Covid-19 Belgium: Extended SEIR-QD model with nursery homes and long-term scenarios-based forecasts from school opening

Nicolas Franco
naXys, Namur Institute for Complex Systems, University of Namur, Belgium
email: nicolas.franco@unamur.be

September 8, 2020

Abstract

We model the evolution of the covid-19 epidemic in Belgium with an age-structured extended SEIR-QD epidemic model with separated consideration for nursery homes. All parameters of the model are estimated using a MCMC method, except integrated data on social contacts. The model is calibrated on hospitals' data, number of deaths, nursery homes' tests and serological tests. We present the current situation on September 2020 as well as long-term scenarios-based forecasts with the possibility of a second wave in function of new transmissions from contacts at school.

Contents

1 Introduction **1**

2 Description of the model **2**

3 Current estimations coming from the model **5**

4 Long-term scenarios-based forecasts **11**

A Equations of the model **15**

B Considered data and method **17**

C Estimated parameters **20**

1 Introduction

While there are many circulating different models concerning the covid-19 pandemic, it is important to have dedicated models to the specific situation of each country since the evolution of the situation as well as chosen political measures are different. SEIR-type epidemic models [1] are the most suitable for long term forecasting and especially SEIR-QD variants concerning the covid-19 pandemic [2, 3]. We present one of the very few existing extended SEIR-QD model adapted and calibrated on Belgium situation and data. Two similar approaches have been developed by the SIMID COVID-19 team (UHasselt-UAntwerp) [4] and the BIOMATH team (UGent) [5]. All of those models have their own characteristics and are complementary since it is difficult at this time to exactly know how to model the covid-19 in the best way. Another alternative approach has also been developed at the VUB [6] as well as a meta-population model from the SIMID COVID-19 team [7].

The main characteristics of our model are the following ones:

- The population is divided into 8 compartments in order to take account of the different possible stages of the disease as well as the separation between asymptomatic and symptomatic people with a different infectiousness.
- Each compartment is divided into 5 age classes with different characteristics concerning the behaviour and evolution of the disease.
- The transmission of the coronavirus between all classes is computed using social contact data at different places (home, work, school, leisure)[8].
- Except social contact data, all of the 62 parameters of the model are estimated using a Monte Carlo method, hence there is no assumption coming from studies in other countries.
- Nursery homes are modelled as isolated entities in order to take account of the different spread timing of the coronavirus compared to the general population.
- Specific parameters for the situation in nursery homes take account of a variable hospitalisation policy based on hospitals load as well as a probability that deaths coming directly from nursery homes are related to the covid-19.
- The model is mainly calibrated using hospitalisations and deaths using both incidence and prevalence data (depending on which one is the more appropriate for the considered data) coming from Sciensano's public raw data [9].
- Additional constraints are coming from Sciensano's serological studies on blood donors, age repartition in hospitals and PCR tests on nursery homes as reported in Sciensano epidemiological reports [9].

In Section 2, we present a general description of the model. Technical details are reserved for the appendices with detailed equations (Appendix A), considered data and explanation of the calibration method (Appendix B) and estimated parameters (Appendix C). Section 3 presents some current estimations on the specificity of the covid-19 and long-term scenarios-based forecasts are detailed in Section 4.

2 Description of the model

We consider the following age classes among the population: 0-24, 25-44, 45-64, 65-74 and 75+. Those classes correspond to public available data, excepted that 75-84 and 85+ classes are merged since it is difficult to know which parts of them are present in nursery homes or homes for the elderly. Hence we assume that the classes 0-24, 25-44, 45-64, 65-74 are only present among the general population, while the remaining is divided between a general 75+ and a specific class of nursery homes residents.

Then the population is divided into the following compartments:

- Susceptible (S): people who have never been infected and are a priori susceptible to be infected.
- Exposed (E): people who have just been infected but are without any symptom and still not infectious, hence in latent period.
- Asymptomatic Infectious (AI): part of the exposed people fall into a continuously asymptomatic disease. During that period they are infectious but with a reduced infectious probability due to their asymptomatic status. They will directly fall into the recovered status after that period.

- Presymptomatic Infectious (PI): the other part of the exposed people fall into a symptomatic disease, but symptoms do not appear directly. Hence there is an intermediate stage where people become infectious but still without any symptom. This is the second part of the incubation period, and the infectious probability is still reduced.
- Symptomatic Infectious (SI): real disease period where the infectious probability is higher. People in this compartment will eventually fall either in a recovered status or will be hospitalised (and concerning nursery home, a significant part of them will directly die).
- Hospitalised (Q): hospitalised people are considered as in quarantine for the model, since their contacts are almost inexistant. We are not considering in this model any subdivision inside the hospital compartment.
- Deceased (D): deaths from the general population are assumed only coming from hospitalised people (there is a small 1% of exceptions which is not taken into consideration here). However, deaths from nursery homes are taken into consideration and separated from deaths coming from hospitals.
- Recovered (R): people who recovered from the disease (from asymptomatic ones, symptomatic ones or from the hospital) which are assumed here immune for the future.

All those compartments exist for every age class. In addition, 2000 isolated nursery homes of similar average size are considered with all those compartments. The transmission of infection from the general population to those nursery homes is modelled by a random infection probability inside each nursery home, which is proportional to the number of infectious people and assumed less important since the lockdown period.

A schematic view of the compartments with their relations is presented in Figure 1.

Several additional or adaptive parameters are considered in order to better catch the reality:

- A specific probability parameter is catching the fact that only a part of deaths directly coming from nursery homes are due to the covid-19.
- A specific corrective coefficient is used to correct the new hospitalisations data since patients initially hospitalised for another reason are not officially considered in the data.
- Recovery and death rated from hospitals are considered variable in time in order to take the continuous improvement of care methods into account.
- A variable hospitalisation policy is considered for nursery homes since resident are less likely to be hospitalised when the hospital load is important.

Equations of the model and precise explanations on those parameters are presented in detail in Appendix A.

Policy changes, according to Belgian epidemic' schedule, are monitored using different coefficients for the social contact matrices. Social contacts are divided into 4 categories: home (inside home and nearby family), work (with transport), school and leisure (with other places). All contacts are considered at 100% during the period up to March 14, 2020. Then reduced percentages are estimated by the model for the different periods of lockdown and phases of lift of measures. Those estimated parameters according to the timeline are described in Appendix C. These reduced percentages are the effect at the same time of mobility restrictions, social distancing, prevention mesures, testing and contact tracing, while it is mathematically impossible to determine the exact part of those effects. Hence



Figure 1: Schematic view of the compartmental model

new parameters for some or all social contact types are estimated each time there is an important policy change. Long-term scenarios-based forecasts are constructed assuming a constant policy and compliance to measures during the future with different realistic possibility of percentage of social contacts for still unknown policy effects.

This model does not take into consideration potential reimportations of the covid-19 from abroad as well as not officially observed effects like seasonality or cross-immunity. The population is only age-structured and not spatially structured. A spatial refinement of such a model would be really important, but currently the public data officially provided are not of sufficient detail in order to correctly fit a complex spatial-structured model.

