

Appendix

A1 Detailed Model Specification

We will explain our agent-based COVID-19 model based on the ODD (Overview, Design Concepts, Details) protocol by Volker Grimm et.al. [13,14].

A1.1 Overview

The modeling of the spread of the disease is based on the interplay of four modules.

1. Population. Altogether the agent-based COVID-19 model is based on the Generic Population Concept (GEPOC, see [10]), a generic stochastic agent-based population model of Austria. It validly depicts state as well as dynamics (birth, death and migration) of the Austrian population on a microscopic level. It's agent population validly depicts demographic (age, sex) as well as regional structure of the population. The flexibility of this agent-based model guaranteed by its generic implementation makes it possible to modify and extend it by modules for simulation of any population-focused research problems.
2. Contacts. In order to develop a basis for infectious contacts, we modified and adapted a contact model previously used for simulation of influenza spread [20]. This model uses a distinction of contacts in different locations (households, schools, workplaces, leisure time) and is based on the POLYMOD study [21], a large survey for tracking social contact behavior relevant to the spread of infectious diseases.
3. Disease. This module models the course of the disease, that is the current pathway of COVID-19 patients starting from infection to recovery or death and links it with the population and the contact module.
4. Policies. The policy module models the implementation of interventions, ranging from hygienic-measures, contact reduction policies (e.g. quarantine, isolation or distancing), and, in particular, contact tracing.

A1.1.1 Purpose

The agent-based COVID-19 model aims to give ideas about the potential impact of certain policies and their combination on the spread of the disease, thus helping decision makers to correctly choose between possible policies by comparing the model outcomes with other important factors such as socioeconomic ones. In order to fulfil this target, it is relevant that the agent-based COVID-19 model validly depicts the current and near future distribution and state of disease progression of infected people and their forecasts. Yet this is not the key feature of this model.

A1.1.2 Entities and State Variables

Each person-agent is a model for one inhabitant of the observed country/region. We describe state variables of a person-agent sorted by the corresponding module.

Population. Each person-agent contains the population specific state variables *sex*, *date of birth* (\cong age) and *location*. The latter defines the person-agent's residence in form of latitude and longitude and uniquely maps to the agent's municipality, district and federal state.

Contacts. The person-agent features several contact network specific properties including a *household*, *workplace* or *school*. We summarise these as *locations* standing for network nodes via which the person-agent has contacts with other agents. Assignment of person-agents to *locations* is based on distance of the agent's residence to the position of the *location*. Each day, an agent has a certain number of contacts within each of the *locations*, which essentially leads to spread of the disease. To model contacts apart from these places, every person-agent has an additional amount of leisure time contacts, which are sampled randomly based on a spatially-dependent distribution. The contact network is schematically displayed in Figure A1.




Figure A1: Contact network of agents in the agent-based COVID-19 model. Regular contacts between agents occur via locations (schools, workplaces and households, while random leisure time contacts extend the standard contact network.

Disease. To model the spread of the disease each person-agent has several health related parameters, henceforth denoted as states, that display the current health status of the agent. The most important ones are *infected*, *infectious*, *symptoms*, *hospitalized*, *critical*, *confirmed*, *severe*, *asymptomatic*, *home-quarantined* and *recovered*. These states can either be true or false, and multiple of them can be true at a time. They stand for certain points within the patient pathway of an infected person and enable or disable, respectively, certain person-agent actions. More on the influence of these state variables and how they change is described in Section A1.1.4.

Policies. Policies apply either to *locations* or to person-agent-behavior directly and require additional agent properties. All *locations* except for households are defined *open* or *closed* which marks whether this place is available for having contacts. For person-agents the variable *preventive quarantine* is introduced to mark agents quarantined due to tracing.

For the sake of simplicity of speech we furthermore address mentioned parameters as attributes for the corresponding agents. I.e. an agent with *infectious* set to true will be denoted as “*infectious agent*”.

A1.1.3 Scales

Unlike other agent-based models it is not possible to validly run the model with a smaller number of agents (for example one agent represents 10 or 100 persons in reality) as certain contact-network parameters do not scale this way (average school size,...). Consequently, one simulation run always uses agents according to the size and structure of the full population.

A1.1.4 Process Overview and Scheduling

Like the underlying population model, the agent-based COVID-19 model can be interpreted as a hybrid between a time-discrete and a time-continuous (i.e. event-updated) agent-based model:

The overall simulation updates itself in daily time steps, wherein each step is split into three phases. In the first phase each agent is called once to plan what it aims to do in the course of this time step. In the second

phase, each agent is, again, called once to execute all planned actions for this time step in the defined order. In the third step, a recorder-agent keeps track of all aggregated state variables.

