

1 Supplementary material




Figure S1. Susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 infection by age. The black line shows the median of the estimated curve of susceptibility by age, which took the form of a modified logistic function defined by four parameters: minimum, maximum, inflection point, and slope. The gray band represents the 95% credible interval. Navy lines show estimates from Davies et al. [19] that were used to inform our estimates. The dashed green line shows an alternative scenario with lower susceptibility for children under 10 years of age.




Figure S2. Changes in A) mobility patterns over time and B) face-mask adherence in the community as a whole. In A, the gray line shows the fitted pattern for the Google mobility index related to residential locations (navy line). Adherence to shelter-in-place in the model follows the same trend, but with its magnitude estimated through the model calibration process. In B, the gray line is informed by fitting to Google search data on “face mask” and assuming that values plateau from July 19 onward at a value informed by survey data [47, 48]




Figure S3. The impact of remote instruction in schools in Indiana on: A) the reproduction number, $R(t)$, over time; B) the proportion of infections acquired in different location types over time; and C) the daily incidence of infection over time. In A and C, the line represents the median, and the shaded region represents the 50% posterior predictive interval.




Figure S4. Distributions for parameters in the model. The probability of death is a product of the age-stratified relative probability of death and the daily relative probability of death, conditional on the individual still having symptoms by that day.




Figure S5. Sensitivity analysis of cumulative infections statewide between August 24 and December 31 to variation in the model's nine parameters. Bars indicate values of the partial rank correlation coefficient. Results are presented separately by school operating capacity (panels) and face-mask adherence in schools (gray shading).




Figure S6. Sensitivity analysis of the proportion of infections acquired in schools between August 24 and December 31 to variation in the model's nine parameters. Bars indicate values of the partial rank correlation coefficient. Results are presented separately by school operating capacity (panels) and face-mask adherence in schools (gray shading).

Capacity	Facemask	Cumulative infections	Cumulative deaths
0.50	Low	1.6 (1.5-1.6)	1.2 (1.1-1.2)
0.50	Med	1.3 (1.3-1.4)	1.1 (1.1-1.2)
0.50	High	1.2 (1.2-1.3)	1.1 (1.0-1.1)
0.75	Low	10.7 (10.1-11.3)	2.6 (2.5-2.7)
0.75	Med	4.9 (4.6-5.2)	1.8 (1.7-1.9)
0.75	High	2.4 (2.3-2.5)	1.4 (1.3-1.4)
1.00	Low	42.9 (41.5-44.4)	9.2 (8.9-9.5)
1.00	Med	30.9 (29.8-32.2)	6.2 (6.0-6.4)
1.00	High	14.3 (13.6-15.1)	3.3 (3.2-3.4)

Table S1. Proportional increase in risk for the overall population of Indiana under alternative scenarios about school operating capacity and face-mask adherence in schools. We define the proportional increase in risk as the ratio of the cumulative number of events (infections or deaths) between August 24 and December 31 under the scenario indicated by the left two columns as compared to a scenario in which schools operate remotely.

Capacity	Facemask	Student infections	Student symptoms
0.50	Low	3.3 (3.1-3.6)	3.1 (2.9-3.3)
0.50	Med	2.4 (2.3-2.5)	2.3 (2.2-2.4)
0.50	High	1.8 (1.7-2.0)	1.8 (1.7-1.9)
0.75	Low	56.4 (52.6-60.5)	48.8 (45.8-52.0)
0.75	Med	21.8 (20.2-23.5)	18.9 (17.5-20.4)
0.75	High	7.4 (6.9-7.9)	6.6 (6.2-7.1)
1.00	Low	250.4 (240.7-261.3)	236.2 (227.3-245.8)
1.00	Med	178.1 (170.1-186.0)	162.9 (156.1-170.3)
1.00	High	76.8 (72.1-81.5)	67.6 (63.6-71.9)

Table S2. Proportional increase in risk for students under alternative scenarios about school operating capacity and face-mask adherence in schools. We define the proportional increase in risk as the ratio of the cumulative number of events (infections or symptomatic infections) between August 24 and December 31 under the scenario indicated by the left two columns as compared to a scenario in which schools operate remotely.

