

More than a year after the onset of the CoVid-19 pandemic in the UK: lessons learned from a minimalistic model capturing essential features including social awareness and policy making

Miguel A. Durán-Olivencia^{a,1} and Serafim Kalliadasis^{a,1}

^aDepartment of Chemical Engineering, Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ, UK

This manuscript was compiled on April 15, 2021

1 **The number of new daily SARS-CoV-2 infections experienced an**
2 **abrupt increase during the last quarter of 2020 in almost every Euro-**
3 **pean country. The phenomenological explanation offered was a new**
4 **mutation of the virus, first identified in the UK. We use publicly avail-**
5 **able data in combination with a time-delayed controlled SIR model,**
6 **which captures the effects of preventive measures and concomitant**
7 **social response on the spreading of the virus. The model, which has**
8 **a unique transmission rate, enables us to reproduce the waves of**
9 **infection occurred in the UK. This suggests that the new SARS-CoV-2**
10 **UK variant is as transmissible as previous strains. Our findings reveal**
11 **that the sudden surge in cases was in fact related to the relaxation**
12 **of preventive measures and social awareness. We also simulate the**
13 **combined effects of restrictions and vaccination campaigns in 2021,**
14 **demonstrating that lockdown policies are not fully effective to flatten**
15 **the curve; fully effective mitigation can only be achieved via a vigor-**
16 **ous vaccination campaign. As a matter of fact, incorporating recent**
17 **data about vaccine efficacy, our simulations advocate that the UK**
18 **might have overcome the worse of the CoVid-19 pandemic, provided**
19 **that the vaccination campaign maintains a rate of approximately 140k**
20 **jabs per day.**

1 The years 2020-2021 have been marked by the extraordinary
2 CoVid-19 pandemic, and the exceptional social measures and
3 restrictions needed to control the spread of the disease. Not
4 surprisingly, a considerable amount of research has been de-
5 voted to trying to forecast the evolution of the pandemic with
6 the principal aim of anticipating new waves of infections (1).
7 The most widely-used framework for epidemic model develop-
8 ment and computational exploration splits society into three
9 main categories (so-called compartments) according to their
10 status with respect to the disease: susceptible (S), infectious
11 (I) and recovered (R). A natural balance-oriented reasoning,
12 originally put forward in the late 1920s by Kermack and McK-
13 endrick (2), can then be used to obtain the so-called SIR model
14 (Fig. 1.a), a nonlinear ordinary differential equation describing
15 the time evolution of the population of the three categories,
16 interconnected via two parameters: the transmission (β) and
17 recovery (α) rates. The ratio of these two give rise to the
18 famous basic reproductive ($\mathcal{R}_0 = \frac{\beta}{\alpha}$) rate. The simplicity and
19 elegance of the SIR have made it a popular generic prototype
20 for numerical and mathematical scrutiny. However, the model
21 also introduces some important limitations which hamper its
22 wide applicability. Specifically, it can only account for a single
23 epidemic outbreak, and only takes into account infection and
24 recovering events. To begin with, the contagious encounters
25 are tacitly assumed to take effect automatically, i.e. whenever a

susceptible person meets an infected one, the former becomes
infected. At the same time, the original SIR model cannot
account for the effects associated with the social preventive
response which characterises the *new normal*, e.g. social dis-
tancing, mask wearing, limited commuting, remote working,
or local curfews and lockdowns, to name but a few examples.
These limitations will in turn impact the estimation of the
intrinsic parameters β and \mathcal{R}_0 by using SIR-like models. For
instance, different values of \mathcal{R}_0 are obtained for the same virus
(hence the same inherent properties) under different social
contexts, e.g. partial and full lockdown.

Despite the limitations, good fitting can be achieved over
limited temporal windows (3–5). However, two serious draw-
backs compromise the accuracy of such predictions: a) one
cannot fit the whole temporal series, characterised by multiple
infection waves, indeed the fit would eventually diverge; and
b) the SIR model would never forecast a second or further
upsurge in cases. Substantially refined versions of the SIR
model have been put forward recently with the aim of includ-
ing additional important effects, such as shield immunity (6)
or exposure to the virus (7). These models are highly intelli-
gent and mathematically elegant, however, their underlying
assumption remains that infection occurs automatically. This
in turn will necessarily restrict their time domain of applicabil-
ity. It is clear that more work is needed. In particular, relaxing
the assumption of automatic infection raises the exciting possi-
bility of capturing the entire pandemic evolution from day
zero up to date and accounting for the multiple waves of infec-
tions already experienced. Indeed, to determine whether new
variants of the SARS-CoV-2 are more transmissible than their
predecessors, the data analysis must cover the entire pandemic
outbreak and include the effects of preventive measures and
contagion policies adopted by populations and governments,
respectively. Many studies also fitted SIR-like models to data
from the last stages of the first wave – even though as high-
lighted earlier the models 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, an

All authors contributed equally to this work.