On the microscopic scope, each person-agent is equipped with its own small discrete event simulator. In the planning phase of the simulation, each agent schedules certain events for the future which may or may not be scheduled within the current global time step. In the second phase, the agent executes all events that are scheduled for the currently observed time interval, but leaves all events that exceed this scope untouched.

This strategy comes with the following benefits:

- In contrast to solely event-based ABMs, the event queue is distributed among all agents which massively increases the speed for sorting (a solely event-based ABM with millions of complex agents would not be executable in feasible time).
- Moreover, in contrast to solely event-based ABMs, usage of daily transition probabilities/rates instead of transition times is possible as well.
- In contrast to solely time-discrete ABMs, agents can operate beyond the scope of time steps and sample continuous time-intervals for their state-transitions.

We shortly describe all actions that are scheduled and executed by one person-agent within one time step sorted by the specified module.

Population. As briefly described in [10], agents trigger birth and death events always via time- and age-dependent probabilities that apply for the observed time step (that is, the observed day). If one of these events triggers, the agent samples a random time instant within the current time step and schedules the event. In contrast to the basic population model, immigration and emigration events are disabled in the agent-based COVID-19 model, as Austrian borders are closed.

Contacts. Also contact-specific events are scheduled and executed within the scope of only one time step: First of all, the agent schedules a contact event with every other member of its household. Moreover, if such a location is present in the contact network, a certain number of workplace or school contacts, respectively, are scheduled and corresponding partners drawn randomly from the assigned location. Finally, a certain number of leisure time contacts are sampled and partners are drawn based on a region-specific distribution: a leisure time contact partner is drawn uniformly from the same municipality with probability p_m^l , from a different municipality within the same district with probability p_d^l , from a different district in the same federal state with probability p_f^l , and finally, from a different federal state with probability p_a^l .

As mentioned, some states limit the agents’ capabilities of interaction. In specific, *quarantined* or *preventively quarantined* agents have no random leisure time contacts and no contacts at *work* or *school*. Furthermore, *hospitalized* agents do not even contact their household members.

Disease. First of all, it is important to mention that the model is not parametrized by a reproduction number R_0 or R_{eff} , but by a contact-specific probability for a transmission in case of a contact. Nevertheless, the agent-based model provides the opportunity to generate estimates for R_0 and R_{eff} by its original definition: the average number of secondary infections of an infected agent. Hence, what comes as model input for many traditional SIR models becomes a model output for the agent-based COVID-19 model.

In case of a contact, *infectious* agents spread the disease to susceptible agents with a certain *infection probability* that triggers the start of the newly-infected agent’s patient-pathway. This pathway describes the different states and stations an agent passes while suffering from the COVID-19 disease and can be interpreted as a sequence of events of which each triggers the next one after a certain sampled duration.

We show this infection strategy in a state chart in Figure A2 and describe how to interpret this figure by explaining the initial steps in the pathway in more detail: As soon as a person-agent becomes infected, its *infected* state is set to *true* and a *latency period* is sampled according to a specific distribution. The corresponding “Infectious” event is scheduled for the sampled time instant in the future. As soon as this “Infectious” event is executed, the *infectious* parameter is set to *true* and a random number decides about whether the person will develop symptoms or not. This point marks the first branch in the patient’s pathway

and whether the “Symptoms Onset” event or the “Asymptomatic” Event is scheduled. The prior would be planned after a sampled time span corresponding to the difference between latency and incubation time, the latter would be triggered instantaneously. All other elements of the pathway follow analogously. The branches are evaluated with age-class-dependent probabilities (see Section A1.3.3).

Finally, it is important to mention that the current model does not specifically consider deceased agents as this is not within the scope of the model (see Section A1.1.1). Consequently, all agents recover from the disease and are assumed to be immunized thereafter.

Policies. Every policy is modeled as a global event occurring before the planning phase of any of the simulation time steps. Policies are timed-events that are fed into the model as an event-timeline. The elements of this timeline may include real policies like closure or opening of locations, start of tracing (for a full list, see Table A5), but may also contain incidents that change the model behavior but are not directly related to policies, such as raising hygiene awareness or distancing.




Figure A2: State chart of the patient pathway of a person-agent in the agent-based COVID-19 model. Only those state variables that are changed by the corresponding event are labeled, all other variables remain at the current value. The initial state of all infection-specific state variables is *false*.

A1.2 Design Concept

A1.2.1 Basic Principles.

