

<sup>1</sup> **Supplementary methods**

<sup>2</sup> **Model description**

<sup>3</sup> **People and their contacts**

<sup>4</sup> FRED simulates pathogen spread in a population by recreating interactions among people on  
<sup>5</sup> a daily basis. To realistically represent the population of Indiana, we drew on a synthetic  
<sup>6</sup> population of the US that represents demographic and geographic characteristics from 2010 [32].  
<sup>7</sup> Each human is modeled as an agent that visits a set of places defined by their activity space. This  
<sup>8</sup> activity space contains places such as houses, schools, workplaces, and neighborhood locations.  
<sup>9</sup> Transmission can occur when an infected person visits the same location as a susceptible person  
<sup>10</sup> on the same day, with numbers of contacts per person specific to each location type. For instance,  
<sup>11</sup> school contacts depend not on the size of the school but on the age of the student. We adopted  
<sup>12</sup> contact rates specific to each location type that were previously calibrated to attack rates for  
<sup>13</sup> influenza in each location type [30, 33].

<sup>14</sup> **Importation to seed local transmission**

<sup>15</sup> To initialize the model, we simulated international and domestic importations similar to Perkins  
<sup>16</sup> et al. [55]. First, we obtained data on internationally and domestically imported deaths in  
<sup>17</sup> Indiana up to March 18 [56], which we used to extrapolate total international and domestic im-  
<sup>18</sup> portations based on the case fatality risk [41], the proportion of infections that are asymptomatic  
<sup>19</sup> [35], and the probability of detecting local and international symptomatic infections [55]. Second,  
<sup>20</sup> we assigned times to internationally imported infections proportional to international incidence  
<sup>21</sup> patterns, adjusted to account for the timing of a ban on travel from China. We assigned times to  
<sup>22</sup> domestically imported infections proportional to total US incidence. Drawing from uncertainty  
<sup>23</sup> distributions for each of the three aforementioned parameters, we repeated this process 1,000  
<sup>24</sup> times and averaged across replicates. We used that average curve to seed our model, scaling  
<sup>25</sup> its magnitude with a parameter that we calibrated. Although importations from outside Indi-  
<sup>26</sup> ana likely continued beyond those that we were able to account for explicitly, we assumed that  
<sup>27</sup> transmission within Indiana was sufficient at that point to be the primary driver of incidence.  
<sup>28</sup> In addition to importations in the overall population, we simulated importation into long-term  
<sup>29</sup> care facilities, given the large number of deaths that took place there and the limited realism of  
<sup>30</sup> our model in simulating visitors to those facilities. We introduced infections into these facilities  
<sup>31</sup> at a constant rate that we calibrated.

<sup>32</sup> **Transmission and disease progression**

<sup>33</sup> Once infected, each individual had latent and infectious periods drawn from distributions cal-  
<sup>34</sup> bricated so that the average generation interval distribution matched estimates from Singapore  
<sup>35</sup> ( $\mu = 5.20$ ,  $\sigma = 1.72$ ) [34]. The absolute risk of transmission depended on the number and location  
<sup>36</sup> of an infected individual's contacts and a parameter that controls SARS-CoV-2 transmissibility  
<sup>37</sup> upon contact, which we calibrated. We assumed asymptomatic infections were as infectious as

38 symptomatic infections and had identical timing of infectiousness [36, 37, 26, 38]. Following  
39 exposure, we assumed that children were less susceptible to infection than adults, which we  
40 modeled with a modified logistic function calibrated to results of Davies et al. [19]. We defined  
41 four parameters of this function as the *minimum* susceptibility, the *maximum* susceptibility, the  
42 *inflection point* of susceptibility with respect to age, and the *slope* of the age-susceptibility re-  
43 lationship around the inflection point. For agents that developed symptoms, we took random  
44 draws from lognormal distributions for the incubation period [39] and duration of symptoms  
45 [40]. Both the probabilities of developing symptoms [19] and dying [21] were assumed to increase  
46 with age. For infections that resulted in death, we modeled the time to death with a gamma  
47 distribution [22] truncated at the 99th percentile. These and other parameters are summarized  
48 in Table S9 and Fig. S5.

#### 49 Changes in agent behavior during the epidemic

50 Agent behavior in FRED has the potential to change over the course of an epidemic. Following  
51 the onset of symptoms, infected agents self-isolate at home according to a fixed daily rate,  
52 whereas others continue their daily activities [42]. This rate is chosen so that on average 68% of  
53 agents will self-isolate at some point during their symptoms, assuming that all individuals who  
54 develop a fever will isolate at some point during their symptoms [43]. Agents can also respond  
55 to public health interventions, including school closure, shelter in place, and a combination  
56 of mask-wearing and social distancing. School closures occur on specific dates [44], resulting  
57 in students limiting their activity space to household and neighborhood locations. Shelter-in-  
58 place interventions reduce some agents' activity spaces to their households only, whereas others  
59 continue with their daily routines. We used mobility reports from Google [45] to drive daily  
60 compliance with shelter-in-place, such that shelter-in-place compliance in our model accounts for  
61 both the effects of shelter-in-place orders and some people deciding to continue staying at home  
62 after those orders are lifted [46]. To account for voluntary mask-wearing and social distancing,  
63 we used Google Trends data for Indiana using the terms "face mask" and "social distancing" [47]  
64 and used estimates on face-mask adherence from a New York Times analysis of a survey from  
65 Dynata [48].