The authors declare no competing interest.

¹E-mails: Miguel A. Durán-Olivencia (m.duran-olivencia@imperial.ac.uk); Serafim Kalliadasis (s.kalliadasis@imperial.ac.uk)




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

67 alternative approach is called for.
 68 The present work is set out as follows. Consideration of the
 69 full-history of the data with a *controlled* SIR model (Fig. 1.b)
 70 avoids the drawbacks of previous models, by capturing the
 71 essence of how the new normal affects the number of infected
 72 people. This unveils unique and constant β and \mathcal{R}_0 for the
 73 entire pandemic. Thousands of mutations have emerged in
 74 the SARS-CoV-2 genome since the first outbreak in 2019,
 75 but the UK strain, known as B.1.1.7, was reported at the
 76 time as a more “aggressive” form of the virus, because of an
 77 alarming surge in new cases thought to be correlated with
 78 the new UK variant, and was one of the main reasons for
 79 the lockdown imposed in the UK at the beginning of 2021,
 80 e.g. Ref. (8). According to the law of parsimony: chose the
 81 simplest explanation from those that fit. Indeed, our results
 82 show that the fierce increase in cases is captured without the
 83 need of a more transmissible variant. We then put forward
 84 the hypothesis that genomic data during the pandemic might
 85 have been overinterpreted. To test this hypothesis we carry
 86 out a succinct analysis of data from a recent study which
 87 links B.1.1.7 with significantly higher viral loads and claims
 88 to provide evidence on why transmission was accelerating (9).
 89 As far as our particular modelling approach is concerned, its
 90 novelty is to include characteristic parameters which could be
 91 pivotal in the decision-making process in the coming months.
 92 For instance, there seems to be an *inertia of society* which plays
 93 a crucial role on the flattening of the curve. For preventive
 94 measures to be effective, these should be encouraged quite early
 95 in the surge of cases, taking into consideration the inherent
 96 social inertia, which typically leads up to a three-week delay up
 97 until society gets to its maximum level of alert. We also account
 98 for the effect of vaccination and show that *social relaxation*
 99 as of April 2021 without fulfilling a sufficient vaccination rate
 100 (determined below) will lead to a new wave of infections over
 101 May-June 2021, independently of the more strict lockdown
 102 currently imposed since January 2021 and relaxed gradually
 103 as of April 12, 2021.

104 Minimalistic model including social awareness and policy making

105
 106 **The model.** The controlled SIR model shown in Fig. 1.b (see
 107 Methods for mathematical details) incorporates the social
 108 awareness and policy making effects on the spreading of the
 109 SARS-CoV-2. The main modifications to the basic SIR model
 110 are: embodiment of control over the number of infectious

111 interactions that might occur at a given time via the function
 112 $(1 - \mathfrak{A})$ which is multiplying the transmission rate β , with
 113 \mathfrak{A} having the general form showed in Fig. 1.c; inclusion of a
 114 time delay for such preventive measures to take effect in re-
 115 ducing the number of effective infectious interactions between
 116 infected and susceptible people; accounting for vaccinations
 117 not fully effective ($\epsilon < 1$), which in turn leads to the in-
 118 clusion of two new categories: susceptible after vaccination
 119 (S_V), and recovered/removed after vaccination (R_V). These
 120 facilitate incorporation of actual vaccination data within the
 121 time-evolution simulations of the pandemic, enabling us to
 122 estimate the effect that vaccines have had so far, and will
 123 have in the next coming months, provided we know the rate
 124 of efficacy of the vaccines. Here we take a conservative stance
 125 adopting the efficacy value reported for the most widely deliv-
 126 ered vaccine so far, i.e. $\epsilon \sim 65\%$ (10). As we will illustrate,
 127 the minimalistic model we put forward exhibits a distinct
 128 predictive capability, and has been rightfully forecasting the
 129 evolution of the daily new infections (Fig. 2).

