The autumn COVID-19 boost dates in Europe are linked to latitudes and not to temperatures pointing vitamin D as a contributing factor.
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**Excel file: data fitting**

*data source modification:*

The daily new cases are now the original numeric data used by John Hopkins center, i.e.:

<https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/download-todays-data-geographic-distribution-covid-19-cases-worldwide>

Use of these data which has two benefits:

- using the manual digitalization, the time points were not equidistant which twisted a little bit the fit weights.

- the curve is complete, i.e. not only the two last months

The resulting new correlation is a little bit less good, i.e. R2 = 0.83 -> 0.77.

*excel file improvements:*

I added in each country page the possibility to visually localize the boost date, i.e. by changing the day value in the blue cell, the corresponding correlation graph is also added in the RESULTS sheet just below the automatic one.

The manual correlation similar than the automatic one, i.e. R2 = 0.75, but for some countries with noisy data, it is not easy to visually determine the boost date. This noise mainly results from the poor reporting performed during the WE, i.e. the Saturday and the Sunday.

For Spain and Switzerland (d>262), the Saturday, Sunday and Monday (column Q) cases were reported together to the Monday, so I split the Monday cases in three to have an useful curve. But for many countries it is like a random part of the WE daily cases were lost.

I also added the mon-exponential curve (thin black curve).

There was an mean offset of 7.2 days (pink cell in RESULTS sheet) between automatic and manual determination, it is like eye see the boost when 11 % of (β-α) is added to α, and not 50% as arbitrary stated in the paper. However, it is possible to also use 11% for the automatic fit by putting 7.2 in the blue cell in the RESULTS sheet (current excel state), obviously this has no impact on the correlation goodness.

In the SUN UV sheet I added a graph with the positions obtained with the manual boost date determination: the positions trend line is less horizontal than that obtained with the fitting.

The fact that the slope of the positions trend line for the automatic determination is a little bit positive is in line with the fact that the populations have skin pigmentation increasing when the latitude decreases, as a result the UV are more filtered before reaching the vitamin D production location in the deep skin, and the boost appears thus at a sun UV threshold higher than that of north populations.

I delete the SOLVER sheet which was the way I fitted all the countries dependent parameters (Nc,αc,βc,Tc) and the independent γ in once at the beginning when I just digitalized 8 countries, this gave γ = 0.252, but with 18 countries this results in to many parameters for the excel solver which fails to improve the global chi2. However, I observed with the 8 countries that the results were not very sensitive to the γ value.

So the only way with excel, is to manually change the γ value (green cell in RESULTS sheet), and to refit country by country.