

Supplementary Material

6 Modeling of variable susceptibility and infectivity

In this section we discuss how to properly set up an equation system that captures the dynamics between a population with variable susceptibility *and* infectivity. We thus divide the susceptibles S into a number of subgroups S_1, \dots, S_J and the infectives I into subgroups I_1, \dots, I_K where J, K can be any integers. To our knowledge, there is no correlation between infectivity and susceptibility, but if such existed it could be taken into account. For simplicity, we do not include this complexity in the model we now present. Also, to fix ideas we restrict attention to $K = J = 3$ since it is a simple exercise to generalize the below argument to the more general situation.

Given a certain amount of super-spreaders $I_1(t)$ at generation (t) , these will have a certain amount of contacts with the susceptible groups S_1 - S_3 , which will be distributed in proportion to the amount of members in the respective groups. More precisely, if $w_j = S_j(0)/N$ is the fraction in each group and a as before denotes the total amount of potentially infectious contacts of one infectee, then the average amount of such contacts from an infective in group I_1 (the super-spreaders) becomes $aw_j I_1(t)$. When super-susceptibles and super-spreaders meet, we can speculate that every contact leads to a new infection, whereas 98% of contacts with S_2 leads to infection, and so on. By the same logic as in previous sections, the amount of new infections from the interactions of I_1 and S_1 is thus $aS_1(t)I_1(t)/N$, the amount of new infections from the interactions of I_1 and S_2 becomes $0.98aS_2(t)I_1(t)/N$ etc. Continuing like this, we can speculate that the interactions between average spreaders I_2 with well-protected leads to almost no new infections, maybe $0.01aS_3(t)I_2(t)/N$. (Thus, here S_1 denotes the group of super-susceptibles instead of S_3 as in §2.2.) Denoting ν_1 , ν_2 and ν_3 the amount of new infected in groups S_1 , S_2 and S_3 respectively, we see that the relationship corresponding to (6) becomes as follows

$$\begin{bmatrix} \nu_1(t) \\ \nu_2(t) \\ \nu_3(t) \end{bmatrix} = \frac{a}{N} \begin{pmatrix} S_1(t) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & S_2(t) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & S_3(t) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0.50 & 0.04 \\ 0.98 & 0.15 & 0 \\ 0.9 & 0.01 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_1(t) \\ I_2(t) \\ I_3(t) \end{bmatrix} \quad (14)$$

where we invented numbers to flesh out the picture. The updates for susceptibles become

$$\begin{bmatrix} S_1(t+1) \\ S_2(t+1) \\ S_3(t+1) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} S_1(t) \\ S_2(t) \\ S_3(t) \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \nu_1(t) \\ \nu_2(t) \\ \nu_3(t) \end{bmatrix} \quad (15)$$

whereas, and this is important, the updates for I_1, \dots, I_3 look a bit different:

$$\begin{bmatrix} I_1(t+1) \\ I_2(t+1) \\ I_3(t+1) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{bmatrix} (\nu_1(t) + \nu_2(t) + \nu_3(t)), \quad (16)$$

where $v_j = I_j(0)/N$ is the fraction in each respective group. The reason being that the newly infected naturally will distribute over super-spreaders, average and low-spreaders according to their respective proportion of the population. Finally we also have $R(t+1) = R(t) + I_1(t) + I_2(t) + I_3(t)$ since the time to recover is one week for all groups, in this simplified model.

The reader may now feel that this is completely useless, since we are clearly making these numbers up and there would be no way to measure them in practice (again, welcome to mathematical epidemiology). This is where the beauty of Theorem 4.1 becomes clear, because as long as we believe that such a model would be a good model for accurately forecasting disease spread, the Theorem states that we can instead run a basic SIR-model with only two unknown parameters, which are easily fitted to real data. Hence we do not need to know the actual transmission probabilities. Moreover, the above equation system is interesting from a theoretical standpoint since the central matrix is not symmetric, in opposition to all previously derived models for SARS-CoV-2 that we have come across. This means that one could have hoped to find a more unexpected behavior than the look-alike curves produced in Section 2.1 and 2.2. The below proposition annihilates such a hope, showing that this model actually reduces to S-SIR.