3 Current estimations coming from the model

We present in this Section the result of the calibration of the model as on September 6, 2020, with considered data up to September 4, 2020. Results are presented in the figures with medians, 5% and 95% percentiles, hence with a 90% confidence interval.



Figure 2: General view on prevalence data and estimations

In Figure 2, we have a general representation of the evolution of the epidemic in Belgium with hospitalisations, people discharged from hospitals and deaths coming from hospitals and from nursery homes, all in prevalence or cumulative numbers. The interest in modelling the epidemic within nursery homes separately from the general population can clearly be seen on this figure. Indeed, the form of the death curve for nursery homes is really different from the ones for the general population since the epidemic started a few time later in nursery homes but took a bigger proportion. Note that the very small percentage of deaths occurring at another places is not taken into consideration in this model.

The model calibration fits the real prevalence data with a very good exactitude (excluding of course data noises) despite that fact that the calibration is almost completely done on incidence data (cf. Appendix B for details). The comparison between the model and some incidence data are presented in Figure 3 for the general incidence data in hospitalisations and deaths and in Figure 4 for incidence data in deaths with age class repartition.



Figure 3: Incidence in new hospitalisations and deaths



Figure 4: Incidence deaths within each age class

We must remark that in order to obtain a correct fit we needed to introduce four specific elements within the model:

- Incidence data on new hospitalisation are underestimated. Indeed, somme patients are initially admitted for another reason than covid-19 and only transferred in a covid-19 section afterwards. This results in more people going out from hospitals than officially entering. The model estimates those supplementary patients at 16.86% [11.31% ; 24.39%]. Real data in Figure 3 are plotted with the estimated correction.

- Deaths coming directly from nursery homes are not all due to covid-19 since many PCR tests are lacking. The model estimates that only 84.7% [75.4% ; 89.5%] of those deaths are really due to covid-19.

- The ratio between deaths coming directly from nursery homes and deceased patients in hospitals coming initially from nursery homes seems to be not constant, and it was necessary to introduce a variable hospitalisation policy. The best answer found was to monitor hospitalisations from nursery homes through a logistic function depending on general hospital load but with a specific delay. Hence, when hospital load starts to become too important, less people from nursery homes are hospitalised and the reverse effect occurs when hospital load gets lower, but each time with a delay estimated at 11.5 days [9.6 ; 13.6] (cf. Appendix A for details).

- Initially the model overestimated the number of deaths from the end of the first wave. It was not possible to calibrate constant death rates throughout all phases of the epidemic. This is the consequence of both a care improvement in hospitals and a lower aggressiveness of the virus. Hence death and recovered rates within each age class are also monitored by a logistic function depending on time (cf. Appendix A for details). The current improvement (in comparison to the very beginning of the epidemic) is estimated as 72.2% [62.4% ; 78.5%], hence 72.2% of patients which should have died in March are now recovering from hospitals. We must remark that it is impossible to know which part is due to care improvement and which part is due to lower aggressiveness of the virus.

From the model, we can extrapolate the evolution of the virus through the whole population over time. In Figure 5, we present the estimated percentage of infected people over time for each age class. We can clearly see the effect of mid-March lockdown measures on children and working people. The effect of lockdown measures on older people (especially 75+) is less important since the curve is broken in a less effective manner. However, the lockdown seems to have an almost negligible effect inside nursery homes, probably since the virus was pursuing its propagation inside each infected nursery home between residents themselves and through the nursing staff.

The basic reproduction number R_0, representing the average number of cases directly generated by one infectious case in a population which is assumed totally susceptible, is estimated in average for each period (we consider this number dependant on lockdown measures) and computed as the leading eigenvalue of the next-generation matrix (cf. Appendix A for details). The effective reproduction number R_t (or R_e) represents the average number of cases directly generated by one infectious case taking account of the already immune population, hence varying over a period. We have the following estimations for those numbers:



Figure 5: Percentage of infected people within each age class

	R_0	R_t (at the end of the period)
Pre-lockdown: March 1 → March 13	4.31 [4.05 ; 4.52]	4.26 [4.00 ; 4.47]
School and leisure closed: March 14 → March 18	2.27 [2.15 ; 2.40]	2.21 [2.08 ; 2.32]
Full lockdown: March 19 → May 3	0.69 [0.62 ; 0.72]	0.63 [0.58 ; 0.67]
Phase 1-2: May 4 → June 7	0.81 [0.78 ; 0.87]	0.74 [0.71 ; 0.80]
Phase 3: June 8 → June 30	0.95 [0.88 ; 1.13]	0.87 [0.81 ; 1.04]
Phase 4: July 1 → June 28	1.52 [1.38 ; 1.60]	1.39 [1.27 ; 1.46]
Phase 4bis: July 29 → Augustus 31	0.86 [0.79 ; 0.97]	0.79 [0.72 ; 0.89]

The reproduction number of the pre-lockdown period is a bit overestimated. This is probably due to the fact that the model does not take explicitly account of infections coming from abroad travellers and this results in an estimated R_0 above 4. For the period phase 1A-1B-2, since there were policy changes almost every weeks, we only provide here the estimated R_0 at the end of this period.

The infection fatality rate (IFR) can be estimated using the total set of recovered people according to the model (hence including untested and asymptomatic people). Due to the consideration of variable death rates, the IFR is different from the early period of the epidemic and the last months:

	General IFR	March-April period	July-August period
All population	0.95% [0.82% ; 1.06%]	0.98% [0.85% ; 1.10%]	0.43% [0.38% ; 0.46%]
0-24	0.00% [0.00% ; 0.00%]	0.00% [0.00% ; 0.00%]	0.00% [0.00% ; 0.00%]
25-44	0.01% [0.01% ; 0.01%]	0.01% [0.01% ; 0.01%]	0.01% [0.00% ; 0.01%]
45-64	0.19% [0.17% ; 0.19%]	0.19% [0.18% ; 0.19%]	0.08% [0.07% ; 0.08%]
65-74	1.65% [1.59% ; 1.70%]	1.72% [1.65% ; 1.77%]	0.77% [0.73% ; 0.81%]
75+ (nurs. homes included)	8.37% [7.63% ; 9.52%]	8.81% [7.99% ; 10.06%]	3.71% [3.55% ; 3.98%]

In Figure 6, we present the estimated percentage of recovered people, hence the estimated percentage of immunity acquired within each age class if we make the assumption that a constant immunity is granted to recovered people. The herd immunity is currently estimated by the model at 9.05% [7.98% ; 10.56%]. Although it may seem quite high, this is in accordance with blood donors tests results (around 1.3% on March 30 and 4.7% on April 14) since those tests where only performed on an (almost) asymptomatic population which have not developed covid-19 symptoms from the past 4 weeks. The model extrapolates immunity coming also from the symptomatic population and from nursery homes. Note that we allow a 7 days delay in our model after recovering to be sure of the detectability of the anticorps. We have the following detailed estimations:

	global immunity	among asymptomatic	inside nursery homes
March 30	2.67% [2.38% ; 3.06%]	2.22% [1.94% ; 2.47%]	1.49% [1.23% ; 1.72%]
April 14	5.77% [5.15% ; 6.57%]	4.49% [3.89% ; 4.77%]	9.56% [8.23% ; 10.62%]
September 6	9.05% [7.98% ; 10.56%]	6.61% [5.69% ; 6.96%]	26.18% [24.05% ; 27.45%]



