

1 **Where to learn to flatten the curve: a modelling study**

2 Matthew J Silk, Ph.D^{1,2,3}, Simon Carrignon, Ph.D^{4,5,6}, R. Alexander Bentley, Ph.D^{4,5}, Nina H
3 Fefferman, Ph.D^{3,7}

4 ¹ Centre for Ecology and Conservation, University of Exeter Penryn Campus, UK

5 ² Environment and Sustainability Institute, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK

6 ³ National Institute for Mathematical and Biological Synthesis (NIMBioS), University of Tennessee, TN, USA

7 ⁴ Center for the Dynamics of Social Complexity (DySoC), University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, US

8 ⁵ Department of Anthropology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, US

9 ⁶ School of Information Science, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, US

10 ⁷ Dept.s of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology & Mathematics, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, USA

11
12 **Corresponding Author:** N.H. Fefferman, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, 447
13 Hesler Biology Building, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 37996, nfefferm@utk.edu, +1 781
14 710 5025

15

16 **Abstract**

17 Background: Individual behavioural decisions are responses to both a person's perceived
18 social norms and could be driven by both their physical and social environment. In the
19 context of the COVID-19 pandemic, these environments correspond to epidemiological risk
20 from contacts and the social construction of risk by communication within networks of
21 friends. Understanding when, and under which circumstances, each modality of influence can
22 foster the widespread adoption of protective behaviours is critical for shaping useful,
23 practical public health messaging that will best enhance the public response.

24 Methods: We use a multiplex network approach to explore how information from both
25 physical contact and social communication networks is driving a mitigating behavioural
26 response to disease risk.

27 Findings: We show that maintaining focus on awareness of risk in each individual's physical
28 layer contacts promotes the greatest reduction in disease spread, but only when an individual
29 is aware of the symptoms of a non-trivial proportion of their physical contacts (approximately
30 20% or more). Information from the communication layer was less useful when these
31 connections matched less well with physical contacts and contributed little in combination
32 with accurate information from the physical layer.

33 Interpretation: We conclude that maintaining social focus on local outbreak status will allow
34 individuals to structure their perceived social norms appropriately and respond more rapidly
35 when risk increases. Finding ways to relay accurate local information from trusted
36 community leaders could improve mitigation even where more intrusive/costly strategies,
37 such as contact-tracing, are not possible.

40 **Introduction**

41 Our current best public health recommendations for mitigation of the COVID-19 pandemic
42 rely on using behavioural interventions such as social distancing and mask wearing, and
43 behaviourally driven acceptance of vaccines (where available) to curtail transmission of
44 infection. The success of these policies requires widespread adherence to achieve epidemic
45 control; as with herd immunity, threshold effects in efficacy mean that gaps in adoption can
46 quickly compromise any benefits^[1, 2]. Therefore, identifying how the adoption of these
47 behaviours is shaped over the course of an epidemic is a key challenge in designing effective
48 mitigation strategies^[3-6].

49 Adherence, however, relies on individual behavioural choices and so can be complicated to
50 understand and predict^[3, 7]. Well-established theory from psychology acknowledges that the
51 factors influencing whether or not people take action are complicated^[8, 9]. One of the
52 dominant theories (the theory of planned behaviour^[10]), posits that action is the composite
53 result of the individual's attitudes and beliefs, the individual's perception of social norms
54 regarding that behaviour, and the individual's perception of their own behavioural control
55 over their actions (alternative theories of behaviour, such as Value-Belief-Norm theory^[11]
56 also posit similar influences, though in different relation to each other). In the case of
57 COVID-19, adoption of and adherence to behavioural interventions are therefore likely to be
58 predicated on perception of two main features: a) individual attitudes and beliefs about
59 personal risk of infection and its consequences^[12], and b) the social norms around adherence
60 in the individual's community^[13].

61 An individual's perception of these features is shaped by communication within their network
62 of friends, neighbours, and community leaders^[14, 15]. Most likely, the network of a person's
63 close physical contacts, through which they risk infection, differs from their regular
64 communication network (in person and online) of people who contribute to their attitudes and
65 beliefs surrounding preventative behaviours, and from whom they are likely to estimate the
66 social norms of their community. These distinct networks underlie a disconnect between
67 someone's perception of their risk versus their actual risk. On one hand, an individual's
68 communication network could provide early warning of encroaching exposure risks derived
69 from the spread of awareness ahead of the infection itself^[16, 17]. On the other hand, the
70 mismatch between the communication layer and infection layer may mean that an individual
71 could underestimate their risk (e.g., communication networks are likely to be more sparsely
72 connected than networks of infection-relevant contacts in populations that are not socially

73 distancing). Despite this, we still understand relatively little about the potential implications
74 of acquiring information from these two different sets of contacts.

75 The dynamics triggered by the spread of awareness through the population are further
76 complicated by the timescales of observable risk due to the etiology of COVID-19. The
77 latency in the development of symptoms and the capacity for presymptomatic, or even
78 asymptomatic, transmission make estimation of real-time risk by surveillance complicated,
79 even without considering different sources of information^[18]. In terms of understanding
80 disease prevalence, the relative reliance of individuals in shaping their beliefs, and thus their
81 actions, on their own direct observation of health among their daily physical contact network
82 may have an effect that is distinct from that of their (potentially more geographically distant)
83 communication network. The balance of these distinct network effects may therefore be the
84 critical feature in determining the success of behavioural public health measures to combat
85 COVID-19.

