

# Understanding soaring coronavirus cases and the effect of contagion policies in the UK

Miguel A. Durán-Olivencia<sup>a,1</sup> and Serafim Kalliadasis<sup>a,1</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Chemical Engineering, Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ, UK

This manuscript was compiled on January 30, 2021

1 The number of new daily SARS-CoV-2 infections is frantically rising  
2 in almost every country of the EU. The phenomenological explanation  
3 offered is a new mutation of the virus, first identified in the UK.  
4 We use publicly available data in combination with a controlled SIR  
5 model, which captures the effects of preventive measures on the active  
6 cases, to show that the current wave of infections is consistent with  
7 a single transmission rate. This suggests that the new SARS-CoV-2  
8 variant is as transmissible as previous strains. Our findings indicate  
9 that the relaxation of preventive measures is closely related with the  
10 ongoing surge in cases. We simulate the effects of new restrictions  
11 and vaccination campaigns in 2021, demonstrating that lockdown  
12 policies are not fully effective to flatten the curve. For effective  
13 mitigation, it is critical that the public keeps on high alert until  
14 vaccination reaches a critical threshold.

1 The susceptible-infectious-recovered (SIR) model (1)  
2 (Fig. 1.a), is a popular vanilla model for computational scrutiny  
3 used in numerous studies, often to estimate the characteristic  
4 transmission rate of SARS-CoV-2. However, despite its flexibility  
5 and mathematical elegance, the model introduces some important  
6 limitations. To determine whether new variants of the SARS-CoV-2  
7 are more transmissible than their predecessors, data analysis must  
8 cover the entire pandemic outbreak and include the effects of  
9 preventive measures and contagion policies taken by populations  
10 and governments, respectively. The model also does not account  
11 for the social preventive response which characterises the *new normal*,  
12 e.g. social distancing, mask wearing, limited commuting, remote  
13 working, or local curfews and lockdowns, to name but a few  
14 examples. Fitting data to a model which does not capture how  
15 these important social changes affect the spreading of the virus  
16 is not a reliable method to discern the transmission ( $\beta$ ), recovery  
17 ( $\alpha$ ) and basic reproductive ( $\mathcal{R}_0 = \frac{\beta}{\alpha}$ ) rates. For instance,  
18 different values of  $\mathcal{R}_0$  for the same virus with the same inherent  
19 properties under different social contexts, e.g. partial and full  
20 lockdown, are obtained. Data for the United Kingdom suggest  
21 much higher values for  $\beta$  and  $\mathcal{R}_0$  during September-December  
22 2020 if analysed under the SIR premises (2). Despite the good  
23 fitting of data achieved over limited temporal windows (2–5),  
24 there are two important limitations compromising the accuracy  
25 of the predictions: a) one cannot fit the whole temporal series,  
26 characterised by multiple infection waves, and indeed the fit  
27 would eventually diverge; and b) the SIR model, or the equivalent  
28 logistic growth model (2), would never forecast a second or  
29 further upsurge in cases. Refined SIR models to include  
30 additional factors, such as “shield immunity” (6), do not come  
31 to our rescue. Indeed, despite their increased flexibility they  
32 are still only capable of showing a single wave. Additionally,  
33 many studies fitted SIR-like models to data from the last stages  
34 of the first wave – even though the models





Fig. 1. Sketch of transitions in (a) free and (b) controlled SIR network model of disease transmission, and (c) preventive social response,  $\mathfrak{A}(t)$ .

suffer from the inherent limitation of a single-wave prediction – thus effectively assuming that the epidemic was coming to an end. Yet it was already known at the time that the number of cases was decreasing because of the preventive measures which in turn should have been sufficient to abandon the corresponding models. Thus, current studies are incomplete and an alternative approach is necessary.

The main results of the present work are as follows. Consideration of the full-history of the data with a *controlled* SIR model (Fig. 1.b) avoids the drawbacks of previous models, by capturing the essence of how the new normal affects the number of infected people. This unveils unique and constant  $\beta$  and  $\mathcal{R}_0$  for the entire pandemic. Thousands of mutations have emerged in the SARS-CoV-2 genome since the first outbreak in 2019, and only the UK strain, known as B.1.1.7, is being reported as a more “aggressive” form of the virus, because of an alarming surge in new cases thought to be correlated with the new UK variant, and was one the reasons for the lockdown imposed in the UK at the beginning of 2021, e.g. Ref. (7). According to the law of parsimony: chose the simplest explanation from those that fit. Indeed, our results show that the fierce increase in cases is captured without the need of a more transmissible variant, suggesting that genomic data during the pandemic might have been overinterpreted. Our approach includes characteristic parameters which could be pivotal in the decision-making process in the coming months. For instance, there seems to be an *inertia of society* which plays a crucial role on the flattening of the curve. For preventive measures to be effective, these should be encouraged quite early in the surge of cases, taking into consideration the inherent social inertia, which typically leads up to three-week delay up until society gets to its maximum level of alert. We also include the effect of vaccination, and show that *social relaxation* as of March 2021 without fulfilling a sufficient vaccination rate

All authors contributed equally to this work.  
The authors declare no competing interest.