Figure 6: Percentage of recovered people (potentially immune)

We present here some estimations concerning some characteristics of the disease coming from the model:

- Average latent (pre-infectious) period (assumed similar in all classes): 1.5 days [1.3 ; 1.9]
- Average presymptomatic period (assumed similar in all classes): 5.8 days [4.9 ; 6.9]
- Average incubation period for symptomatic (latent + presymptomatic) : 7.4 days [6.4 ; 8.5] Note that the model cannot really detect the exact time when symptoms appear, hence the end of the incubation period merely corresponds to the estimated time when the infectiousness becomes more important.
- Average total disease duration for asymptomatic peoples:

0-24	5.0 days [4.2 ; 5.7]
25-44	5.6 days [4.8 ; 6.2]
45-64	6.0 days [5.0 ; 6.8]
65-74	6.4 days [5.3 ; 7.5]
75+	7.3 days [5.7 ; 9.3]
nursery homes	21.7 days [16.1 ; 30.8]

Note that the duration for asymptomatic nursery homes' residents cannot really be estimated by the model. Indeed, once a single nursery home (or an isolated part of it) is completely infected, asymptomatic infected residents can remain forever ill without any new possible contamination, hence there is no boundary on such duration coming from the available data, so this excessive duration must be considered as an outlier.

- Average total disease duration for symptomatic peoples (not hospitalised):

0-24	10.3 days [9.2 ; 11.6]
25-44	11.0 days [9.8 ; 12.9]
45-64	11.4 days [10.3 ; 13.3]
65-74	11.9 days [11.0 ; 13.6]
75+	12.5 days [11.5 ; 13.9]
nursery homes	12.8 days [11.8 ; 14.3]

- Hospitalisation duration (average until discharged or deceased at the beginning of the epidemic, hence before care improvement):

0-24	17.6 days [15.0 ; 20.1]
25-44	19.1 days [17.6 ; 20.4]
45-64	16.1 days [15.2 ; 17.1]
65-74	12.0 days [11.2 ; 13.0]
75+	11.7 days [11.0 ; 12.9]
nursery homes	10.4 days [8.8 ; 11.4]

- Overall percentage of completely asymptomatic infected people (note that this probably include mild symptomatic people):

0-24	83.1% [70.4% ; 95.2%]
25-44	77.6% [64.2% ; 90.1%]
45-64	65.9% [58.0% ; 76.5%]
65-74	54.9% [44.3% ; 63.3%]
75+	35.1% [26.0% ; 45.4%]
nursery homes	30.6% [22.6% ; 41.9%]

4 Long-term scenarios-based forecasts

Every long-term forecast is hypothetical. New measures that have not been tested cannot really be estimated on the level of their impact and it is impossible to predict evolution in compliance to them from the population as well as future policy changes. This is why any realistic forecast must rely on the assumption of a perfect continuity of measures and compliance for elements which are a priori not suspected to change soon and on different hypothetical scenarios for unknown or untested modifications of measures.

In order to establish those scenarios, we start with the estimated percentage of transmissions/contacts within different places, which are approximatively the following ones (exact values for smaller periods can be found in Appendix C):

	Lockdown	June	July	August
Home	47%	51%	51%	51%
Work + transport	6%	9%	9%	9%
School	0%	25%	0%	0%
Leisure + others	7%	10%	51%	14%

We must emphasise that those percentages do not represent the percentage of attendees at those places, but the percentage of virus transmission in comparison to early March period, hence a reduction of transmission both due to a reduction in the number of contacts (lockdown, telecommuting, quarantine,...) and to a change in the quality of those contacts (protective measures, mask wearing,...). A 80% attendees can result in a 40% transmission due to additional measures. At this time, it is impossible to really distinguish both effects.

School contacts is the must unknown effect. The estimation from June is very imprecise since the partial school opening was mixed up with Horeca/leisure opening. The impact from school full opening in September must surely be greater than June estimation and less than 100% since protective measures are applicable. We choose to present two different scenarios, one optimistic with 50% transmission at school and one more pessimistic with 75% transmission.

Home and work contacts are all the time assumed constant, as they are the most stationary effects. On the other hand leisure contacts are very volatile as it was spotted during July increase. This is mainly due to the fact that a lot of elements are included in the category "leisure and others", as for example incoming transmissions by travellers as well as big events. For this reason, we include in our scenarios a potential small increase in leisure contacts in order to monitor either a future lower compliance to measures or a lift of some measures in this sector.

Future school closures according to the Belgian calendar are taken into consideration, which results at some points in small variations within the forecasts. However, special events like Christmas or new year are not monitor here and might have a non negligible but still unknown impact. There is no explicit horizon of predictability computed for this model, since the evolution of the epidemic is in reality far more dependant of potential policy changes than chaotic dynamical evolutions. The unpredictability of the model is monitored here through the sensibility analysis (MCMC) and the corresponding orbits.

For all figures of this section, we have chosen to represent the sensibility analysis using all deciles and ventiles, hence with every 5% percentile. Deciles are represented by continuous lines while the additional ventiles are represented by dashed lines.

Scenario: School 50% - Leisure constant







Scenario: School 75% - Leisure constant







We can see that a constant leisure scenario with only 50% contacts at school gives rise to a completely controlled epidemic. A scenario with more contacts at school is however far more incertain, although not really problematic at the level of hospital load. In such a case, the herd immunity could reach around 25% by June 2021.

Scenario: School 50% - Leisure +5%







Scenario: School 75% - Leisure +5%







Even a small increase of 5% in leisure contacts might have a noticeable impact on the epidemic. If the transmission at school is low, it only results in a circulating virus still under control. If the transmission at school is high, this may give rise to a second wave of a similar size than the first one. We must note that, unlike the first wave, this second wave should go down by herself after February-March due to a herd immunity reaching $\sim 30\%$.

Scenario: School 50% - Leisure +10%







Scenario: School 75% - Leisure +10%







An increase of 10%, although still far from the near 40% estimated increase in July, could have a more problematic effect. Such an increase is only admissible if the transmission at school is really low (50%). With a too high transmission at school this could result in an uncontrolled restarting epidemic where additional measures could be taken.

We must remark that a $\sim$ 10% increase in leisure contacts seems to have a similar impact as a 25% increase in school contacts. This is an indication that the effect from school contacts is less important and problematic than leisure contacts. This is probably due to the fact that the percentage of asymptomatic people among students is far more important than among adults.