#### 66 Model calibration

67 We selected nine parameters to estimate based on calibration of the model to four data types  
68 on COVID-19 in Indiana: daily incidence of death, age distribution of deaths, daily incidence of  
69 hospitalization, and daily test positivity. The initial ranges for the statewide and long-term care  
70 facility importations were adjusted to cover a wide range of values. Compliance with shelter-  
71 in-place was informed with changes in mobility patterns in the Google community reports [45].  
72 We fitted a GAM to the trends from the percentage change on mobility trends for places of  
73 residence, and projected the compliance of shelter-in-place orders after the period for which we  
74 had data by assuming a linear trend thereafter. We normalized these mobility trends from 0%  
75 (baseline) to 100% (everyone at home) and adjusted its magnitude with a parameter representing  
76 the maximum compliance in the historical trends. The minimum, maximum, inflection point,

77 and slope of the logistic function with which we model the age-susceptibility relationship were  
 78 calibrated to estimates by Davies et al. [19].

79 We simulated 6,000 combinations of these nine parameters,  $\vec{\theta}$ , using a sobol design sampling  
 80 algorithm with the sobolDesign function in R [50, 51]. For each parameter set, we calculated the  
 81 likelihood of the model given the observed data on daily incidence of death, cumulative deaths  
 82 in long-term care facilities through July 13, the decadal age distribution of cumulative deaths  
 83 through July 13, daily incidence of hospitalization, and test positivity.

84 We calculated the contribution to the likelihood for daily incidence of death and cumulative  
 85 deaths in long-term care facilities using a negative binomial distribution as

$$\mathcal{L}(\vec{\theta}|D_{t,k}) = \text{Negative Binomial}(r, p),$$

86 where  $D_{t,k}$  is the daily incidence of death on day  $t$  and location  $k$  (long-term care facilities or all  
 87 other locations), and  $r$  and  $p$  are size and probability parameters, respectively. We informed  $r$  and  
 88  $p$  using the conjugate prior relationship between a beta prior and negative binomial likelihood,  
 89 such that  $r = r_{prior} + d_{t,m}$  and  $p = 1/(1 + \frac{p_{prior}}{p_{prior}+1})$ , where  $d_{t,m}$  is the daily incidence of death  
 90 predicted by the model on day  $t$ . For the decadal age distribution of cumulative deaths through  
 91 July 13, we used a multinomial distribution, such that

$$\mathcal{L}(\vec{\theta}|D_a) = \text{Multinomial}(D_a, d_{a,m}/\sum_a d_a),$$

92 where  $D_a$  is the observed number of deaths in the age group  $a$ , and  $d_{a,m}$  are the deaths by age  
 93 group obtained by the model. To fit to data on testing, we first observe, using Bayes' rule, that

$$\begin{aligned} P(C|T) &= \frac{P(T|C)P(C)}{P(T|C)P(C) + P(T|\neg C)P(\neg C)} \\ &= \frac{P(C)}{P(C) + r(1 - P(C))}, \end{aligned}$$

94 where  $C$  refers to a symptomatic case,  $T$  refers to an administered PCR test for current in-  
 95 fection, and  $r = P(T|\neg C)/P(T|C)$ . Next, we assume that non-symptomatic infections (either  
 96 presymptomatic or asymptomatic) exhibit treatment-seeking behavior similar to uninfected in-  
 97 dividuals, or  $P(T|I) = P(T|U) = P(T|\neg C)$ , where  $I$  refers to a non-symptomatic infection and  
 98  $U$  to uninfected. We then observe, again using Bayes' rule, that

$$P(I|T) = \frac{rP(I)}{P(C) + r(1 - P(C))}$$

99 and

$$P(U|T) = \frac{rP(U)}{P(C) + r(1 - P(C))}.$$

<sup>100</sup> Next, we incorporate PCR sensitivity and specificity by assuming that sensitivity =  $(P|C) =$   
<sup>101</sup>  $P(P|I)$ , where  $P$  refers to a positive test (i.e., we assume that PCR sensitivity is similar for  
<sup>102</sup> non-symptomatic and symptomatic infections). This allows us to write

$$P(P|T) = \text{sensitivity}(P(C|T) + P(I|T)) + (1 - \text{specificity})P(U|T).$$

<sup>103</sup> Then, we are in a position to write the contribution to the likelihood from the testing data,  
<sup>104</sup> assuming that the number of positive tests in the data,  $T_+$ , follows a binomial distribution

$$\mathcal{L}(\vec{\theta}|T_+, T_-) = \text{Binomial}(T_+ + T_-, P(P|T)),$$

<sup>105</sup> where  $T_-$  represents the number of negative tests in the data.

<sup>106</sup> Finally, the combined log-likelihood was obtained as

$$\log(\mathcal{L}(\vec{\theta})) = \sum_t \left( \log(\mathcal{L}(\vec{\theta}|D_{t,overall})) \right) + \log(\mathcal{L}(\vec{\theta}|D_{longtermcare})) + \log(\mathcal{L}(\vec{\theta}|T_+, T_-)) + \sum_a \left( \log(\mathcal{L}(\vec{\theta}|D_a)) \right).$$

<sup>107</sup> We sampled the parameters proportional to their likelihood to obtain a set of parameter combi-  
<sup>108</sup> nations that constitute our approximation of the posterior distribution of parameter values.