Comparison with observations and predictions. Figure 2 re-
 130 ports curve fits and predictions of the free and controlled SIR
 131 models. The free version (Fig. 1.a) fits well the data of the first
 132 wave of infections from March to June 2020, but completely
 133 fails to predict any second or further wave. This is because
 134 in a free SIR model the decay of the infected cases is only
 135 possible when the pandemic is already in recession. [As we
 136 know now and back in June 2020, this was not the reason
 137 for the decrease in cases at the time; rather the reduction of
 138 susceptible people was due to preventive measures.] Yet, it has
 139 been quite common to use the first wave to extract estimates
 140 for β , α and \mathcal{R}_0 . Several works have published estimates
 141 for these quantities even by using doubtful methodologies, e.g.
 142 in (5), manual fitting of the data to the SIR model was per-
 143 formed, effectively via a trial-and-error approach, on the basis
 144 that rigorous non-linear fitting did not follow the data as well
 145 as manual fitting. However, instead of imposing the SIR model
 146 and changing the fitting method to achieve agreement with
 147 the model, the disagreement with a nonlinear fit is instead a
 148 strong indication that the model should have been abandoned.
 149

150 Evidently, not only does the controlled SIR model (Fig. 1.b)
 151 fits better the first-wave data (inset plot, Fig. 2.b), but also
 152 captures the underlying reason for the decrease in cases from
 153 mid April to August 2020, namely a wave of *social awareness*
 154 (\mathfrak{A}) which effectively reduced the number of susceptible people.
 155 The function \mathfrak{A} embodies both contagion policies and the
 156 efforts made by citizens to flatten the curve, e.g. wearing
 157 masks, reducing travelling or self-isolating. Moreover, the
 158 model correctly predicts a sudden rise in cases when society
 159 relaxes, because the downtrend in new infections is not related
 160 with the end of the pandemic but with a temporary removal of
 161 susceptible candidates from the system. This is precisely what
 162 happened from July to September 2020, and what eventually
 163 led to the surge in cases in early September 2020. This sharp
 164 increase immediately raised the alarm (11, 12), and \mathfrak{A} started
 165 growing again, reaching a maximum effectiveness when the
 166 three-tier restrictions system was imposed (13). However, these
 167 measures were not sufficient to flatten the curve and a new
 168 increase appeared in December 2020 because of a gradual
 169 relaxation over the month of November. By incorporating
 170 new waves of preventive measures in \mathfrak{A} , the model is able to
 171 reproduce the above observations, as illustrated in Figs 2.b-e.




Fig. 3. Number of people who have received a first dose CoVid-19 vaccination per day. Split into effective (green) and ineffective (blue) cases has been artificially carried out by utilising an efficacy estimation of $\epsilon \sim 65\%$. The dashed-grey line marks the target vaccination rate of $0.2\%d^{-1}$ ($\sim 140k$ doses per day), also represented as light blue and green bars between April and May 2021 to highlight that these are not real data, as opposed to data from January up to April 2021, taken from official sources.

172 This provides evidence of the predictive capabilities of the model.
173

174 Figures 2.c-d reveal the effects of the third lockdown imposed on January 4, 2021 and of the intensive vaccination
175 campaign followed in the UK (see Fig. 3 for the actual number of doses delivered between January and April 2021). Figure 2.c
176 depicts predictions of what would have happened in case the UK had not delivered any vaccines during the first quarter
177 of 2021. In contrast, Fig. 2.d shows predictions taking into account both the third lockdown just mentioned, and publicly
178 available vaccination campaign data up until April 10, 2021, assuming a conservative 65% efficacy of the vaccine, and stop-
179 ping vaccination thereafter. As can be seen, had it not been for the very successful vaccination strategy adopted by the
180 UK (exceeding on average the original vaccination target set in January 2021 (14)), the country would be currently facing
181 a new and tremendous wave. This was already forecasted in January 2021 using an early version of the model developed
182 here (15), which was recently confirmed in Ref. (16). In a very recent news article (17) the UK Prime Minister attributed
183 the reduction of new CoVid-19 infections mainly to the lockdown. While the lockdown has certainly contributed to a
184 temporal slowdown of the curve having an immediate effect, as illustrated in Fig 2.c, it appears that the sustained slow-
185 down of the curve is due to a combined effect of lockdown and vaccination campaign, Figs 2.d-e, with eventual flattening of
186 the curve for sufficiently high vaccination rate, as shown in Fig. 2.f. In fact, Figs 2.e-f uncover a more optimistic scenario
187 for the rest of the year 2021 by simply maintaining a vaccination rate in the range between $70 \times 10^3 d^{-1}$ and $140 \times 10^3 d^{-1}$,
188 respectively. What is more, if a target of $140 \times 10^3 d^{-1}$ is met, the UK could be returning to pre-CoVid-19 normality as early as
189 June 2021.
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204