In order to introduce a continuous time (ODE) version of (14)-(16), we let $\mathbf{S} = (S_1, \dots, S_J)^T$ be a vector such that $S = \sum_{j=1}^J S_j$ is the total amount of susceptibles. The symbol T is for transpose, which is a mathematical operation that turns a row-vector into a column-vector. (All vectors considered here are to be column-vectors for the matrix vector formalism to function.) Similarly $\mathbf{I} = (I_1, \dots, I_K)^T$ will represent the various compartments of I where $I = \sum_{k=1}^K I_k$. Hence $S(t)$ and $I(t)$ continue to denote the total amount of susceptible and infectives at time t , whereas \mathbf{I} and \mathbf{S} contain the amount in respective compartment (for variable infectivity/susceptibility). Note that there is no need to introduce

various compartments for R , since once you recover neither infectivity level nor susceptibility level is important. Let $\text{diag}_{\mathbf{S}}$ denote the diagonal matrix with $\mathbf{S}(t)$ on the diagonal, as in (14), and let M_P denote the matrix with probability of transmission between the various groups per encounter, i.e. the generalization of the second matrix on the right in (14). Our equation for the vector version of ν then becomes

$$\boldsymbol{\nu} = \frac{a}{N} \text{diag}_{\mathbf{S}} M_P \mathbf{I} \quad (17)$$

where a now has to be interpreted as the daily amount of potentially infectious contacts by an average infective (in the main manuscript the time interval was a week, not a day). If we let $\mathbf{v}^T = (v_1, \dots, v_K)$ denote the fraction of the total population in the various compartments for infectivity level, then the corresponding SIR-equation system becomes

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{S}' &= -\boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \mathbf{I}' &= \boldsymbol{\nu} \mathbf{v} - \sigma \mathbf{I} \\ R' &= \sigma \mathbf{I}(t) \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

where $\nu = \sum_{j=1}^J \nu_j$ (so it is not a misprint that one is bold and the other not, compare with (15)-(16)). Here $\sigma = 1/T_{\text{generation}}$ which we here take to be 7 days (we measure the time in days throughout the supplementary material). The initial conditions become

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{S}(0) &= \mathbf{w}N \\ \mathbf{I}(0) &= \mathbf{v}n \\ R(0) &= 0 \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

where $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_J)^T$ is the fraction of the population in the respective susceptibility group.

Proposition 6.1. *Given any solution $(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{I}, R)$ to the system (17)-(19), the triple (\mathbf{S}, I, R) solves the system*

$$\boldsymbol{\nu} = \frac{a}{N} \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{S} \mathbf{I} \quad (20)$$

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{S}' &= -\boldsymbol{\nu} \\ I' &= \boldsymbol{\nu} - \sigma I \\ R' &= \sigma I(t) \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{S}(0) &= \mathbf{w}N \\ I(0) &= n \\ R(0) &= 0 \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

where \cdot denotes componentwise multiplication and $\mathbf{p} = M_P \mathbf{v}$. Moreover, $R_0 = a \mathbf{w}^T M_P \mathbf{v} = a \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{p} \rangle$.

Proof. Let $(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{I}, R)$ be given and let $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ be defined by (17). Given a scalar solution to the equation $i' = \nu - \sigma i$, $i(0) = n$, it follows that $I_j(t) = v_j i(t)$ is a solution to the corresponding row in the equation $\mathbf{I}' = \boldsymbol{\nu} \mathbf{v} - \sigma \mathbf{I}$, and hence we see that $\mathbf{I}(t) = \mathbf{v} i(t)$. Hence, since I denotes the sum of \mathbf{I} , we see that $i = I$. With $\mathbf{p} = M_P \mathbf{v}$ it is easy to see that (17) reduces to (20), and that the equation for \mathbf{I} in (18) reduces to the middle equation of (21). At $t = 0$ we have $\mathbf{S}/N = \mathbf{w}$ so this equation then reads $I'(0) = a \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{p} \rangle I - \sigma I$, which gives the desired formula for R_0 . \square

Note that the numbers in \mathbf{p} are between 0 and 1 and can be interpreted as transmission probabilities just as in Section 2.2.