**Fig. 2.** SARS-CoV-2 new daily cases (left axis): blue circles for first-wave data used to fit free and controlled SIR models (light-blue lines), red circles for second- and third-wave data used to test the models and their predictions (light-blue dashed lines). (a) Free SIR model captures the essence of the time evolution of new CoVid-19 cases over March-July 2020 (inset plot), but totally fails to predict the second and third waves. (b) Controlled SIR model without vaccination fits better to first-wave data (inset plot) than the free version. The gray area represents the effectiveness of preventive measures,  $\mathfrak{A}(t)$  (right axis). The first wave of social awareness is fit together with  $\beta$  and  $\alpha$ , showing a maximum of effectiveness  $\eta_1 \simeq 65\%$ , social inertia  $\delta_i \simeq 21$  d, and social relaxation starting at mid June 2020, with prediction of no measures in  $\delta_r \simeq 45$  d after relaxation begins. The second wave of social awareness begins in September (confirmed by Prime Minister (9)), reaching  $\eta_2 \simeq 60\%$  by mid October 2020 (three-tier system was introduced (10)). The upsurge of CoVid-19 cases in December 2020 is again a consequence of social relaxation. (c)-(e) Controlled SIR model with vaccination rates:  $0.1\%d^{-1}$ ,  $0.2\%d^{-1}$ , and  $0.4\%d^{-1}$ , respectively, along with a third-wave of preventive measures (expected to reach maximum effectiveness,  $\eta_3 = 70\%$ , by the mid January 2021). To avoid a fourth wave, the vaccination campaign would need to deliver  $\sim 200 \times 10^3$  vaccines per day ( $\sim 0.4\%N/d$ ) as of the first week of January 2021.

70 (determined below) will lead to a new wave of infections over  
 71 May-June 2021, independently of the more strict lockdown  
 72 currently imposed since January 2021.

73 Figure 2 reports curve fits and predictions of the free and  
 74 controlled SIR models. The free version (Fig. 1.a) fits well the  
 75 data of the first wave of infections from March to June 2020,  
 76 but completely fails to predict any second or further wave. This  
 77 is because in a free SIR model the decay of the infected cases  
 78 is only possible when the pandemic is already in recession. [As  
 79 we know now and back in June 2020, this was not the reason  
 80 for the decrease in cases back then; rather the reduction of  
 81 susceptible people is due to preventive measures.] Yet has been  
 82 a standard way of extracting estimates for  $\beta$ ,  $\alpha$  and  $\mathcal{R}_0$ . Some  
 83 works even published estimates for these quantities via manual  
 84 fitting to data (5), effectively a trial-and-error approach. The  
 85 authors justified this by asserting that a rigorous non-linear  
 86 fitting did not follow the data as close as their approach.

70 However, instead of imposing the SIR model and changing  
 71 the fitting method to achieve agreement with the model, the  
 72 disagreement with a nonlinear fit means that they should have  
 73 abandoned the model.  
 74

75 Not only does the controlled SIR model fits better the first-  
 76 wave data (inset plot, Fig. 2.b), but also captures the reason for  
 77 the decrease in cases from mid April to August 2020, namely  
 78 a wave of *social awareness* ( $\mathfrak{A}$ ) which effectively reduced the  
 79 number of susceptible people.  $\mathfrak{A}$  embodies both contagion  
 80 policies and the citizens efforts made to “flatten the curve”, e.g.  
 81 wearing masks, reducing travelling or self-isolating. Moreover,  
 82 the model predicts a sudden rise in cases when society relaxes,  
 83 because the downtrend in new infections is not related with  
 84 the end of the pandemic but with a temporary removal of  
 85 susceptible candidates from the system. This is precisely what  
 86 happened from July to September 2020, and what eventually  
 87 led to the surge in cases in early September 2020. This sharp  
 88  
 89  
 90  
 91  
 92  
 93  
 94  
 95  
 96  
 97  
 98  
 99  
 100  
 101  
 102  
 103