205 **Future refinements of the model.** There is a number of interesting questions related to the analysis presented here and
206 a discussion of extensions of the model is in order. A first question would be the effect of immunity loss after vaccination,
207 which would involve a new transition $R_V \rightarrow S$ in Fig. 1.c. This enhancement of the model should not entail a major difficulty
208
209
210




Fig. 4. Histogram of C_T values corresponding to S-negative (red bars) and S-positive (blue bars) of ORF positive samples. The median C_T values for each distribution are shown as dashed lines. Data from Ref. (9).

211 and would allow for the study of when and how the pandemic-
212 endemic transition will occur. However, it must wait up until
213 conclusive data is gathered regarding such immunity loss pro-
214 cess. Another exciting avenue would be the coupling of the
215 model with a model for the population dynamics, which would
216 permit interrogation of the effects of spatial heterogeneities
217 in the evolution of the pandemic. A similar connection with
218 the basic SIR model has been recently introduced in Ref. (18)
219 by using a generalised diffusion equation, also referred to as
220 dynamical-density functional theory DDFT. This work could
221 be nicely extended by coupling the basic DDFT equation with
222 our controlled SIR model. Additionally, more general DDFT
223 versions can be used to incorporate the effect of mobility
224 anisotropies and “hydrodynamic interactions” (19, 20). Last
225 but not least, the effects of fluctuations, inherent to complex
226 systems, could be accounted for by using fluctuating DDFT
227 as a model for the population dynamics (21, 22).

228 Higher-transmission evidence?

229 **Insufficient statistics in QPCR tests.** In a recent study Kidd
230 *et al.* (9) examined the presence of SARS-CoV-2 in respira-
231 tory samples using the ThermoFisher TaqPath RT-QPCR test.
232 They found that a considerable number of such samples exhib-
233 ited a characteristic mutation of the lineage B.1.1.7, namely
234 the $\Delta 69/70$ deletion. This mutation induces a failure in detect-
235 ing the S-gene (“S-gene negative”) of the TaqPath test, but
236 with two other gene targets clearly detectable: ORF and N.
237 Analysing the RT-qPCR threshold-crossing (C_T) values origi-
238 nated from both S-gene negative and positive samples, they
239 obtained the data shown in Fig. 4 for the C_T -value histograms
240 corresponding to ORF-positive samples (in their study both
241 ORF and N-gene targets are shown, but they exhibit similar
242 behavior). Such histograms, where S-negative (B.1.1.7) is red
243 and S-positive is blue, were then used to extract the corre-
244 sponding median C_T -values, also shown in Fig. 4: 18.2 (red
245 dashed line) and 22.3 (blue dashed line). From an ensemble
246 point of view, a low C_T value indicates a high concentration
247 of viral genetic material, and vice versa. And it is precisely
248 this concept the authors used to justify that given the lower
249 median C_T value of the S-negative samples, the UK variant
250 had a higher viral load. Had the S-negative histogram been at
251 least as good and clear as the S-positive histogram, the con-
252 clusion that the B.1.1.7 samples have a higher viral load could

253 have been defended (whether this means higher transmission
 254 rates or not would require further analysis). However, it is
 255 clear that the statistics of the S-negative is poor to enable
 256 concrete conclusions from the comparison of its median with
 257 the S-positive counterpart. Even more so, there is a subtler
 258 and more problematic issue when contrasting C_T values: the
 259 lack of infection synchronisation between patients makes it
 260 difficult, if not impossible, to unequivocally justify that lower
 261 C_T values mean higher transmission rates. For this to be true,
 262 the samples should come from patients who have been infected
 263 for the same amount of time. Otherwise, by pure chance we
 264 could be comparing people at an early stage, of whom a lower
 265 viral load, in general, is expected, against patients who have
 266 been infected for a longer time, hence with higher viral loads.
 267 In any case, it is clear from Fig. 4 that the median C_T values
 268 extracted from such histograms are not sufficient to establish a
 269 clear difference between the viral-load distributions observed.