86 We employ a multiplex network method to test the relative adoption of behavioural
87 interventions in populations of individuals who rely on a) their communication network layer
88 only (henceforth referred to as simply the “communication layer”), b) their physical contact
89 network layer only (henceforth referred to as the “infection layer”), and c) both layers
90 simultaneously to inform their understanding of COVID-19, and therefore their individual
91 adherence to protective behaviours such as mask wearing or social distancing. We further
92 consider the influence of structure in both layers of the network and how that structure might
93 impact the behaviour of populations as they rely on perceptions constructed from contacts in
94 those layers. Geographic and social heterogeneity in contact structure are modelled at low
95 and high levels of modularity (i.e. differences in local versus global density of contacts; see
96 Methods). In addition to homogeneous mixing, we consider homophily based upon
97 predisposition, which are modelled as social norms that can be shared in the communication
98 network. While not exhaustive, these studies offer insight into how communities can
99 reinforce the types of informational access that foster protective behavioural decision making
100 among their members.

101

102 **Methods**

103 **Overview**

104 We used stochastic models to test how the awareness of symptomatic neighbours in either a)
105 the set of people that a person who communicates with on a regular basis (their

106 communication layer), b) the set of people that a person is in close proximity to (their
107 infection layer), or c) both of these sets of contacts can impact epidemic spread of an
108 infection with COVID-19 like dynamics. We simulated realistic, multiplex social networks
109 for our populations that coupled a layer of infection-relevant contacts through which the
110 epidemic was simulated and a communication layer through which concern about the disease
111 could simultaneously spread. All modelling was conducted in R3.6.1^[19] and the code used is
112 provided on GitHub (https://github.com/matthewsilk/CoupledDynamics2_layeruse). The
113 general modelling framework was the same as that used by Silk et al.^[20] and is described in
114 that paper and in the Supplementary Material.

115

116 **Population generation**

117 We generated populations of 2000 individuals (a balance between minimising stochasticity in
118 early epidemic outcomes and computational efficiency), which consisted of children (24%),
119 young adults (63%) and old adults (13%). Age classes could differ in the social connections,
120 epidemiological outcomes and concern about the disease (as detailed below). Individuals also
121 had one of two baseline predispositions and homophily by predisposition impacted patterns
122 of social connections (in either or both layers of the multiplex network).

123

124 **Social network generation**

125 We used the same 9 multiplex social networks as detailed in Silk et al.^[20]. These were
126 coupled, multiplex networks that connected all individuals within a communication layer that
127 influenced the spread of concern about the disease and an infection layer that influenced the
128 transmission of the pathogen itself. A full description of the algorithm used to generate these
129 networks is provided in the Supplementary Material. For this study, global edge densities
130 were always higher in the infection layer than in the communication layer. The network
131 contained either a) no homophily in either layer, b) homophily in the communication layer, or
132 c) homophily in both layers. Community structure was introduced using a re-wiring
133 algorithm (as detailed in the Supplementary Material): either the relative modularity of both
134 layers was set to 0.4, both to 0.6, or the infection layer was set to 0.6 and the communication
135 layer to 0.4. Each child was assigned two parents from the same predisposition and
136 community. If children shared one parent they also shared the other but parents could be
137 connected or unconnected. Each young adult formed connections with a number of old adults
138 of the same predisposition (representing older relatives, friends or community members) as

139 detailed in the Supplementary Material. Children shared the same connections to old adults as
140 their parents. When the multiplex network was constructed we re-assigned parents from the
141 infection layer to match those in the communication layer. Child-old adult connections were
142 re-assigned accordingly.

143

144 **Concern model**

145 We used the same concern model as Silk et al.^[20]. Concern about the disease was modelled as
146 a complex contagion^[21] through the communication layer. Whether an individual was
147 adherent to mitigation measures or not (a binary trait) was based on a Bernoulli draw in
148 which the probability of adherence depended on an underlying trait continuous we term
149 concern. As a result, individuals could fluctuate between adherent or non-adherent states and
150 this was more likely if they had intermediate values of concern. Concern could be influenced
151 by a) Social Construction (becoming more concerned if neighbours in the communication
152 layer were adherent), b) Reassurance (becoming less concerned if all neighbours in the
153 communication layer were perceived to be healthy (i.e. symptom free) and c) Awareness
154 (becoming more concerned if network neighbours were symptomatic). For this study the
155 information gained for Awareness could be gained from either the communication layer, the
156 infection layer or both layers. Because an individual is unlikely to find out about the status of
157 every individual in their infection layer, we conducted additional simulations in which there
158 was imperfect detection of symptomatic contacts in the infection layer (probability of
159 detection: 0.5, 0.2 and 0.05). The concern of children was not modelled. They were assigned
160 as adherent if either or both of their parents were concerned.

161 Each time an individual became adherent they cut connections to a negligible edge weight
162 (see Supplementary Material) within the infection layer while maintaining their connectivity
163 in the communication layer. If an individual became non-adherent then these edge weights
164 returned to their full weight.

165

166 **Infectious disease model**

167 Our infectious disease model is the same stochastic network model described in Silk et al.^[20]
168 with parameter values adapted from^[22, 23]. The model contains susceptible (S), exposed (E),
169 pre-symptomatic (I1), symptomatic (I2), hospitalised (I3), recovered (R) and dead (D)
170 compartments. Parameter values are provided in Table S1 and details of the algorithm used
171 are provided in the Supplementary Material.

