

Supplementary Material

SEIR Model

To model the dynamics of a SARS-CoV-2 outbreak and its demand on healthcare over time the following SEIR model structure, parameterised to match our current best estimates of key parameters determining the natural history and spread of the virus. The model is available as an R package at <https://github.com/mrc-ide/squire> (Figure S1) and is age-stratified, explicitly incorporating patterns of mixing across and between different age groups.




Figure S1 Age Structured Compartmental model structure. Individuals in the population begin as susceptible to infection with SARS-CoV-2 (S); once infected (through an age-specific force of infection determined by age-dependent contact rates with infected individuals) and following a latent period of infection (E), individuals either develop mild symptoms and therefore do not require hospitalisation (I_{Mild}) or they require hospitalisation and in which case move to the I_{Case} compartment. Individuals in the I_{Case} compartment are then hospitalised, and will either require high pressure oxygen treatment requiring an hospital bed ($I_{Hospital}$) or ventilator support in an ICU unit (I_{ICU}). Hospitalised cases either recover (R) or die (D). Those cases in the ICU either die (D) or recover (R) after spending a period of recovery time in a general hospital bed (I_{Rec}). Pale blue box indicates compartments related to hospitalisation and occupation of a general hospital bed, pale red box indicates compartments related to hospitalisations that occupy an ICU hospital bed.




Figure S2 Decision tree cascades to capture excess mortality with healthcare capacity being exceeded. At each timestep, individuals requiring general hospital and ICU beds respectively are assigned available beds (independently of age) Those receiving a bed are subject to a lower probability of mortality than those who do not. Notation to the right hand side of each box describes the compartment in terms of the notation introduced below.

The discrete-time stochastic equations for the model are given below. Where (a) represents the different age groups within the model such that $S(a)$ represents the susceptible population in age group a . $E_1(a)$ and $E_2(a)$ two sequential latent periods, $I_{Mild}(a)$ represents infections that are asymptomatic or mildly symptomatic that do not require hospitalisation and $I_{CASE,1}(a)$ and $I_{CASE,2}(a)$ two sequential states for those cases that will develop severe disease and require hospitalisation. The following compartments are all represented by two sequential states (two chosen to produce a gamma distribution of time spent in each compartment): $I_{HOSPITAL,1}(a)$ and $I_{HOSPITAL,2}(a)$ for infections requiring a hospital bed, $I_{ICU,1}(a)$ and $I_{ICU,2}(a)$ for infections requiring an ICU bed, $I_{REC,1}(a)$ and $I_{REC,2}(a)$ for those infections requiring a general hospital bed while recovering from ICU care. Finally, $R(a)$ all those who recover (and are assumed to remain immune for the duration of the epidemic) and $D(a)$ those that die from disease in age group a . To capture hospital capacity constraints all $I_{HOSPITAL,i}(a)$ and $I_{ICU,i}(a)$ states ($i = 1,2$) are split to track those that do receive care (1) and those that don't receive care (0) depending on the set limits. This allows the model to capture different durations of hospital stay dependent on outcome (Figure S2). For example, the state tracking those that require a general bed, receive it and go on to die is $I_{HOSPITAL,i(a,1,0)}$ whilst the state tracking those that require a general bed, do not receive it and go on to die is $I_{HOSPITAL,i(a,0,0)}$. Births, deaths, and ageing are not modelled due to the short-term epidemic dynamics considered.

$$S(t+1, a) = S(t, a) - \beta \frac{S(t, a)}{N} \sum_{a'} c(a, a') [I_{MILD}(t, a') + I_{CASE}(t, a')]$$

$$E_1(t+1, a) = E_1(t, a) + \beta \frac{S(t, a)}{N} \sum_{a'} c(a, a') [I_{MILD}(t, a') + I_{CASE}(t, a')] - 2\alpha E_1(t, a)$$

$$E_2(t+1, a) = E_2(t, a) + 2\alpha E_1(t, a) - 2\alpha E_2(t, a)$$

$$I_{MILD}(t+1, a) = I_{MILD}(t, a) + (1 - \phi_1(a))(2\alpha E_2(t, a)) - \gamma_1 I_{MILD}(t, a)$$

