medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The health effects in the US of quarantine policies based on predicted individual risk of severe COVID-19 outcomes

Sam Lovick, JD[1], Gillian S. Dite, PhD[2], Richard Allman, PhD[2]

Affiliations:

[1]Sam Lovick Consulting, 74 Belford Road, Kew East VIC 3102, Australia

[2]Genetic Technologies Ltd, 60–66 Hanover Street, Fitzroy VIC 3065, Australia

Corresponding Author:

Richard Allman, Genetic Technologies Ltd, 60–66 Hanover St, Fitzroy VIC 3065, Australia.

Email: richard.allman@gtglabs.com. Ph: +61 3 8412 7005

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Abstract

Background: Social distancing, testing and public health measures are the principal protections against COVID-19 in the US. Social distancing based on an accurate assessment of the individual risk of severe outcomes could reduce harm even as infection rates accelerate.

Methods: An SEIR dynamic transmission model of COVID-19 was created to simulate the disease in the US after October 2020. The model comprised 8 age groups with US-specific contact rates and low- and high-risk sub-groups defined in terms of the risk of a severe outcome determined by relevant comorbidities and a genetic test. Monte Carlo analysis was used to compare quarantine measures applied to at risk persons identified with and without the genetic test.

Results: Under the piecemeal social distancing measures currently in place, absent a vaccine the US can expect 114 million symptomatic infections, 4.8 million hospitalisations and 262,000 COVID-19 related deaths. Social distancing based solely on comorbidities with 80% compliance reduces symptomatic infections by between 1.2 and 2.2 million, hospitalisations by between 1.2 and 1.3 million, and deaths by between 71,800 and 80,900. Refining the definition of at risk using a test of single-nucleotide polymorphisms further reduces symptomatic infections by 1.0 to 1.2 million, hospitalisations by 0.4 million and deaths by between 20,500 and 24,100.

Conclusions: Models are now available that can accurately predict the likelihood of severe COVID-19 outcomes based on age, sex, comorbidities and polygenetic testing. Quarantine based on risk of severe outcomes could substantially reduce pandemic harm, even when infection rates outside of quarantine are high.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Introduction

The current COVID-19 pandemic is causing enormous harm globally from both health and economic perspectives. In some population groups, up to 30% of those infected will experience severe symptoms requiring hospitalisation; some of those will require intensive care and some will die.[1,2]

Globally, public health responses have been aimed at reducing spread and protecting high risk groups such as the elderly in residential care. Pending a vaccine, governments have sought to reduce community transmission through measures such as rapid and high volume testing, track and trace, quarantine, social distancing, mask wearing, curtailing non-essential services and travel restrictions.

Extensive social distancing including travel constraints has been shown to control COVID-19 spread in practice.[3] Disease modelling has also identified the importance of these measures on disease spread and pandemic harm.[4] However, the economic and social impacts of these interventions have been substantial, with considerable damage to local economies.[5] There have also been allied health effects such as increases in reported mental health diagnoses[6] and decreases in cancer screening heralding likely increases in future cancer deaths.[7]

Most of these social distancing regimes have focused on measures applied broadly across the population. While some states within the US have temporarily imposed broad-based measure, the US as a whole appears reluctant to impose the stringent measures that have been a feature of Australia's and some European countries' responses to COVID-19.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Infection rates in northern hemisphere countries in Europe and North America have increased markedly as initial measures that were successful in curbing infection rates were relaxed.[8] In the US, close to 10% of hospital beds were occupied with COVID-19 patients before the July 2020 second peak in infections. In the worst affected states, more than 25% of beds were occupied with COVID-19 with similarly high ICU bed occupancy.[9] US infection rates in November 2020 are considerably higher, resulting in concomitant stresses on hospital care. One of the policy imperatives is therefore to ensure that rising infection rates do not overwhelm hospital capacity.

There is growing awareness of the factors that affect patient outcomes after infection. Age, gender and comorbidities have been identified as factors affecting the risk of a severe outcome (one requiring hospitalisation).[10] Several epidemiological studies have sought to quantify the importance of these factors.[11,12] To more accurately identify those at risk of a severe outcome, Dite et al examined a UK database of health and genomic data combing age, sex, comorbidities and a screening test based on 62 single-nucleotide polymorphisms ('the SNP test').[13] The SNP test markedly improved identification of those at risk.