Capacity	Facemask	Teacher infections	Teacher symptoms	Teacher deaths
0.50	Low	2.1 (2.0-2.2)	2.0 (1.9-2.2)	2.0 (1.9-2.2)
0.50	Med	1.7 (1.6-1.8)	1.7 (1.6-1.8)	1.8 (1.7-2.0)
0.50	High	1.5 (1.4-1.6)	1.5 (1.4-1.6)	1.6 (1.5-1.7)
0.75	Low	24.8 (23.3-26.4)	23.6 (22.0-25.1)	22.0 (20.3-23.5)
0.75	Med	10.7 (10.0-11.5)	10.1 (9.4-10.9)	9.8 (9.1-10.6)
0.75	High	4.5 (4.2-4.8)	4.4 (4.1-4.7)	4.4 (4.1-4.7)
1.00	Low	119.7 (114.3-124.7)	126.7 (121.4-132.2)	165.9 (157.6-175.0)
1.00	Med	88.8 (84.9-93.0)	90.4 (86.1-94.9)	102.7 (97.1-109.3)
1.00	High	41.9 (39.3-44.4)	41.0 (38.6-43.4)	41.3 (38.4-44.4)

Table S3. Proportional increase in risk for teachers under alternative scenarios about school operating capacity and face-mask adherence in schools. We define the proportional increase in risk as the ratio of the cumulative number of events (infections, symptomatic infections, or deaths) between August 24 and December 31 under the scenario indicated by the left two columns as compared to a scenario in which schools operate remotely.

Capacity	Facemask	Family infections	Family symptoms	Family deaths
0.50	Low	3.5 (3.3-3.7)	3.3 (3.1-3.5)	2.8 (2.6-3.0)
0.50	Med	2.5 (2.3-2.7)	2.4 (2.3-2.5)	2.3 (2.1-2.5)
0.50	High	1.9 (1.8-2.0)	1.9 (1.8-2.0)	1.9 (1.7-2.0)
0.75	Low	55.8 (52.1-59.7)	49.3 (46.4-52.8)	32.5 (30.0-35.2)
0.75	Med	22.1 (20.5-23.7)	19.4 (18.0-21.0)	13.3 (12.3-14.5)
0.75	High	7.7 (7.2-8.3)	7.0 (6.6-7.6)	5.7 (5.3-6.1)
1.00	Low	253.4 (243.5-263.4)	249.2 (240.0-259.9)	222.7 (211.1-236.1)
1.00	Med	178.1 (170.0-186.0)	168.3 (160.6-175.8)	132.1 (124.7-140.5)
1.00	High	77.2 (72.2-82.2)	69.5 (65.5-73.9)	48.5 (45.0-52.2)

Table S4. Proportional increase in risk for family members of students and teachers under alternative scenarios about school operating capacity and face-mask adherence in schools. We define the proportional increase in risk as the ratio of the cumulative number of events (infections, symptomatic infections, or deaths) between August 24 and December 31 under the scenario indicated by the left two columns as compared to a scenario in which schools operate remotely.

Capacity	Facemask	Cumulative infections	Cumulative deaths
0.50	Low	0.03 (0.03-0.03)	0.09 (0.09-0.10)
0.50	Med	0.03 (0.03-0.03)	0.09 (0.09-0.09)
0.50	High	0.02 (0.02-0.02)	0.08 (0.08-0.09)
0.75	Low	0.21 (0.20-0.22)	0.21 (0.20-0.21)
0.75	Med	0.10 (0.09-0.10)	0.14 (0.14-0.15)
0.75	High	0.05 (0.04-0.05)	0.11 (0.10-0.11)
1.00	Low	0.84 (0.83-0.85)	0.72 (0.70-0.73)
1.00	Med	0.61 (0.59-0.62)	0.48 (0.47-0.49)
1.00	High	0.28 (0.27-0.29)	0.26 (0.25-0.26)

Table S5. Overall proportional reduction in risk for the overall population of Indiana under alternative scenarios about school operating capacity and face-mask adherence in schools. We define the proportional reduction in risk as the ratio of the cumulative number of events (infections or deaths) between August 24 and December 31 under the scenario indicated by the left two columns as compared to a scenario in which schools operate at full capacity and without face masks.

