

# 1 Impact of the Tier system on SARS-CoV-2 transmission in 2 the UK between the first and second national lockdowns

3  
4 *Daniel J Laydon<sup>1,\*</sup>, Swapnil Mishra<sup>1</sup>, Wes R Hinsley<sup>1</sup>, Pantelis Samartsidis<sup>2</sup>, Seth*  
5 *Flaxman<sup>3</sup>, Axel Gandy<sup>3</sup>, Neil M Ferguson<sup>1</sup>, Samir Bhatt<sup>1</sup>*

6  
7 <sup>1</sup> Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis, Jameel-  
8 Institute for Disease and Emergency Analytics, Imperial College London, School of Public Health, Norfolk Place,  
9 London, W2 1PG

10 <sup>2</sup> MRC Biostatistics Unit, Cambridge Institute of Public Health, Forvie Site, Robinson Way, Cambridge Biomedical  
11 Campus, CB2 0SR, United Kingdom

12 <sup>3</sup> Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, South Kensington Campus, London, SW7 2AZ

13 \*Corresponding Author: [d.laydon@imperial.ac.uk](mailto:d.laydon@imperial.ac.uk);

## 14 15 Abstract

16 **Objective:** Measure the effects of the Tier system on the COVID-19 pandemic in the  
17 UK between the first and second national lockdowns, before the emergence of the  
18 B.1.1.7 variant of concern.

19 **Design:** Modelling study combining estimates of the real-time reproduction number  $R_t$   
20 (derived from UK case, death and serological survey data) with publicly available data  
21 on regional non-pharmaceutical interventions. We fit a Bayesian hierarchical model  
22 with latent factors using these quantities, to account for broader national trends in  
23 addition to subnational effects from Tiers.

24 **Setting:** The UK at Lower Tier Local Authority (LTLA) level.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

25 **Primary and secondary outcome measures:** Reduction in real-time reproduction  
26 number  $R_t$ .

27 **Results:** Nationally, transmission increased between July and late September,  
28 regional differences notwithstanding. Immediately prior to the introduction of the tier  
29 system,  $R_t$  averaged 1.3 (0.9 – 1.6) across LTLAs, but declined to an average of 1.1  
30 (0.86 – 1.42) two weeks later. Decline in transmission was not solely attributable to  
31 Tiers. Tier 1 had negligible effects. Tiers 2 and 3 respectively reduced transmission by  
32 6% (5%-7%) and 23% (21%-25%). 93% of LTLAs would have begun to suppress their  
33 epidemics if every LTLA had gone into Tier 3 by the second national lockdown,  
34 whereas only 29% did so in reality.

35 **Conclusions:** The relatively small effect sizes found in this analysis demonstrate that  
36 interventions at least as stringent as Tier 3 are required to suppress transmission,  
37 especially considering more transmissible variants, at least until effective vaccination  
38 is widespread or much greater population immunity has amassed.

39

## 40 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 41 • First study to measure effects of UK Tier system for SARS-CoV-2 control at  
42 national and regional level.
- 43 • Model makes minimal assumptions and is primarily data driven.
- 44 • Insufficient statistical power to estimate effects of individual interventions that  
45 comprise Tiers, or their interaction.
- 46 • Estimates show that Tiers 1 and 2 are insufficient to suppress transmission, at  
47 least until widespread population immunity has amassed. Emergence of more  
48 transmissible variants of concern unfortunately supports this conclusion.

## 49 Introduction

50 There is substantial evidence supporting the effectiveness of government mandated  
51 social distancing (so-called “lockdown”) measures [1-5] in suppressing SARS-CoV-2  
52 transmission. The massive economic and social cost of these measures in the United  
53 Kingdom motivated the less socially disruptive Tier system, introduced on 14<sup>th</sup> October  
54 2020 [6]. Its aim was to provide a consistent set of COVID-19 control measures with  
55 geographic flexibility. Tiers consist of multiple non-pharmaceutical interventions  
56 (NPIs), and were determined by Lower Tier Local Authorities (LTLAs) in response to  
57 their local transmission intensity. Tiers were inconsistently defined across LTLAs, e.g.  
58 some LTLAs left gyms and fitness centres open under in Tier 1, while most did not.  
59 There is currently little evidence of the effectiveness or otherwise of the UK Tier  
60 system, which ran until the second national lockdown on 5<sup>th</sup> November 2020, before  
61 the emergence of the more transmissible variant of concern B.1.1.7.