7 Motivation of Theorem 4.1

We now motivate Theorem 4.1 in the more general setting of continuous time (ODE) SIR, which in its simplest incarnation looks as follows

$$\begin{cases} S' &= -\nu \\ I' &= \nu - \sigma I \\ R' &= \sigma I \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

where $\nu(t)$ is the rate of new infections at time t given by

$$\nu = \frac{\alpha}{N} S I \quad (24)$$

and N is the population size. Again, we now measure time in days and set $\sigma = 1/T_{\text{generation}} = 1/7$. Let $\omega = 1 - \theta$ be a level of initially susceptible in the population, and assume that n additional infective individuals are introduced at time $t = 0$. The initial conditions then become

$$\begin{cases} S(0) &= \omega N \\ I(0) &= n \\ R(0) &= 0 \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

To even state a proper version of Theorem 4.1 is a non-trivial task, not to mention making a theorem out of it. We first introduce some notation and explain the intuition behind the formulas (9)-(10) for ω and α .

Given a solution (S_0, I_0, R_0) to (23)-(25) we introduce the normalized functions $s_0(t) = S_0(t)/N$, $i_0(t) = I_0(t)/N$, $r_0(t) = R_0(t)/N$. These functions solve the system

$$\begin{cases} s' &= -\alpha s i \\ i' &= \alpha s i - \sigma i \\ r' &= \sigma i \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

with $s(0) = \omega$, $i(0) = n/N =: \varepsilon$ and $r(0) = 0$. Note that $s_0(t) + i_0(t) + r_0(t) = \omega + \varepsilon$. Next, we reduce (26) by using the well-known fact that t can be replaced by r as the independent variable. Let \tilde{s}_0 and \tilde{i}_0 be functions defined via $s_0(t) = \tilde{s}_0(r_0(t))$ and $i_0(t) = \tilde{i}_0(r_0(t))$. By the chain rule the functions $(\tilde{s}_0, \tilde{i}_0)$ are solutions to the system

$$\begin{cases} ds/dr &= -\alpha s/\sigma \\ di/dr &= \alpha s/\sigma - 1 \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

which is easily solved. Since $r_0(0) = 0$ we have that $\tilde{s}_0(0) = s_0(0) = S_0(0)/N = \omega$, by which we infer that

$$\tilde{s}_0(r) = \tilde{s}_0(0)e^{-\alpha r/\sigma} = \omega e^{-\alpha r/\sigma} = \frac{\sigma}{\alpha} f_0(r) \quad (28)$$

where $f_0(r) := \frac{\alpha\omega}{\sigma} e^{-\alpha r/\sigma} = R_0 e^{-R_0 r/\omega}$. Returning to (27) we see that

$$\frac{d\tilde{i}_0}{dr} = \frac{\alpha\tilde{s}_0}{\sigma} - 1 = f_0 - 1.$$

Integrating both sides and using the initial condition $\tilde{i}_0(0) = i_0(0) = \varepsilon$ gives the solution

$$\tilde{i}_0(r) = \varepsilon + F_0(r) - r, \quad (29)$$

where $F_0(r) = \int f_0 = \omega(1 - e^{-R_0 r/\omega})$. See Figure 5 for an illustration.