We used disease modelling to examine the health effects of social distancing in the US based on quarantining those individuals most likely to have a severe COVID-19 outcome upon infection. The potential benefit of such an approach is that for a given level of COVID-19 infections, it results in fewer hospitalisations, ICU admissions and deaths.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Methods

The disease model

A conventional four pool (susceptible, exposed, infectious, recovered — SEIR) dynamic transmission model developed to simulate influenza pandemics written in R using the EpiModel[14] library was adapted to simulate COVID-19. Disease spread within the population is based on rates of contact between 8 defined age-groups across four activity areas: home, work, school and leisure/other derived after Mossong et al[15] (undertaken as part of the European Union POLYMOD initiative[16]), extended to 136 countries including the US based on the demographic and economic characteristics of each country.[17] Daily contact rates in the US by age for school, work, home and all other locations are shown in Supplementary Table 1.

Disease characteristics are defined in terms of naïve population R_0 values, symptomatic and asymptomatic proportions, differential rates of spread from symptomatic and asymptomatic infections, case fatality rate for symptomatic infections, transitional probabilities for different outcomes (primary care consultation, hospitalisation, critical care and death), and typical duration of illness, hospitalisation and critical care to determine overall demand for health care services. These were largely based on Ferguson et al.[4]

The model includes details of health care capabilities in each country. These include hospital beds and critical care beds.[9] The costs of each of these resources are also included.[18,19] The model can therefore estimate utilisation of these resources under different intervention strategies.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The model also estimates health burden in terms of the value of saved quality of life years (QALYs) assuming QALYs lost from symptomatic COVID-19 infections reflect QALYs lost from symptomatic influenza-like infections.[20] The model assumes a $50,000 cost for each lost QALY.

The model uses second-order Monte Carlo analysis to represent uncertain factors such as R_0, case fatality rate (CFR), and duration of infection with Latin hypercube sampling to ensure representative numbers of cases. The core modelling assumptions are set out in Table 1 and Table 2.

Social distancing assumptions

The model was adapted to include a number of different social distancing policies after Ferguson et al in the UK in March 2020.[4] They are: school closures; work from home requirements; age-based quarantine; case quarantine; household quarantine where there is an infection in the household; and broad-based social distancing comprising restrictions on activities outside the home, school and workplace. In addition, the model was adapted to allow quarantine (with a specified rates of compliance) of adult individuals determined to be at high risk of severe outcomes under the Dite model.[13] The Dite model is summarised in Supplementary Table 2.

These policies can be used singly or in combination. Appropriate adjustments are made to the rates of contact and risk of infection for each of the social distancing measures. Start-week and end-week for each measure can be specified. In addition, measures can be endogenously applied by the model based on the instant underlying COVID-19 mortality rate in the population as a whole.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

In this modelling, school closure programs and work from home social distancing were applied when the daily COVID-19 mortality rate rose above 0.5 deaths per 100,000 population per day. We also assumed that 50% of symptomatic infections are identified from testing sufficiently early for effective quarantine of those individuals to prevent further spread. This quarantine measure was adopted once the daily COVID-19 mortality rate rose above 0.1 deaths per 100,000 population per day. Cases were quarantined for 14 days. This established the base for comparison of different social distancing measures based on at risk status.

Quarantine based on at risk status, when in place, was also imposed when the daily COVID-19 mortality rate rose above 0.1 deaths per 100,000 population per day. Social distancing parameters are summarised in Supplementary Table 3.

Characterisation of at risk individuals

The proportion of the population by age and sex with comorbidities was gathered from a number of sources. Where used: body mass index[21]; smoking[22]; heart disease[23–25]; hyperlipidaemia[26]; hypertension[27]; diabetes[28]; COPD[29] and asthma[30]; kidney disease[31]; cerebrovascular[25]; kidney disease[32]; and cancer[33]. The comorbidities were assumed to be independent, an assumption that could be relaxed in future simulations. Relevant comorbidity rates by age and sex in the base population are summarised in Supplementary Table 4.

The odds ratios for each of the factors were taken from the model developed by Dite et al[13] with only those factors with an odds ratio p value of 0.001 or below included in the analysis. The proportion of at risk in each age group for the purposes of the disease modelling was set as the proportion of the cohort exhibiting an odds ratio above of 2.5 and 3.5 of a severe outcome post

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

infection. These proportions were determined with and without the SNP test. Rates of at risk within the population are summarised in Supplementary Tables 5 and 6 for the 2.5 and 3.5 odds ratio threshold respectively.


Population sizes by age was based on US census data[34]. Age cohorts were specified for years 0 to 10, 10 to 18, 18 to 30, deciles to 70, and 70 years and above. Social distancing measures for high-risk individuals applied only to adults 18 years and above.