As a conclusion, we can say that the impact from school opening on the epidemic must be taken into consideration, since the currently unknown effect from such a school opening is uncertain and can lead to two different scenarios: one with a low transmission at school which could allow a partial lift of measure at the level of leisure, or a high transmission at school which imposes to hold the current measures (or ones with similar effects) until February-March 2021. We must remark that in order to correctly monitor the impact from school opening, at least four weeks are needed in order to have a clear trend in hospitalisations' data. This means that a constant policy during the whole month of September must be in application in order to reach a valid mathematical estimation of the situation.

Acknowledgement

The author wants to acknowledge the different members of the Walloon consortium on mathematical model of the covid-19 epidemic for the numerous discussions, especially Sebastien Clesse, Annick Sartenaer, Alexandre Mauroy, Timoteo Carletti as well as Germain van Bever for statistical discussions. The author wants also to acknowledge the members of the Flemish consortium for the very useful exchanges, models' comparisons and helps on improvement.

A Equations of the model

Equations of the model for the general population are the following ones, with i = 0-24, 25-44, 45-64, 65-74, 75+ depending on the age class:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Susceptible:} \quad & \frac{\mathrm{d}S_i}{\mathrm{d}t} = -S_i \sum_j M_{ij} \frac{\lambda_a(AI_j + PI_j) + \lambda_s SI_j}{N_j} \\
\text{Exposed:} \quad & \frac{\mathrm{d}E_i}{\mathrm{d}t} = S_i \sum_j M_{ij} \frac{\lambda_a(AI_j + PI_j) + \lambda_s SI_j}{N_j} - \sigma E_i \\
\text{Asymptomatic Infectious:} \quad & \frac{\mathrm{d}AI_i}{\mathrm{d}t} = \sigma p_{ai} E_i - \gamma_{ai} AI_i \\
\text{Presymptomatic Infectious:} \quad & \frac{\mathrm{d}PI_i}{\mathrm{d}t} = \sigma \left(1 - p_{ai}\right) E_i - \tau PI_i \\
\text{Symptomatic Infectious:} \quad & \frac{\mathrm{d}SI_i}{\mathrm{d}t} = \tau PI_i - \delta_i SI_i - \gamma_{si} SI_i \\
\text{Hospitalised (Quarantined):} \quad & \frac{\mathrm{d}Q_i}{\mathrm{d}t} = \delta_i SI_i - r_i(t) Q_i - \gamma_{q_i}(t) Q_i \\
\text{Deceased:} \quad & \frac{\mathrm{d}D_i}{\mathrm{d}t} = r_i(t) Q_i \\
\text{Recovered:} \quad & \frac{\mathrm{d}R_i}{\mathrm{d}t} = \gamma_{ai} AI_i + \gamma_{si} SI_i + \gamma_{q_i}(t) Q_i
\end{aligned}$$

There are different kinds of parameters:

- Parameters without age class index i are assumed similar for all classes:
  - λ_a transmission rate from asymptomatic infectious persons
  - λ_s transmission rate from symptomatic infectious persons
  - σ rate at which an exposed person becomes contagious
  - τ rate at which an presymptomatic person becomes symptomatic
- Parameters with age class index i are distinguished between the classes:

- p_{ai}: probability of a completely asymptomatic disease
- δ_i: rate at which a symptomatic person develops heavy symptoms and is hospitalised
- γ_{ai}: rate at which a person recovers from asymptomatic disease
- γ_{si}: rate at which a person recovers from light symptomatic disease

- Specific parameters are time-dependent:
  - $\gamma_{q_i}(t)$: rate at which a person recovers from hospital
  - $r_i(t)$: rate at which a person dies from hospital

  This time-dependence is computed using a logistic function with estimated parameters P_{recovery}, μ_{recovery} and s_{recovery}:

$$\gamma_{q_i}(t) = \gamma_{q_i}\left(1 + \frac{P_{\text{recovery}}}{1 + e^{-\frac{t-\mu_{\text{recovery}}}{s_{\text{recovery}}}}}\right) \qquad r_i(t) = r_i\left(1 - \frac{P_{\text{recovery}}}{1 + e^{-\frac{t-\mu_{\text{recovery}}}{s_{\text{recovery}}}}}\right)$$

- Contants of the model are $N_{0-24} = 3250000$, $N_{25-44} = 3000000$, $N_{45-64} = 3080000$, $N_{65-74} = 1150000$ and $N_{75+} = 870000$ outside nursery homes (with an additional $N_h = 150000$ inside nursery homes) for a total population of $N = 11500000$. Those numbers are round numbers coming from the structure of the Belgian population as provided by the Belgian Federal Government on April 2020 [10].

- Social contact matrices M_{ij} (WAIFW) are collected using the SOCRATES online tool [8] and the 2010 dataset [11]. Work and transport categories are merged as well as leisure and otherplace. 4 different parameters which are adapted depending on lockdown/policy mesures are used as coefficients, hence the complete contact matrices are:

$$M_{ij} = C_{\text{home}} M_{ij_{\text{home}}} + C_{\text{work}} M_{ij_{\text{work}}} + C_{\text{school}} M_{ij_{\text{school}}} + C_{\text{leisure}} M_{ij_{\text{leisure}}}$$

- An initial condition p_0 is proportionally distributed between the E_i on day 1 among the general population (corresponding to March 1 reported situation = February 29 real situation). Nursery homes are assumed not initially infected.

Equations of the model for the specific population in nursery homes are the following variations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Susceptible:} \quad & \frac{\mathrm{d}S_h}{\mathrm{d}t} = -S_h m_h \frac{\lambda_a(AI_h + PI_h) + \lambda_s SI_h}{75} - \tilde{r}_h(t)(1 - P_{cor})I_h \\
& \qquad - \text{Random transmissions from visits} + \text{New entrances} \\
\text{Exposed:} \quad & \frac{\mathrm{d}E_h}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\frac{\mathrm{d}S_h}{\mathrm{d}t} - \sigma E_h \\
\text{Asymptomatic Infectious:} \quad & \frac{\mathrm{d}AI_h}{\mathrm{d}t} = \sigma p_{ah} E_h - \gamma_{ah} AI_h \\
\text{Presymptomatic Infectious:} \quad & \frac{\mathrm{d}PI_h}{\mathrm{d}t} = \sigma\left(1 - p_{ah}\right) E_h - \tau PI_h \\
\text{Symptomatic Infectious:} \quad & \frac{\mathrm{d}SI_h}{\mathrm{d}t} = \tau PI_h - \delta_h SI_h - \gamma_{sh} SI_h - \tilde{r}_h(t) P_{cor} SI_h \\
\text{Hospitalised (Quarantined):} \quad & \frac{\mathrm{d}Q_h}{\mathrm{d}t} = \delta_h SI_h - r_h(t) Q_h - \gamma_{q_h}(t) Q_h \\
\text{Deceased from hospitals:} \quad & \frac{\mathrm{d}D_{75+}}{\mathrm{d}t} + = r_h(t) Q_h \\
\text{Deceased from homes:} \quad & \frac{\mathrm{d}D_h}{\mathrm{d}t} = \tilde{r}_h(t) Q_h \\
\text{Recovered:} \quad & \frac{\mathrm{d}R_h}{\mathrm{d}t} = \gamma_{ah} AI_h + \gamma_{sh} SI_h + \gamma_{q_h}(t) Q_h
\end{aligned}$$

