

Supporting Information

Predictions of COVID-19 dynamics in the UK: short-term forecasting and analysis of potential exit strategies

Matt J. Keeling^{1*}, Edward M. Hill^{1‡}, Erin E. Gorsich¹, Bridget Penman¹, Glen Guyver-Fletcher^{1,3}, Alex Holmes^{1,2}, Trystan Leng^{1,2}, Hector McKimm^{1,4}, Massimiliano Tamborrino^{1,4}, Louise Dyson^{1‡}, Michael J. Tildesley^{1‡}.

1 The Zeeman Institute for Systems Biology & Infectious Disease Epidemiology Research, School of Life Sciences and Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, United Kingdom.

2 Mathematics for Real World Systems Centre for Doctoral Training, Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, United Kingdom.

3 Midlands Integrative Biosciences Training Partnership, School of Life Sciences, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, United Kingdom.

4 Department of Statistics, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, United Kingdom.

‡These authors contributed equally to this work.

* Corresponding Author. Email: M.J.Keeling@warwick.ac.uk

Table of Contents

1	Supporting Text S1: Model description	2
2	Supporting Text S2: Modelling social distancing	4
3	Supporting Text S3: Additional tables	5
4	Supporting Text S4: Additional figures	6

1 Supporting Text S1: Model description

We present here the system of equations that account for both household saturation of transmission and household quarantining. As described in the main text, individuals may be susceptible (S), exposed (E), with detectable infection (D), or undetectable infection (asymptomatic, U). Undetectable infections are assumed to transmit infection at a reduced rate given by τ . We let superscripts denote the first infection in a household (F), a subsequent infection from a detectable/symptomatic household member (SD) and a subsequent infection from an asymptomatic household member (SU). A fraction (H) of the first detected case in a household is quarantined (QF), as are all their subsequent household infections (QS).

Model equations

The full equations are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dS_a}{dt} &= -(\lambda_a^F + \lambda_a^{SD} + \lambda_a^{SU} + \lambda_a^Q) \frac{S_a}{N_a}, \\
\frac{dE_a^F}{dt} &= \lambda_a^F \frac{S_a}{N_a} - \epsilon E_a^F, \\
\frac{dE_a^{SD}}{dt} &= \lambda_a^{SD} \frac{S_a}{N_a} - \epsilon E_a^{SD}, \\
\frac{dE_a^{SU}}{dt} &= \lambda_a^{SU} \frac{S_a}{N_a} - \epsilon E_a^{SU}, \\
\frac{dE_a^Q}{dt} &= \lambda_a^Q S - \epsilon E_a^Q, \\
\frac{dD_a^F}{dt} &= d_a(1 - H)\epsilon E_a^F - \gamma D_a^F, \\
\frac{dD_a^{SD}}{dt} &= d_a\epsilon E_a^{SD} - \gamma D_a^{SD}, \\
\frac{dD_a^{SU}}{dt} &= d_a(1 - H)\epsilon E_a^{SU} - \gamma D_a^{SU}, \\
\frac{dD_a^{QF}}{dt} &= d_a H \epsilon E_a^F - \gamma D_a^{QF}, \\
\frac{dD_a^{QS}}{dt} &= d_a H \epsilon E_a^{SU} + d_a \epsilon E_a^Q - \gamma D_a^{QS}, \\
\frac{dU_a^F}{dt} &= (1 - d_a)\epsilon E_a^F - \gamma U_a^F, \\
\frac{dU_a^S}{dt} &= (1 - d_a)\epsilon(E_a^{SD} + E_a^{SU}) - \gamma U_a^S, \\
\frac{dU_a^Q}{dt} &= (1 - d_a)\epsilon E_a^Q - \gamma U_a^Q,
\end{aligned}$$

with the forces of infection obeying

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_a^F &= \sigma_a \sum_b (D_b^F + D_b^{SD} + D_b^{SU} + \tau(U_b^F + U_b^S)) \beta_{ba}^N, \\ \lambda_a^{SD} &= \sigma_a \sum_b D_b^F \beta_{ba}^H, \\ \lambda_a^{SU} &= \sigma_a \tau \sum_b U_b^F \beta_{ba}^H, \\ \lambda_a^Q &= \sigma_a \sum_b D_b^{QF} \beta_{ba}^H,\end{aligned}$$

where β^H is household transmission and $\beta^N = \beta^S + \beta^W + \beta^O$ is all other transmission locations, comprising school-based transmission (β^S), work-place transmission (β^W) and transmission in all other locations (β^O). σ_a corresponds to the age-dependent susceptibility of individuals to infection, d_a the age-dependent probability of displaying symptoms (and hence being detected), and τ represents reduced transmission of infection by undetectable individuals compared to detectable infections.

Amendments to within-household transmission

Note that this raw, un-scaled format would under-estimate the amount of within-household transmission, as only the first infection generates any secondary cases. However, a simple multiplicative scaling to the household transmission ($\beta^H \rightarrow z\beta^H$, $z \approx 1.3$) generates a comparable match between the new model and the standard approach — even when age structure is included.