270 **Enhanced binding does not equal enhanced infection.** Protein-
 271 protein interactions play a pivotal role in the docking and entry
 272 stages of viral infections. In the particular case of SARS-CoV-
 273 2, the spike-like protein on the surface of the virus binds to
 274 the human cells primarily via interaction with the angiotensin-
 275 converting enzyme 2, or simply ACE2 “receptor.” Therefore,
 276 ACE2 acts as a cellular doorway for the SARS-CoV-2. Mu-
 277 tations on the spike protein, as is the case of the B.1.1.7, can
 278 affect the stability of the binding, and hence the infective
 279 capability of the virus. Using a large number of molecular dy-
 280 namics (MD) trajectories of different spike protein interactions
 281 with the human target protein (ACE2), a recent in-silico study
 282 has reported that mutations of the UK variant has greatly
 283 stabilised the interaction with the ACE2, which in turned has
 284 enhanced the binding stability (23). The study conjectures
 285 that the enhanced binding associated with the spike mutations
 286 of the B.1.1.7 lineage might be responsible for a higher trans-
 287 missibility of the SARS-CoV-2 virus. However, the binding of the
 288 viral particle with the surface receptor of the host cell is only
 289 one of the several and complex processes involved in a viral
 290 infection (24). For instance, it can happen that the mutation
 291 provides the virus with a more stable binding, but follow-
 292 ing binding the virion remains attached to the cell surface
 293 without being internalised (which leads to viral replication)
 294 by the cell for longer times, which could potentially result
 295 in even slower infection rates. Even if the binding is better
 296 and, say, the internalisation effectiveness is the same for all
 297 the mutations, this only ensures evolutionary displacement of
 298 the lesser stable by the more stable binding, and not higher
 299 infection rates. The only way to assert that a given mutation
 300 yields a higher infection rate would be by measuring a higher
 301 number of virions newly formed inside the cell over a similar
 302 time period, which is entirely dependent of the cell machinery
 303 itself. Thus, by only having evidence of an improved binding
 304 capacity, it seems reasonable to assume that the same amount
 305 of virions per second will be produced by using the same cell
 306 machinery, which means the same infection rate. In fact, the
 307 improved binding associated with the UK variant offers a good
 308 justification for the dominance of the B.1.1.7 lineage observed
 309 elsewhere (25, 26), but it does not represent a good basis to
 310 justify a higher transmissibility/infection rate.

311 **Methods**

Population dynamics. The population is split into four groups: sus-
 ceptible (S), infected (I), recovered (R) and vaccinated (V), as il-
 lustrated in Fig.1. The vaccinated group consists of two sub-groups:
 susceptible (S_V) due to ineffective vaccination; and recovered (R_V)
 due to effective vaccination. The groups follow the delayed dynam-
 ical system:

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

where $R + R_V = \int_0^t ds (\alpha I(s) + \nu_{\text{eff}}(s)N)$, $N = S + S_V + I + R + R_V$ 312
 is the total population, assumed $N \approx 66.6$ million, $\Theta(t - t_\nu)$ is the 313
 Heaviside step function, t_ν is the onset of the vaccination campaign, 314
 ν is the vaccination rate per day normalised to the total population, 315
 and $\nu_{\text{eff}} = \epsilon\nu(t)$ with $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$ is the vaccine efficacy. The param- 316
 eters β and α , are the transmission and recovery rates, respectively, 317
 and the function $\mathfrak{A}(t - \tau)$ is the percentage of susceptible people using 318
 effective preventive measures at time $t - \tau$ (τ being a characteristic 319
 time for such preventive measures to become apparent, assumed 14 320
 days, the incubation period (27)), with general functional form: 321

$$\mathfrak{A}(t) = \sum_k \frac{\eta^k}{2} \left\{ \left(1 + \text{erf} \left(\frac{t - t_0^k}{\delta_i} \right) \right) - \left(1 + \text{erf} \left(\frac{t - (t_0^k + T^k)}{\delta_r} \right) \right) \right\},$$
 322
 where $\eta^k \in [0, 1]$ is the effectiveness of the preventive measures 323
 taken in the k -th wave, T^k is related to the time extension of these 324
 measures, and $\delta_{i,r}$ are the social inertia (i) and relaxation (r) time 325
 scales, respectively. With $\mathfrak{A} = 0$ and $\nu = 0$, Eq. (1) becomes the 326
 free SIR model. For $\mathfrak{A} \neq 0$ we get a controlled SIR model. The 327
 initial condition used: $I_0 = 1$ (number of infective cases reported 328
 on January 11, 2020), $S_0 = N - I_0$ and $R_0 = V_0 = 0$. Thus, fitting 329
 of five parameters is needed, and this is done at the first wave only. 330