Most of the parameters are similar to the general population (but assumed with different values) with those additional considerations:

- There are 2000 nursery homes considered as separated entities, with a constant population of 75 inside each one, for a total of $N_h = 150000$ residents.
- Transmissions inside a specific nursery home follow usual SEIR-type transmission with a specific coefficient m_h.
- Transmissions from the general population is computed in a particular way using a daily probability of infection, i.e. each day one additional (integer) infected resident is added with probability $P_{th}\frac{S_h}{N_h}\sum_j \frac{\lambda_a(AI_j+PI_j)+\lambda_s SI_j}{N}$, where the coefficient is distinguished between the initial phase P_{th} and lockdown phases P'_{th}. Starting from lockdown, transmissions are only considered from the 25-65 population (i.e. with $j = 25-44$ and $45-64$) since transmissions are mainly from nursery homes' workers. Potential reverse transmissions are however not monitored here.
- Deaths from care centres through hospitalisations are counted within the 75+ class.
- Additional deaths from care homes are monitored using a death rate $\tilde{r}_h$ with a coefficient P_{cor} which captures the probability that the death is covid-19 related. Remaining non-covid-19 related deaths are assumed occurring in the susceptible class (or in the recovered class if the first one is empty).
- A variable hospitalisation policy is computed using variable parameters of constant sum $\delta_h(t) + P_{cor}\tilde{r}_h(t) = \delta_h$, the proportion being monitored over time by a logistic function depending on hospitals load with an additional delay, with estimated parameters P_{delay}, μ_{hosp} and s_{hosp}:

$$\delta_h(t) = \delta_h - \frac{\tilde{r}_h P_{\text{cor}}}{1+e^{-\frac{Q(t-\text{delay})-\mu_{\text{hosp}}}{s_{\text{hosp}}}}} \qquad \tilde{r}_h(t) = \frac{\tilde{r}_h}{1+e^{-\frac{Q(t-\text{delay})-\mu_{\text{hosp}}}{s_{\text{hosp}}}}}$$

- New entrances are considered in order to fit the empty places up to 75 residents per nursery home and are removed from the 75+ susceptible class.

The basic reproduction number is estimated by the leading eigenvalue of the next-generation matrix [12, 13] (The eigenvalue is real since this matrix is positive definite):

$$R_0 = \text{max eigenvalue}\left[\lambda_a\left(\frac{p_{aj}}{\gamma_{aj}} + \frac{1-p_{aj}}{\tau}\right)M_{ij} + \lambda_s\left(\frac{1-p_{aj}}{\gamma_{sj}+\delta_j}\right)M_{ij}\right]_{ij}$$

The effective reproduction number $R_t = R_e$ is estimated as $R_t = R_0\frac{\sum_i S_i(t)}{N-\sum_i D_i(t)}$.

B Considered data and method

We consider the following data for the calibration of the model coming from Sciensano's public raw data:

- New hospitalisations (incidence) with an additional corrective estimated parameter SUPP_{hosp} which estimates the percentage of missing covid-19 patients at the time of admission (hence catching supplementary patients not initially hospitalised for covid-19)
- Hospital load (prevalence only)

- Released from hospital (cumulative)
- Total deaths from hospital (cumulative)
- Deaths (incidence) from age classes 45-64, 65-74, 75+ (incidence data are more suitable for those classes since there are a percentage of deaths for which the age class is unknown and prevalence data could contain an accumulation of errors)
- Deaths (cumulative) from age classes 0-24, 25-44 (cumulative data are more suitable for those classes since incidence data are almost zero)
- Deaths from nursery homes (incidence and cumulative)
- Total deaths (incidence and cumulative)

Deaths reported with a specific date are considered on that specific date while situations reported by hospitals are considered to occur up to 24h before the hospital report hence 2 days before the official data communication. Note that graphics are plotted using the dates of Sciensano's communications (1 day delay).

Additional constraints are considered coming from Sciensano's epidemiological reports [9] (those constraints determine the set of admissibles parameters):

- Serological studies on blood donors are considered in the following way: the ratio between immune people (for the classes 25-44, 45-64 and 65-74) coming directly from the asymptomatic compartment ($\sum_i AI \to R$) and the total asymptomatic population who has not developed a symptomatic covid-19 disease ($\sum_i S + E + AI + [IA \to R] + PI$) should be respectively between 0.5% and 2.8% 7 days before March 30 and between 3.5% and 6.2% 7 days before April 14, April 27 and May 11 (the 7 day delay is here to take the needed time to build a detectable immunity into account).
- Large constraints on the average percentage of hospitalised people among each age class are imposed: 0-24 between 1.7% and 3.7%, 25-44 between 6.1% and 12.1%, 45-64 between 23% and 32.1%, 65-74 between 17.1% and 29.2%, 75+ between 31.4% and 50.8%.
- Additional constraints are imposed on nursery homes coming from the result of massive PCR test on April-May: the average percentage of infected people should be $8\% \pm 3\%$ during the period April 15-30 and less than $2\% \pm 2\%$ during the period May 15-31. Those percentages are estimated from Sciensano's epidemiological reports using a calculated incidence between each week. Additionally, the average percentage of asymptomatic residents (including presymptomatic ones) among infected should be $75\% \pm 10\%$.
- There are also constraints on parameters as e.g. $p_{a0-24} > p_{a25-44} > \dots$ in order to reproduce the more severity of the covid-19 on older persons as well as trivial constraints to avoid negative or out-of-bound parameters.

All parameters are estimated using a MCMC Metropolis–Hastings algorithm [14]. Two different modes are used for the calibration and the statistical analysis:

- Best-fit burning mode: an optimised First-choice hill climbing algorithm using weighted least-squares performed on one parameter at a time (i.e. one neighbour = variation of one parameter), with downhill moves allowed up to 0.5% in order to avoid local optima and with a quick best fit search performed on accepted neighbours

- MCMC mode: a Metropolis–Hastings algorithm performed on all parameters (i.e. one neighbour = variation of all parameters) where the likelihood fonction is constructed using the property that the empirical variance from n data follows up to a coefficient a χ^2 distribution (we use $\frac{nS^2}{\sigma^2} \sim \chi^2(n) \cong \mathcal{N}(n, 2n)$ with σ estimated from the burning period)

Weights for least-squares are defined in the following way: For each set of data (and each age class), the weight is chosen such that a best fit search considering only those data (hence a best fit discarding all other data) gives similar empirical variance. Hence each sort of data gives a similar contribution to the likelihood. For data with both incidence and prevalence numbers considered, the contribution of incidence numbers is favoured at ∼80%. From this method, we obtained the following weights: new hospitalisations incidence 2 (lockdown) and 100 (after lockdown), hospitalisations prevalence 1, released 1, deaths from hospital 20, deaths 0-24 10000, deaths 25-44 5000, deaths 45-64 2000, deaths 65-74 1000, deaths 75+ 200, deaths from nursery homes incidence 100 and prevalence 0.2, total deaths incidence 100 and prevalence 0.2.