172

173 **Simulations**

174 For this paper we conducted simulations for the nine multiplex networks described (with
175 different combinations of homophily by predisposition and modularity), for 50 values of the
176 Social Construction and Reassurance effects (paired draws from independent uniform
177 distributions) and 10 values of the Awareness effect. We then conducted simulations in which
178 the Awareness effect (observational learning of symptomatic infection) applied to a) contacts
179 in the communication layers, b) contacts in the infection layer and c) contacts from both
180 layers combined. For scenario b) we repeated the full set of simulations with 0·5, 0·2 and
181 0·05 probability of symptomatic contacts being detected at each day. This resulted in a total
182 of 27,000 independent simulation runs. For each simulation run we simulated a time period of
183 300 days. The simulation algorithm was the same used in Silk et al.^[20] and is detailed in the
184 Supplementary Material.

185

186 **Analysis**

187 To compare between different runs of the simulations we quantified the height of the
188 epidemic peak at a population level by aggregating the daily counts of symptomatic
189 infections in all 10 communities. This measure of the height of the epidemic peak indicated
190 how successfully each simulated population managed to “flatten the curve” with their
191 adherence to mitigating behaviours^[4]. We compare epidemic peaks from when individuals
192 learned about symptomatic network neighbours from different types of social contact while
193 considering values of the Social Construction and Reassurance effects. To help explain some
194 of the differences between the infection and communication layers in their ability to “flatten
195 the curve” we also examined the similarity of connections in these layers by quantifying the
196 proportion of contacts in each layer that were also present in the other for each multiplex
197 network.

198


199 **Role of the funding source**

200 The funding source had no role whatsoever in the design, analysis, interpretation, or
201 presentation of this work.

202

203 **Results**

204 When we assume individual can identify 100% of symptomatic contacts the Awareness
205 Effect is more effective in flattening the curve when people respond to illness in their
206 infection layer rather than in their communication layer (panels a versus b in Figs. 1 and 2).
207 When this is the case, even relatively weak Awareness Effects can contribute to flattening the
208 curve. Using information from the infection layer is nearly as effective as using information
209 from both the infection and communication layers except when the Awareness Effect is very
210 weak (compare panels b and c in Figs 1 and 2). When social construction is weak there is an
211 important difference regardless of the strength of the Reassurance effect (Fig. 1), while when
212 social construction is strong it plays an important role in flattening the curve except in the
213 case when the Reassurance Effect is strong, meaning that differences caused by the source of
214 information for the Awareness Effect are only noticeable when this is the case (Fig. 2).
215 Consequently, we focus on the case when Social Construction is weak for subsequent results.
216 A second notable difference that arises when people respond to prevalence in their infection
217 layer rather than the communication layer is that the strength of the Reassurance Effect
218 becomes less important. When individuals respond to illness in their communication layer,
219 the epidemics always have higher peaks with a strong Reassurance effect (also reliant on the
220 communication layer) even when the Awareness effect is strong and the curve has been
221 flattened (Fig. 1a). However, when the Awareness Effect is stronger (>0.6), learning about
222 illness from the infection layer or both layers results in similar epidemic peaks regardless of
223 the strength of the Reassurance Effect (Figs. 1b and 1c).
224



225

226 **Figure 1. The relationship between the height of the epidemic peak and strength of the Awareness**

227 **effect when Social Construction is weak (<0.3). An individual learns of symptomatic contacts from**

228 **a) their communication layer, b) their infection layer (learning from 100% of contacts) and c) both**

229 **layers together. The colour of points in panels (a-c) indicates the strength of the Reassurance effect:**


230 **yellow indicating a strong reassurance effect through to purple indicating a weak Reassurance effect.**

231 **In panel (d) we contrast the height of the epidemic peak directly for selected values of the Awareness**

232 **effect. Boxes indicate the interquartile range, the bold horizontal line the median and the whiskers**

233 **extend to the full range of the data.**

234



235

236 **Figure 2. The relationship between the height of the epidemic peak and strength of the Awareness**

237 **effect when Social Construction is strong (>0.3). An individual learns of symptomatic contacts from**

238 **a) their communication layer, b) their infection layer (learning from 100% of contacts) and c) both**


239 **layers together. The colour of points indicates the strength of the Reassurance effect: yellow**

240 **indicating a strong reassurance effect through to purple indicating a weak Reassurance effect.**

241


242 When we assume that individual can partially identify the symptomatic contacts in their
243 infection layer, the mitigating effect is reduced considerably in our networks (Fig. 3). When
244 there is a 50% chance of an individual detecting an ill neighbour in their infection layer, the
245 height of the epidemic peak remains lower than when an individual gains information on the
246 prevalence of infection from their communication layer with the difference increasing as the
247 strength of the Awareness Effect gets stronger. When there is a 20% chance of detection in
248 the infection layer, the epidemic peak is marginally higher than when (accurate) information
249 is used from the communication layer with a weak Awareness Effect and slightly lower with
250 a strong Awareness Effect. When there is a 5% chance of detection the mitigating influence
251 of the Awareness Effect is very limited indeed and restricted to strong Awareness Effects.
252 The structure of the network was relatively unimportant in determining the success with
253 which populations were able to “flatten the curve” (Fig. 4, Fig. S1). Most strikingly, there
254 was a small negative impact on the value of information from the communication layer when
255 there was homophily only in that layer and not in the infection layer (networks 7-9). When
256 this was the case epidemic peaks remained higher when individuals acquired information on
257 local prevalence from their communication layer. This pattern was driven by their being a
258 greater mismatch between the two layers when there was only homophily in the
259 communication layer; a lower proportion of edges in the infection layer were also present in
260 the communication layer (Fig. 5). It is harder, therefore, to flatten the curve when key aspects
261 of structure of communication and infection layers are mismatched and individuals gain
262 information on illness from their communication layer. Otherwise there were no clear and
263 consistent patterns related to network structure over the range of structures tested here.
264 Results were qualitatively similar regardless of the strength of the Awareness Effect (Fig.
265 S1).