We now solve the equation for $r_0(t)$ in (26), which is separable and can be written

$$\frac{dr_0/dt}{\sigma\tilde{i}_0(r_0(t))} = 1.$$

Integrating both sides with respect to t and making the change of variables $x = r_0(t)$ gives

$$\int_0^{r_0(t)} \frac{dx}{\sigma\tilde{i}_0(x)} = t.$$

Letting t_0 be the primitive function of $1/(\sigma\tilde{i}_0)$ satisfying $t_0(0) = 0$ we thus obtain the implicit solution $t_0(r_0(t)) = t$. Hence, t_0 is also the inverse of r_0 (which exists since $r_0'(t) > 0$ for all $t > 0$), and so

$$r_0(t) = t_0^{-1}(t), \quad t_0(r) := \int_0^r \frac{dx}{\sigma\tilde{i}_0(x)}. \quad (30)$$

Let r_∞ be the positive solution of the equation $\tilde{i}_0(r) = 0$, which is unique by concavity of \tilde{i} . By standard calculus this is a non-integrable singularity and hence $\lim_{r \rightarrow r_\infty} t_0(r) = \infty$. Since r_0 is the inverse of t_0 , we see that r_∞ equals the limit $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} r_0(t)$, known as the final size of the pandemic. We therefore refer to this number simply as $r_0(\infty)$ in what follows. Summing up, t_0 is only defined for values of r in $[0, r_0(\infty))$. Note also that as a consequence we also obtain

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} i_0(t) = 0 \quad (31)$$

since $i_0(t) = \tilde{i}_0(r_0(t))$ so the above limit becomes $\tilde{i}_0(r_0(\infty)) = 0$.

Applying the same arguments to (20)–(22) we obtain first a system in terms of normalized variables

$$\begin{cases} s'_j &= -ap_j s_j i & 1 \leq j \leq J \\ i' &= \sum_{j=1}^J ap_j s_j i - \sigma i \\ r' &= \sigma i \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

and then an equivalent reduced system of the form

$$\begin{cases} ds_j/dr &= -ap_j s_j/\sigma & 1 \leq j \leq J \\ di_1/dr &= \sum_{j=1}^J ap_j s_j/\sigma - 1. \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

Let $(\tilde{s}_1, \dots, \tilde{s}_J, \tilde{i}_1)$ be a solution to (33) with $\tilde{i}_1(0) = \varepsilon$ and $\tilde{s}_j(0) = S_j(0)/N = w_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, J$. Similarly, we will write $r_1(t)$ to denote the function described by (30) with \tilde{i}_0 swapped for \tilde{i}_1 . As in (28)–(29) we obtain the solutions

$$\tilde{s}_j(r) = w_j e^{-ap_j r/\sigma} \quad 1 \leq j \leq J \quad (34)$$

$$\tilde{i}_1(r) = \varepsilon + \sum_{j=1}^J w_j (1 - e^{-ap_j r/\sigma}) - r \quad (35)$$

See Figure 5 (black curve) for an illustration using the same values as in Section 2.2, in particular note that it meets the x -axis at the final size of the pandemic $r_1(\infty)$, which is seen slightly above 0.3 for the pink graph in Figure 1 (the slight overshooting is due to the discretization).

The philosophy behind Theorem 4.1 is that we want to pick the parameters α and ω so that (29) becomes approximately equal to (35). (We do not care about the relationship between s_0 and (s_1, \dots, s_J) .) Then, due to (30) we will have $r_1(t)$ approximately equal to $r_0(t)$ and therefore $i_1(r_1(t))$ approximately equal to $i_0(r_0(t))$. Now, by Taylor's formula we have

$$\tilde{i}_0(r) = \varepsilon - r + \omega \left(\frac{\alpha}{\sigma} r - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\alpha^2}{\sigma^2} r^2 + O(r^3) \right)$$

and

$$\tilde{i}_1(r) = \varepsilon - r + \sum_{j=1}^J w_j \left(\frac{ap_j}{\sigma} r - \frac{1}{2} \frac{(ap_j)^2}{\sigma^2} r^2 + O(r^3) \right)$$