The program is written is C language. The full ODEs are solved by numerical integration using the GNU gsl odeiv2 librairy and a Runge-Kutta-Fehlberg45 integrator. The computation is performed on the HPC cluster Hercules2 [15].

The method of approaching global minima is particular due to the presence of a very high number of estimated parameters, a large number of numerical integrations to be performed (due to the presence of 2000 separated nursery homes) and the fact that the algorithm should not take several days to complete in order to quickly produce previsions of the pandemic. Hence the method is separated into different steps:

- In a first time, a set of best-fit search is performed from a very large distribution (100 times usual standard deviation) using 5000000 iterations with a 10 times average step and a special trick to increase the rapidity of the algorithm: instead of 2000 different nursery homes, only 100 nursery homes are considered with each time 20 copies of each. This approximation is suitable as long as the algorithm is still far from the best-fit.

- In a second time, the best-fit search is pursued for at least 10000 iterations using the complete 2000 different nursery homes in order to affine parameters. A set of at least 100 different priors is collected from the best obtained results.

- In a third time, the MCMC algorithm is performed from 250 random priors taken among the set of priors, with 50000 iterations retaining every 5000 iterations. This produces a set of 2500 samples coming from potentially different local minima zones which avoids a too high autocorrelation of the results.

- Since the first step is very time-consuming, further runs of the model are performed without a complete recalibration, by reusing the previous 2500 samples as the random set from which priors are taken and running a 10000 burning best-fit period before the MCMC step. This is a kind of data assimilation process. Recalibration should however be performed each time there is a major change in the model or in the policy.

C Estimated parameters

Timeline	Home	Work (with transport)	School	Leisure (with others)
Pre-pandemic: March 1 → March 13	1	1	1	1
School and leisure closed: March 14 → March 18	1	1	0	$C_{\text{leisurelock}}$
Full lockdown: March 19 → May 3	C_{homelock}	C_{worklock}	0	$C_{\text{leisurelock}}$
Phase 1A: May 4 → May 10	$\frac{C_{\text{homelock}}+C_{\text{homeunlock}}}{2}$	$\frac{C_{\text{worklock}}+C_{\text{workunlock}}}{2}$	0	$C_{\text{leisurelock}}$
Phase 1B: May 11 → May 17	$\frac{C_{\text{homelock}}+C_{\text{homeunlock}}}{2}$	$C_{\text{workunlock}}$	0	$C_{\text{leisurelock}}$
Phase 2: May 18 → May 24	$\frac{C_{\text{homelock}}+C_{\text{homeunlock}}}{2}$	$C_{\text{workunlock}}$	$0.2 \times C_{\text{schoolunlock}}$	$C_{\text{leisurelock}}$
Phase 2: May 25 → June 1	$\frac{C_{\text{homelock}}+C_{\text{homeunlock}}}{2}$	$C_{\text{workunlock}}$	$0.4 \times C_{\text{schoolunlock}}$	$C_{\text{leisurelock}}$
Phase 2: June 2 → June 7	$\frac{C_{\text{homelock}}+C_{\text{homeunlock}}}{2}$	$C_{\text{workunlock}}$	$0.6 \times C_{\text{schoolunlock}}$	$C_{\text{leisurelock}}$
Phase 3: June 8 → June 30	$C_{\text{homeunlock}}$	$C_{\text{workunlock}}$	$C_{\text{schoolunlock}}$	$C_{\text{leisurejune}}$
Phase 4: July 1 → June 28	$C_{\text{homeunlock}}$	$C_{\text{workunlock}}$	0	$C_{\text{leisurejuly}}$
Phase 4bis: July 29 → Augustus 31	$C_{\text{homeunlock}}$	$C_{\text{workunlock}}$	0	$C_{\text{leisureaug}}$
Forecasts: September 1 → June 30	$C_{\text{homeunlock}}$	$C_{\text{workunlock}}$	? (with holidays)	$C_{\text{leisureaug}}+?$