Results

Left to run its course from October 2020 with no social distancing measures in place, the model predicts 232.6 m new infections (SD 3.2 m), 139.9 m symptomatic infections (SD 4.7 m), 5.7 m hospitalisations (SD 0.7 m) and 370,100 deaths (SD 48,500).

The profile of disease spread absent social distancing appears more rapid than is currently observed (notwithstanding uncertainty over actual rather than observed infection rates) and the US is putting some social distancing measures in place albeit with wide variation in timing and extent across the states. With limited social distancing comprising school closure, home-based work and infected case quarantine endogenously triggered based on mortality rate, the model predicts 190.5 m infections (SD 4.1 m), 114.3 m symptomatic infections (SD 3.7 m), 4.8 m hospitalisations (SD 0.6 m) and 262,100 deaths (SD 34,100). The predicted weekly profile of COVID-19 spread with and without limited social distancing is shown in Figure 1a. Weekly symptomatic COVID-19 infections are shown in Figure 1b and weekly predicted deaths in Figure 1c.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 1a. Predicted weekly cases of COVID-19 (symptomatic and asymptomatic) with and without limited social distancing without a vaccine. **1b**. Predicted weekly symptomatic COVID-19 cases (symptomatic and asymptomatic) with and without limited social distancing without a vaccine. **1c**. Predicted weekly deaths with limited social distancing and quarantine of at risk individuals using different odds ratio thresholds, with and without SNP test.

Table 3 summarises health outcomes with and without at risk social distancing assuming either an 80% compliance or 50% compliance with the social distancing measures. Where 80% compliance is achieved, at risk social distancing makes a small 1% to 3% difference to the number of infections and symptomatic cases when compared to the limited social distancing case. At risk social distancing using a 2.5 odds ratio threshold but without the SNP test results in 172,000 deaths (SD 23,500) compared to 274,000 (SD 35,000) from limited social distancing alone, a reduction of 87,200 deaths. Inclusion of the SNP test to identify at risk individuals results in a further reduction of 23,200 deaths, a 27% increase in lives saved. Inclusion of the SNP test results in a similar reduction in deaths using the higher 3.5 odds ratio threshold for classifying at risk individuals. Reductions in hospitalisations show a similar pattern.

Where a lower compliance rate of 50% is achieved, at risk social distancing without the SNP test reduces deaths by 52,300. Inclusion of the SNP test results in a further reduction in deaths of 14,900, a 28% increase in lives saved. Figure 3 shows the profile of deaths during the pandemic with limited social distancing, and under all at risk-based social distancing scenarios, with and without the SNP test.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 3 shows that at risk-based social distancing and limited social distancing deliver similar reductions in infections and symptomatic infections. At risk-based social distancing is much more effective at reducing severe outcomes. The largest effect on severe outcomes is in the older cohorts which exhibit the highest odds ratio of severe outcomes, as shown in Supplementary Tables 7 and 8,Supplementary Figures 1 and 2.

Discussion

Countries around the globe are grappling with the complex task of reducing the health burden from the COVID-19 pandemic. This typically involves a trade-off between social distancing and public health measures aimed at reducing infections to deliver a concomitant reduction in hospitalisations and deaths, against minimising the economic consequences that arise from restrictions of activity.

After some initial success, most European countries have seen dramatic rises in infections following relaxation of initial protective measures. Most have had to re-impose strict economy-wide social restrictions to curb infection rates. The US has, in most regions, imposed less stringent social distancing measures, which is reflected in high and rising infection rates in the fall of 2020 approaching winter.

There is growing evidence[10–13] showing an identifiable group with a high risk of severe outcomes (hospitalisation, ICU admission and death). This analysis suggests that quarantine or social distancing applied to accurately identified “at risk” individuals could reduce these severe outcomes by a much greater amount than alternative social distancing measures covering a similar but broader-based proportion of the population.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

This analysis also shows that improving the accuracy of identification of those at risk, in this case using an SNP test, markedly improves the effectiveness of an at risk-based social distancing regime. These simulations indicate that 26% of the population would need to be SNP tested when the 2.5 odds ratio screen is used, 15% when the 3.5 odds ratio screen is used. Given these testing rates, each test would generate between $285 and $360 in the value of saved QALYs.

In this analysis we have not sought to examine the practicality of an at risk social distancing policy. However, we already know that where there is concentration of at risk individuals, notably in care homes, specific safeguard to protect against sources of COVID-19 are advisable.[35] Such specific safeguards are, in effect, a form of at risk social distancing.