Increasing the level of detail from a standard epidemiological model for simulation of disease waves to a model that is capable of dealing with various different policies is a huge step with respect to model complexity. It excludes the use of macroscopic strategies and requires modeling of a contact network and contact behavior. Consequently a detailed demography, spatial components and stochasticity need to be introduced to the model which come with a huge number of additional parameters and parameter values.

Hence, we were very careful that the agent-based model is designed as simple as possible yet tracking the most important features for evaluation of certain policies. Hereby, many details within the pathway of an infected person and, in particular, lots of details within the personal daily routine are simplified to avoid indeterminable model parameters and unpredictable model dynamics.

A1.2.2 Emergence.

In addition to the classic emergence of nonlinear epidemiological effects, analysis of the effects of interaction between different measures is one of the key objectives of the model. For example, seemingly unconnected policies like *school closure* and *contact reduction for the 65+* might lead to unexpected effects when applied simultaneously. More generally speaking, the model displays that the individual effects of applied policies do not add up linearly.

A1.2.3 Sensing.

Agents' perception of reality is one of the key problems of modeling COVID-19 as no agent is actually aware of its own disease and, more importantly, infectiousness until symptoms occur. Therefore, agent parameters can be distinguished into two sets: the ones the agent is aware of (e.g. *symptoms*, *hospitalized*), and the ones it is not (e.g. *infected*, *infectious*).

Interestingly, besides the individual perception of agents and the perception of an omniscient observer, there is also a third level of perception included into the model: the perception of the general public. While an individual agent knows about its symptoms, the public is not yet aware of this additional infected case, until the person-agent has reacted on the disease, has had itself tested and eventually becomes *confirmed*. Consequently, the levels of perception can be sorted with regards to their amount of knowledge:

omniscient observer > person-agent > general public.

A1.2.4 Interaction.

Interaction between agents only occurs in form of contacts at *locations* or *leisure time*. The features provided by the underlying population model make it possible to investigate contacts on a very local level. As described before, *leisure time* contacts are weighted by their regionality, but also *school* and *workplace* contacts depict locality: Using specified latitude and longitude for locations, it is possible to assign person-agents with distance-dependent probabilities (see Section A1.3.1). Consequently, interactions between agents follow a spatially-continuous locally-biased contact network.

A1.2.5 Stochasticity.

Basically all model processes, including the initialization, contain sampling of random numbers. Therefore, Monte Carlo simulation is applied, results of runs are averaged and also their variability is assessed (see Section A2).

A1.2.6 Observation.

Inspired by [22], a recorder-agent takes care about tracking and aggregating the current status of the simulation. At the end of each global time step, all person-agents report to the recorder-agent which furthermore keeps track of all necessary aggregated model outputs. This includes for example *confirmed active cases*, *confirmed cumulative cases*, *hospitalized agents*, *asymptomatic agents*, *pre-symptomatic agents*, *recovered agents*, *agents in a certain hospital*, or *average-number of contacts per infectious agent*. If required, numbers can also be tracked with respect to age, sex, regional level and/or location.

A1.3 Details

Clearly, Section A1.1 could only outline the basic concepts of the model and left a lot of technical and modeling details necessary for a reproducible model definition open. In particular, this refers to the highly non-trivial initialization process of the model. Hereby, two problems occur that require completely different approaches. The first problem considers the generation of the person-agents, locations and hospitals in the first place. The second problem deals with the initialization of the status quo of the distribution of the disease states of the agents for the specified initial date.

A1.3.1 Initialization of Person-agents, Locations and Hospitals.

A lot of problems that deal with the sampling of the initial population have already been solved in the original GEPOC model [10]. In particular this refers to the delaunay-triangulation-based sampling method for locations. We apply this method to merge information from the national statistics institute and the global human settlement layer [12]. Consequently, besides initialization of the disease states which is described in the next section, only new methods for location- and hospital-generation had to be implemented.

Schools are initialized based on known distributions w.r.t. average school size and number of pupils in total. A *school-sampler* iteratively generates schools with a random size/capacity (truncated normal distribution) until the sum of all capacities matches the known number of pupils in reality. Each school is furthermore sampled a position (latitude and longitude) analogous to the sampling for person-locations (see [10]). In a second step, schools are “filled” with person agents. Hereby, model agents with age between 6 and 18 are assigned to a random school within reach. This is done analogous to the sampling concept of leisure time contacts (see Section *sec:process_overview*) with probabilities p_m^s , p_a^s , p_f^s and p_a^s for assigning the school in the same municipality, district, federal-state and country as the agent’s residence. Clearly, the number of model agents in this age group is larger than the number of known pupils. Consequently, we force distribution of all 6 to 14 year old agents, and distribute as many 15 to 18 year old agents as possible. All remaining 15 to 18 year old agents are considered to be working.