62

63 Estimating the effect of the Tiers on underlying transmission is challenging, due to lags  
64 between their implementation and any change in cases, deaths, and the results of  
65 serological surveys. Therefore, estimating effect sizes by using only raw data can  
66 produce spurious results. Semi-mechanistic modelling that combines a transmission  
67 model with statistical modelling of transmission provides an alternative. There are two  
68 common approaches, estimating effect sizes directly within a semi-mechanistic  
69 transmission model [1], or estimating effect sizes in two stages [4]. by first  
70 nonparametrically estimating  $R_t$  and then performing a more classical regression  
71 analysis. Both approaches have their strengths and weaknesses from a statistical  
72 viewpoint. From a computational perspective, however, full Bayesian modelling of a  
73 semi-mechanistic model across more than 300 LTLAs is not tractable. In this work, we

74 therefore adopt a two-stage approach. Leveraging our existing LTLA transmission  
75 intensity estimation platform [7], we first estimate  $R_t$  (the rate of transmission, i.e. the  
76 number of secondary infections per infection at time  $t$ ) using data on cases, deaths  
77 and serology. We model  $R_t$  as a weekly random process, making no assumptions on  
78 the effect or timing of interventions, and incorporate a wide range of data synthesis  
79 mechanisms. We further collate publicly available data on NPIs and Tiers at LTLA  
80 level. We combine these two sources of information to fit a Bayesian hierarchical  
81 model and estimate the effects of the UK Tier system between the first and second  
82 national lockdowns.

83

## 84 Methods

### 85 Collation of intervention data by LTLA

86 We compiled a list of the interventions implemented by each LTLA over time between  
87 1<sup>st</sup> July 2020 and 5<sup>th</sup> November 2020. Data was obtained by monitoring the following  
88 government sources:

- 89 • [https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/local-restrictions-areas-with-an-](https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/local-restrictions-areas-with-an-outbreak-of-coronavirus-covid-19)  
90 [outbreak-of-coronavirus-covid-19](https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/local-restrictions-areas-with-an-outbreak-of-coronavirus-covid-19)
- 91 • <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/full-list-of-local-covid-alert-levels-by-area>,

92 and amending the interventions and Tiers that LTLAs were subject to accordingly.

93

### 94 Back-dating Tier classification

95 Since the Tier classification came into place on 14<sup>th</sup> October 2020, a strict evaluation  
96 of the effects of Tiers would limit our analysis to only 21 days until the second national

97 lockdown on 5<sup>th</sup> November. However, the interventions that comprise a given Tier  
98 were in place earlier. We therefore retrospectively assign a Tier rating to LTLAs from  
99 1<sup>st</sup> July 2020, when restrictions of the first national lockdown were lifted for the majority  
100 of the UK. The challenge is that the exact interventions that were implemented under  
101 Tiers 1, 2 and 3 varied firstly between LTLAs, and secondly over time. We determine  
102 the interventions that comprise a given Tier (and thus which Tier a given LTLA would  
103 have been in before the creation of the Tier system) using the number of LTLAs that  
104 implemented a given intervention on the day Tiers 1-3 were applied.

105

## 106 [Real-time reproduction number estimates](#)

107 Full details of the  $R_t$  estimation can be found in [7]. Briefly however, the method  
108 estimates transmission by calculating backwards from observed deaths (day of death),  
109 cases and serological survey data while simultaneously allowing for the time lag  
110 between infection and death. Infection fatality ratios and infection ascertainment rates  
111 are also calibrated nationally. The method accounts for noise in the data, noise in the  
112 stochastic process, lags in reporting, and day of the week variation.