This analysis indicates that, where governments choose minimal levels of social distancing to safeguard the economy, social distancing targeting those at most risk will be particularly valuable in minimising the burden of disease, not least because retirees are a large proportion of that group for COVID-19. Improving the accuracy of identification through, for example, a low cost genetic test, increases this value. And while this analysis examines the US as a whole, the conclusions are equally applicable at the regional or community level.

To date, there has been only limited study of the use of targeted quarantine measures as a means of limiting pandemic harm, whether in terms of burden of disease or economic harm. In part, this reflects the difficulty in identifying and the subsequent costs of quarantining individuals. The value of this study is an assessment of genetic testing to better identify at risk individuals, which could change the relative costs and benefits of targeted quarantine.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The evidence indicates that single-nucleotide polymorphism testing, combined with age, sex and comorbidities, can accurately identify those at risk of severe COVID-19 outcomes, making quarantine of those individuals within communities, whether small or large, a more viable response to the pandemic.

Footnote

The modelling was undertaken in October 2020 using data on the social distancing measures that States had implemented up to that time as the base social distancing assumptions. Subsequently and after this paper was drafted, there was an effective relaxation of social distancing measures in the US as COVID spread to US regions that adopted less stringent measures and following Thanksgiving travel. In combination, these resulted in outcomes that were materially worse than forecast. Had these events not taken place, outcomes in the US would have been in line with this forecast.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Funding

The study was fully funded by Genetic technologies Limited

Ethical Considerations

Ethics approval not required as the research is a computer modelling study.

Authorship Statement

RA and SL conceived the study concept and design. GSD and SL contributed to acquisition of data. SL conducted the data analysis. SL drafted the first version of the manuscript. All authors contributed to interpretation of data and critical revision of the manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest

GSD and RA are employees of Genetic Technologies Limited. SL is a consultant to Genetic Technologies Limited. The test for COVID-19 severity analysed in this study is a commercial product of Genetic Technologies Limited.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

References

1 Shovlin CL, Vizcaychipi MP. Implications for COVID-19 triage from the ICNARC report of 2204 COVID-19 cases managed in UK adult intensive care units. *Emerg Med J* 2020; **37**(6): 332–3. doi:10.1136/emermed-2020-209791

2 Rapid risk assessment – coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in the EU/EEA and the UK – ninth update. 2020. Accessed September 21, 2020, at https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/rapid-risk-assessment-coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-pandemic-ninth-update

3 O'Sullivan D, Rahamathulla M, Pawar M. The impact and implications of COVID-19: an Australian perspective. *International Journal of Community and Social Development* 2020; **2**(2): 134–51. doi:10.1177/2516602620937922

4 Ferguson N, Laydon D, Nedjati-Gilani G et al. Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand. London: Imperial College London, 2020. Accessed 11 November, 2020, at https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/medicine/sph/ide/gida-fellowships/Imperial-College-COVID19-NPI-modelling-16-03-2020.pdf

5 World Bank. Global economic prospects. June 2020. Washington, DC: World Bank. 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

6 Moreno C, Wykes T, Galderisi S, et al. How mental health care should change as a consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Lancet Psychiat* 2020; **7**(9): 813–24. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30307-2

7 Sud A, Torr B, Jones M, et al. Effect of delays in the 2-week-wait cancer referral pathway during the COVID-19 pandemic on cancer survival in the UK: a modelling study. *Lancet Oncol* 2020; **21**(8): 2035–44. doi:10.1016/S1470-2045(20)30392-2

8 Dong E, Du H, Gardner L. An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real time. Lancet Infect Dis 2020; **20**(5): 533–4. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30120-1

9 Centres for Disease Control and Prevention. Current hospital capacity estimates – Snapshot 14 July 2020. Accessed 11 November, 2020, at https://www.cdc.gov/nhsn/covid19/report-patient-impact.html#anchor_1594393649

10 Kim L, Garg S, O'Halloran A, et al. Risk factors for intensive care unit admission and in-hospital mortality among hospitalized adults identified through the U.S. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)-Associated Hospitalization Surveillance Network (COVID-NET). Clin Infect Dis 2020; July 16 (Epub ahead of print). doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa1012

11 Williamson EJ, Walker AJ, Bhaskaran K, et al. Factors associated with COVID-19-related death using OpenSAFELY. *Nature* 2020; **584**(7821): 430–6. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2521-4

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

12 Petrilli CM, Jones SA, Yang J, et al. Factors associated with hospital admission and critical illness among 5279 people with coronavirus disease 2019 in New York City: prospective cohort study. *BMJ* 2020; **369**: m1966. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m1966

13 Dite S, Murphy N, Allman R. (2020) An integrated clinical and genetic model for predicting risk of severe COVID-19. *medRxiv* doi: 10.1101/2020.09.30.20204453

14 Jenness S, Goodreau S, Morris M. EpiModel: An R package for mathematical modeling of infectious disease over networks. *J Stat Softw* 2018; **84**(8): 1–47. doi: 10.18637/jss.v084.i08

15 Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, Beutels P, Auranen K, Mikolajczyk R, et al. Social Contacts and Mixing Patterns Relevant to the Spread of Infectious Diseases. *PLoS Med* 2008; **5**(3); e74. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.0050074.