$$I_{CASE,0}(t+1, a) = I_{CASE,0}(t, a) + \phi_1(a)(2\alpha E_2(t, a)) - 2\gamma_2 I_{CASE,0}(t, a)$$

$$I_{CASE,1}(t+1, a) = I_{CASE,1}(t, a) + 2\gamma_2 I_{CASE,0}(t, a) - 2\gamma_2 I_{CASE,1}(t, a)$$

$$I_{HOSPITAL,0}(t+1, a, 0, 0) = I_{HOSPITAL,0}(t, a, 0, 0) + (1 - \delta(H))\mu(1 - \phi_2(a))2\gamma_2 I_{CASE,1}(t, a) - 2\gamma_{3,0} I_{HOSPITAL,0}(t, a, 0, 0)$$

$$I_{HOSPITAL,1}(t+1, a, 0, 0) = I_{HOSPITAL,1}(t, a, 0, 0) + 2\gamma_{3,0} I_{HOSPITAL,0}(t, a, 0, 0) - 2\gamma_{3,0} I_{HOSPITAL,1}(t, a, 0, 0)$$

$$I_{HOSPITAL,0}(t+1, a, 1, 0) = I_{HOSPITAL,0}(t, a, 1, 0) + \delta(H)\mu(1 - \phi_2(a))2\gamma_2 I_{CASE,1}(t, a) - 2\gamma_{3,0} I_{HOSPITAL,0}(t, a, 1, 0)$$

$$I_{HOSPITAL,1}(t+1, a, 1, 0) = I_{HOSPITAL,1}(t, a, 1, 0) + 2\gamma_{3,0} I_{HOSPITAL,0}(t, a, 1, 0) - 2\gamma_{3,0} I_{HOSPITAL,1}(t, a, 1, 0)$$

$$I_{HOSPITAL,0}(t+1, a, 0, 1) = I_{HOSPITAL,0}(t, a, 0, 1) + (1 - \delta(H))(1 - \mu)(1 - \phi_2(a))2\gamma_2 I_{CASE,1}(t, a) - 2\gamma_{3,0} I_{HOSPITAL,0}(t, a, 0, 1)$$

$$I_{HOSPITAL,1}(t+1, a, 0, 1) = I_{HOSPITAL,1}(t, a, 0, 1) + 2\gamma_{3,0} I_{HOSPITAL,0}(t, a, 0, 1) - 2\gamma_{3,0} I_{HOSPITAL,1}(t, a, 0, 1)$$

$$I_{HOSPITAL,0}(t+1, a, 1, 1) = I_{HOSPITAL,0}(t, a, 1, 1) + \delta(H)(1 - \mu)(1 - \phi_2(a))2\gamma_2 I_{CASE,1}(t, a) - 2\gamma_{3,0} I_{HOSPITAL,0}(t, a, 1, 1)$$

$$I_{HOSPITAL,1}(t+1, a, 1, 1) = I_{HOSPITAL,1}(t, a, 1, 1) + 2\gamma_{3,0} I_{HOSPITAL,0}(t, a, 1, 1) - 2\gamma_{3,0} I_{HOSPITAL,1}(t, a, 1, 1)$$

$$I_{ICU,0}(t+1, a, 0, 0) = I_{ICU,0}(t, a, 0, 0) + (1 - \delta(ICU))\mu\phi_2(a)2\gamma_2 I_{CASE,1}(t, a) - 2\gamma_{4,0} I_{ICU,0}(t, a, 0, 0)$$

$$I_{ICU,1}(t+1, a, 0, 0) = I_{ICU,1}(t, a, 0, 0) + 2\gamma_{4,0} I_{ICU,0}(t, a, 0, 0) - 2\gamma_{4,0} I_{ICU,1}(t, a, 0, 0)$$

$$I_{ICU,0}(t+1, a, 1, 0) = I_{ICU,0}(t, a, 1, 0) + \delta(ICU)\mu\phi_2(a)2\gamma_2 I_{CASE,1}(t, a) - 2\gamma_{4,0} I_{ICU,0}(t, a, 1, 0)$$