113

## 114 [Hierarchical Model](#)

115 With  $R_t$  estimates for weekly time points  $t = 1, \dots, \tau$  ( $\tau = 19$  weeks between July 1<sup>st</sup>  
116 2020 and November 4<sup>th</sup> 2020) and for each individual LTLA indexed by  $m = 1, \dots, M$ ,  
117 ( $M = 310$  individual local authorities), we use a regression model to estimate the effect  
118 size of the introduction of Tiers. Specifically, for each LTLA  $m$ , we have a response  
119 variable  $y_m \in \mathbb{R}^\tau$  of  $R_t$  values, and a binary design matrix  $x_m \in \mathbb{1}^{\tau \times 3}$ , where each  
120 column corresponds to the back dated Tier 1, 2 or 3, and the indicator function is a

121 binary toggle for whether an LTLA is in a given Tier on a given date. Defining Tiers  
122 cumulatively (e.g. if an LTLA is in Tier 2 then it is also in Tier 1), makes little difference  
123 to our results. We propose a latent factor model that estimates the effect of Tiers, but  
124 that also accounts for confounding from other factors. We name these other factors  
125 secular trends, and they represent changes in transmission due to individual or wider  
126 societal behavioural changes along with LTLA idiosyncrasies and demographics, that  
127 are not part of the formal Tier system.

128

129 The linear model specification is:

$$\begin{aligned} y_m &\sim \text{Normal}(\mu_m, \sigma) \\ \mu_m &= \exp(\lambda \alpha_m^T - \beta x_m^T) \\ \beta &\sim \text{Normal}^+(0, \phi_1) \\ \alpha_m &\sim \text{Normal}^+(0, \phi_2) \\ \lambda &\sim \text{Normal}^+(0, \phi_3) \\ \phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3 &\sim \text{Normal}^+(0, 2) \\ \sigma &\sim \text{Normal}^+(0, 2) \end{aligned}$$

131

132 In the absence of LTLA-mandated interventions, a given LTLA  $m$  has a trend  $\lambda \alpha_m^T$  in  
133 its reproduction number over time  $R_t$ . The above model is multiplicative: tiers reduce  
134 the  $R_t$  trend  $\lambda \alpha_m^T$  by a factor of  $\exp(-\beta x_m^T)$ , for  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^3$ . The secular trends  $\lambda \alpha_m^T$  can be  
135 factorised into two basis functions with internal dimension  $b$ , i.e.  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{\tau \times b}$  and  $\alpha_m \in$   
136  $\mathbb{R}^b$ . This factorisation enforces shared trends across all LTLAs. The internal dimension  
137  $b$  can be interpreted as the number of factors or categories that each LTLA has (to  
138 varying extents), in addition to the Tiers, that may influence transmission intensity.  $b$   
139 can also be interpreted as the number of ways in which regional  $R_t$  values can differ  
140 from national values. Model flexibility and complexity increases with  $b$ , and we set  $b =$   
141 2. Note that the  $\lambda$  has the same values for all LTLAs, while each  $\alpha_m$  basis differs by  
142 LTLA  $m$ . The first column in the basis function  $\lambda$  is an intercept, and the second are  $\tau$

143 independent parameters. Normal shrinkage priors are used for  $\lambda$  to balance over and  
144 under fitting. Conceptually, the intercept component of the basis matrix  $\lambda$  accounts for  
145 different LTLA starting values in  $R_t$ , which could be due to different demographics,  
146 behaviour, or contact patterns.

147

148 The second basis  $\alpha_m$  scales and moves the national secular trend for a given LTLA.  
149 The secular trend broadly corresponds to changes over time due to behaviour and  
150 other national policies that are independent from the Tiers (such as “the rule of six”).  
151 However, the absolute impact of the national trend can vary by LTLA. That is, the  
152 overall shape of trend is shared nationally, but its magnitude and starting value can  
153 differ across LTLAs. As well as being relatively parsimonious, this formulation captures  
154 the interdependence of  $R_t$  values between LTLAs, while not assuming any *a priori*  
155 relationship between LTLAs.

156

157 It is possible to allow for a larger internal dimension value  $b$ , but given that our  $R_t$   
158 estimates and back-dated Tiers consist of only 22 weeks of data for each LTLA,  
159 increasing  $b$  risks overfitting. With greater internal dimension, the model is too flexible  
160 and so the data will struggle to separate the effects of the Tiers  $\beta x_m^T$  from the  
161 underlying trend in each LTLA’s transmission  $\lambda \alpha_m^T$ . Such additional model complexity  
162 spuriously nullifies the effects of Tiers. Alternative bases for  $\lambda$  such as b-splines could  
163 be used, but we opted for a non-structured basis to limit *a priori* assumptions. Partial  
164 pooling of  $\beta$ , whereby the effects of Tiers would differ by LTLA, was investigated but  
165 did not produce significant differences between LTLAs.