Training and testing the model. The full dataset, Y , was re- 331
 normalised to \tilde{Y} , by using a linear fit, $z = b + mx$, to the number of 332
 daily CoVid-19 tests per thousand people given in Ref. (28), with 333
 $b = 0$ and $m = 0.0191 \text{ test}/10^3 \text{ people/d}$ (from 0 to 7 test/ 10^3 people 334
 in 366 days), so that $\tilde{Y} = (1 + (\frac{1}{z} - \frac{1}{z_{\text{last}}}))Y$. We then use non- 335
 linear least squares to fit the daily new cases $\Delta = \frac{d(I+R)}{dt}$ to the 336
 first-wave data (training dataset). This fitting yields for the free 337
 model: $\beta = 0.475 \text{d}^{-1}$ and $\alpha = 0.381 \text{d}^{-1}$ so that $\mathcal{R}_0 = \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \simeq 1.23$. 338
 For the controlled model we get: $\beta = 0.209 \text{d}^{-1}$, $\alpha = 0.102 \text{d}^{-1}$, 339
 $\eta = 0.65$, $\delta_i = 21 \text{d}$ and $\delta_r = 45 \text{d}$, which yields $\mathcal{R}_0 \simeq 2.042$. To 340
 test the models we numerically integrate Eq. (1) for both cases, 341
 i.e., $\mathfrak{A}(t) = 0$ and $\mathfrak{A}(t) \neq 0$. The controlled-model prediction for 342
 new infections grows exponentially as of September 2020 (testing 343
 dataset) when the first wave of preventive measures would van- 344
 ish according to the summer trend. With $\delta_{i,r}$ fixed from the first 345
 wave, we fit the parameters η and T of a second social response 346
 to unveil the behavioural changes adopted against the apparent 347
 second wave of cases, obtaining a maximum of social response by 348
 mid-end October 2020. This appears to be in agreement with the 349
 declaration of the UK Prime Minister of “seeing a second wave” on 350
 September 18, 2020 (12), and his statement on coronavirus where the 351
 three-tier restrictions system was imposed, October 12, 2020 (13). 352
 For predictions as of January 2021, we introduce a third wave of 353
 measures with $\eta = 0.70$, starting in January and ending in April 354
 2021, $T = 90 \text{d}$, which represents the current contagion policies 355
 being taken by the UK government. Finally, we use the official 356
 number of first doses delivered in the UK in conjunction with two 357
 scenarios as of April 10, 2021: $\nu_1 = 0.1\% \text{d}^{-1} (\sim \frac{70 \times 10^3}{N} \text{d}^{-1})$ and 358
 $\nu_2 = 0.2\% \text{d}^{-1} (\sim \frac{140 \times 10^3}{N} \text{d}^{-1})$. 359

Error propagation and uncertainty quantification. For the computa- 360
 tion of the uncertainty areas showed along with the model sim- 361
 ulations in Fig. 2, we used the common first-order truncation of 362
 the Taylor’s expansion of the law of propagation of uncertainty 363
 method (29, 30), given the numerical errors calculated after fitting 364
 the parameters of the model to data during the training stage. 365

366 **Data Availability.** All data for the analysis was collected
367 from <https://coronavirus.data.gov.uk/>. Specifically, new cases:
368 <https://coronavirus.data.gov.uk/details/cases>, and vaccinations:
369 <https://coronavirus.data.gov.uk/details/vaccinations>.

370 **Code Availability.** The code used in the creation of this manuscript
371 is available at <https://github.com/migduroli/covid-uk-variant/>.
372 Model simulations were numerically integrated using `odeint` from
373 `scipy` (31), a Python wrapper for LSODA from the FORTRAN library
374 ODEPACK (32). The non-linear square fittings were carried out by
375 using `curve_fit` from `scipy` (31).

376 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.** We acknowledge financial support from
377 the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council of the UK
378 via Platform Grant No. EP/L020564/1.