266




267

268 **Figure 3. The relationship between the height of the epidemic peak and strength of the Awareness**
269 **effect when Social Construction is weak (<0.3). We show the relationship when Awareness is**
270 **acquired through the communication layer (grey) and the infection layer when 100% (blue), 50%**
271 **(yellow), 20% (orange) and 5% (red) of symptomatic contacts are detected each day. Boxes indicate**
272 **the interquartile range, the bold horizontal line the median and the whiskers extend to the full range**
273 **of the data.**



274

275 **Figure 4. The relationship between the height of the epidemic peak and how an individual finds out**
 276 **about symptomatic contacts when the Social construction effect is weak (<0.3) for an Awareness**
 277 **effect of 0.1 plotted separately for each of the nine multiplex networks used in the study. Networks**
 278 **1-3 have no homophily in either layer, networks 4-6 have homophily in both layers and networks 7-9**
 279 **have homophily in the communication layer only. In networks 1, 4 and 7 both layers have a relative**
 280 **modularity of 0.4 , in networks 2, 5 and 8 both layers have a relative modularity of 0.6 , and in**
 281 **networks 3, 6 and 9 the relative modularity of the infection layer is 0.6 and the relative modularity of**
 282 **the communication layer is 0.4 . Plots for other Awareness effects are qualitatively similar (see Fig.**
 283 **SI).**



284

285 **Figure 5. The proportion of contacts in each layer of the multiplex network that are present in the**
286 **other layer.** Panel (a) shows the proportion of infection layer contacts also present in the
287 communication layer and panel (b) show the proportion of communication layer contacts also present
288 in the infection layer. Networks 1-3 have no homophily in either layer, networks 4-6 have homophily
289 in both layers and networks 7-9 have homophily in the communication layer only. In networks 1, 4
290 and 7 both layers have a relative modularity of 0.4, in networks 2, 5 and 8 both layers have a relative
291 modularity of 0.6, and in networks 3, 6 and 9 the relative modularity of the infection layer is 0.6 and
292 the relative modularity of the communication layer is 0.4.

293

294

295 **Discussion**

296 Despite the natural inclination to believe that the influence of community leaders and trusted
297 social contacts can help us each to make better decisions, in this case, the results of our study
298 demonstrate that the impact of that trusted community may instead compromise our ability to
299 respond to the actual risks around us (see Figs. 1,2, and 3) if the alternative is accurate
300 information on prevalence in an individual's likely physical contacts. However, the
301 advantage brought about by an individual's knowledge of the prevalence in their "infection
302 layer" declines very rapidly as the accuracy of this information deteriorates. This has strong,
303 direct implications for individuals living in circumstances in which their physical contacts are
304 likely removed from their social spheres of influence. Critically, this pattern reflects large
305 urban centres in which individuals may physically contact many people using public
306 transportation, or riding elevators and moving among offices or apartments in large in high-
307 rise buildings, but are likely instead to rely on a mostly separate community of family, faith,
308 or recreational activities for social community and conversation from which they will form
309 their perceptions of risks and norms.

310 Of course, this result relies on the low overlap between contacts present in both the
311 communication and disease layers that shape an individual's perceptions and risks (see Fig.
312 5). If those layers were instead identical (as in small, remote rural communities or highly
313 segregated, small, well-mixed communities as exist affiliated with some religious groups),
314 then the communication layer and infection layer will be equivalent in the information they
315 provide, meaning that more information is available on local prevalence in an individual's
316 infection layer and so improving the decision-making of individuals based on observations
317 of their personal networks.

318 Our results show that the availability of accurate information from an individual's infection
319 layer is much more effective in mitigating disease spread (i.e. "flattening the curve") than
320 using only their communication layer, and that when this is the case using information from
321 both only performs marginally better than using the infection layer alone. However, as the
322 availability of accurate information from the infection layer declines the success of mitigation
323 declines very rapidly. In our networks, a >20% chance of detecting each symptomatic
324 neighbour in the infection layer is required for mitigation to be more successful than when
325 individuals use their communication layer alone.

326 The former result suggests that populations comprised of individuals who tend more towards
327 independent risk assessment than on reliance on community leadership may respond better to

328 public health interventions. However, the latter result indicates the importance of highly
329 accurate information from the infection layer at a community level. Therefore any social
330 norms that reduce observability of infection in a local community can undercut the efficacy
331 of recommended behavioural interventions. This is especially important in shaping public
332 messaging since both within group density (i.e. modularity) and closeness of beliefs within a
333 community (i.e. homophily) have less of an impact than the information on which the
334 members of that community rely (see Fig. 4). We therefore strongly support the adoption of
335 public reports of identified cases in local communities that come into regular potential
336 contact with each other. While, of course, this requires sensitivity to personal privacy, regular
337 announcements/reminders at a city, company, school, or neighbourhood level of active
338 disease prevalence can potentially provide critical and effective reinforcement for the
339 individual adoption of behaviours that can protect everyone.