166

167 We conducted a sensitivity analysis on the priors of the hyperparameters  $\varphi_1$ ,  $\varphi_2$ ,  $\varphi_3$ ,  
168 and  $\sigma$  of the hierarchical model (which respectively inform values for Tier coefficients,  
169 LTLA-specific scaling of the secular trend, the secular trend itself, and random noise  
170 around the resulting  $R_t$  values). In our main model these are given as positive normal  
171 distributions with standard deviations of 2. However, allowing the standard deviation  
172 to take values 0.5, 1, or 2.5 made negligible difference to our results. Further, we  
173 investigated heavy tailed Cauchy distributions. While this resulted in a posterior  
174 distribution with greater curvature, it made negligible difference to estimated Tier  
175 coefficients. Our results are therefore robust to changes in the prior, and we therefore  
176 opted for normal distributions with standard deviations of 2 for our main model, as this  
177 prior is wide and uninformative.

178

179 We fit to  $R_t$  estimates by LTLA over time, and not to cases and deaths. NPIs and Tiers  
180 ultimately affect transmission, which in turn affects cases and deaths only after a  
181 delay. Therefore, regressing on the time-varying reproduction number is preferable as  
182 such delays do not need to be incorporated into the model.


183

184 Fitting was performed using the Bayesian software platform Stan [8], via the R  
185 package “rstan” [9] and R version 3.6.3 [10], using 2000 iterations with a warm-up of  
186 500 iterations across 10 chains. R-hat and other diagnostics indicated a fully  
187 converged model. All model code and data sets are available from either the authors,  
188 or alternatively at <https://github.com/ImperialCollegeLondon/covid19model>.

189

## 190 Results

191 Figure 1 shows  $R_t$  estimates the day before the Tier system was introduced and two  
192 weeks afterwards. On 13<sup>th</sup> October,  $R_t$  averaged 1.3 (0.9 – 1.6) across LTLAs, but by  
193 28<sup>th</sup> October had declined to 1.1 (0.86 – 1.42).



194


195

196 **Figure 1:**  $R_t$  by LTLA one day before and two weeks after introduction of the Tier System. Blue points  
197 are Tier 1, green points are Tier 2 and red points are Tier 3. Line of equality shown in orange.

198

199 Figure 2 shows the number of LTLAs that implemented a given intervention when  
200 nominally under Tiers 1, 2 and 3, at the earliest date they were introduced. Four  
201 interventions are implemented in all 310 LTLAs when under Tier 1: i) limiting indoor  
202 gatherings to at most six people; ii) limiting outdoor gatherings to at most six people;  
203 iii) curfew of 10pm for hospitality venues; iv) instruction to work from home where  
204 possible. A further three interventions (“travel discouraged”, “no indoor mixing”,

205 “overnight stays discouraged”) are considered to be part of Tier 1 for 30 LTLAs.  
206 However, as this is minority of LTLAs, and as these interventions are always present  
207 under Tier 2, we include them in the definition of Tier 2. Tier 3 is the most consistently  
208 defined set of interventions, and adds the following two interventions to Tier 2:  
209 “residents cannot leave the local area” and “pubs and bars closed table service only”.  
210 Closure of gyms is included in Tier 3 for six LTLAs, but this is insufficiently frequent to  
211 warrant inclusion in the backdating of Tier 3.




212

213 **Figure 2:** Number of LTLAs applying interventions at introduction of Tier 1 (green), Tier 2 (yellow), or  
 214 Tier 3 (red).