$$I_{ICU,1}(t+1, a, 1, 0) = I_{ICU,1}(t, a, 1, 0) + 2\gamma_{4,0} I_{ICU,0}(t, a, 1, 0) - 2\gamma_{4,0} I_{ICU,1}(t, a, 1, 0)$$

$$I_{ICU,0}(t+1, a, 0, 1) = I_{ICU,0}(t, a, 0, 1) + (1 - \delta(ICU))(1 - \mu)\phi_2(a)2\gamma_2 I_{CASE,1}(t, a) - 2\gamma_{4,1} I_{ICU,0}(t, a, 0, 1)$$

$$I_{ICU,1}(t+1, a, 0, 1) = I_{ICU,1}(t, a, 0, 1) + 2\gamma_{4,1} I_{ICU,0}(t, a, 0, 1) - 2\gamma_{4,1} I_{ICU,1}(t, a, 0, 1)$$

$$I_{ICU,0}(t+1, a, 1, 1) = I_{ICU,0}(t, a, 1, 1) + \delta(ICU)(1 - \mu)\phi_2(a)2\gamma_2 I_{CASE,1}(t, a) - 2\gamma_{4,1} I_{ICU,0}(t, a, 1, 1)$$

$$I_{ICU,1}(t+1, a, 1, 1) = I_{ICU,1}(t, a, 1, 1) + 2\gamma_{4,1} I_{ICU,0}(t, a, 1, 1) - 2\gamma_{4,1} I_{ICU,1}(t, a, 1, 1)$$

$$I_{REC,0}(t+1, a) = I_{REC,0}(t, a) + 2\gamma_{4,1} I_{ICU,1}(t, a, 1, 1) - 2\gamma_5 I_{REC,0}(t, a)$$

$$I_{REC,1}(t+1, a) = I_{REC,1}(t, a) + 2\gamma_5 I_{REC,0}(t, a) - 2\gamma_5 I_{REC,1}(t, a)$$

$$R(t+1, a) = R(t, a) + \gamma_1 I_{MILD}(t, a) + 2\gamma_{3,1} I_{HOSPITAL,1}(t, a, 0, 1) + 2\gamma_{3,1} I_{HOSPITAL,1}(t, a, 1, 1) + 2\gamma_5 I_{REC,1}(t, a) + 2\gamma_{4,1} I_{ICU,1}(t, a, 0, 1)$$

$$D(t+1, a) = D(t, a) + 2\gamma_{3,0} I_{HOSPITAL,1}(t, a, 0, 0) + 2\gamma_{3,0} I_{HOSPITAL,1}(t, a, 1, 0) + 2\gamma_{4,0} I_{ICU,1}(t, a, 0, 0) + 2\gamma_{4,0} I_{ICU,1}(t, a, 1, 0)$$

1 Further, $c(a, a')$ is the social contact mixing matrix by age and t denotes time. Here $\delta(\cdot)$ denotes the Kronecker
 2 delta function such that this equals 1 if there is capacity (Hospital or ICU) and 0 otherwise. Further details of
 3 model parameters and their values are given in Table S1.

4 Age-stratified parameters for the infection fatality ratio (IFR), probability of hospitalisation and probability of
 5 requiring ICU care are also shown in Table S1. These estimates are taken from the work of Verity et al.¹ IFR
 6 estimates have been adjusted to transform them to 5-year age brackets (using linear interpolation on a log10 scale)
 7 and scaled to account for non-uniform attack rates by age. To do so, analytical estimates of the final size of the
 8 epidemic based on Chinese demographics were generated using mixing matrices from Chinese surveys.² Then
 9 where $I(a)$ denotes the number of infections generated in age-group a , $N(a)$ the underlying population and
 10 $AR(a) = I(a)/N(a)$ the attack rate the adjusted IFR is given by:

$$11 \quad IFR'(a) = \frac{AR(50-59)}{AR(a)} IFR(a)$$

12 Age stratified estimates of the probability of hospitalisation by age were also determined from the estimates of
 13 Verity et al.¹ To account for the small numbers of severe cases observed in younger age groups the pattern
 14 determined in Verity et al is smoothed to relate it to the above estimates of the IFR in order to prevent fluctuations
 15 for these younger age groups in the proportion of hospitalised cases that die. The original IFR estimates and
 16 proportion of infections hospitalised (PIH) from Verity et al were first scaled to the oldest age group:

$$17 \quad S_{IFR}(a) = \frac{IFR(a)}{IFR(80+)} \text{ \& } S_{PIH}(a) = \frac{PIH(a)}{PIH(80+)}$$