340 Awareness itself is not without complexity. The centralized collection and analysis of data at
341 regional or national scales involves logistical challenges and can cause delay in reporting that
342 information back to the public^[24]. It is also frequently the case that communities pay more
343 attention to, and place greater trust in, local sources of information than in more remote
344 sources^[25]. Policies that focus on community leadership to ensure a local focus for awareness
345 helps to address both of these difficulties.

346 Perhaps most importantly, this study suggests the need for leaders of social groups to ensure
347 attention is paid to cases of COVID-19 in their community. Luckily, this is in keeping with
348 the mission of many social groups focused on community support. Communities of worship,
349 social action organizations, and community volunteer groups have all been active participants
350 across the globe in making sure that individuals who are unwell but not so severely impacted
351 as to be hospitalized have access to groceries, medicines, and wellness checks. By actively
352 highlighting the need for these services within their own community, these actions
353 themselves support broader adoption of preventative behaviours and thereby not only help
354 individuals already affected by COVID-19, but actively decrease the likely magnitude of
355 local impacts from the pandemic.

356

357 **Conclusion**

358 One of the most fundamental challenges in creating effective public health policies is the
359 design of recommendations that will not only achieve theoretical outcomes but will be
360 adopted by enough of a willing public to accomplish those outcomes in the real world.

361 Integrating an understanding of how individual perceptions shape behaviours, and how social
362 context itself shapes perceptions has become one of the critical stumbling points in our local,
363 national, and global response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Our results clearly show that local,
364 accurate, rapid, and trusted information can enable better emergent behaviours. Thankfully,
365 these paths are within the capability of our public health community and local community
366 leadership to provide.

367

368 **Data Sharing Statement**

369 No primary data was collected as part of this effort. All relevant code is publicly available at
370 (https://github.com/matthewsilk/CoupledDynamics2_layeruse).

371

372 **Supplementary Methods**

373 **Overview**

374 We used stochastic models to test how the awareness of symptomatic neighbours in either a) the set of
375 people that a person who communicates with on a regular basis (their communication layer), b) the set
376 of people that a person is in close proximity to (their infection layer), or c) both of these sets of
377 contacts can impact epidemic spread of an infection with COVID-19 like dynamics. We simulated
378 realistic, multiplex social networks for our populations that coupled a layer of infection-relevant
379 contacts through which the epidemic was simulated and a communication layer through which
380 concern about the disease could simultaneously spread. All modelling was conducted in R3.6.1^[19] and
381 the code used is provided on GitHub (https://github.com/matthewsilk/CoupledDynamics2_layeruse).
382 The general modelling framework was the same as that used by Silk et al.^[20].

383

384 **Population generation**

385 We generated populations of 2000 individuals (a balance between minimising stochasticity in early
386 epidemic outcomes and computational efficiency), which consisted of children (24%), young adults
387 (63%) and old adults (13%). These proportions were set to match recent US demographic data. Age
388 classes could differ in the social connections, epidemiological outcomes and concern about the
389 disease (as detailed below). Individuals also had one of two baseline predispositions, with 50% of
390 each predisposition. Homophily by predisposition impacted only patterns of social connections (in
391 either or both layers of the multiplex network).

392

393 **Social network generation**

394 We generated 9 multiplex social networks as detailed in Silk et al.^[20]. These were coupled, multiplex
395 networks that connected all individuals within a communication layer that influenced the spread of

396 concern about the disease and an infection layer that influenced the transmission of the pathogen
397 itself. Briefly, networks were generated as follows:

398 1. For each layer, within age class and within predisposition connections were simulated as
399 Erdős-Renyi random graphs using `igraph`^[26]. We specified age-specific edge densities for within
400 predisposition connections. For this study, global edge densities were always higher in the infection
401 layer than in the communication layer.

402 2. Between predisposition connections were then added to form three overall networks for each
403 age class in each layer. We specified age-specific between-predisposition edge densities (which could
404 differ from within-predisposition densities). The level of homophily according to predisposition is
405 defined by the difference between within- and between-predisposition edge densities. We included
406 three types of homophily in the multiplex network: a) no homophily in either layer, b) homophily in
407 the communication layer, or c) homophily in both layers.

408 3. We then introduced community structure into each network layer. A rewiring algorithm was
409 used to impose community structure within the three age-class networks as per Silk et al.^[20]. We
410 implemented a block model with 10 communities and re-assigned edges to achieve a target
411 modularity while maintaining the initial edge density and level of homophily. We used 0.4 and 0.6 as
412 target relative modularity^[27] for our community structure. The proportion of each predisposition
413 within each community was the same as the overall population. In this study either both layers had a
414 modularity of 0.4, both had a modularity of 0.6, or the infection layer had a modularity of 0.6 and the
415 communication layer a modularity of 0.4 (as per Silk et al.^[20]).

416 4. Each child was assigned two parents from the same predisposition and community. If children
417 shared one parent they also shared the other but parents could be connected or unconnected.

418 5. Each young adult formed connections with a number of old adults of the same predisposition
419 (representing older relatives, friends or community members). The number of connections for each
420 young adult was a drawn from a Poisson distribution ($\lambda=3$). Connections could occur within or
421 between communities with the probability of within-community connections being the same as the
422 modularity of the network. Children shared the same connections to old adults as their parents.

423 We used 8 different simulated networks in total for this study (four for the communication layer and
424 four for the infection layer), which when combined generated nine different multiplex networks that
425 were a full combination of the three homophily conditions and three modularity conditions defined
426 above. When the multiplex network was constructed we re-assigned parents from the infection layer
427 to match those in the communication layer. Child-old adult connections were re-assigned accordingly.