Relationship between age-dependent susceptibility and detectability

We interlinked age-dependent susceptibility, σ_a , and detectability, d_a , by a quantity Q_a . Q_a can be viewed as the scaling between force of infection and symptomatic infection.

Explicitly, we let $d_a = 0.9Q_a^{(1-\alpha)}$ and $\sigma_a = \frac{1}{0.9}Q_a^\alpha$. As a consequence, $Q_a = d_a\sigma_a$.

2 Supporting Text S2: Modelling social distancing

Age-structured contact matrices for the United Kingdom were obtained from Prem et al. [1] and used to provide information on household transmission (β_{ab}^H , with the subscript ab corresponding to transmission from age group a against age group b), school-based transmission (β_{ab}^S), work-place transmission (β_{ab}^W) and transmission in all other locations (β_{ab}^O). We assumed that social-distancing acted to reduce the work, school and other matrices while increasing household contacts.

We defined an age-dependent scaling for pre-school (1 age-group), school (2 age groups), adults (11 age-groups) and elderly (7 age-groups) in each of the four settings:

$$\begin{aligned} Q^H &= (q_1^h \quad q_2^h q_2^h \quad q_3^h \dots q_3^h \quad q_4^h \dots q_4^h) \\ Q^S &= (q_1^s \quad q_2^s q_2^s \quad q_3^s \dots q_3^s \quad q_4^s \dots q_4^s) \\ Q^W &= (q_1^w \quad q_2^w q_2^w \quad q_3^w \dots q_3^w \quad q_4^w \dots q_4^w) \\ Q^O &= (q_1^o \quad q_2^o q_2^o \quad q_3^o \dots q_3^o \quad q_4^o \dots q_4^o) \end{aligned}$$

where $q_1^h = 1 + 0.25q_1^o$, $q_2^h = 1 + 0.25q_2^o + 0.25q_2^s$, $q_3^h = 1 + 0.25q_3^o + 0.25q_3^w$, $q_4^h = 1 + 0.25q_4^o$, and q^s, q^w, q^o correspond to the relative fraction of contacts remaining (given full compliance) after imposing the effect of school closure, work closure and social distancing, respectively.

For a compliance level, ϕ , we scaled the matrices as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{ab}^H &= \beta_{ab}^H \times (\phi Q_a^H + (1 - \phi)) \\ \beta_{ab}^S &= \beta_{ab}^S \times (\phi Q_a^S + (1 - \phi)) \\ \beta_{ab}^W &= \beta_{ab}^W (\phi Q_a^W + (1 - \phi)) \times ((1 - \theta) + \theta(\phi Q_a^O + (1 - \phi))) \\ \beta_{ab}^O &= \beta_{ab}^O \times (\phi Q_a^O + (1 - \phi))^2 \end{aligned}$$

As such, home and school interactions scaled with the assumed scaling Q and the compliance ϕ . Work interactions not attributed to ‘service industries’ (a proportion $1 - \theta$) were also assumed to scale in this manner; while those that interact with the general populations (such as shop-workers) were assumed to scale as both a function of their reduction and the reduction of others. Throughout, we have assumed $\theta = 0.3$.

Finally, we assumed the transmission in other settings (β_{ab}^O) scaled with the reduction in activity of both members of the interaction.

3 Supporting Text S3: Additional tables

Table S1: UK population aggregated to ten regions (rounded to nearest 10,000). With regard to our intervention scenario in which regional ICU occupancy triggered the reintroduction and relaxation of social distancing measures within that region, the final column lists each of the regional ICU bed occupancy thresholds (equating to 45 occupied ICU beds per one million population).

Region	Population (millions)	Intervention trigger threshold (ICU bed occupancy)
Wales	3.14	142
Scotland	5.44	245
Northern Ireland	1.88	85
East of England	6.20	280
London	8.91	401
Midlands	10.70	482
North East and Yorkshire	8.14	367
North West England	7.29	328
South East England	9.13	412
South West England	5.60	252

4 Supporting Text S4: Additional figures




Fig. S1: Regional projections for hospitalisations per 100,000 with and without imposition of lockdown. In each panel: filled markers correspond to observed data (squares are for reported deaths, circles are for death of death), solid lines correspond to the mean outbreak over a sample of posterior parameters; shaded regions depict prediction intervals, with darker shading representing stricter confidence (dark shading - 50%, moderate shading - 90%, light shading - 99%); dashed lines illustrate the mean projected trajectory had no lockdown measures being introduced.




Fig. S2: Regional projections for ICU bed occupancy per 100,000 with and without imposition of lockdown. In each panel: filled markers correspond to observed data (squares are for reported deaths, circles are for death of death), solid lines correspond to the mean outbreak over a sample of posterior parameters; shaded regions depict prediction intervals, with darker shading representing stricter confidence (dark shading - 50%, moderate shading - 90%, light shading - 99%); dashed lines illustrate the mean projected trajectory had no lockdown measures being introduced.

References

- [1] Prem K, Cook AR, Jit M. Projecting social contact matrices in 152 countries using contact surveys and demographic data. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **13**(9):e1005697 (2017). doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005697.