18 A smooth ratio of $S_{PIH}(a)/S_{IFR}(a)$ for those aged under 40 is used (to ensure constant proportion of deaths in
 19 hospitalised cases of 3%) along with the $IFR'(a)$ to obtain an adjusted $PIH'(a)$.

20 The age-distribution of cases requiring ICU care $p_{cc}(a)$ is assumed to follow the same distribution of the IFR
 21 such that:

$$22 \quad p_{cc}(a) = S_{IFR}(a)p_{cc}(80+)$$

23 $p_{cc}(80+)$ is fixed at 30% based on early reports from the UK, China and Italy.

24 Clinical outcome parameters are based on data from China, the UK and the US and therefore are also dependent
 25 on the quality of healthcare available in these settings. It is likely that COVID-19 outcomes will differ in
 26 Senegal given the weaker healthcare system relative to these countries. To account for this, severity outcome
 27 parameters were adjusted following consultations from a UK Department for International Development
 28 convened panel of clinical experts from both the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medica and clinicians
 29 in Malawi and are given in Table S1.

30

31

32

33 **Table S1 Model input parameters.**

Parameter	Symbol	Value	Description
Transmission parameter	β	-	Calculated from R0
Basic reproduction number	R_0	-	Estimated from model fitting
Mean Latent Period	$\frac{1}{\alpha}$	4.6 days	Estimated at 5.1 days. ³ The last 0.5 days are incorporated in the infectious periods to capture pre-symptomatic infectivity
Mean Duration of Mild Infection	$\frac{1}{\gamma_2}$	2.1 days	Incorporates 0.5 days of infectiousness prior to symptoms. In combination with mean duration of severe illness this gives a mean serial interval of 6.75 days. ⁴
Mean Duration of Severe Infection Prior to Hospitalisation	$\frac{1}{\gamma_{3,1}}$	4.5 days	Mean onset-to-admission of 4 days based on unpublished analysis of data from the ICNARC study. ⁵ Includes 0.5 days of infectiousness prior to symptom onset.
Mean Duration of Hospitalisation for non-critical cases if survive	$\frac{1}{\gamma_{3,0}}$	9.5 days	Based on unpublished analysis of data from the ICNARC study. ⁵
Mean Duration of Hospitalisation for non-critical cases if die	$\frac{1}{\gamma_{4,1}}$	7.6 days	Based on unpublished analysis of data from the ICNARC study. ⁵
Mean Duration in ICU if survive	$\frac{1}{\gamma_{4,0}}$	11.3 days	Based on data from the ICNARC study adjusted for censoring. ⁵
Mean Duration in ICU if die	$\frac{1}{\gamma_5}$	10.1 days	Based on data from the ICNARC study adjusted for censoring. ⁵
Mean Duration in Recovery after ICU	$\frac{1}{\gamma_5}$	3.4 days	Based on unpublished analysis of data from the ICNARC study. ⁵
Probability of dying if admitted to critical care	μ	50%	Probability of death from severe infection that is treated based on data from the ICNARC study in the UK. ⁵
Age-stratified parameters			
Age adjusted IFR		0 to 4 0.003% 5 to 9 0.002% 10 to 14 0.004% 15 to 19 0.01% 20 to 24 0.02% 25 to 29 0.04% 30 to 34 0.06% 35 to 39 0.09% 40 to 44 0.13% 45 to 49 0.21% 50 to 54 0.44% 55 to 59 0.80% 60 to 64 1.68% 65 to 69 2.65% 70 to 74 4.16% 75 to 79 6.01% 80+ 9.42%	Age-stratified estimates of the IFR from Verity et al. ¹
Proportion of infections that require hospitalisation	$\phi(a)$	0 to 4 0.001 5 to 9 0.001 10 to 14 0.001 15 to 19 0.002 20 to 24 0.005 25 to 29 0.010 30 to 34 0.016 35 to 39 0.023 40 to 44 0.029 45 to 49 0.039 50 to 54 0.058 55 to 59 0.072 60 to 64 0.102 65 to 69 0.117	Smooth scaling age-stratified estimate of the proportion of infections that require hospitalisation from Verity et al. ¹