428

429 **Concern model**

430 We used the same concern model as Silk et al.^[20]. Concern about the disease was modelled as a
431 complex contagion^[21] through the communication layer. Whether an individual was adherent to

432 mitigation measures or not (a binary trait) was based on a Bernoulli draw in which the probability of
433 adherence depended on an underlying trait continuous we term concern. As a result, individuals could
434 fluctuate between adherent or non-adherent states and this was more likely if they had intermediate
435 values of concern. Concern could be influenced by the following factors with changes modelled on a
436 logit scale.

- 437 1. For this study all adults started with the same concern. The initial level of concern was
438 defined with an expectation of 20% of adults being adherent to mitigation measures at the start of
439 each simulation run.
- 440 2. Social Construction of concern – concern could change based on the proportion of immediate
441 neighbours in the communication layer of the network that were adherent in the previous day. We
442 modelled this change as a linear increase in belief as the proportion of adherent connections increased.
443 We allowed the strength of this relationship to vary, drawing 50 different values from a uniform
444 distribution between 0 and 0.5 for the effect size per day. This range of parameter values were
445 selected based on prior use of the model (Silk et al.^[20]).
- 446 4. Reassurance effect from communication neighbours – concern could be reduced at each day
447 that all of an individual’s connections in the communication layer were symptom free (whether
448 susceptible, exposed, pre-symptomatic or recovered). We drew 50 values from a uniform distribution
449 between -0.1 and 0 (which we paired with equivalent values of the Social Construction effect).
- 450 5. Awareness effect based on prevalence of symptomatic contacts – concern could increase
451 based on the number of an individual’s connections that were symptomatic. We assigned 10 values (0,
452 0.1, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8, 1, 1.2, 1.4 and 1.6) for this per day increase in concern per symptomatic
453 neighbour. For this paper the awareness effect could depend on a) an individual’s contacts in the
454 communication layer, b) an individual’s contacts in the infection layer or c) an individual’s contacts in
455 both layers combined. Because an individual is unlikely to find out about the status of every
456 individual in their infection layer, we conducted additional sets of simulations in which there was
457 imperfect detection of symptomatic contacts in the infection layer. We used detection probabilities of
458 50%, 20% and 5%.
- 459 6. The concern of children was not modelled. They were assigned as adherent if either or both of
460 their parents were adherent.
461 Each time an individual became adherent they cut connections within the infection layer while
462 maintaining their connectivity in the communication layer. Individuals cut connections with a
463 probability of 0.5, with edges cut to have edge weights of 0.001 (i.e. not removed but sufficiently low
464 to result in a negligible probability of transmission). If an individual became non-adherent then these
465 edge weights returned to their full weight.

466

467 **Infectious disease model**

468 Our infectious disease model is the same stochastic network model described in Silk et al.^[20] with
469 parameter values adapted from Weitz et al.^[22] and Lofgren et al.^[23]. The model contains susceptible
470 (S), exposed (E), pre-symptomatic (I1), symptomatic (I2), hospitalised (I3), recovered (R) and dead
471 (D) compartments. The transition between compartments is detailed below and parameter values are
472 provided in Table S1 (reproduced from Silk et al.^[20]). The infection model proceeded as follows
473 (reproduced from Silk et al.^[20]):

- 474 1. The transition from susceptible to exposed depended on the number of contacts each
475 susceptible individual had with infected individuals (I1, I2, I3). Each contact was associated with a
476 pre-defined probability of transmission. We selected a value for the transmission probability that
477 resulted in unmitigated epidemics infecting approximately 80% of the population as per Ferguson et
478 al.^[28].
- 479 2. The length, in days, of the incubation period (exposed; E) and of each infectious period (I1-3)
480 were set using draws from Poisson distribution (Table S1).
- 481 3. Individuals could transition from symptomatic (and at home) to hospitalised, and from
482 hospitalised to dead with pre-defined daily probabilities which differed for young (low risk) adults
483 and old (high risk) adults. These daily probabilities were calculated based on Weitz et al.^[22] and
484 Lofgren et al.^[23] and then adapted to produce a realistic proportion of cases being hospitalised during
485 trial runs of the simulations (c.f. Reno et al.^[29]). Children could be symptomatic (I2) but were never
486 hospitalised reflecting the very low probability of this occurring in reality^[30]. All individuals that
487 reached the end of each infectious period without further progression of the disease were deemed to
488 have recovered.
- 489 4. Symptomatic (I2) and hospitalised (I3) individuals cut all connections in the infection layer of
490 the network to 0.001. These connections were restored to their full value if and when individuals
491 recovered.

492

493 **Simulations**

494 For this paper we conducted simulations for the nine multiplex networks described (with different
495 combinations of homophily by predisposition and modularity), for 50 values of the Social
496 Construction and Reassurance effects (paired draws from independent uniform distributions) and 10
497 values of the Awareness effect. We then conducted simulations in which the Awareness effect
498 (observational learning of symptomatic infection) applied to a) contacts in the communication layers,
499 b) contacts in the infection layer and c) contacts from both layers combined. For scenario b) we
500 repeated the full set of simulations with 0.5, 0.2 and 0.05 probability of symptomatic contacts being
501 detected at each day. This resulted in a total of 27,000 independent simulation runs. For each
502 simulation run we simulated a time period of 300 days.