where O is the big O notation of Bachman-Landau. Comparing Taylor coefficients we set $\omega\alpha = \sum_{j=1}^J w_j ap_j$ and $\omega\alpha^2 = \sum_{j=1}^J w_j (ap_j)^2$ so that the Taylor polynomials of order two of \tilde{i}_0 and \tilde{i}_1 coincide. This gives

$$\alpha = a \frac{\sum_{j=1}^J w_j p_j^2}{\sum_{j=1}^J w_j p_j}, \quad \omega = \frac{(\sum_{j=1}^J w_j p_j)^2}{\sum_{j=1}^J w_j p_j^2}, \quad (36)$$

which generalizes (9) and (10).

Note here that $\omega < 1$. In fact, since $\sum_{j=1}^J w_j = 1$ and $0 < w_j, p_j \leq 1$ for all j it follows that $\sum_j w_j p_j \leq 1$, which implies that

$$\sum_{j=1}^J w_j p_j^2 > \sum_{j=1}^J w_j p_j \geq \left(\sum_{j=1}^J w_j p_j \right)^2 \iff 1 > \frac{(\sum_{j=1}^J w_j p_j)^2}{\sum_{j=1}^J w_j p_j^2} = \omega \quad (37)$$

(with strict inequality since at least one p_j is strictly less than one). These formulas can be put in somewhat neater form by introducing $R_1 = a/\sigma$, i.e. the R_0 -value one would have at the beginning of the pandemic if everyone were a super-susceptible. We then get

$$R_0 = \frac{\omega\alpha}{\sigma} = \frac{a \sum_{j=1}^J w_j p_j}{\sigma} = R_1 \sum_{j=1}^J w_j p_j.$$

Introducing $f_1(r) = R_1 \sum_{j=1}^J w_j p_j e^{-R_1 p_j r}$ and $F_1 = \int f_1 = \sum_{j=1}^J w_j (1 - e^{-R_1 p_j r})$, we can write

$$\tilde{i}_1(r) = \varepsilon + F_1(r) - r, \quad (38)$$




Figure 5: \tilde{i}_1 (black) for the same example as in Fig 1 and \tilde{i}_0 (blue) using the choice of α and ω stipulated in Theorem 4.1.

which should be compared with (29). Note that F_1 is engineered to have same first three Taylor coefficients as F_0 . Moreover, introducing

$$t_1(r) := \int_0^r \frac{dx}{\sigma \tilde{i}_1(x)}, \quad (39)$$

we obtain r_1 as t_1^{-1} and subsequently $r_1' = \sigma i_1$.

To summarize this section, we argue that if $F_0 \approx F_1$ and $r_0 \approx r_1$, then it should follow that $i_0 \approx i_1$ since $i_j(t) = \tilde{i}_j(r_j(t))$, $j = 0, 1$, and \tilde{i}_0 and \tilde{i}_1 are given by (29) and (38), respectively. To formalize this statement a bit, consider now the more general ODE

$$r'(t) = G(r(t), \delta), \quad r(0) = 0, \quad (40)$$

where

$$G(r, \delta) = \sigma(\varepsilon + (1 - \delta)F_0(r) + \delta F_1(r) - r), \quad \delta \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then $r_0(t)$ is the unique solution to (40) for $\delta = 0$, while $r_1(t)$ is the unique solution to (40) for $\delta = 1$. It is well-known that since $G(x, \delta)$ is independent of t and continuous in δ for every fixed x , it follows that the solution $r(t) = r(t, \delta)$ of (40) is continuous in δ , uniformly in $t \in [0, T]$ for any $T > 0$, see for example [2] and the references therein. We collect these observations in the following theorem.