16 European Commission. Improving public health policy in Europe through modelling and economic evaluation of interventions for the control of infectious diseases 2004. Accessed 11 November, 2020, at https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/502084

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

18 American Hospital Association. 1999–2018 AHA annual survey. Chicago, IL: Health Forum, LLC, 2019. Accessed 11 November, 2020, at http://www.ahaonlinestore.com

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

19 Dasta JF, Mclaughlin TP, Mody SH, Piech CT. (2005). Daily cost of an intensive care unit day: the contribution of mechanical ventilation. *Crit Care Med* 2005; **33**(6): 1266–71. doi: 10.1097/01.CCM.0000164543.14619.00.

20 Hollmann M, Garin O, Galante M, Ferrer M, Dominguez A, Alonso J. Impact of influenza on health-related quality of life among confirmed (H1N1)2009 patients. *PLoS One* 2013; **8**(3): e60477. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0060477.

21 Flegal KM, Kruszon-Moran D, Carroll MD, Fryar CD, Ogden CL. Trends in obesity among adults in the United States, 2005 to 2014. *JAMA* 2016; **315**(21): 2284–91. doi: 10.1001/jama.2016.6458

22 Raghupathi W, Raghupathi V. An empirical study of chronic diseases in the United States: a visual analytics approach to public health. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2018; **15**(3): 431.

23 Sanchis-Gomar F, Perez-Quilis C, Leischik R, Lucia A. Epidemiology of coronary heart disease and acute coronary syndrome. *Ann Transl Med* 2016; **4**(13): 256. doi: 10.21037/atm.2016.06.33

24 Savarese G, Lund LH. Global Public Health Burden of Heart Failure. *Card Fail Rev* 2017; **3**(1): 7–11. doi:10.15420/cfr.2016:25:2

25 National Center for Health Statistics. Health, United States, 2018. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics. 2019.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

26 Carroll M, Fryar C, Nguyen D. HDL, National health and nutrition examination survey: total and high-density lipoprotein cholesterol in adults: United States, 2015–2016. NCHS data brief, no. 290. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics. 2017.

27 Mozaffarian D, Roger VL, Benjamin EJ et al. Heart disease and stroke statistics—2013 update: a report from the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 2013; **127**: e6–e245.

28 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National diabetes statistics report, 2020. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, US Deptartment of Health and Human Services. 2020.

29 Akinbami LJ, Liu X. Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease among adults aged 18 and over in the United States, 1998–2009. NCHS data brief, no 63. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics. 2011.

30 Villarroel MA, Blackwell DL, Jen A. Tables of Summary Health Statistics for US Adults: 2018 National Health Interview Survey. National Center for Health Statistics. 2019. Accessed 11 November, 2020, at http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhis/SHS/tables.htm

31 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Chronic kidney disease surveillance system—United States. Accessed 11 November, 2020, at http://www.cdc.gov/ckd

32 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Chronic kidney disease in the United States, 2019. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2019.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

33 US Cancer Statistics Working Group. US cancer statistics data visualizations tool, based on 2019 submission data (1999–2017): US Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and National Cancer Institute. Accessed 11 November, 2020, at www.cdc.gov/cancer/dataviz

34 US Census Bureau. Projected age groups and sex composition of the population: main projections series for the United States, 2017–2060. Washington, DC: Population Division, US Census Bureau. 2018.