215

216 Between July 1<sup>st</sup> and November 5<sup>th</sup> 2020,  $R_t$  took an average value of 1.13 (95%  
 217 percentiles between 0.74 and 1.62) across all LTLAs. The latent factor secular trend  
 218 accounts for much of the variation in  $R_t$ . The mean absolute error for our model is

219 8.7%, and without latent factors is 14%. The overall model fit (Figure 3, top left)  
220 suggests our model can reproduce trends in  $R_t$  relatively accurately (87% correlation).  
221 The secular trends (Figure 3, bottom right) suggest that transmission increased  
222 through to mid-September, when it began to reach a plateau. Transmission started to  
223 decline from late September, i.e. before the Tier system was introduced on October  
224 14<sup>th</sup>. This implies that reduction in transmission is partly attributable to secular trends,  
225 independent of Tiers.



226

227 **Figure 3: (Top Left)** Observed versus predicted  $R_t$ . Mean absolute error of 10% correlation of 63%.

228 Blue points are Tier 1, green are Tier 2 and red are Tier 3. Black points are dates before the Tier system

229 introduction. **(Top Right)** Histogram of  $R_t$  on 4<sup>th</sup> November 2020 for all LTLAs. Red bars are actual  $R_t$

230 values, blue bars are  $R_t$  if all LTLAs entered Tier 3. **(Bottom Left)** Black line is  $R_t = 1$  the implied

231 starting and ending  $R_t$  for a given Tier blue is Tier 1, green is Tier 2 and red is Tier 3 and the dotted

232 lines are the 1 to 1 line and  $R_t = 1$ . **(Bottom Right)** Secular National trend from the latent factor models.

233 Each dot for each week represents the mean effect size for a given LTLA and the red dots are the mean

234 across all LTLA's. The first purple line corresponds to the rule of 6 being introduced and the second

235 purple line corresponds to the formal introduction of the Tier system.

236 Tier coefficients can be interpreted as a relative reduction in  $R_t$ . Therefore if  $R_t = 1$ , in  
237 the absence of Tiers, the reproduction number after entering a given Tier is given by  
238 the exponentiated coefficients in Table 1. That is, for any value of  $R$ , the reduction  
239 from Tier  $i$ , relative to the secular trend, is simply  $R \times \exp(-\beta_i)$  for Tier coefficient  $\beta_i$   
240 (Table 1). We detected no discernible effect from Tier 1 in addition to the secular trend,  
241 with  $\beta_1 = 0.001$  ( $1.3 \times 10^{-5} - 0.002$ ), scaling  $R_t$  by 1. Tier 2 is slightly more effective and  
242 scales  $R_t$  by a factor of 0.94 (0.93 – 0.95). However, the effects of Tier 3 are significant,  
243 as it scales  $R_t$  by 0.77 (0.75 – 0.79).

244

Variable	Mean	2.5% CrI	97.5% CrI
Tier 1	1	1	1
Tier 2	0.94	0.93	0.95
Tier 3	0.77	0.75	0.79

245

246 **Table 1:** Coefficient reductions from a given Tier. Note these have been exponentiated and can be  
247 interpreted by directly multiplying them with a given  $R_t$

248

249 It is important to stress that these estimates do not imply that the interventions  
250 comprising Tier 1 (e.g. working from home recommendations or limiting indoor  
251 gatherings to six people or less) would have zero effect, but rather that they have no  
252 additional effect beyond the secular trend. For example, Tier 1's prohibition of indoor  
253 or outdoor gatherings larger than six people was introduced on 14<sup>th</sup> October, after the  
254 more general "rule of six" that was already in place from 14<sup>th</sup> September.

255

256 We investigated what the effects on transmission would have been if all LTLAs had  
257 entered Tier 3. On November 4<sup>th</sup> 2020, only 28% of LTLAs were managing to suppress  
258 their epidemic with  $R_t < 1$ , with 95% of LTLAs having  $R_t$  values ranging from 0.79 to  
259 1.35. Figure 3 (top right) shows the overall effect on  $R_t$  if all LTLAS had entered Tier  
260 3 on November 4<sup>th</sup>, 2020. If all LTLAs had entered Tier 3 on November 5<sup>th</sup>, we  
261 estimate that 93% would have reduced  $R_t$  to less than 1, (95% credible interval of  $R_t$   
262 values range between 0.66 and 1.03). In fact, only 29% of LTLAs managed to do so.  
263 These results suggest Tier 3 would have had a substantial effect on transmission, but  
264 would not conclusively reduce  $R_t$  below 1 in every LTLA. It should also be noted that  
265 if all LTLAs had been in Tier 3 on a different date, the effect would not have been the  
266 same due to secular trend changes.

