

Supplementary Information

1. Assumptions
2. Incident cases over time in different scenarios
3. References for Supplementary Information

Assumptions

Population size

Our target population was all individuals who were either rough sleeping or living in homeless hostel accommodation in England in March 2021. We estimated the number of people living in homeless hostels using the number of hostel beds, which was reported to be 35,817 across 1,085 accommodation projects in 2019 (mean size 33.6 beds, median 21).¹ Occupancy of these hostels is high, with hostels reporting only 784 empty beds on one night in 2018, so for simplicity we used the number of beds as an estimate of the number of residents.

We estimated the number of people sleeping rough at one point in time using official counts conducted by the UK government on one night in Autumn 2019,² plus an estimate of case ascertainment (the proportion of the true rough sleeping population identified by this exercise). Case ascertainment was estimated for London based on the CHAIN database,³ which records rough sleepers identified by street outreach teams over the course of a year. In 2018/19, 2,080 ‘long-term’ rough sleepers were identified, plus 6,775 other individuals who had not been seen in the previous year (‘short-term’). We assumed that the mean duration of rough sleeping for the short-term population was 6 weeks, suggesting there would be 782 ($6775 \times 6/52$) short-term rough sleepers at one point in time. This gave an estimate of 2,862 rough sleepers in London, suggesting that the case ascertainment of the official count in London was 40%. We applied this ratio to other regions in England, with results shown in Table S1.

We did not account for entry into or exit from the homeless population, and assumed that people leaving the population are replaced by similar people at a constant rate.

Table S1: estimates of the number of homeless people in England, by region

Region	Number of hostel beds	Official count of rough sleepers on one night in Autumn 2019	Estimate of rough sleeping population with case ascertainment of 40%
London	9,671	1,136	2,862
South West	4,177	490	1,234
North East	1,400	67	169
West Midlands	3,623	319	804
South East	4,124	900	2,267
North West	3,342	349	879
East Midlands	2,626	305	768
East	4,009	458	1,154
Other	184	0	0
Yorkshire & the Humber	2,661	242	610
England	35,817	4,266	10,748

Vulnerability to severe disease

We defined vulnerability to severe disease as being aged 55 or older and/or having one or more long-term conditions. Our assumptions were based on a cross-sectional survey of 1,709 homeless people in London and Birmingham, in which participants self-reported long-term conditions including asthma, bronchitis, emphysema or obstructive airways disease/chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, epilepsy, heart problems, (including heart attack, angina, murmur or abnormal heart rhythms), stroke and diabetes. Results from this study have been published⁴ but were limited to people aged under 65, so we requested the results for the full age range from the authors, which showed that 37% were either aged 55 or older or had one or more long term condition (table S2).

Table S2: Prevalence of one or more long-term condition by age among homeless people in London and Birmingham

	No long-term conditions	One or more long-term condition	Total
Under 55	1082 (63%)	434 (25%)	1516 (89%)
55 or older	106 (6%)	87 (5%)	193 (11%)
Total	1188 (70%)	521 (30%)	1709 (100%)

Infection fatality rates

Fatality rates due to COVID-19 remain uncertain. Fatality rates may be described as (a) an infection fatality rate (IFR); the proportion of all cases who die including asymptomatic cases; (b) the symptomatic case fatality rate (sCFR); the proportion who die after developing symptoms; or (c) the hospitalisation fatality rate (HFR); the proportion of hospitalised cases who die. Most available estimates are ‘naive CFRs’ (nCFRs); crude ratios of deaths to total cases at a given time point. This is biased by delays between onset and death (i.e. cases who have not yet died and are not included in the numerator) and case ascertainment (less severe cases not included in the denominator). China’s CDC⁵ reported a nCFR of 2.9% in Hubei province and 0.4% in other Chinese provinces. An attempt to adjust for delays and case ascertainment suggested a sCFR for Wuhan of 1.4% and of 0.8% in other cities in China.⁶ A review of sCFRs for COVID-19 showed high heterogeneity with a prediction interval of 0.6% to 7.2%,⁷ with higher sCFRs likely relating to testing being limited to more severe cases.