Workplaces¹ are initialized analogously to schools. A *workplace-sampler* iteratively generates workplaces with size/capacity according to a discrete distribution (see Table A2). The sampler stops generating if the sum of all capacities matches $(a + b)(1 - \alpha)$, whereas a denotes all model agents between 19 and 64, b denotes all agents between 15 and 18 that have not been yet assigned to a school, and α denotes the current unemployment rate. Location sampling and “filling” works analogously to the *school-sampler* with different probabilities.

Hospitals are generated based on publicly available data. This includes capacities (beds, intensive-care units) as well as their location (latitude and longitude).

A1.3.2 Initialization of the Disease State

The spread of SARS-CoV-2 displays probably better than any other system, that the most dangerous enemy is the invisible one. While confirmed infected persons are detected and well known, they hardly contribute to

¹Workplaces should not be confused with total companies. They rather represent the different teams where the members are in regular contact with each other.

the spread of the disease – they are already isolated properly, and most infections occur even before the onset of symptoms.

Consequently, it is not possible to simply “start” the simulation with a certain number of confirmed cases, acquired for example from official internet sources. Valid values for pre-symptomatic (e.g. persons within latency and incubation period) and asymptomatic persons need to be acquired as well – yet, this number is hardly measurable in reality.

In order to solve this problem, a three stage concept, henceforth denoted as initialization phase, was designed to generate a feasible initial state for a certain time t_0 :

1. **Initialize-Simulation.** The agent-based COVID-19 model is set up with a small number of initially infected agents. This number corresponds to an estimated count of initial infection clusters in the country, but actually hardly influences the outcome. Furthermore, the agent-based simulation is run and interrupted by a state event, namely if the cumulative number of *confirmed agents* in the model is greater or equal to a specific value $C(t_{-1})$. Hereby, t_{-1} refers to a self chosen point in time and $C(t_{-1})$ to the reported number of positive tests in reality until t_{-1} . Hereby t_{-1} must be chosen properly so that the reported number of positive tests is large enough to be representative yet before implementation of any policies.

As soon as the simulation is interrupted by the state-event, the timelines of simulation and reality are synced: t_{-1} in reality becomes t_{-1} in the simulation.

The initialize-simulation is continued, considering all policies that have been implemented in reality, until, finally, t_0 is reached. Properly calibrated by a calibration routine (see Section A1.3.4), the initialize-simulation contains approximately the same cumulative number of *confirmed agents* as the corresponding reported number in the real system.

The initialize-simulation is finished by exporting parts of the final state of the simulation. This refers to all households that contain either infected or recovered agents which are finally written into a file. Hereby, an initial population is generated that contains not only a valid approximation of the confirmed cases, but also a valid estimate for the unknown pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic persons, a correct distribution of their future planned events and a correct household distribution as well.

2. **Fine Tuning.** Even with best calibration routines (see Section A1.3.4) it is not possible to perfectly match the model output with the status quo in reality, in particular w.r.t. regional distribution. Therefore, a bootstrapping algorithm was implemented that corrects the small differences between the initialize-simulation output and the real data (confirmed cases, hospitalization, intensive-care units and recoveries per region) to make sure, that the initial state of the actual simulation matches the current state precisely. This step can be omitted, if matching the current state precisely is not required.
3. **Load Households.** Finally, the actual simulation is initialized with the previously recorded and fine-tuned agents from the initialize-simulation. To be precise, this process does not only include agents themselves, but also the *households* these agents live in. Hereby, at least, the fundamental network structure from the initialize-simulation can be maintained.

A1.3.3 Parametrization

With respect to parametrization, we will distinguish between model input and model parameters.

Classical model parameters specify scalar or array-typed model variables that are initialized at the beginning of the simulation and, if not changed by certain model events, keep their value for the entire simulation time. Examples are the infection probability of the disease, the age-dependent death rate of the population, or the distribution parameters of the recovery time.

In contrast to model parameters, the model input consists of an event-timeline that describes at which point in time a certain incident changes the behavior of the model. This incident usually refers to the introduction

of a policy, e.g. closure of schools or start of tracing, but may also refer to instantaneous changes of model parameters which are related but cannot be directly attributed to policies, e.g. the increase of compliance among the population to increase hygiene.