503 The simulations proceeded as follows (reproduced from Silk et al.^[20]):

- 504 1. Ten random individuals were seeded with infection (in the exposed [E] class of the
505 compartmental model).
- 506 2. Individuals were allocated initial values of belief based on pre-defined starting values and
507 these were used to calculate which individuals were adherent on the first day.
- 508 3. The algorithm repeated a sequence events on each day, namely:
- 509 a) The infection layer of the network was rewired so that adherent individuals cut a 50% of their
510 connections to have negligible edge weight.
- 511 b) The infection layer of the network was rewired so that newly symptomatic individuals cut
512 their connections to have negligible edge weight.
- 513 c) The infection layer of the network was rewired so that newly recovered individuals restored
514 their full connections (edge weights increased to 1)
- 515 d) We recorded the identity of all individuals that were currently symptomatic or hospitalised.
- 516 e) We ran the concern model to update the concern and adherence of individuals.
- 517 f) We ran the infectious disease model to update the infection status of all individuals
- 518 4. The algorithm moves on to the next day until the end of the defined time period (300 days).
519 From each run of the simulations we recorded the total number of individuals who were infected on
520 each day in each social community. We also recorded the proportion of each social community that
521 was concerned or adherent to social distancing on each day.

522

523 **Analysis**

524 To compare between different runs of the simulations we quantified the height of the epidemic peak at
525 a population level by aggregating the daily counts of symptomatic infections in all 10 communities
526 and calculating the maximum prevalence of infected individuals (I1) in the population. This measure
527 of the height of the epidemic peak indicated how successfully each simulated population managed to
528 “flatten the curve” with their adherence to mitigating behaviours^[4]. We present these results by
529 comparing epidemic peaks when individuals learned about symptomatic network neighbours from
530 different types of social contact while considering different values of the Social Construction and
531 Reassurance effects.

532 To help explain some of the differences between the infection and communication layers in their
533 ability to “flatten the curve” when used to provide information on local prevalence (to the Awareness
534 effect), we also examined the similarity of connections in these layers by quantifying the proportion
535 of contacts in each layer that were also present in the other (Fig. S1) for each of the nine multiplex
536 networks that differed in homophily and modularity.

537

538

539 Supplementary Tables and Figures


540

541 Table S1. Parameter values for the SEIRD model used

Parameter	Value used
Transmission probability per contact	0.3/mean degree
Mean length of incubation period	5.1 days
Mean length of pre-symptomatic period	6.7 days
Mean length of symptomatic period	10 days
Mean length of hospitalisation	4.2 days
Daily probability of symptomatic case becoming hospitalised for young adults and children	0.0125
Daily probability of symptomatic case becoming hospitalised for old adults	0.025
Daily probability of death in hospitalised cases for young adults	0.012
Daily probability of death in hospitalised cases for young old adults	0.092

542

543



544

545 **Figure S1. The relationship between the height of the epidemic peak and how an individual finds**
 546 **out about symptomatic contacts when the Social construction effect is weak (<0.3) for the full**
 547 **range of Awareness effects modelled and plotted separately for each of the nine multiplex networks**
 548 **used in the study. Networks 1-3 have no homophily in either layer, networks 4-6 have homophily in**
 549 **both layers and networks 7-9 have homophily in the communication layer only. In networks 1, 4 and 7**
 550 **both layers have a relative modularity of 0.4, in networks 2, 5 and 8 both layers have a relative**
 551 **modularity of 0.6, and in networks 3, 6 and 9 the relative modularity of the infection layer is 0.6 and**
 552 **the relative modularity of the communication layer is 0.4.**