We followed four steps to estimate IFRs for people experiencing homelessness:

1. Estimating an IFR for homeless people who are not vulnerable to severe disease. We set this at 0.6% as this was the lower limit of the prediction interval estimated by the CEBM,⁷ which is likely to be least biased), and also a modelled estimate of the all-age IFR.⁸ This approach represents some inflation of the expected mortality rate for homeless people, since we used the IFR from the whole general population (which includes vulnerable people) for homeless people who we have classified as not vulnerable.
2. Estimating an IFR for homeless people who are vulnerable to severe disease (due to being aged 55 or older or having an underlying health condition). We used a relative risk (RR) of death

for this group (compared with homeless individuals aged under 55 with no LTCs) of 9, based on existing modelled estimates of mortality risk for those age 55 or older compared with those aged under 55,⁹ adjusted for LTC status (8.1; weighted to reflect the homeless population's age structure)⁴ and for having a long-term condition⁹ (LTC), after adjustment for age (7.4; based on estimates for chronic respiratory disease, as the most common LTC in this population). We assumed these effects were additive (and thus a RR of 14.5) in those aged 55 or older with one or more LTC, and used population estimates (table S2) to estimate a weighted average of 8.2. Using a baseline IFR of 0.6% amongst non-vulnerable individuals, this gives an IFR of 4.9% for vulnerable individuals.

3. Estimating the proportion of cases who are (a) asymptomatic, (b) have mild symptoms and do not require medical support, (c) have moderate symptoms and require some medical support, such as oxygen, (d) have severe symptoms and require hospitalisation, and (e) require critical care; and fatality rates for each of these five groups. We used case series from China⁵ alongside estimates of the proportion of asymptomatic or undetected mildly symptomatic cases to estimate the proportions of cases in each category overall, and then set group-level fatality rates that achieve the above overall IFRs and relative risk, assuming that most deaths occur in the 'critical' group.
4. Creating additional 'low' and 'high' IFR scenarios to use in sensitivity analysis. In the low scenario, we used an IFR of 0.15%⁸ for non-vulnerable homeless people, which is the modelled IFR for under 60s after adjustment for delays to onset and case ascertainment from the data in China. Using the same risk ratio as in step (2), the IFR for vulnerable homeless people in the low scenario is 1.23%. In the 'high' scenario, we multiplied the low scenario by ten to give IFRs of 1.5% for non-vulnerable homeless people and 12.3% for vulnerable homeless people.

The IFRs we used in our base scenario are summarised in table 2 of the main report.

Incident cases over time in different scenarios

The number of new cases by day in each scenario is shown in Figure 1 (note the different y-axes).




Figure 1: Number of COVID-19 cases in eight scenarios

References

1. Homeless Link. Support for single homeless people in England, Annual Review 2018. 2019. <https://www.homeless.org.uk/sites/default/files/site-attachments/Annual%20Review2018.pdf> (accessed April 1, 2020).
2. Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government. Rough sleeping snapshot in England: autumn 2019. 2020. <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/rough-sleeping-snapshot-in-england-autumn-2019> (accessed April 1, 2020).
3. Greater London Authority. Rough sleeping in London (CHAIN reports). 2019. <https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/chain-reports> (accessed April 24, 2020).
4. Lewer D, Aldridge RW, Menezes D, et al. Health-related quality of life and prevalence of six chronic diseases in homeless and housed people: a cross-sectional study in London and Birmingham, England. *BMJ Open* 2019; 9: e025192.
5. Bi Q, Wu Y, Mei S, et al. Epidemiology and Transmission of COVID-19 in Shenzhen China: Analysis of 391 cases and 1,286 of their close contacts. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*, 2020 DOI:10.1101/2020.03.03.20028423.
6. Wu J, Liu J, Zhao X, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Imported Cases of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Jiangsu Province: A Multicenter Descriptive Study. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2020; : ciaa199.
7. Oke J, Heneghan C. Global Covid-19 Case Fatality Rates. 2020. <https://www.cebm.net/covid-19/global-covid-19-case-fatality-rates/> (accessed April 24, 2020).
8. Verity R, Okell LC, Dorigatti I, et al. Estimates of the severity of COVID-19 disease. *Epidemiology*, 2020 DOI:10.1101/2020.03.09.20033357.
9. Caramelo F, Ferreira N, Oliveiros B. Estimation of risk factors for COVID-19 mortality - preliminary results. *Epidemiology*, 2020 DOI:10.1101/2020.02.24.20027268.