35 Burton K, Bayne G, Evans C et al. Evolution and effects of COVID-19 outbreaks in care homes: a population analysis in 189 care homes in one geographical region of the UK. *Lancet Healthy Longevity* 2020; **1**(1): E21–E31. doi: 10.1016/S2666-7568(20)30012-X.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure Legends

Figure 1a. Predicted weekly cases of COVID-19 (symptomatic and asymptomatic) with and without limited social distancing without a vaccine. **1b**. Predicted weekly symptomatic COVID-19 cases (symptomatic and asymptomatic) with and without limited social distancing without a vaccine. **1c**. Predicted weekly deaths with limited social distancing and quarantine of at risk individuals using different odds ratio thresholds, with and without SNP test.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Tables

Table 1. Core disease modelling assumptions absent interventions

	Min	Max	Mean	Distribution
Basic R_0	2.15	2.55	2.35	Uniform
Proportion of symptomatic infections	50.0%	70.0%	60.0%	Uniform
Symptomatic case fatality rate	0.075%	0.367%	0.221%	Uniform
Likelihood of hospitalisation	1.5%	8.0%	4.8%	Uniform
Conditional probability of ICU admission	30.0%	30.0%	30.0%	Constant
Duration of exposed period (days)	4.40	5.92	5.1	Normal
Duration of infectious period (days)	9.48	12.76	11	Normal
Symptomatic illness duration (days)	11			
Mean hospital duration (days)	8			
Mean ICU duration (days)	8			

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 2. Relative risk of hospitalisation and death by age

Age (years)	Relative risk of hospitalisation/death
0–4	1%
5–9	1%
10–14	4%
15–19	4%
20–24	16%
25–29	16%
30–34	41%
35–39	41%
40–44	64%
45–49	64%
50–54	132%
55–59	132%
60–64	215%
65–69	215%
70–74	315%
75–79	315%
80+	354%

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 3.

80% compliance with at risk quarantine measures						
Social distancing Odds ratio threshold SNP test included	None	Limited	At risk 2.5 Yes	At risk 2.5 No	At risk 3.5 Yes	At risk 3.5 No
Infections (m)	232.6 (226.1,239.0)	190.5 (182.4,198.6)	184.7 (176.9,192.6)	186.8 (178.7,194.9)	186.8 (178.8,194.9)	188.3 (180.2,196.5)
Symptomatic infections (m)	139.9 (130.5,149.4)	114.3 (106.9,121.6)	110.9 (103.8,118.0)	112.1 (104.7,119.4)	112.1 (104.9,119.3)	113.1 (105.7,120.5)
Hospitalisations (m)	5.7 (4.2,7.1)	4.8 (3.6,6.0)	3.1 (2.4,3.9)	3.5 (2.6,4.4)	3.2 (2.4,4.0)	3.7 (2.8,4.6)
Deaths ('000')	370.1 (273.2,467.0)	262.1 (194.0,330.3)	160.7 (120.2,201.2)	181.2 (134.7,227.7)	166.2 (123.8,208.5)	190.3 (141.4,239.2)
Lost QALYs ($bn)	478.5 (353.2,603.8)	343.1 (253.9,432.3)	257.7 (192.7,322.6)	282.1 (209.7,354.5)	267.2 (199.2,335.3)	294.1 (218.5,369.7)
50% compliance with at risk quarantine measures						
Social distancing Odds ratio threshold SNP test included	None	Limited	At risk 2.5 Yes	At risk 2.5 No	At risk 3.5 Yes	At risk 3.5 No
Infections (m)	232.6 (226.1,239.0)	190.5 (182.4,198.6)	186.7 (178.8,194.7)	188.1 (179.9,196.4)	188.2 (180.2,196.1)	189.1 (181.0,197.3)
Symptomatic infections (m)	139.9 (130.5,149.4)	114.3 (106.9,121.6)	112 (104.8,119.3)	113 (105.5,120.4)	113 (105.6,120.3)	113.4 (106.1,120.7)
Hospitalisations (m)	5.7 (4.2,7.1)	4.8 (3.6,6.0)	3.8 (2.9,4.8)	4.1 (3.1,5.1)	3.9 (2.9,4.8)	4.1 (3.1,5.1)
Deaths ('000')	370.1 (273.2,467.0)	262.1 (194.0,330.3)	199.3 (147.9,250.7)	214.2 (159.8,268.5)	203.6 (151.2,255.9)	216.9 (160.1,273.7)
Lost QALYs ($bn)	478.5 (353.2,603.8)	343.1 (253.9,432.3)	288.5 (215.8,361.2)	306.3 (227.7,384.9)	295.8 (220.5,371.1)	310.7 (230.9,390.6)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Supplementary Tables

Supplementary Table 1. Daily contact rates

School	0–10	10–18	19–29	30–39	40–49	50–59	60–69	70+
0–10	2.29	0.15	0.08	0.17	0.11	0.05	0.01	0.00
10–18	0.36	5.77	0.09	0.14	0.17	0.08	0.01	0.00
19–29	0.07	0.40	0.33	0.05	0.06	0.02	0.00	0.00
30–39	0.26	0.25	0.08	0.11	0.08	0.02	0.00	0.00
40–49	0.27	0.59	0.03	0.08	0.09	0.05	0.01	0.00
50–59	0.47	0.92	0.04	0.08	0.12	0.07	0.01	0.00
60–69	0.09	0.13	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.01
70+	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.01