In the following, we state lists of used parameters and parameter-values including corresponding sources and/or justifications. They are found in Tables A1 to A4. Table A5 states a list of possible event-timeline elements that can pose as the model's input.




Figure A3: Event-timeline as the input of the simulation model in contrast to standard model parameters.

parameter	description	value	source
<i>birthrates,</i> <i>deathrates,</i> <i>initial popula-</i> <i>tion,</i> <i>regional</i> <i>distribution</i>	parameters used by the underlying population model	see source	rates and population tables from Austrian National Statistics Institute [5]. Maps from the Global Human Settlement Project [4, 12] and [3].

Table A1: List of population specific parameters

parameter	description	value	source
<i>leisure time contacts per day</i>	number of leisure time transmission-relevant contacts of an agent per day	$X \sim \Gamma(6.11, 1.0)$	based on the results of the POLYMOD study [21]
<i>workplace contacts per day</i>	number of transmission-relevant contacts at work (if assigned) of an agent per day	$X \sim \Gamma(5.28, 1.0)$	based on the results of the POLYMOD study [21]
<i>school contacts per day</i>	number of transmission-relevant contacts at school (if assigned) of an agent per day	$X \sim \Gamma(4.64, 1.0)$	based on the results of the POLYMOD study [21]
<i>household sizes and structure</i>	distribution of household sizes and structure	see source	distribution and structure from freely accessible tables for household statistics from the Austrian National Statistics Institute [5]
<i>school sizes</i>	The actual number of schools and pupils were gathered to calculate the average size of schools for the model. Based on this average, sizes for the simulation are sampled truncated normally.	$X \sim N(\mu, \sqrt{\mu})$, with $\mu = \frac{pupils}{schools}$ and $X > \mu/4$ a.s.	counts gathered from a publication of the Austrian National Statistics Institute [7]
<i>workplace sizes</i>	discrete distribution of workplace sizes	see source	gathered from a survey [8] by the Austrian National Statistics Institute
<i>unemployment rate</i>	fraction of adults who are not assigned a workplace	10.4%	according to Austrian definition (AMS) gathered from the web-page of the city of Vienna [6]
<i>regional distribution of leisure time contacts</i>	leisure time contact partners are sampled based on locally biased distribution according to the regional structure: municipality, district and federal state	$[p_m, p_d, p_f, p_a] = [0.7, 0.2, 0.05, 0.05]$	based on estimates from mobility experts

Table A2: List of contact specific parameters. Note that all parameter values are specified for the standard model without policies. The Γ -distribution is given as $\Gamma(k, \theta)$.

parameter	description	value	source
<i>infection probability</i>	probability that a contact between a susceptible and an infected agent leads to a transmission. Depending on the type of contact (household, school, work, leisure time) this parameter is scaled by a factor α	$\alpha \cdot 0.077$	calibrated based on the doubling rates in Austria before introduction of policies (see Section A1.3.4)
<i>incubation time</i>	time between infection and symptom on-set	scaled β distribution with $\min(X) = 2[d]$, $\max(X) = 14[d]$, $E(X) = 5.1[d]$	based on [18]
<i>latency time</i>	time between infection and infectivity	always incubation time minus $2[d]$	estimated based on expert opinions
<i>reaction time</i>	time between symptom on-set and reaction/testing of the agent which furthermore leads to its confirmation and isolation	$X \sim \text{Weibull}(4.29, 1.65)$	based on [16]

Table A3: List of disease specific parameters (1/2).

parameter	description	value	source
<i>recovery time symptomatic</i>	time between symptom on-set and recovery for symptomatic persons	$X \sim Tri(11, 18, 25)$	based on expert opinions and calibrated w.r.t. official recovery data (as the model scenarios are not focused on prognosis of hospitalizations we do not differ between recovery time in home-quarantine, hospital or ICU)
<i>recovery time asymptomatic</i>	time between symptom on-set and recovery for asymptomatic persons	$Tri(1, 5, 7)$	estimated based on expert opinions
<i>hospitalization probability</i>	age-dependent probability that a symptomatic patient requires hospitalization	[6.2, 1.0, 2.6, 2.7, 7.1, 10.3, 26.7, 48.3, 61.8, 53.3]% for 10-year age classes	Calculated from reported cases via Elektronisches Meldesystem (EMS) by AGES [2] by comparison with the age-pyramid in Austria
<i>icu probability</i>	probability that a hospitalized agent becomes critical (needs an intensive care unit)	25.4%	calibrated for data in Austria
<i>initialization data</i>	current epidemiological numbers for Austria for initialization (see Section A1.3.2)	see source	initial data dumps updated on regular basis via Elektronisches Meldesystem (EMS) by AGES [2]
<i>probability asymptomatic</i>	probability of an asymptomatic disease progression	50%	Based on an early antibody study from Iceland [15]