**Fig. 3.** Daily new cases (7-day moving average): UK (blue), Spain (red) and Italy (green).

$$\mathfrak{A}(t) = \sum_k \eta^k \left\{ \left( 1 + \operatorname{erf} \left( \frac{t-t_0^k}{\delta_i} \right) \right) - \left( 1 + \operatorname{erf} \left( \frac{t-(t_0^k+T^k)}{\delta_r} \right) \right) \right\}, \quad 138$$

where  $\eta^k \in [0, 1]$  is the effectiveness of the preventive measures taken in the  $k$ -th wave,  $T^k$  is related to the time extension of these measures, and  $\delta_{i,r}$  are the social inertia ( $i$ ) and relaxation ( $r$ ) time scales, respectively. With  $\mathfrak{A} = 0$  and  $\nu = 0$ , Eq. (1) becomes the free SIR model. For  $\mathfrak{A} \neq 0$  we get a controlled SIR model. The initial condition used:  $I_0 = 1$  (number of infective cases reported on January 11, 2020),  $S_0 = N - I_0$  and  $R_0 = V_0 = 0$ . Thus fitting of five parameters is needed, and this is done at the first wave. 146

**Training and testing the model.** The full dataset,  $Y$ , was re-normalised  $\tilde{Y}$ , by using a linear fit,  $z = b + mx$ , to the number of daily CoVid-19 tests per thousand people given in Ref. (11), with  $b = 0$  and  $m = 0.0191 \text{ test}/10^3 \text{ people/d}$  (from 0 to 7 test/ $10^3$  people in 366 days), so that  $\tilde{Y} = (1 + (\frac{1}{z} - \frac{1}{z_{\text{last}}}))Y$ . We then use non-linear 151

least squares to fit the daily new cases  $\Delta = \frac{d(I+R)}{dt}$  to the first-wave data (training dataset). This fitting yields for the free model:  $\beta = 0.515 \text{d}^{-1}$  and  $\alpha = 0.420 \text{d}^{-1}$  so that  $\mathcal{R}_0 = \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \simeq 1.23$ . For the controlled model we get:  $\beta = 0.211 \text{d}^{-1}$ ,  $\alpha = 0.102 \text{d}^{-1}$ ,  $\eta = 0.65$ ,  $140 \text{d}$ ,  $\delta_a = 21 \text{d}$  and  $\delta_r = 45 \text{d}$ , which yields  $\mathcal{R}_0 \simeq 2.068$ . To test the models we numerically integrate Eq. (1) for both cases, i.e.,  $\mathfrak{A}(t) = 0$  and  $\mathfrak{A}(t) \neq 0$ . The controlled-model prediction for new infections grows exponentially as of September 2020 (testing dataset) when the first wave of preventive measures would vanish according to the summer trend. With  $\delta_{i,r}$  fixed from the first wave, we fit the parameters  $\eta$  and  $T$  of a second social response to unveil the behavioural changes adopted against the apparent second wave of cases, obtaining a maximum of social response by mid-end October 2020. This is in perfect agreement with the declaration of the UK Prime Minister “seeing a second wave” on September 18, 2020 (9), and his statement on coronavirus where the three-tier restrictions system was imposed on October 12, 2020 (10). For predictions as of January 2021, we introduce a third wave of measures aiming at an 70% of effectiveness, i.e.  $\eta = 0.70$ , starting in January and ending in April 2021,  $T = 90 \text{d}$ , which represents the current contagion policies being taken by the UK government. Finally, we adopt three potential values for  $\nu$ :  $\nu_1 = 0.1\% \text{d}^{-1} (\sim \frac{75 \times 10^3}{N} \text{d}^{-1})$ ,  $\nu_2 = 0.2\% \text{d}^{-1} (\sim \frac{120 \times 10^3}{N} \text{d}^{-1})$  and  $\nu_3 = 0.4\% \text{d}^{-1} (\sim \frac{200 \times 10^3}{N} \text{d}^{-1})$ , with  $\nu_3$  being the current vaccination target since January 2021 (13). 175

**Data Availability.** All data for the analysis was collected from <https://www.worldometers.info> 177

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.** We acknowledge financial support from the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council of the UK via grant No. EP/L020564/1. 180