Work	0–10	10–18	19–29	30–39	40–49	50–59	60–69	70+
0–10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
10–18	0.00	0.39	0.45	0.32	0.31	0.11	0.01	0.00
19–29	0.00	0.40	1.73	1.51	1.13	0.58	0.05	0.00
30–39	0.00	0.32	1.27	2.00	1.71	0.75	0.04	0.00
40–49	0.00	0.30	1.09	1.71	1.89	0.89	0.05	0.00
50–59	0.00	0.26	0.71	1.18	1.48	0.91	0.05	0.00
60–69	0.00	0.02	0.09	0.14	0.16	0.11	0.01	0.00
70+	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Home	0–10	10–18	19–29	30–39	40–49	50–59	60–69	70+
0–10	1.22	0.52	0.37	1.14	0.44	0.09	0.03	0.01
10–18	0.47	1.84	0.17	0.49	0.79	0.17	0.03	0.01
19–29	0.40	0.29	1.32	0.17	0.27	0.29	0.04	0.01
30–39	1.11	0.58	0.16	1.07	0.16	0.06	0.05	0.01
40–49	0.56	1.09	0.28	0.20	0.89	0.11	0.04	0.02
50–59	0.48	0.65	0.63	0.24	0.22	0.97	0.12	0.02
60–69	0.57	0.43	0.28	0.43	0.24	0.23	0.76	0.06
70+	0.39	0.56	0.13	0.24	0.45	0.23	0.17	0.46

Other	0–10	10–18	19–29	30–39	40–49	50–59	60–69	70+
0–10	1.53	0.53	0.47	0.70	0.46	0.38	0.27	0.09
10–18	0.57	3.72	0.81	0.53	0.61	0.26	0.14	0.08
19–29	0.24	0.94	2.33	0.90	0.59	0.39	0.11	0.06
30–39	0.31	0.30	0.81	1.21	0.73	0.51	0.26	0.08

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

40–49	0.18	0.32	0.53	0.80	0.86	0.46	0.22	0.10
50–59	0.18	0.28	0.77	0.76	0.81	0.87	0.42	0.13
60–69	0.14	0.14	0.46	0.65	0.60	0.67	0.62	0.23
70+	0.06	0.13	0.20	0.33	0.40	0.34	0.50	0.30

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Supplementary Table 2. Dite model of risk of severe outcomes incorporating SNP test

	Odds ratio	Standard error	z	p	95% confidence interval	
SNP (% of risk alleles)	1.1879	0.1016	11.6900	0.0000	0.1433	0.2011
Age group						
50–59 years	1.0000					
60–69 years	0.9418	0.1547	-0.3700	0.7150	0.6826	1.2994
70+ years	1.7032	0.2705	3.3500	0.0010	1.2476	2.3252
Sex						
Female	1.0000					
Male	1.1488	0.1402	1.1400	0.2560	0.9044	1.4591
Ethnicity						
Caucasian	1.0000					
Non-Caucasian	1.4300	0.7333	1.9500	0.0510	0.9987	2.0639
Blood group						
O	1.0000					
A	0.8054	0.1052	-1.6600	0.0980	0.6234	1.0405
B	1.1868	0.2458	0.8300	0.4080	0.7908	1.7811
AB	0.4170	0.1349	-2.7000	0.0070	0.2212	0.7863
Health						
No co-morbidities	1.0000					
Autoimmune	2.1982	0.6778	2.5500	0.0110	1.2011	4.0230
Cancer – blood	2.8222	1.3508	2.1700	0.0300	1.1045	7.2109
Cancer – solid	1.4430	0.2405	2.2000	0.0280	1.0409	2.0003
Diabetes	1.6307	0.2862	2.7900	0.0050	1.1561	2.3002
Hypertension	1.3545	0.1881	2.1900	0.0290	1.0318	1.7782
Respiratory	3.4319	0.5278	8.0200	0.0000	2.5389	4.6391
Cerebrovascular	1.0000					
Heart disease	1.0000					
Kidney disease	1.0000					
Constant	0.0000	0.0000	-11.7900	0.0000	0.0000	0.0001

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Supplementary Table 3. Social distancing parameters

	Impact on rates of contact				Mortality threshold
Measure	School	Work	Home	Other	(deaths/100,000/day
School closures	-80%	0%	20%	0%	0.5
Work from home	0%	-20%	20%	0%	0.5
Case isolation	-10%	25%	25%	-80%	0.1
Quarantine at risk	5%	-100%	0%	-100%	0.1 (when selected)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Supplementary Table 4. Proportion of adult population with relevant comorbidities