Table A4: List of disease specific parameters (2/2).

event	description	parameters
<i>leisure-time contact number reduction event</i>	Based on an age-class (child, adult, retired) dependent probability, an agent may “reject” a leisure-time contact with a different agent. As the rejection happens symmetrically, the probabilities multiply.	age-class-dependent fraction by which daily leisure-time contacts are reduced
<i>location closing event</i>	Fraction of locations of a certain type are closed in this policy.	affected location type; fraction of locations of this type that remain open / are opened
<i>adapt hygiene event</i>	Changes the <i>infection probability</i> for contacts in a certain location	affected location type; factor to scale the original <i>infection probability</i> with
<i>start location tracing event</i>	Starts with location tracing measures. I.e. all members of a newly <i>confirmed</i> agent’s location are put under preventive isolation for a certain period of time.	affected location type; length of preventive quarantine length
<i>start contact tracing event</i>	Starts with contact tracing measures. I.e. recorded contacts of a newly <i>confirmed</i> agent are put under preventive isolation.	fraction of agents capable of recording contacts; length of preventive quarantine length

Table A5: List of possible event-timeline elements that can pose for the model’s input including their effect an, if available, options for the event parametrization.

A1.3.4 Calibration

With respect to calibration we distinguish between calibration of parameter values and calibration of certain parts of the model input. The prior primarily refers to the calibration of the *infection probability* parameter value, the latter is usually needed in the course of the Initialize-Simulation (see A1.3.2).

Clearly, there is no valid data available for direct parametrization of the *infection probability* in case of a direct contact. First of all, this parameter is hardly measurable in reality and moreover strongly depends on the definition of “contact”. Consequently, this parameter needs to be fitted in the course of a calibration loop.

The calibration experiment is set up as follows:

- We vary the parameter *infection probability* using a bisection algorithm.
- For each parameter value, the simulation, parametrized without any policies, is executed ten times (Monte Carlo simulation) and the results are averaged.
- The average time-series for the *cumulative confirmed cases* is observed and cropped to the beginning upswing of the epidemic curve, to be specific, all values between 200 and 3200. In this interval the growth of the curve can be considered as exponential.
- The cropped time-series is compared with the corresponding time-series of real measured data in Austria, specifically the confirmed numbers between March 10th and 20th 2020 (source EMS system, [2]).

- Both time-series are compared w.r.t. the average doubling time of the confirmed cases. The difference between the doubling times is taken as the calibration error for the bisection algorithm.

Note: As the sample standard deviation of each observable of the runs has been observed to be at most a fifth of the sample mean, the iteration number of nine for the Monte Carlo simulation has been considered to be sufficient for calibration purposes w.r.t. the ideas in [11, 17].

Calibration of the model input, as required for the Initialize Simulation, is done in two steps. First, the event types and dates of the event-timeline are specified abstracted from the implemented policies and observations from the real world. Thereafter, the parameters of the events (see Table A5) are tuned using a bisection algorithm as well. Hereby, we make use of the feature, that this multidimensional calibration problem can be decoupled into several scalar ones by iteratively adjusting one event parameter after the other, starting from the earliest to the latest occurring event.

A2 Technical Implementation Details

The implementation of the agent-based COVID-19 model uses JAVA 11 and applies the *UniformRandomProvider* random number generator (RNG) by Apache Commons [1]. This RNG implements a 64 bit version of the Mersenne Twister [19] and exceeds the standard RNG of JAVA, a simple Linear Congruential Generator, in both performance and quality.

The simulation itself is always executed in a Monte Carlo setting and several runs with different RNG seeds are averaged. Due to the huge number of agents, a Law-of-Large-Numbers-effect can be observed (similar to [9] Chapter 5.2), and the standard deviation of the model output is always comparably small. Consequently, Monte Carlo replication numbers of 10 to 20 are usually enough to estimate the mean sufficiently well (we apply the algorithms from [11, 17]).

A3 Detailed Scenario Definition

In order to give a reproducible definition of scenarios, we explain the used event-timelines in detail in tables A6 and A7. The prior shows the calibrated timeline of initialization phase, the latter displays the timeline of the baseline scenarios.