553 References

- 554 1. Ngonghala, C.N., E. Iboi, S. Eikenberry, M. Scotch, C.R. MacIntyre, M.H. Bonds, and A.B.
555 Gumel, *Mathematical assessment of the impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on*
556 *curtailing the 2019 novel Coronavirus*. Mathematical biosciences, 2020. **325**: p. 108364.
- 557 2. Imai, N., K.A. Gaythorpe, S. Abbott, S. Bhatia, S. van Elsland, K. Prem, Y. Liu, and N.M.
558 Ferguson, *Adoption and impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions for COVID-19*.
559 Wellcome Open Research, 2020. **5**.
- 560 3. Funk, S., E. Gilad, C. Watkins, and V.A. Jansen, *The spread of awareness and its impact on*
561 *epidemic outbreaks*. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 2009. **106**(16): p.
562 6872-6877.
- 563 4. Block, P., M. Hoffman, I.J. Raabe, J.B. Dowd, C. Rahal, R. Kashyap, and M.C. Mills, *Social*
564 *network-based distancing strategies to flatten the COVID-19 curve in a post-lockdown world*.
565 Nature Human Behaviour, 2020. **4**(6): p. 588-596.
- 566 5. Courtemanche, C., J. Garuccio, A. Le, J. Pinkston, and A. Yelowitz, *Strong Social Distancing*
567 *Measures In The United States Reduced The COVID-19 Growth Rate: Study evaluates the*
568 *impact of social distancing measures on the growth rate of confirmed COVID-19 cases across*
569 *the United States*. Health Affairs, 2020: p. 10.1377/hlthaff.2020.00608.
- 570 6. Reluga, T.C., *Game theory of social distancing in response to an epidemic*. 2010.
- 571 7. Funk, S., M. Salathé, and V.A. Jansen, *Modelling the influence of human behaviour on the*
572 *spread of infectious diseases: a review*. Journal of The Royal Society Interface, 2010. **7**(50):
573 p. 1247-1256.
- 574 8. Schwarzer, R., *Modeling health behavior change: How to predict and modify the adoption*
575 *and maintenance of health behaviors*. Applied psychology, 2008. **57**(1): p. 1-29.
- 576 9. Schwarzer, R. and R. Fuchs, *Changing risk behaviors and adopting health behaviors: The*
577 *role of self-efficacy beliefs*. Self-efficacy in changing societies, 1995: p. 259-288.
- 578 10. Ajzen, I., *The theory of planned behavior*. Organizational behavior and human decision
579 processes, 1991. **50**(2): p. 179-211.
- 580 11. Stern, P.C., T. Dietz, T. Abel, G.A. Guagnano, and L. Kalof, *A value-belief-norm theory of*
581 *support for social movements: The case of environmentalism*. Human ecology review, 1999:
582 p. 81-97.
- 583 12. Cori, L., F. Bianchi, E. Cadum, and C. Anthonj, *Risk perception and COVID-19*. 2020,
584 Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute.
- 585 13. Van Bavel, J.J., K. Baicker, P.S. Boggio, V. Capraro, A. Cichocka, M. Cikara, M.J. Crockett,
586 A.J. Crum, K.M. Douglas, and J.N. Druckman, *Using social and behavioural science to*
587 *support COVID-19 pandemic response*. Nature Human Behaviour, 2020: p. 1-12.
- 588 14. Seiler, M., A. Collins, and N. Fefferman, *Strategic Mortgage Default in the Context of a*
589 *Social Network: An Epidemiological Approach*. Journal of Real Estate Research, 2013. **35**(4):
590 p. 445-475.
- 591 15. Scherer, C.W. and H. Cho, *A social network contagion theory of risk perception*. Risk
592 Analysis: An International Journal, 2003. **23**(2): p. 261-267.
- 593 16. Salehi, M., P. Siyari, M. Magnani, and D. Montesi, *Multidimensional epidemic thresholds in*
594 *diffusion processes over interdependent networks*. Chaos, Solitons & Fractals, 2015. **72**: p.
595 59-67.
- 596 17. Kitchovitch, S. and P. Lio, *Risk perception and disease spread on social networks*. Procedia
597 Computer Science, 2010. **1**(1): p. 2345-2354.
- 598 18. Zhao, H., X. Lu, Y. Deng, Y. Tang, and J. Lu, *COVID-19: asymptomatic carrier transmission*
599 *is an underestimated problem*. Epidemiology & Infection, 2020. **148**.
- 600 19. R Core Team, *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. 2013, R Foundation
601 for Statistical Computing: Vienna, Austria.
- 602 20. Silk, M., S. Carrignon, R.A. Bentley, and N. Fefferman, *Improving pandemic mitigation*
603 *policies across communities through coupled dynamics of risk perception and infection*.
604 Submitted.

- 605 21. Firth, J.A., *Considering complexity: animal social networks and behavioural contagions.*
606 Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 2020. **35**(2): p. 100-104.
- 607 22. Weitz, J.S., S.J. Beckett, A.R. Coenen, D. Demory, M. Dominguez-Mirazo, J. Dushoff, C.-Y.
608 Leung, G. Li, A. Măgălie, and S.W. Park, *Modeling shield immunity to reduce COVID-19*
609 *epidemic spread.* Nature medicine, 2020: p. 1-6.
- 610 23. Lofgren, E., K. Lum, A. Horowitz, B. Madubuowu, and N. Fefferman, *The Epidemiological*
611 *Implications of Incarceration Dynamics in Jails for Community, Corrections Officer, and*
612 *Incarcerated Population Risks from COVID-19.* medRxiv, 2020.
- 613 24. Jajosky, R.A. and S.L. Groseclose, *Evaluation of reporting timeliness of public health*
614 *surveillance systems for infectious diseases.* BMC public health, 2004. **4**(1): p. 1-9.
- 615 25. Bond, K.C., S.B. Macfarlane, C. Burke, K. Ungchusak, and S. Wibulpolprasert, *The evolution*
616 *and expansion of regional disease surveillance networks and their role in mitigating the*
617 *threat of infectious disease outbreaks.* Emerging health threats journal, 2013. **6**(1): p. 19913.
- 618 26. Csardi, G. and T. Nepusz, *The igraph software package for complex network research.*
619 InterJournal, complex systems, 2006. **1695**(5): p. 1-9.
- 620 27. Sah, P., S.T. Leu, P.C. Cross, P.J. Hudson, and S. Bansal, *Unraveling the disease*
621 *consequences and mechanisms of modular structure in animal social networks.* Proceedings
622 of the National Academy of Sciences, 2017. **114**(16): p. 4165-4170.
- 623 28. Ferguson, N.M., D. Laydon, G. Nedjati-Gilani, N. Imai, K. Ainslie, M. Baguelin, S. Bhatia,
624 A. Boonyasiri, Z. Cucunubá, and G. Cuomo-Dannenburg, *Report 9: Impact of non-*
625 *pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand.*
626 *Imperial College London; 16 March 2020.* DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25561/77482>, 2020.
- 627 29. Reno, C., J. Lenzi, A. Navarra, E. Barelli, D. Gori, A. Lanza, R. Valentini, B. Tang, and M.P.
628 Fantini, *Forecasting COVID-19-Associated Hospitalizations under Different Levels of Social*
629 *Distancing in Lombardy and Emilia-Romagna, Northern Italy: Results from an Extended*
630 *SEIR Compartmental Model.* Journal of Clinical Medicine, 2020. **9**(5): p. 1492.
- 631 30. Yuki, K., M. Fujiogi, and S. Koutsogiannaki, *COVID-19 pathophysiology: A review.* Clinical
632 immunology, 2020: p. 108427.

633