Theorem 7.1. *Let $r(t, \delta)$ be the unique solution of (40). Then for any $T > 0$, the solution $r(t, \delta)$ is a continuous function of δ , uniformly in $t \in [0, T]$. Moreover, we have $r(t, 0) = r_0(t)$ and $r(t, 1) = r_1(t)$.*

Our numerical simulations have confirmed that indeed, the difference between i_0 and i_1 is small, but we have been unable to prove a strict mathematical version. In the coming section, we offer some partial results and a conjecture.

7.1 A conjecture

It remains to establish proper estimates proving that the resulting solution (i_0, r_0) is near (i_1, r_1) . We first establish the following important inequality, which is the explanation behind that the black curve (from S-SIR) always seems to be a bit higher than the blue one (from SIR).

Proposition 7.2. *It holds that $f_1 \geq f_0$. Consequently $F_1 \geq F_0$, $\tilde{i}_1 \geq \tilde{i}_0$ and $d\tilde{i}_1/dr \geq d\tilde{i}_0/dr$.*

Proof. The choice of ω and α is designed so that $f_1(0) = f_0(0)$ and $f_1'(0) = f_0'(0)$. Moreover we have

$$f_1(r) - f_0(r) = \frac{1}{\sigma} \left(\sum_{j=1}^J w_j a p_j e^{-a p_j r / \sigma} - \omega \alpha e^{-\alpha r / \sigma} \right).$$

Multiplying with $e^{\alpha r / \sigma}$ we obtain $\sum_{j=1}^J w_j a p_j e^{(\alpha - a p_j) r / \sigma} - \omega \alpha$ which is a strictly convex function (unless $\alpha = a p_j$ for all j , which means that all probabilities are the same and the model collapses to the standard SIR model, and there is nothing to prove) that in addition equals zero and has derivative zero at $r = 0$ by construction. By convexity it follows that the function is non-negative, giving $d\tilde{i}_1/dr \geq d\tilde{i}_0/dr$ with strict inequality for $r > 0$. Convexity also implies that the function and its derivative are increasing. The desired inequality follows by integrating $d\tilde{i}_1/dr \geq d\tilde{i}_0/dr$, keeping in mind that $\tilde{i}_1(0) = \tilde{i}_0(0)$. \square

Proposition 7.3. *Let r_0 be the solution to (26) and r_1 the solution to (32). Then $r_1 \geq r_0$.*

Proof. Let $g(x) = \sigma \tilde{i}_0(x)$. Then $r_0'(t) = g(r_0(t))$ while $r_1'(t) \geq g(r_1(t))$ by Proposition 7.2. Since $r_1(0) = r_0(0)$, standard theory of ordinary differential equations then dictates that $r_1(t) \geq r_0(t)$ for $t \geq 0$. \square

We have not been able to prove the following observation:




Figure 6: Line between pairs $(i_0(t), r_0(t))$ and $(i_1(t), r_1(t))$ for a grid of t -values, using the same parameters as in Fig. 1. Note that the inner and outer envelope is given by \tilde{i}_0 and \tilde{i}_1 (cf. Fig. 5).




Figure 7: Left: SEIR with $R_0 = 1.66$ and $T_{generation} = 7$, SIR with the same parameters and finally SIR with a 1% lower R_0 , same $T_{generation}$ and a lower initial condition. Right: Age-activity stratified SEIR with $R_0 = 1.66$ and $T_{generation} = 7$ (blue); SIR using the same $T_{generation}$ but a pre-immunity of 25% and different transmission parameters (red).

Conjecture 7.4. We have $i_1 \geq i_0$ and furthermore, $s_0 - \sum_{j=1}^J s_j$ is an increasing function.

Recall that the final size of the pandemic solves $\tilde{i}_j(r_j(\infty)) = 0$, $j = 1, 2$, and that these two points tend to be quite close, see for example Fig. 5 where the difference is around 0.02 or 2%. Since $s_0 - \sum_{j=1}^J s_j = \omega - 1 + (i_1 + r_1) - (i_0 + r_0)$ and $r_1(\infty) - r_0(\infty)$ is the limit of $(i_1 + r_1) - (i_0 + r_0)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, the conjecture implies that both the difference $r_1(t) - r_0(t)$ as well as $i_1(t) - i_0(t)$ are bounded by $r_1(\infty) - r_0(\infty)$.