Capacity	Facemask	Student infections	Student symptoms
0.50	Low	0.011 (0.010-0.012)	0.011 (0.010-0.011)
0.50	Med	0.008 (0.008-0.008)	0.008 (0.008-0.008)
0.50	High	0.006 (0.006-0.006)	0.006 (0.006-0.006)
0.75	Low	0.186 (0.176-0.196)	0.169 (0.160-0.178)
0.75	Med	0.072 (0.068-0.077)	0.065 (0.061-0.070)
0.75	High	0.024 (0.023-0.026)	0.023 (0.022-0.024)
1.00	Low	0.828 (0.822-0.833)	0.817 (0.811-0.823)
1.00	Med	0.588 (0.577-0.599)	0.562 (0.550-0.574)
1.00	High	0.253 (0.242-0.265)	0.234 (0.223-0.245)

Table S6. Proportional reduction in risk for students under alternative scenarios about school operating capacity and face-mask adherence in schools. We define the proportional reduction in risk as the ratio of the cumulative number of events (infections or symptomatic infections) between August 24 and December 31 under the scenario indicated by the left two columns as compared to a scenario in which schools operate at full capacity and without face masks.

Capacity	Facemask	Teacher infections	Teacher symptoms	Teacher deaths
0.50	Low	0.015 (0.014-0.016)	0.014 (0.013-0.014)	0.009 (0.008-0.009)
0.50	Med	0.012 (0.012-0.013)	0.011 (0.011-0.012)	0.008 (0.008-0.008)
0.50	High	0.011 (0.010-0.011)	0.010 (0.010-0.010)	0.007 (0.007-0.007)
0.75	Low	0.178 (0.170-0.187)	0.156 (0.149-0.164)	0.095 (0.090-0.101)
0.75	Med	0.077 (0.073-0.081)	0.067 (0.063-0.071)	0.043 (0.041-0.045)
0.75	High	0.032 (0.031-0.034)	0.029 (0.027-0.030)	0.019 (0.018-0.020)
1.00	Low	0.858 (0.853-0.863)	0.838 (0.832-0.845)	0.723 (0.712-0.733)
1.00	Med	0.637 (0.625-0.647)	0.597 (0.585-0.610)	0.447 (0.433-0.462)
1.00	High	0.300 (0.288-0.314)	0.271 (0.260-0.285)	0.180 (0.171-0.188)

Table S7. Proportional reduction in risk for teachers under alternative scenarios about school operating capacity and face-mask adherence in schools. We define the proportional reduction in risk as the ratio of the cumulative number of events (infections, symptomatic infections, or deaths) between August 24 and December 31 under the scenario indicated by the left two columns as compared to a scenario in which schools operate at full capacity and without face masks.

Capacity	Facemask	Family infections	Family symptoms	Family deaths
0.50	Low	0.005 (0.005-0.005)	0.005 (0.004-0.005)	0.004 (0.004-0.005)
0.50	Med	0.003 (0.003-0.003)	0.003 (0.003-0.003)	0.003 (0.003-0.003)
0.50	High	0.002 (0.002-0.002)	0.002 (0.002-0.002)	0.003 (0.003-0.003)
0.75	Low	0.081 (0.078-0.085)	0.069 (0.066-0.073)	0.042 (0.040-0.044)
0.75	Med	0.015 (0.014-0.015)	0.013 (0.013-0.014)	0.011 (0.011-0.012)
0.75	High	0.004 (0.004-0.004)	0.004 (0.004-0.004)	0.004 (0.004-0.005)
1.00	Low	0.705 (0.695-0.716)	0.673 (0.660-0.685)	0.533 (0.519-0.547)
1.00	Med	0.241 (0.232-0.250)	0.210 (0.202-0.218)	0.128 (0.122-0.133)
1.00	High	0.015 (0.015-0.016)	0.014 (0.013-0.015)	0.012 (0.012-0.013)

Table S8. Proportional reduction in risk for family members of students and teachers under alternative scenarios about school operating capacity and face-mask adherence in schools. We define the proportional reduction in risk as the ratio of the cumulative number of events (infections or deaths) between August 24 and December 31 under the scenario indicated by the left two columns as compared to a scenario in which schools operate at full capacity and without face masks.