1. W. O. Kermack, A. G. McKendrick, A Contribution to the Mathematical Theory of Epidemics. Proc. R. Soc. A. 115 (772): 700–721 (1927). 181
2. E. Volz, N. Ferguson, et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 Lineage B.1.1.7 in England: Insights from linking epidemiological and genetic data, pre-print. url: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2021/01/04/2020.12.30.20249034.1> 182
3. G. G. Katull, et al. Global convergence of COVID-19 basic reproduction number and estimation from early-time SIR dynamics, PLoS ONE 15(9): e0239800 (2020) 183
4. U. Nguemdo, F. Meno, A. Dongfack, B. Ventelou. Simulating the progression of the COVID-19 disease in Cameroon using SIR models. PLoS ONE 15(8): e0237832 (2020) 184
5. I. Cooper, A. Mondal, C. G. Antonopoulos. A SIR model assumption for the spread of COVID-19 in different communities, Chaos Soliton. Fract. 139: 110057 (2020) 185
6. J. S. Weitz, et al. Modeling shield immunity to reduce COVID-19 epidemic spread. Nat. Med. 26 849–854 (2020) 186
7. J. Macfarlane. New Covid strain UK: what are the symptoms of the new coronavirus variant - and will the vaccine still work? *The Scotsman*, 11 January 2021, <https://www.scotsman.com/health/coronavirus/new-covid-strain-uk-what-are-symptoms-new-coronavirus-variant-and-will-vaccine-still-work-3068541> 187
8. Coronavirus: Hancock concern over ‘sharp rise’ in cases, *BBC News* 8 September 2020, <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-54066831> 188
9. Covid: UK seeing second wave, says Boris Johnson, *BBC News* 18 September 2020, <https://www.bbc.com/news/av-uk-54213129> 189
10. PM Commons statement on coronavirus, *Prime Minister’s Office*, 12 October 2020, <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-commons-statement-on-coronavirus-12-october-2020> 190
11. J. Hasell, et al. A cross-country database of CoVid-19 testing. Sci. Data 7, 345 (2020). 191
12. B. Korber, et al. Tracking Changes in SARS-CoV-2 Spike: Evidence that D614G Increases Infectivity of the COVID-19 Virus, Cell 182, 812–827 (2020). 192

104 increase immediately raised the alarm (8, 9), and  $\mathfrak{A}$  started  
105 growing again, reaching a maximum effectiveness when the  
106 three-tier restrictions system was imposed (10). However, these  
107 measures were not enough to flatten the curve and a new  
108 increase appeared in December 2020 because of a gradual  
109 relaxation over the month of November. By incorporating  
110 new waves of preventive measures in  $\mathfrak{A}$  the model is able to  
111 reproduce the above observations, as illustrated in Figs 2.b-e.  
112 This provides evidence of the predictive capabilities of the  
113 model.

114 Figures 2.c-e reveal the effects of the third lockdown imposed  
115 on January 4, 2021 and of the vaccination campaign with rates  
116  $0.1\% \text{d}^{-1}$ ,  $0.2\% \text{d}^{-1}$ , and  $0.4\% \text{d}^{-1}$ , respectively. The  
117 trends illustrate that unless the campaign delivers  $\sim 200 \times 10^3$   
118 vaccines per day, a fourth wave is unavoidable. At the same  
119 time, if the vaccination rate is less than  $100 \times 10^3$  vaccines per  
120 day, the fourth wave will be as severe as previous ones.

121 Analysis of European countries’ data depicted in Fig.3,  
122 including countries severely hit by the pandemic, like Spain  
123 and Italy, reveals that virtually in all cases, the UK pattern  
124 persists and similar conclusions can be drawn. This means,  
125 social relaxation – typically two-to-three months – driving an  
126 abrupt increase of cases, followed by increased awareness and  
127 preventive measures leading to temporal stagnation, which is  
128 then followed by further growth, i.e. a third, more powerful,  
129 wave.

## 130 Methods

**Population dynamics.** The population is split into four groups: susceptible ( $S$ ), infected ( $I$ ), recovered ( $R$ ) and vaccinated ( $V$ ), as illustrated in Fig.1. The groups follow the delayed dynamical system:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dS}{dt} &= -\frac{SI}{N} (1 - \mathfrak{A}(t - \tau))\beta - \Theta(t - t_\nu) \nu N \\ \frac{dI}{dt} &= \frac{SI}{N} (1 - \mathfrak{A}(t - \tau))\beta - \alpha I \end{aligned} \quad [1]$$

131 where  $R + V = \int_0^t ds (\alpha I(s) + \nu N)$ ,  $N = S + I + R + V$  is the  
132 total population, assumed 60 million. The parameters  $\beta$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $\nu$   
133 are the transmission, recovery, and vaccination rates, respectively,  
134 and  $\mathfrak{A}(t - \tau)$  is the percentage of susceptible people using effective  
135 preventive measures at time  $t - \tau$ , ( $\tau$  being a characteristic  
136 time for such preventive measures to become apparent, assumed 14  
137 days, the incubation period,(14)) with general functional form:

- 208 13. M. Dathan, H. Cole, K. Ferguson, N. Clark. Boris Johnson vows to deliver 200,000  
209 vaccines a day by next week & every care home resident this month, *The Sun*, 7  
210 January 2021, [https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/13672615/covid-vaccine-press-conference-](https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/13672615/covid-vaccine-press-conference-boris-johnson-hundreds)  
211 [boris-johnson-hundreds](https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/13672615/covid-vaccine-press-conference-boris-johnson-hundreds)
- 212 14. S. A. Lauer SA, et al. The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) From  
213 Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and Application. *Ann Intern Med.* 172 (9):  
214 577-582 (2020)