379 1. H. Else. How a torrent of COVID science changed research publishing - in seven charts.
380 Nature. 588(7839):553 (2020).
381 2. W. O. Kermack, A. G. McKendrick, A Contribution to the Mathematical Theory of Epidemics.
382 Proc. R. Soc. A. 115 (772): 700–721 (1927).
383 3. G. G. Katull, et al. Global convergence of COVID-19 basic reproduction number and estima-
384 tion from early-time SIR dynamics, PLoS ONE 15(9): e0239800 (2020)
385 4. U. Nguemdjo, F. Meno, A. Dongfack, B. Ventelou. Simulating the progression of the COVID-19
386 disease in Cameroon using SIR models, PLoS ONE 15(8): e0237832 (2020)
387 5. I. Cooper, A. Mondal, C. G. Antonopoulos. A SIR model assumption for the spread of COVID-
388 19 in different communities, Chaos Soliton. Fract. 139: 110057 (2020)
389 6. J. S. Weitz, et al. Modeling shield immunity to reduce COVID-19 epidemic spread. Nat. Med.
390 26 849–854 (2020)
391 7. Bjørnstad, O.N., Shea, K., Krzywinski, M. et al. The SEIRS model for infectious disease
392 dynamics. Nat, Methods 17, 557–558 (2020)
393 8. J. Macfarlane. New Covid strain UK: what are the symptoms of the new coro-
394 navirus variant - and will the vaccine still work? *The Scotsman*, 11 Janu-
395 ary 2021, [https://www.scotsman.com/health/coronavirus/new-covid-strain-uk-what-are-](https://www.scotsman.com/health/coronavirus/new-covid-strain-uk-what-are-symptoms-new-coronavirus-variant-and-will-vaccine-still-work-3068541)
396 [symptoms-new-coronavirus-variant-and-will-vaccine-still-work-3068541](https://www.scotsman.com/health/coronavirus/new-covid-strain-uk-what-are-symptoms-new-coronavirus-variant-and-will-vaccine-still-work-3068541)
397 9. M. Kidd, et al. S-variant SARS-CoV-2 lineage B.1.1.7 is associated with significantly higher
398 viral loads in samples tested by ThermoFisher TaqPath RT-qPCR, J. Infect. Dis. (2021)
399 10. M. Voysey, et al. Safety and efficacy of the ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine (AZD1222) against
400 SARS-CoV-2: an interim analysis of four randomised controlled trials in Brazil, South Africa,
401 and the UK. Lancet 397: 99 (2021)
402 11. Coronavirus: Hancock concern over 'sharp rise' in cases, *BBC News* 8 September 2020,
403 <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-54066831>
404 12. Covid: UK seeing second wave, says Boris Johnson, *BBC News* 18 September 2020,
405 <https://www.bbc.com/news/av/uk-54213129>
406 13. PM Commons statement on coronavirus, *Prime Minister's Office*, 12 October
407 2020, [https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-commons-statement-on-coronavirus-](https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-commons-statement-on-coronavirus-12-october-2020)
408 [12-october-2020](https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-commons-statement-on-coronavirus-12-october-2020)
409 14. M. Dathan, H. Cole, K. Ferguson, N. Clark. Boris Johnson vows to deliver 200,000 vac-
410 cines a day by next week & every care home resident this month, *The Sun*, 7 Jan-
411 uary 2021, [https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/13672615/covid-vaccine-press-conference-boris-](https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/13672615/covid-vaccine-press-conference-boris-johnson-hundreds)
412 [johnson-hundreds](https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/13672615/covid-vaccine-press-conference-boris-johnson-hundreds)
413 15. M. A. Durán-Olivencia, S. Kalliadasis. Understanding soaring coronavirus
414 cases and the effect of contagion policies in the UK, preprint. url:
415 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.01.30.21250822v1>
416 16. L.K. Whittles et al. "Unlocking" Roadmap Scenarios for England v2, 22 Febru-
417 ary 2021 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/imperial-college-london-unlocking-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/imperial-college-london-unlocking-roadmap-scenarios-for-england-18-february-2021)
418 [roadmap-scenarios-for-england-18-february-2021](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/imperial-college-london-unlocking-roadmap-scenarios-for-england-18-february-2021).
419 17. COVID-19: Lockdown is main reason for drop in coronavirus cases and deaths - not vaccina-
420 tions, says Boris Johnson, *SkyNews* 14 April 2021, <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-54066831>
421 18. M. te Vrugt, J. Bickmann, R. Wittkowski. Effects of social distancing and isolation on epidemic
422 spreading modeled via dynamical density functional theory, Nat. Comm. 11: 5576 (2020)
423 19. B. D. Goddard, A. Nold, N. Savva, G. A. Pavliotis, S. Kalliadasis. General dynamical density
424 functional theory for classical fluid, Phys. Rev. Lett. 109: 120603 (2012).
425 20. M. A. Durán-Olivencia, B. D. Goddard, S. Kalliadasis. Dynamical Density Functional Theory
426 for Orientable Colloids Including Inertia and Hydrodynamic Interactions, J. Stat. Phys. 164:
427 785–809 (2016)
428 21. M. A. Durán-Olivencia, P. Yatsyshin, B. D. Goddard, S. Kalliadasis. General framework for
429 fluctuating dynamic density functional theory, New J. Phys. 19: 123022 (2017)
430 22. A. Russo, M. A. Durán-Olivencia, P. Yatsyshin, S. Kalliadasis. Memory effects in fluctuating
431 dynamic density-functional theory: theory and simulations, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 53:
432 445007 (2020)
433 23. P. Rynkiewicz, G.A. Babbitt, F. Cui, A.O. Hudson, M.L. Lynch. A compar-
434 ative survey of Betacoronavirus binding dynamics relevant to the functional
435 evolution of the highly transmissible SARS-CoV-2 variant N501Y, preprint. url:
436 <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.09.11.293258v2>
437 24. L. Makowski, W. Olson-Sidford, J. W. Weisel. Biological and Clinical Consequences of Integrin
438 Binding via a Rogue RGD Motif in the SARS CoV-2 Spike Protein. Viruses 13(2):146 (2021).
439 25. Kent Covid variant "likely to sweep globe" and become world's dominant strain, *Mirror*,
440 11 February 2021, [https://www.mirror.co.uk/news/uk-news/uk-migrant-covid-19-variant-](https://www.mirror.co.uk/news/uk-news/uk-migrant-covid-19-variant-23480531)
441 [23480531](https://www.mirror.co.uk/news/uk-news/uk-migrant-covid-19-variant-23480531)