8 Extension to more general models

The argument in Section 7 does not extend to the more commonly used SEIR-model. However, for a disease like COVID-19, with a short incubation period followed by an even shorter infectious period, there is almost no difference between modeling using SIR or using SEIR, and hence we believe that the key conclusions of this paper extend to this model as well.

Similarly, we find that more advanced SEIR-models taking variable age and activity levels into account, behave just like SIR if we allow for pre-immunity. We leave the formal verification of these observations as an open conjecture for the mathematical community.

8.1 SEIR

SEIR has two key parameters apart from R_0 , namely $T_{infectious}$ and $T_{incubation}$, where the former is the average time that a person is infectious and the latter is the time from when a person becomes infected until he or she becomes infectious.³ Estimates for these vary, we here follow Britton et. al. [4] and set $T_{incubation} = 4$ and $T_{infectious} = 3$. It then follows that the generation time equals

$$T_{generation} = T_{infectious} + T_{infective} = 7,$$

where the generation time is the average time it takes from that a person gets infected until that person infects others (see equation (5) in [7]). Note that this is consistent with the choice of σ in previous sections.

The reason why SEIR and SIR give almost identical output for COVID-19 is that both are primarily determined by the values of $T_{generation}$ and R_0 . To wit, during a major outbreak, it does not matter if a person is sick for 7 days and infect R_0 people during those 7 days, or if he undergoes incubation for 4 days and then infect R_0 people during the remaining 3 days. In fact, one may consider even more accurate models taking age of infection into account, and designing a transmission profile to COVID-19. This was done in Section 5 of [7], where it was shown that the transmission profile

³See the supplementary material of [7] for a fuller discussion of how to setup SEIR and its parameters

has a marginal effect on the corresponding curves, which are determined by R_0 and $T_{generation}$. In the interest of keeping this supplementary section at reasonable length, we do not develop these ideas further, but content ourselves with showing an example, see Fig. 7, left. Just like in Fig. 3, we get a good fit by choosing parameters in accordance with the general philosophy, and an almost perfect overlap by allowing free parameters. Since these parameters are unknown in reality, we argue that it is irrelevant whether one uses SIR or SEIR. Therefore, the observations of this paper should extend to SEIR as well.

8.2 Heterogeneous models

Variable susceptibility is not the only type of population heterogeneity which could manifest itself as pre-immunity on a macro level. In [4] the authors develop a heterogeneous SEIR model taking variable interaction pattern between different age-groups into account, as well as the fact that people in each age-group have varying amount of contacts. We implemented their model and then sought parameters for SIR, allowing for pre-immunity, that would yield a similar output. The result is seen in Figure 7, right. Again, the difference is so fine that it would be impossible to spot in practice. Henceforth, what appears as pre-immunity in mathematical models may in fact be a mix of various population heterogeneities, in which variable susceptibility is only one ingredient.

This begs the following question: Could it then be that the seeming pre-immunity could be only attributed to variation in age and social patterns? We believe that the answer is no. The model by Britton et. al. [4] is analyzed in depth in Section 6 of [7], where it is shown that the variable activity levels are chosen with such high variability that R_0 would drop by close to 50% if the highly active group would cut the amount of daily contacts by half, which seems unrealistic. Furthermore, as seen in the above figure, even if we accept the large activity-variation in their model, it only accounts for 25% pre-immunity in a simple SIR model. However, to accurately model Stockholm County, it is shown in [8] that we need around 60% pre-immunity, which seems impossible to reach with activity and age variation alone. That being said, both factors clearly pull in the same direction, and hence how much of these 60% to attribute to activity-variation and how much to attribute to variation in susceptibility, will probably never be fully known.