Parameter	Value
Importations scaling factor	1.299 (95% CrI: 0.502-1.461)
Susceptibility slope	0.757 (95% CrI: 0.578-3.344)
Susceptibility minimum	0.346 (95% CrI: 0.311-0.506)
Susceptibility inflection point	18.640 (95% CrI: 18.521-19.804)
Susceptibility maximum	0.834 (95% CrI: 0.652-0.946)
Shelter in place adherence	0.321 (95% CrI: 0.288-0.669)
Face-mask adherence	0.534 (95% CrI: 0.461-0.540)
LTC importations scaling factor	0.037 (95% CrI: 0.022-0.092)
Transmissibility	0.593 (95% CrI: 0.501-0.788)
Probability of symptoms Age	Fig. S4A
Incubation period	Fig. S4B
Symptomatic period	Fig. S4C
Probability of death Age	Fig. S4D
Probability of death after symptom onset	Fig. S4E
Pre-infectious period	meanlog = 23.7, sdlog = 50 (Fig. S4F)
Infectious period	meanlog = 33.8, sdlog = 43.1 (Fig. S4F)
Adjusted odds ratio for face-mask efficacy	0.15[31]

Table S9. List of model parameters. The first nine were estimated through the model calibration process, and the subsequent seven were assumed based on the literature, as described in the Methods. Values of the first nine parameters reflect marginal posterior estimates.

		Settings related to juvenile transmission		
Capacity	Facemask	Default	Low 0-10 Susc.	Low Asymp. Inf.
0.50	Low	1.33 (1.26-1.41)	1.25 (1.19-1.31)	1.74 (1.67-1.80)
0.50	Med	1.15 (1.09-1.21)	1.09 (1.04-1.14)	1.49 (1.43-1.54)
0.50	High	1.04 (0.99-1.09)	0.99 (0.94-1.03)	1.31 (1.27-1.36)
0.75	Low	9.10 (8.57-9.67)	7.59 (7.28-7.88)	10.01 (9.55-10.41)
0.75	Med	4.23 (3.96-4.50)	3.79 (3.60-3.96)	5.93 (5.65-6.22)
0.75	High	2.04 (1.92-2.16)	1.86 (1.78-1.94)	3.16 (3.02-3.32)
1.00	Low	36.63 (35.15-38.16)	21.56 (21.04-22.15)	26.17 (25.54-26.84)
1.00	Med	26.43 (25.38-27.54)	16.96 (16.52-17.42)	21.01 (20.39-21.62)
1.00	High	12.25 (11.53-12.93)	9.21 (8.87-9.56)	13.23 (12.70-13.74)

Table S10. Proportional increase in risk of infection for the overall population of Indiana for alternative model settings related to juvenile transmission (columns) and alternative scenarios about school operating capacity and face-mask adherence in schools (rows). In addition to the baseline scenario (left), we explored scenarios in which children aged 0-10 had reduced susceptibility beyond the baseline scenario (middle) and in which the infectiousness of asymptomatic infections was 50% that of symptomatic infections (right). We define the proportional increase in risk as the ratio of the cumulative number of infections between August 24 and December 31 compared to a scenario in which schools operate remotely.