26. UK variant is now the dominant coronavirus strain in the US, says CDC chief, *CNN* 7 April 2021, [https://edition.cnn.com/2021/04/07/us/uk-variant-dominant-coronavirus-](https://edition.cnn.com/2021/04/07/us/uk-variant-dominant-coronavirus-strain/index.html)
442 [strain/index.html](https://edition.cnn.com/2021/04/07/us/uk-variant-dominant-coronavirus-strain/index.html)
443
444
27. S. A. Lauer SA, et al. The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) From
445 Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and Application. Ann Intern Med. 172 (9):
446 577-582 (2020)
447
28. J. Hasell, et al. A cross-country database of CoVid-19 testing. Sci. Data 7, 345 (2020).
448
29. H. H. Ku. Notes on the use of propagation of error formulas, J. Res. Natl. Bur. Stand., 70C
449 (4): 262 (1966)
450
30. S. Mekid, D.Vaja. Propagation of uncertainty: Expressions of second and third order uncer-
451 tainty with third and fourth moments, Measurement 41(6): 600–609 (2008)
452
31. P. Virtanen, et al. SciPy 1.0: Fundamental Algorithms for Scientific Computing in Python, Nat.
453 Methods 17, 261–272 (2020)
454
32. A. C. Hindmarsh. ODEPACK, A Systematized Collection of ODE Solvers, Scientific Comput-
455 ing, R. S. Stepleman et al. (eds.), North-Holland, Amsterdam, vol. 1: 55-64 (1983)
456




Fig. 2. SARS-CoV-2 new daily cases (left axis): blue bars for first-wave data used to fit free and controlled SIR models (light-green lines), red bars for second- and third-wave data used to test the models and their predictions (light-green dashed lines), green areas represent the model uncertainty due to the absolute error of the fitting parameters. (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 β and α , 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 (12)), reaching $\eta_2 \simeq 60\%$ by mid October 2020 (three-tier system was introduced (13)). The upsurge of CoVid-19 cases in December 2020 is again a consequence of social relaxation. (c)-(e) Controlled SIR model with with a third-wave of preventive measures (reaching maximum effectiveness, $\eta_3 = 70\%$, by the mid January 2021), along with the following casuistry for vaccination: (c) no vaccination, (d)-(f) actual vaccination data from January up to April 10, 2021. Panel (d) shows the effect of stopping vaccination right after April 10, 2021, whilst (e)-(f) reveals a dramatic decrease in infections if maintaining the vaccination rate at $\sim 70 \times 10^3$ and $\sim 140 \times 10^3$ vaccines per day, respectively. Even with a lower vaccination rate than the mean vaccination rate kept between January and April 2021 ($\sim 335 \times 10^3$ per day), the UK could be restoring to normal (pre-pandemic) life by June 2021 without risk of a new wave.