This event-timeline was calibrated extending the ideas from Section A1.3.4

Table A6: Initialization phase definition: model policies introduced to fit the current lockdown time-series in Austria

date	policy event	interpretation	parameters
Mar.10	reduction of leisure time contacts	Due to the raising anxiety and awareness among the population resulting from the medial coverage, we assume that many Austrians have already minimized their contact behavior before introduction of the policies.	A simulated leisure time contact is refused by an agent with probability 0.16.
Mar.10	increased hygiene and distancing in <i>leisure time</i>	Increasing awareness leads to increased hygiene among the population.	<i>Leisure time transmission probability</i> is reduced by 50%.
Mar.14	closing of <i>schools</i> and <i>workplaces</i>	Although closure of schools and workplaces was announced for March 16 th , a Monday, the policy is actually active already two days earlier, as all schools and most workplaces are closed during the weekend anyway.	All <i>schools</i> and 50% of the <i>workplaces</i> are disabled for contacts.
Mar.14	increased hygiene and distancing at <i>workplaces</i>	Due to increasing hygiene and distancing at work, contacts are less infectious.	<i>Workplace transmission probability</i> is reduced by 50%.
Mar.14	reduced contact frequency at <i>workplaces</i>	Due to increased use of home-office, also the total number of contacts at work per day is reduced.	The average number of <i>workplace contacts per day</i> is reduced by 50%.
Mar.16	reduction of leisure time contacts	Due to massive restriction of mobility, leisure time contacts of people are heavily reduced.	A simulated leisure time contact is refused by an agent with probability 0.7.

Table A7: Compliance Scenarios *high*, *medium* and *low compliance*: Lift of the lockdown measures on May 1st 2020.

date	policy event	interpretation	parameters
before May 01	lockdown	All shutdown policies are active.	all policies introduced in Table A6 are active.
May 01	open schools and workplaces	All policies introduced on Mar.14 are lifted.	All <i>school</i> and <i>workplace</i> locations are open for contacts as normal. Transmission probabilities and contact numbers are reset to the original value.
May.01	increase of leisure time contacts	Due to massive lift of policies, leisure time contacts are increasing.	<p>In the <i>high compliance</i> scenario, the <i>leisure time contact reduction</i> is set to 75% and the <i>leisure time transmission probability</i> remains at 50% of its original value.</p> <p>In the <i>medium compliance</i> scenario, the <i>leisure time contact reduction</i> is set to 50% and the <i>leisure time transmission probability</i> remains at 50% of its original value.</p> <p>In the <i>medium compliance</i> scenario, the <i>leisure time contact reduction</i> is set to 0% and the <i>leisure time transmission probability</i> remains at 50% of its original value.</p>

References

- [1] Apache commons rng homepage. <https://commons.apache.org/proper/commons-rng/>. Accessed: 2020-04-17.
- [2] Covid-19 information page by ages. <https://www.ages.at/en/wissen-aktuell/publikationen/epidemiologische-parameter-des-covid19-ausbruchs-oesterreich-2020/>. Accessed: 2020-04-08.
- [3] Geo- and topojson files of municipalities, districts and states in austria by flooh perlot. <https://github.com/ginseng666/GeoJSON-TopoJSON-Austria>. Accessed: 2019-05-12.
- [4] Global human settlement layer. <https://ghsl.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>. Accessed: 2020-04-08.
- [5] Statistik austria. https://www.statistik.at/web_de/statistiken/index.html. Accessed : 2020 – 04 – 08.
- [6] Web-page of the city of vienna. <https://www.wien.gv.at/>. Accessed: 2020-03-01.
- [7] Statistik Austria. Bildung in zahlen 2017/18-tabellenband. 2019.
- [8] Wien Statistik Austria. *Arbeitsstättenzählung 2001*. Verlag Österreich, 2004.