		70 to 74 75 to 79 80+	0.146 0.177 0.180	
Proportion of hospitalised cases requiring critical care	$p_{cc}(a)$	0 to 4 5 to 9 10 to 14 15 to 19 20 to 24 25 to 29 30 to 34 35 to 39 40 to 44 45 to 49 50 to 54 55 to 59 60 to 64 65 to 69 70 to 74 75 to 79 80+	0.050 0.050 0.050 0.050 0.050 0.050 0.053 0.060 0.075 0.104 0.149 0.224 0.307 0.386 0.461 0.709	Adjusted estimates from Verity et al. ¹
Adjusted model parameters to capture different outcomes in Senegal compared to UK, China and USA				
Proportion of non-critical care cases dying	$\mu(a)$	0 to 4 5 to 9 10 to 14 15 to 19 20 to 24 25 to 29 30 to 34 35 to 39 40 to 44 45 to 49 50 to 54 55 to 59 60 to 64 65 to 69 70 to 74 75 to 79 80+	0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.580	Probability of death from non-severe treated infection. Values here have been adjusted to account for the potentially lower quality healthcare in a LMIC setting “poorer outcomes” in the main text. Assumed model defaults from a HIC setting are as follows: 0.013, 0.013, 0.013, 0.013, 0.013, 0.013, 0.013, 0.013, 0.015, 0.019, 0.027, 0.042, 0.069, 0.105, 0.149, 0.203, 0.580
Mean duration of hospitalisation if require critical care (ICU) but only a general bed is available		1 day		Death is likely to be quicker than in patients in high-income countries.
Probability of dying if require critical care but do not receive it	μ	90.5% (range 85%-95%)		Probability of death from severe infection that is not treated
Probability of dying if hospitalised (non-ICU) but no oxygen available (referred to as “poorer outcomes”).	μ	60% (range 50-70%)		Probability of death in non-severe hospital infections that aren't treated
Probability of dying if require hospitalisation but no hospital beds are available	μ	60% (range 50-70%)		We assume that the outcome is similar to not receiving oxygen.

34

35 **Model fitting**

36 When calibrating the model, we consider the time series, D_t , as a partially-observed Markov process. We
37 incorporate the assumed 50% death ascertainment to relate the Markov process to the observed realisations of
38 death, which is given by


39

40

$$D_t \sim NB(\mu, \sigma)$$

41 where NB is the Negative Binomial distribution, with mean, μ and standard deviation, σ , which can be expressed
42 as $\sqrt{(\mu + \mu^2/r)}$, where r is the dispersion parameter and assumed to be equal to 2 to account for overdispersion.
43 The stochastic model is fit to D_t by allowing two parameters to vary: the start date of the epidemic, t_0 , and the
44 initial R_0 in the absence of interventions. The likelihood of the observed data given the model, t_0 and R_0 cannot be
45 analytically expressed and so we used a Sequential Monte Carlo (SMC) process to approximate the marginal
46 likelihood and to obtain an unbiased estimate of the likelihood.⁶ For a complete description of this particle filtering
47 method see Endo et al.⁷ 100 model simulations were conducted and iteratively subsampled at each day in D_t
48 according to the weighted likelihood of the simulation trajectory, with the overall likelihood for a parameter pair

49 given by the sum of the mean likelihoods at each time step. The marginal likelihood yielding the posterior for our
50 parameters was explored using a grid search over t_0 and R_0 . The resultant posterior parameter space is subsequently
51 drawn from to provide model projections.
52



53

54 **Figure S3 Sensitivity analysis to the relationship between movement reductions assumed contact reductions**

55 **and R_t .** A) The estimated percentage change in contacts for Senegal since the start of the state of emergency up

56 to 9th June. Reductions are reported in work and social contacts. These are accompanied by an increase in the

57 time spent within the household. We use the average of the changes in work and social contacts as a measure of

58 the effectiveness of the state of emergency. Data provided by Google.¹⁹ mobility reports.⁸ B) Model calibration

59 to deaths time series assuming a linear relationship between mobility data and increases in R_t accounting for a

60 50% reporting fraction. If we take two separate periods of reduction up to 5th May with an average reduction of

61 35% and following May 5th movement increases equate to reductions in transmission of 29% we see that we no

62 longer fit the reported deaths data as well as when we took the average over the whole period. Black points

63 represent reported deaths. C) epidemic trajectory assuming if the current contact reductions are maintained.