	Age band (years)	18–29	30–39	40–49	50–59	60–69	70+
Diabetes	Male	0.6%	2.6%	5.4%	9.1%	13.8%	22.7%
	Female	0.9%	1.8%	3.5%	6.2%	9.8%	16.9%
Autoimmune		0.5%	0.5%	1.5%	4.0%	4.0%	6.5%
Respiratory		2.5%	3.0%	3.5%	6.0%	8.0%	9.5%
Hypertension	Male	8.2%	17.0%	24.7%	32.4%	40.0%	51.5%
	Female	1.2%	10.3%	18.2%	26.1%	34.0%	45.9%
Cancer - solid		0.3%	0.8%	2.4%	4.8%	7.9%	16.0%
Cancer - blood		0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	0.9%
Cerebrovascular	Male	0.7%	0.7%	3.9%	3.9%	6.7%	10.9%
	Female	0.5%	0.5%	3.4%	3.4%	5.5%	11.3%
Heart disease	Male	3.6%	3.6%	10.2%	16.3%	28.8%	42.0%
	Female	4.3%	4.3%	9.0%	13.1%	17.7%	31.2%
Kidney disease	Male	3.2%	4.7%	7.9%	10.5%	19.9%	31.9%
	Female	4.0%	6.0%	10.0%	13.0%	25.0%	40.0%

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Supplementary Table 5. Characteristics of at risk persons (odds ratio threshold 2.5)

	Comorbidities and SNP test			Comorbidities only		
Age (years)	% at risk	Average number of comorbidities	Odds ratio above threshold	% at risk	Average number of comorbidities	Odds ratio above threshold
18–29	0.2%	1.23	3.39	0.0%	1.00	1.00
30–39	1.1%	1.28	3.61	0.1%	2.33	3.22
40–49	5.4%	1.37	4.02	1.3%	2.20	3.42
50–59	16.6%	1.53	4.75	10.1%	1.98	3.88
60–69	19.3%	2.02	5.03	12.3%	2.43	4.24
70+	49.0%	2.24	7.07	44.9%	2.49	5.49

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Supplementary Table 6 Characteristics of at risk persons (odds ratio threshold 3.5)

	Comorbidities and SNP test			Comorbidities only		
Age (years)	% at risk	Average number of comorbidities	Odds ratio above threshold	% at risk	Average number of comorbidities	Odds ratio above threshold
18–29	0.0%	1.80	5.14	0.0%	1.00	1.00
30–39	0.4%	1.34	4.78	0.0%	2.50	5.16
40–49	2.3%	1.53	5.46	0.4%	2.59	4.57
50–59	9.2%	1.74	6.23	4.7%	2.32	5.04
60–69	11.2%	2.20	6.54	5.9%	2.73	5.58
70+	35.1%	2.41	8.69	29.5%	2.69	6.88

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Supplementary Table 7. Deaths by age, 80% compliance with at risk quarantine measures

Social distancing	None	Limited	At risk	At risk	At risk	At risk
Odds ratio threshold			2.5	2.5	3.5	3.5
SNP test included			Yes	No	Yes	No
18–30 years	10,888	7,629	7,177	7,261	7,214	7,338
30–40 years	24,580	17,175	15,795	16,295	16,016	16,510
40–50 years	36,189	25,149	20,888	23,264	21,918	23,883
50–60 years	78,903	54,331	34,923	41,608	37,897	45,348
60–70 years	83,625	57,901	35,143	41,848	37,907	45,870
70–85 years	133,235	98,062	45,007	49,164	43,431	49,552


medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Supplementary Table 8. Deaths by age, 50% compliance with at risk quarantine measures

Social distancing	None	Limited	At risk	At risk	At risk	At risk
Odds ratio threshold			2.5	2.5	3.5	3.5
SNP test included			Yes	No	Yes	No
18–30 years	10,888	7,629	7,279	7,411	7,351	7,384
30–40 years	24,580	17,175	16,158	16,653	16,407	16,617
40–50 years	36,189	25,149	22,254	24,003	23,050	24,149
50–60 years	78,903	54,331	41,848	46,433	43,886	48,270
60–70 years	83,625	57,901	43,345	47,946	45,236	49,908
70–85 years	133,235	98,062	66,593	69,881	65,801	68,759

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Supplementary Figure 1.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.21.21254065; this version posted March 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Supplementary Figure 2.