- [9] Martin Bicher. *Classification of Microscopic Models with Respect to Aggregated System Behaviour*. Dissertation, TU Wien, Vienna, Austria, November 2017.
- [10] Martin Bicher, Christoph Urach, and Niki Popper. GEPOC ABM: A Generic Agent-Based Population Model for Austria. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Winter Simulation Conference*, pages 2656–2667, Gothenburg, Sweden, 2018. IEEE.
- [11] Martin Bicher, Matthias Wastian, Dominik Brunmeir, Matthias Rößler, and Niki Popper. Review on Monte Carlo Simulation Stopping Rules: How Many Samples Are Really Enough? In *Proceedings of the 10th EUROSIM Congress on Modelling and Simulation*, Logrono, Spain, July 2019. In Print.
- [12] Aneta Jadwiga Florczyk, Stefano Ferri, Vasileios Syrri, Thomas Kemper, Matina Halkia, Pierre Soille, and Martino Pesaresi. A new european settlement map from optical remotely sensed data. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*, 9(5):1978–1992, 2016.
- [13] Volker Grimm, Uta Berger, Finn Bastiansen, Sigrunn Eliassen, Vincent Ginot, Jarl Giske, John Goss-Custard, Tamara Grand, Simone K. Heinz, Geir Huse, Andreas Huth, Jane U. Jepsen, Christian Jørgensen, Wolf M. Mooij, Birgit Müller, Guy Pe’er, Cyril Piou, Steven F. Railsback, Andrew M. Robbins, Martha M. Robbins, Eva Rossmanith, Nadja Rüger, Espen Strand, Sami Souissi, Richard A. Stillman, Rune Vabø, Ute Visser, and Donald L. DeAngelis. A standard protocol for describing individual-based and agent-based models. *Ecological Modelling*, 198(1):115–126, 2006.
- [14] Volker Grimm, Uta Berger, Donald L. DeAngelis, J. Gary Polhill, Jarl Giske, and Steven F. Railsback. The ODD protocol: A review and first update. *Ecological Modelling*, 221(23):2760–2768, 2010.
- [15] Daniel F. Gudbjartsson, Agnar Helgason, Hakon Jonsson, Olafur T. Magnusson, Pall Melsted, Gudmundur L. Norddahl, Jona Saemundsdottir, Asgeir Sigurdsson, Patrick Sulem, Arna B. Agustsdottir, Berglind Eiriksdottir, Run Fridriksdottir, Elisabet E. Gardarsdottir, Gudmundur Georgsson, Olafia S. Gretarsdottir, Kjartan R. Gudmundsson, Thora R. Gunnarsdottir, Arnaldur Gylfason, Hilma Holm, Brynjar O. Jensson, Aslaug Jonasdottir, Frosti Jonsson, Kamilla S. Josefsdottir, Thordur Kristjansson, Droplaug N. Magnusdottir, Louise le Roux, Gudrun Sigmundsdottir, Gardar Sveinbjornsson, Kristin E. Sveinsdottir, Maney Sveinsdottir, Emil A. Thorarensen, Bjarni Thorbjornsson, Arthur Löve, Gisli Masson, Ingileif Jonsdottir, Alma D. Möller, Thorolfur Gudnason, Karl G. Kristinsson, Unnur Thorsteinsdottir, and Kari Stefansson. Spread of SARS-CoV-2 in the Icelandic Population. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 382(24):2302–2315, June 2020.
- [16] Joel Hellewell, Sam Abbott, Amy Gimma, Nikos I Bosse, Christopher I Jarvis, Timothy W Russell, James D Munday, Adam J Kucharski, W John Edmunds, Fiona Sun, et al. Feasibility of controlling covid-19 outbreaks by isolation of cases and contacts. *The Lancet Global Health*, 2020.
- [17] Juan Ignacio Latorre Jimenez. EUROSIM 2019 Abstract Volume. In *EUROSIM 2019 Abstract Volume*. ARGESIM, 2019.
- [18] Stephen A Lauer, Kyra H Grantz, Qifang Bi, Forrest K Jones, Qulu Zheng, Hannah R Meredith, Andrew S Azman, Nicholas G Reich, and Justin Lessler. The incubation period of coronavirus disease 2019 (covid-19) from publicly reported confirmed cases: estimation and application. *Annals of internal medicine*, 2020.
- [19] Makoto Matsumoto and Takuji Nishimura. Mersenne twister: a 623-dimensionally equidistributed uniform pseudo-random number generator. *ACM Transactions on Modeling and Computer Simulation (TOMACS)*, 8(1):3–30, 1998.
- [20] F. Miksch, C. Urach, N. Popper, G. Zauner, G. Endel, I. Schiller-Frühwirth, and F. Breitenecker. New Insights on the Spread of Influenza Through Agent Based Modeling. *Value in Health - The Journal of the International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research*, 14(7), November 2011.

- [21] Joël Mossong, Niel Hens, Mark Jit, Philippe Beutels, Kari Auranen, Rafael Mikolajczyk, Marco Massari, Stefania Salmaso, Gianpaolo Scalia Tomba, Jacco Wallinga, and others. POLYMOD social contact data. 2017.
- [22] Muaz A. K. Niazi, Amir Hussain, and Mario Kolberg. Verification and Validation of Agent Based Simulations using the VOMAS (Virtual Overlay Multi-agent System) Approach. volume 494. CEUR-WS, July 2009.