267

## 268 Discussion

269 We estimated the effects of Tiers 1, 2 and 3 between the first and second national  
270 lockdowns in the UK. We estimated of the local time-varying reproduction number  $R_t$   
271 using our established semi-mechanistic model. We combined these estimates with  
272 data detailing the timing of NPIs and Tiers at LTLA level to use as inputs in a Bayesian  
273 hierarchical model with a latent factor analysis.

274

275 Our approach aimed to account for broader secular trends at the national level in  
276 addition to the Tiers at LTLA level. The model reproduced  $R_t$  estimates reasonably  
277 well, and broadly captured their variation over time and variation between LTLAs. The  
278 national secular trend increased between early July and late September,  
279 notwithstanding regional differences and control measures applied. The national trend

280 began to plateau from mid-September (before the introduction of the Tier system) and  
281 declined shortly after, implying that transmission reduction was not solely attributable  
282 to Tiers. We find that Tier 1 has almost no effect on transmission beyond the secular  
283 national trend, and that Tier 2 yielded only minor reductions in transmission. However,  
284 Tier 3 was more effective, reducing transmission by an average of 23%. We estimated  
285 that, had Tier 3 been in effect throughout all LTLAs, suppression ( $R_t < 1$ ) would have  
286 been achieved in 93% of LTLAs at the start of the second national lockdown, as  
287 opposed to the 29% of LTLAs that actually did manage to reduce  $R_t$  to below 1 at this  
288 time.

289

290 Our approach has a number of limitations. While the latent factors account for  
291 confounding to some degree, the coefficients we estimate are noncausal and therefore  
292 provide only associative effects. We do not consider the interaction of interventions,  
293 but merely their joint effect as mandated through the Tier system. In generating  
294 counterfactuals our model makes a “difference in differences” counterfactual  
295 assumption, which has previously been shown to have limitations [11] arising from the  
296 assumption of parallel trajectories. It is important to note that the effect sizes we model  
297 quantify the instantaneous and constant impact of the Tiers on  $R_t$ , whereas the effects  
298 of Tiers may vary over time, perhaps with a lag before they take effect or with a waning  
299 of efficacy. Our backdating of Tiers is imperfect: government announcement of a given  
300 Tier may have an additional effect beyond that of the particular NPIs within that Tier.  
301 However, it remains a reasonable approximation that enables the analysis of NPIs in  
302 finer detail than lockdown. It would be useful to measure the effects of the specific  
303 interventions that and comprise the Tiers, as this would enable more targeted

304 measures for COVID-19 control. However, the data is unfortunately insufficiently  
305 powered to make such inferences.

306

307 Our analysis focussed on the period between the first and second national lockdowns,  
308 before the emergence of the more-transmissible B.1.1.7 variant and before the rollout  
309 of vaccination. This focus avoids potential confounding factors of vaccination – it is  
310 impossible that we have falsely attributed the effects of vaccination to the impact of  
311 Tiers. While mass vaccination will enable less stringent interventions over time, the  
312 emergence of more transmissible variants will render Tiers 1 and 2 even less likely to  
313 be able to control SARS-CoV-2 transmission.

314

315 Non-pharmaceutical interventions will remain necessary to control SARS-CoV-2  
316 transmission, particularly in light of newer more transmissible variants, and at least  
317 until an efficacious and effective vaccine becomes widely available or much greater  
318 population immunity has amassed. The relatively small effect sizes found in this  
319 analysis caution against expecting dramatic additional reductions in  $R_t$  from  
320 interventions less extreme than Tier 3.

321

## 322 [Acknowledgements](#)

323 We thank Joni Kirk and Pantelis Hadjipantelis of the Joint Biosecurity Centre,  
324 Department of Health & Social Care, and Shaun Seaman of the MRC Biostatistics  
325 Unit, Cambridge Institute of Public Health for helpful discussions.