64 Accounting for the slight increases in movement from May onwards the final epidemic trajectory peaks slightly

65 earlier and is of similar magnitude to that when we take the average reduction as our proxy for the success of

66 emergency measures.




Figure S4 Age distribution of A) total infections and B) symptomatic cases. Estimated from the model up to the date of calibration accounting for the current measures in Senegal. Age bands are chosen to represent those reported by the Ministry of Health in their Epidemiological reports.⁹




Figure S5 Sensitivity analysis of the triggered ICU scenario to the choice of ICU incidence trigger. Due to the low number of ICU beds available in Senegal if we increase the daily ICU incidence trigger we see a progressive increase in all outcomes measured here such that ICU bed demand rapidly exceeds the capacity which results in increased deaths. The amount of time spent in suppression in all scenarios remains the same at 9 months. Due to the stochastic nature of the model and the low numbers of daily deaths estimated following these simulations there is high uncertainty in the numbers of deaths estimated.




Figure S6 Sensitivity analysis of the triggered ICU scenario to movement reductions in the intervening periods. If in the time periods in between suppression we allow contact patterns to return to pre-epidemic levels we see rapid returns to suppression periods resulting in higher additional lengths of time spent in lock down: 8 months compared to the 5 months if contact patterns are reduced by 33% of their pre-epidemic levels following suppression with ICU demand also peaking at higher levels during this period for the same incidence trigger.




Figure S7 Population age structure in Senegal used to run the model. Sourced from the UN World Population Statistics. Total population size of 16,743,930.




Figure S8 Age distribution of model predicted cases requiring hospitalisation. Excluding those who need ICU care stratified by intervention scenario.




Figure S9 Age distribution of model predicted deaths stratified by intervention scenario. **A)** with “poorer outcomes” assumed to result from lower quality healthcare services in LMICs and **B)** with patient outcome assumptions from China, the UK and the US. Differences can be seen more clearly in the scenarios where hospital bed capacity is not significantly overwhelmed (long term suppression strategies) where we predict lower mortality across the younger age groups. This helps to highlight that hospital capacity and not treatment quality we predict will be a larger driver of excess mortality in younger age groups in Senegal given the current level of beds available under ou.

References

1. Verity R, Okell LC, Dorigatti I, et al. Estimates of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based analysis. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2020.
2. Zhang J, Klepac P, Read JM, et al. patterns of human social contact and contact with animals in Shanghai, china. *Scientific reports* 2019; **9**(1): 1-11.
3. Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, et al. The incubation period of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) from publicly reported confirmed cases: estimation and application. *Annals of internal medicine* 2020.
4. Bi Q, Wu Y, Mei S, et al. Epidemiology and transmission of COVID-19 in 391 cases and 1286 of their close contacts in Shenzhen, China: a retrospective cohort study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2020.
5. Intensive Care National Audit & Research Centre. ICNARC report on COVID-19 in critical care, 2020.
6. Del Moral P, Doucet A, Jasra A. Sequential monte carlo samplers. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 2006; **68**(3): 411-36.
7. Endo A, van Leeuwen E, Baguelin M. Introduction to particle Markov-chain Monte Carlo for disease dynamics modellers. *Epidemics* 2019; **29**: 100363.
8. Google. COVID-19 community mobility reports 2020. <https://www.google.com/covid19/mobility/> (accessed May 2020).
9. Ministère de la Santé et l'Action sociale. Riposte à l'épidémie du nouveau coronavirus COVID-19, Sénégal. Rapport de situation n°26 du 04 juin 2020. 2020.