Capacity	Facemask	Settings related to juvenile transmission		
		Default	Low 0-10 Susc.	Low Asymp. Inf.
0.50	Low	1.10 (1.05-1.14)	1.02 (0.98-1.06)	1.26 (1.22-1.30)
0.50	Med	1.05 (1.00-1.09)	0.97 (0.93-1.01)	1.18 (1.14-1.22)
0.50	High	1.00 (0.96-1.05)	0.93 (0.90-0.97)	1.14 (1.10-1.17)
0.75	Low	2.44 (2.33-2.54)	2.58 (2.49-2.67)	2.97 (2.86-3.08)
0.75	Med	1.67 (1.60-1.74)	1.70 (1.64-1.76)	2.11 (2.02-2.18)
0.75	High	1.28 (1.23-1.34)	1.22 (1.17-1.27)	1.59 (1.54-1.64)
1.00	Low	8.51 (8.20-8.84)	7.47 (7.26-7.68)	7.91 (7.69-8.15)
1.00	Med	5.71 (5.49-5.95)	5.44 (5.27-5.61)	6.01 (5.80-6.21)
1.00	High	3.05 (2.91-3.18)	3.11 (3.00-3.22)	3.88 (3.73-4.04)

Table S11. Proportional increase in risk of death for the overall population of Indiana for alternative model settings related to juvenile transmission (columns) and alternative scenarios about school operating capacity and face-mask adherence in schools (rows). In addition to the baseline scenario (left), we explored scenarios in which children aged 0-10 had reduced susceptibility beyond the baseline scenario (middle) and in which the infectiousness of asymptomatic infections was 50% that of symptomatic infections (right). We define the proportional increase in risk as the ratio of the cumulative number of deaths between August 24 and December 31 compared to a scenario in which schools operate remotely.

Capacity	Facemask	Face-mask adjusted odds ratio		
		0.12	0.30	0.73
0.50	Low	1.25 (1.21-1.30)	1.56 (1.48-1.64)	3.74 (3.57-3.93)
0.50	Med	1.14 (1.11-1.18)	1.34 (1.28-1.41)	3.37 (3.23-3.52)
0.50	High	1.07 (1.03-1.11)	1.22 (1.16-1.28)	3.07 (2.92-3.22)
0.75	Low	3.26 (3.10-3.44)	10.65 (10.05-11.23)	24.91 (24.04-25.78)
0.75	Med	1.59 (1.53-1.64)	4.94 (4.66-5.23)	23.45 (22.68-24.26)
0.75	High	1.17 (1.13-1.21)	2.38 (2.27-2.53)	21.91 (21.19-22.69)
1.00	Low	29.53 (28.75-30.47)	42.85 (41.36-44.40)	33.43 (32.29-34.56)
1.00	Med	5.61 (5.29-5.94)	30.98 (29.68-32.15)	33.13 (32.07-34.31)
1.00	High	1.47 (1.42-1.52)	14.33 (13.50-15.10)	32.74 (31.71-33.95)

Table S12. Proportional increase in risk of infection for the overall population of Indiana for alternative model settings related to face-mask efficacy (columns) and alternative scenarios about school operating capacity and face-mask adherence in schools (rows). In addition to the baseline scenario (left), we explored scenarios in which children aged 0-10 had reduced susceptibility beyond the baseline scenario (middle) and in which the infectiousness of asymptomatic infections was 50% that of symptomatic infections (right). We define the proportional increase in risk as the ratio of the cumulative number of infections between August 24 and December 31 compared to a scenario in which schools operate remotely.

Capacity	Facemask	Face-mask adjusted odds ratio		
		0.12	0.30	0.73
0.50	Low	1.10 (1.06-1.14)	1.19 (1.14-1.24)	1.74 (1.67-1.82)
0.50	Med	1.06 (1.02-1.10)	1.13 (1.09-1.18)	1.66 (1.60-1.73)
0.50	High	1.03 (0.99-1.07)	1.09 (1.04-1.13)	1.61 (1.54-1.68)
0.75	Low	1.54 (1.49-1.60)	2.64 (2.53-2.74)	7.48 (7.21-7.78)
0.75	Med	1.20 (1.16-1.25)	1.82 (1.74-1.89)	6.91 (6.66-7.19)
0.75	High	1.08 (1.04-1.12)	1.39 (1.34-1.45)	6.34 (6.12-6.59)
1.00	Low	5.26 (5.09-5.46)	9.23 (8.91-9.57)	12.96 (12.51-13.39)
1.00	Med	1.97 (1.90-2.05)	6.19 (5.97-6.45)	12.70 (12.31-13.16)
1.00	High	1.18 (1.14-1.22)	3.30 (3.16-3.43)	12.47 (12.05-12.86)