Parameter	Short description	Prior (SD)	Step (SD)	Mean	Median	90% confidence interval
p_0	initial value	$0.0002 \pm 5 \times 10^{-5}$	5×10^{-7}	0.000151868769	0.000154263068	[0.000075572537 ; 0.000218255045]
λ_a	transmission (asympt)	$0.04 \pm 1 \times 10^{-2}$	1×10^{-4}	0.058248665262	0.058515827912	[0.052433440808 ; 0.063935553809]
λ_s	transmission (sympt)	$0.04 \pm 1 \times 10^{-2}$	1×10^{-4}	0.063461590711	0.063401301724	[0.055349335466 ; 0.071707834532]
σ	latent period^{-1}	$0.5 \pm 1 \times 10^{-1}$	1×10^{-3}	0.649272060692	0.647724558732	[0.520924474240 ; 0.786461724944]
τ	presympt period^{-1}	$0.2 \pm 5 \times 10^{-2}$	5×10^{-4}	0.173244745562	0.172100192619	[0.144465556013 ; 0.204528188152]
$p_{a\,(0-24)}$	proba asympt	$0.8 \pm 1 \times 10^{-1}$	1×10^{-3}	0.836632834108	0.831403851957	[0.704199778555 ; 0.952907554511]
$p_{a\,(25-44)}$	proba asympt	$0.7 \pm 1 \times 10^{-1}$	1×10^{-3}	0.772945299972	0.775915588148	[0.642720849650 ; 0.901400118101]
$p_{a\,(45-64)}$	proba asympt	$0.6 \pm 1 \times 10^{-1}$	1×10^{-3}	0.665870975933	0.658694964212	[0.579932848910 ; 0.765828384502]
$p_{a\,(65-74)}$	proba asympt	$0.5 \pm 1 \times 10^{-1}$	1×10^{-3}	0.545247065828	0.549460113122	[0.443231427657 ; 0.633283302941]
$p_{a\,(75+)}$	proba asympt	$0.4 \pm 1 \times 10^{-1}$	1×10^{-3}	0.355440902373	0.351447922678	[0.260692900012 ; 0.454496752771]
$p_{a\,h}$	proba asympt	$0.3 \pm 1 \times 10^{-1}$	1×10^{-3}	0.312599704930	0.306792444447	[0.226181324918 ; 0.418705867657]
$\delta_{(0-24)}$	hospitalisation rate	$0.04 \pm 1 \times 10^{-2}$	1×10^{-4}	0.004928892084	0.003835580676	[0.001592986228 ; 0.011758589162]
$\delta_{(25-44)}$	hospitalisation rate	$0.045 \pm 1 \times 10^{-2}$	1×10^{-4}	0.007424463619	0.005768025773	[0.003164437922 ; 0.015436662119]
$\delta_{(45-64)}$	hospitalisation rate	$0.05 \pm 1 \times 10^{-2}$	1×10^{-4}	0.015181986466	0.014184552637	[0.009702120906 ; 0.024404460853]
$\delta_{(65-74)}$	hospitalisation rate	$0.055 \pm 1 \times 10^{-2}$	1×10^{-4}	0.041074273784	0.040474320875	[0.031959253795 ; 0.050997374282]
$\delta_{(75+)}$	hospitalisation rate	$0.06 \pm 1 \times 10^{-2}$	1×10^{-4}	0.060603652616	0.060512413255	[0.051729627811 ; 0.069485135635]
δ_h	hospitalisation rate	$0.065 \pm 1 \times 10^{-2}$	1×10^{-4}	0.066059595994	0.065842201438	[0.058310241636 ; 0.074156766269]
$\gamma_{a\,(0-24)}$	recover rate (asympt)	$0.29 \pm 5 \times 10^{-2}$	5×10^{-4}	0.293048444349	0.289270221627	[0.243581058498 ; 0.353342294943]
$\gamma_{a\,(25-44)}$	recover rate (asympt)	$0.27 \pm 5 \times 10^{-2}$	5×10^{-4}	0.253823614028	0.248969829999	[0.212281492070 ; 0.303396613494]
$\gamma_{a\,(45-64)}$	recover rate (asympt)	$0.25 \pm 5 \times 10^{-2}$	5×10^{-4}	0.231085191711	0.226544242772	[0.191256427174 ; 0.278159814139]
$\gamma_{a\,(65-74)}$	recover rate (asympt)	$0.23 \pm 5 \times 10^{-2}$	5×10^{-4}	0.210267478021	0.206059677617	[0.168601896852 ; 0.259761675861]
$\gamma_{a\,(75+)}$	recover rate (asympt)	$0.21 \pm 5 \times 10^{-2}$	5×10^{-4}	0.178119040187	0.175427009382	[0.130257833037 ; 0.234636644709]
$\gamma_{a\,h}$	recover rate (asympt)	$0.19 \pm 5 \times 10^{-2}$	5×10^{-4}	0.050490404401	0.049453885013	[0.034177563724 ; 0.069778916367]
$\gamma_{s\,(0-24)}$	recover rate (sympt)	$0.29 \pm 5 \times 10^{-2}$	5×10^{-4}	0.350289320864	0.338035804229	[0.276367720557 ; 0.487726328071]
$\gamma_{s\,(25-44)}$	recover rate (sympt)	$0.27 \pm 5 \times 10^{-2}$	5×10^{-4}	0.273957747879	0.275933176934	[0.206838040449 ; 0.331587304517]
$\gamma_{s\,(45-64)}$	recover rate (sympt)	$0.25 \pm 5 \times 10^{-2}$	5×10^{-4}	0.245018191886	0.243196684733	[0.193126857964 ; 0.294378801217]
$\gamma_{s\,(65-74)}$	recover rate (sympt)	$0.23 \pm 5 \times 10^{-2}$	5×10^{-4}	0.220625856921	0.217944872180	[0.176850798666 ; 0.273062517496]
$\gamma_{s\,(75+)}$	recover rate (sympt)	$0.21 \pm 5 \times 10^{-2}$	5×10^{-4}	0.197406040753	0.196937741512	[0.159013583584 ; 0.231549479557]
$\gamma_{s\,h}$	recover rate (sympt)	$0.19 \pm 5 \times 10^{-2}$	5×10^{-4}	0.185476971730	0.186757989601	[0.150451155461 ; 0.217854838518]
$\gamma_{q\,(0-24)}$	recover rate (hosp)	$0.07 \pm 1 \times 10^{-2}$	1×10^{-4}	0.056944494980	0.056375043910	[0.049287389226 ; 0.066173158673]
$\gamma_{q\,(25-44)}$	recover rate (hosp)	$0.06 \pm 1 \times 10^{-2}$	1×10^{-4}	0.050785467694	0.050579710225	[0.046575654301 ; 0.055754150116]
$\gamma_{q\,(45-64)}$	recover rate (hosp)	$0.05 \pm 1 \times 10^{-2}$	1×10^{-4}	0.049522985728	0.049183636214	[0.045638711036 ; 0.054402296709]
$\gamma_{q\,(65-74)}$	recover rate (hosp)	$0.04 \pm 1 \times 10^{-2}$	1×10^{-4}	0.048218836933	0.047813308958	[0.044613682970 ; 0.052998660181]
$\gamma_{q\,(75+)}$	recover rate (hosp)	$0.03 \pm 1 \times 10^{-2}$	1×10^{-4}	0.046431811540	0.046194662386	[0.042574418346 ; 0.051003692136]
$\gamma_{q\,h}$	recover rate (hosp)	$0.02 \pm 1 \times 10^{-2}$	1×10^{-4}	0.044005500729	0.044132631455	[0.038873172590 ; 0.048877059384]
$r_{(0-24)}$	death rate (hosp)	$0.01 \pm 5 \times 10^{-3}$	5×10^{-5}	0.000540081115	0.000528901606	[0.000314228115 ; 0.000797331838]
$r_{(25-44)}$	death rate (hosp)	$0.015 \pm 5 \times 10^{-3}$	5×10^{-5}	0.003111268092	0.003141744441	[0.002204647613 ; 0.003915175531]
$r_{(45-64)}$	death rate (hosp)	$0.02 \pm 5 \times 10^{-3}$	5×10^{-5}	0.012678871842	0.012516956993	[0.009638850765 ; 0.016143878307]
$r_{(65-74)}$	death rate (hosp)	$0.025 \pm 5 \times 10^{-3}$	5×10^{-5}	0.034990288979	0.035461775146	[0.026672263304 ; 0.042828955744]
$r_{(75+)}$	death rate (hosp)	$0.03 \pm 5 \times 10^{-3}$	5×10^{-5}	0.038271324761	0.038482703295	[0.029929106385 ; 0.047323372158]
r_h	death rate (hosp)	$0.035 \pm 5 \times 10^{-3}$	5×10^{-5}	0.054466322103	0.052278018062	[0.045815260852 ; 0.069050059543]
$\tilde{r}_h$	death rate (homes)	$0.02 \pm 5 \times 10^{-3}$	5×10^{-5}	0.064815250486	0.062368997791	[0.057097969819 ; 0.079883877596]
P_{recovery}	care improvement	$0.4 \pm 5 \times 10^{-1}$	5×10^{-3}	0.716253601565	0.722013428035	[0.624918313044 ; 0.785007094799]
μ_{recovery}	care improvement	$180 \pm 5 \times 10^{1}$	5×10^{-1}	47.78187161472	46.57413595271	[33.52465525295 ; 66.10287891054]
s_{recovery}	care improvement	$30 \pm 5 \times 10^{1}$	5×10^{-1}	30.85147007590	31.03421582038	[23.70142037615 ; 37.86335550850]
SUPP_{hosp}	supplementary entries	$1.15 \pm 1 \times 10^{-1}$	1×10^{-3}	1.172964886274	1.168690783378	[1.113195526614 ; 1.243852793801]
μ_{hosp}	variable hosp. policy	$5000 \pm 1 \times 10^{3}$	1×10^{1}	1944.264413093	1876.942904177	[1170.039771158 ; 2899.753820370]
s_{hosp}	variable hosp. policy	$5000 \pm 1 \times 10^{3}$	1×10^{1}	1334.588744666	1314.075691866	[895.180548084 ; 1921.582945662]
P_{delay}	variable hosp. policy	$30 \pm 5 \times 10^{1}$	5×10^{-1}	11.56870748673	11.56367648310	[9.62933794878 ; 13.59967593210]
P_{cor}	covid-19 related deaths	$0.8 \pm 1 \times 10^{-1}$	1×10^{-3}	0.839446328348	0.846972908837	[0.754332599949 ; 0.894945619457]
P_{th}	transmission to homes	$1.5 \pm 2 \times 10^{-1}$	2×10^{-4}	1.902455175618	1.878469231914	[1.530831218327 ; 2.329693501927]
P'_{th}	transmission to homes	$0.4 \pm 5 \times 10^{-2}$	5×10^{-4}	0.704521016565	0.709722589618	[0.625343608848 ; 0.786666844929]
m_h	transmission in homes	$0.3 \pm 5 \times 10^{-2}$	5×10^{-4}	0.145520937024	0.150886692524	[0.038118921382 ; 0.241904929576]
C_{homelock}	contacts coefficient	$0.5 \pm 2 \times 10^{-2}$	2×10^{-4}	0.468723190588	0.468238026480	[0.429684840555 ; 0.506697845772]
C_{worklock}	contacts coefficient	$0.1 \pm 2 \times 10^{-2}$	2×10^{-4}	0.061342085999	0.059689127708	[0.034011963269 ; 0.090660007505]
$C_{\text{leisurelock}}$	contacts coefficient	$0.1 \pm 2 \times 10^{-2}$	2×10^{-4}	0.069336100767	0.069034582247	[0.045754129283 ; 0.094060582658]
$C_{\text{homeunlock}}$	contacts coefficient	$0.55 \pm 2 \times 10^{-2}$	2×10^{-4}	0.504489162784	0.506699830010	[0.460671030421 ; 0.545470996217]
$C_{\text{workunlock}}$	contacts coefficient	$0.15 \pm 2 \times 10^{-2}$	2×10^{-4}	0.085670799387	0.085713027900	[0.046323090482 ; 0.127919351785]
$C_{\text{schoolunlock}}$	contacts coefficient	$0.15 \pm 2 \times 10^{-2}$	2×10^{-4}	0.278096285564	0.250388792461	[0.207831172234 ; 0.485053241264]
$C_{\text{leisurejune}}$	contacts coefficient	$0.15 \pm 2 \times 10^{-2}$	2×10^{-4}	0.103843393788	0.100525501864	[0.068985849840 ; 0.147603707341]
$C_{\text{leisurejuly}}$	contacts coefficient	$0.25 \pm 2 \times 10^{-2}$	2×10^{-4}	0.507076950168	0.513091459653	[0.429743976334 ; 0.558988272333]
$C_{\text{leisureaug}}$	contacts coefficient	$0.2 \pm 2 \times 10^{-1}$	2×10^{-3}	0.139830639440	0.134955678051	[0.088487483595 ; 0.211639498145]