326

## 327 Author Contributions

328 **Conceptualization:** DJL, SM, NMF, SB. **Data Curation:** DJL, SM, WRH, SF, AG,  
329 NMF, SB. **Formal Analysis:** DJL, SM, SF, AG, NMF, SB. **Funding Acquisition:** NMF,  
330 SB. **Investigation:** DJL, SM, NMF, SB. **Methodology:** DJL, SM, SF, PS, AG, NMF,  
331 SB. **Project administration:** NMF, SB. **Resources:** DJL, SM, WRH, SF, AG, NMF,  
332 SB. **Software:** DJL, SM, WRH, NMF, SB. **Supervision:** NMF, SB. **Validation:** DJL,  
333 SM, SF, AG, NMF, SB. **Visualisation:** DJL, NMF, SB. **Writing – original draft:** DJL,  
334 SB. **Writing – review & editing:** All authors reviewed the final draft.

335

## 336 Data Sharing Statement

337 All model code and data sets are available from either the authors, or alternatively at  
338 <https://github.com/ImperialCollegeLondon/covid19model>.

339

## 340 Funding Statement

341 DJL, NMF acknowledge funding from Vaccine Efficacy Evaluation for Priority  
342 Emerging Diseases (VEEPED) grant, (ref. NIHR: PR-OD-1017-20002) from the  
343 National Institute for Health Research. SB acknowledges the NIHR BRC Imperial  
344 College NHS Trust Infection and COVID themes, the Academy of Medical Sciences  
345 Springboard award (ref. SBF004\1080). DJL, SM, WRH, NMF and SB are supported  
346 by Centre funding (grant MR/R015600/1) from the UK Medical Research Council  
347 under a concordat with the UK Department for International Development, the NIHR  
348 Health Protection Research Unit in Modelling Methodology and Community Jameel.  
349 The funders of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis,  
350 data interpretation, or writing of the report. The corresponding author had full access

351 to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for  
352 publication.

353

#### 354 [Competing Interests](#)

355 All authors have completed the Unified Competing Interest form (available on request  
356 from the corresponding author) and declare: no support from any organisation for the  
357 submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an  
358 interest in the submitted work in the previous three years, no other relationships or  
359 activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

## 360 References

- 361 1. Flaxman S, Mishra S, Gandy A, Unwin HJT, Mellan TA, Coupland H, et al.  
362 Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in Europe.  
363 Nature. 2020;584(7820):257-61. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2405-7.
- 364 2. Salje H, Kiem CT, Lefrancq N, Courtejoie N, Bosetti P, Paireau J, et al.  
365 Estimating the burden of SARS-CoV-2 in France. 2020;369(6500):208-11.
- 366 3. Okell LC, Verity R, Watson OJ, Mishra S, Walker P, Whittaker C, et al. Have  
367 deaths from COVID-19 in Europe plateaued due to herd immunity?  
368 2020;395(10241):e110-e1.
- 369 4. Haug N, Geyrhofer L, Londei A, Dervic E, Desvars-Larrive A, Loreto V, et al.  
370 Ranking the effectiveness of worldwide COVID-19 government interventions. Nature  
371 Human Behaviour. 2020;4(12):1303-12. doi: 10.1038/s41562-020-01009-0.
- 372 5. Fowler JH, Hill SJ, Obradovich N, Levin RJm. The Effect of Stay-at-Home  
373 Orders on COVID-19 Cases and Fatalities in the United States. 2020.
- 374 6. Iacobucci G. Covid-19: Three tier alert system takes effect across England.  
375 British Medical Journal Publishing Group; 2020.
- 376 7. Mishra S, Scott J, Zhu H, Ferguson NM, Bhatt S, Flaxman S, et al. A COVID-  
377 19 Model for Local Authorities of the United Kingdom. 2020:2020.11.24.20236661.  
378 doi: 10.1101/2020.11.24.20236661 %J medRxiv.
- 379 8. Carpenter B, Gelman A, Hoffman MD, Lee D, Goodrich B, Betancourt M, et al.  
380 Stan: a probabilistic programming language. 2017;76(1):1-32.
- 381 9. Team SD. RStan: the R interface to Stan (Version 2.17. 3). 2018.
- 382 10. Team RC. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. 467.  
383 2020.
- 384 11. Samartsidis P, Seaman SR, Presanis AM, Hickman M, De Angelis DJSS.  
385 Assessing the causal effect of binary interventions from observational panel data with  
386 few treated units. 2019;34(3):486-503.