Table S13. Proportional increase in risk of death for the overall population of Indiana for alternative model settings related to face-mask efficacy (columns) and alternative scenarios about school operating capacity and face-mask adherence in schools (rows). In addition to the baseline scenario (left), we explored scenarios in which children aged 0-10 had reduced susceptibility beyond the baseline scenario (middle) and in which the infectiousness of asymptomatic infections was 50% that of symptomatic infections (right). We define the proportional increase in risk as the ratio of the cumulative number of deaths between August 24 and December 31 compared to a scenario in which schools operate remotely.

2 **Supplementary methods**

3 **Model description**

4 **People and their contacts**

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

15 **Importation to seed local transmission**

16 To initialize the model, we simulated international and domestic importations similar to Perkins
17 et al. [56]. First, we obtained data on internationally and domestically imported deaths in
18 Indiana up to March 18 [57], which we used to extrapolate total international and domestic im-
19 portations based on the case fatality risk [41], the proportion of infections that are asymptomatic
20 [35], and the probability of detecting local and international symptomatic infections [56]. Second,
21 we assigned times to internationally imported infections proportional to international incidence
22 patterns, adjusted to account for the timing of a ban on travel from China. We assigned times to
23 domestically imported infections proportional to total US incidence. Drawing from uncertainty
24 distributions for each of the three aforementioned parameters, we repeated this process 1,000
25 times and averaged across replicates. We used that average curve to seed our model, scaling
26 its magnitude with a parameter that we calibrated. Although importations from outside Indi-
27 ana likely continued beyond those that we were able to account for explicitly, we assumed that
28 transmission within Indiana was sufficient at that point to be the primary driver of incidence.
29 In addition to importations in the overall population, we simulated importation into long-term
30 care facilities, given the large number of deaths that took place there and the limited realism of
31 our model in simulating visitors to those facilities. We introduced infections into these facilities
32 at a constant rate that we calibrated.

33 **Transmission and disease progression**

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

39 symptomatic infections and had identical timing of infectiousness [36, 37, 26, 38]. Following
40 exposure, we assumed that children were less susceptible to infection than adults, which we
41 modeled with a modified logistic function calibrated to results of Davies et al. [19]. We defined
42 four parameters of this function as the *minimum* susceptibility, the *maximum* susceptibility, the
43 *inflection point* of susceptibility with respect to age, and the *slope* of the age-susceptibility re-
44 lationship around the inflection point. For agents that developed symptoms, we took random
45 draws from lognormal distributions for the incubation period [39] and duration of symptoms
46 [40]. Both the probabilities of developing symptoms [19] and dying [21] were assumed to increase
47 with age. For infections that resulted in death, we modeled the time to death with a gamma
48 distribution [22] truncated at the 99th percentile. These and other parameters are summarized
49 in Table S9 and Fig. S4.

50 **Changes in agent behavior during the epidemic**

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

67 **Model calibration**

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

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

80 We simulated 6,000 combinations of these nine parameters, $\vec{\theta}$, using a sobol design sampling
 81 algorithm with the `sobolDesign` function in R [51, 52]. For each parameter set, we calculated the
 82 likelihood of the model given the observed data on daily incidence of death, cumulative deaths
 83 in long-term care facilities through July 13, the decadal age distribution of cumulative deaths
 84 through July 13, daily incidence of hospitalization, and test positivity.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

100 and

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

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

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

104 Then, we are in a position to write the contribution to the likelihood from the testing data,
 105 assuming that the number of positive tests in the data, T_+ , follows a binomial distribution

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

106 where T_- represents the number of negative tests in the data.

107 Finally, the combined log-likelihood was obtained as

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

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