton, K. Riely. (The Atlantic).