References

[1] K. Rock, S. Brand, J. Moir and M. Keeling, *Dynamics of infectious diseases*, Rep. Prog. Phys. 77 026602 (2014), doi:10.1088/0034-4885/77/2/026602.

[2] L. Peng, W. Yang, D. Zhang, C. Zhuge and L. Hong, *Epidemic analysis of COVID-19 in China by dynamical modeling*, medRxiv, doi:10.1101/2020.02.16.20023465.

[3] W. Yang, D. Zhang, L. Peng, C. Zhuge and L. Hong, *Rational evaluation of various epidemic models based on the COVID-19 data of China*, medRxiv, doi:10.1101/2020.03.12.20034595.

[4] S. Abrams, J. Wambua, E. Santermans, et al., *Modeling the early phase of the Belgian COVID-19 epidemic using a stochastic compartmental model and studying its implied future trajectories*, medRxiv, doi:10.1101/2020.06.29.20142851.

[5] T.W. Alleman, J. Vergeynst, E. Torfs, D.I. Gonzalez, I. Nopens and J.M. Baetens, *A deterministic, age-stratified, extended SEIRD model for assessing the effect of non-pharmaceutical interventions on SARS-CoV-2 spread in Belgium*, medRxiv, doi:10.1101/2020.07.17.20156034.

[6] K. Barbé, S. Blotwijk and W. Cools, *Data-driven epidemiological model to monitor the sustainability of hospital care*, VUB Covid19 Technical Note No. ICDS043020, 2020.

[7] P. Coletti, P. Libin, O. Petrof, S. Abrams et al., *COVID-19 report on a meta-population model for Belgium: a first status report*, `https://www.uhasselt.be/Images/DSI/report_meta.pdf`.

[8] L. Willem, T.V. Hoang , S. Funk, P. Coletti, P. Beutels and N.Hens, *Socrates: An online tool leveraging a social contact data sharing initiative to assess mitigation strategies for covid-19*, BMC Res Notes 13, 293 (2020), doi:10.1186/s13104-020-05136-9.

[9] Sciensano, Datasets and epidemiological reports `https://epistat.wiv-isp.be/covid/`.

[10] StatBel, Belgian Federal Government, Structure of the Population `https://statbel.fgov.be/en/themes/population/structure-population`.

[11] L. Willem, K. Van Kerckhove, D.L. Chao , N. Hens , R. Beutels, *A Nice Day for an Infection? Weather Conditions and Social Contact Patterns Relevant to Influenza Transmission*, PLoS ONE 7(11): e48695 (2012), doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0048695.

[12] O. Diekmann, J.A.P. Heesterbeek and J.A.J Metz,*On the definition and the computation of the basic reproduction ratio R0 in models for infectious diseases in heterogeneous populations*, Journal of mathematical biology, 28(4):365–382 (1990). doi:10.1007/BF00178324.

[13] O. Diekmann, J.A.P. Heesterbeek and M.G. Roberts, *The construction of next-generation matrices for compartmental epidemic models*, Journal of the Royal Society, Interface, 7(47):873–885, (2010), doi:10.1098/rsif.2009.0386.

[14] W. K. Hastings, *Monte Carlo sampling methods using Markov chains and their applications*, Biometrika 57, Issue 1 (1970), 97–109, doi:10.1093/biomet/57.1.97

[15] "Plateforme Technologique de calcul Intensif" (PTCI) located at the University of Namur, Belgium.