

# Quantifying the impact of physical distance measures on the transmission of COVID-19 in the UK

*Authors:* Christopher I Jarvis<sup>1†\*</sup>, Kevin Van Zandvoort<sup>1</sup>, Amy Gimma<sup>1</sup>, Kiesha Prem<sup>1</sup>, CMMID COVID-19 working group, G James Rubin<sup>2</sup>, W John Edmunds<sup>1</sup>

† these authors contributed equally

\* Corresponding author

The CMMID COVID-19 working group is: Megan Auzenberg, Graham Medley, Sebastian Funk, Carl A B Pearson, Mark Jit, Adam J Kucharski, Thibaut Jombart, Gwen Knight, Rosalind M Eggo, Emily S Nightingale, Sam Abbott, Joel Hellewell, Arminder K Deol, Nikos I Bosse, Timothy W Russell, Simon R Procter, Quentin Leclerc, Charlie Diamond, Yang Liu, Akira Endo, James D Munday, Jon C Emery, Alicia Rosello, Kathleen O'Reilly, Hamish Gibbs, Fiona Sun, Stefan Flasche, Billy J Quilty, Rein M G J Houben, Samuel Clifford, Nicholas Davies and Simon Procter. Order of working group determined at random.

*Affiliations:* <sup>1</sup>Centre for Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases, Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Keppel Street, WC1E 7HT London, UK

<sup>2</sup>Department of Psychological Medicine, King's College London, Denmark Hill, London United Kingdom

## Supplemental Material

### Survey Recruitment

Data was collected on behalf of our study team by Ipsos, an international market research company. Participants are recruited by Ipsos from a variety of sources to create panels that are representative of the population in which they are recruited. Ipsos primarily recruits through social networks, allowing them to target hard to recruit populations, and includes providing participant-relevant incentives for completing surveys. Other methods for recruitment include email lists, banners, website and text ads, co-registration, and search engine marketing. When necessary, they also partner with thoroughly vetted third party recruiters. Ipsos limits the amount of surveys each participant is able to complete in a given time period, and uses algorithms to detect fraud and remove users from the survey in real-time.

For this survey, Ipsos recruited adults (ages 18 years and older) in census representative age bands. We compare our participants to census figures by age, gender, and household size.

## Search terms and Results

Pubmed was searched using the terms “(2019 nCoV OR COVID) AND (reproduction number OR reproductive number OR severity OR incubation OR serial OR fatality)”. MedRxiv was searched with the terms “COVID OR ncov OR cov OR coronavirus OR SARS-cov-2 OR Novel coronavirus” with the last search on 15 March 2020. Both search terms were broad to include a range of epidemiological characteristics and clinical indicators as part of a wider data extraction effort. In addition, references of relevant publications were scanned for additional sources, and data was retrieved from the Midas Network. The CMMID COVID-19 Student group participated in the search and data extraction.

The search resulted in 49 estimates of the reproduction number using case data from China, Italy, South Korea, Singapore, Iran, and global cases. The central estimate of the reproduction number ranged from 0.3 to 7.05. The uncertainty intervals ranged from 0.17 to 8.46.

## Methods

The studies were ranked from zero to five by modelling experts for quality and type of data collection, method and application of method, and plausibility of the estimate. Only early outbreak data was included to remove estimates that were likely to have been affected by public health interventions or independent behavior changes. Only studies with a quality score above one were included.

To parameterize each of the included distributions, we used the Nelder-Mead optimization algorithm to identify the PERT distribution (a scaled beta distribution, characterised by a minimum value, a maximum value, and a modal value) that uniquely fit the central estimate and uncertainty interval reported by each study, using the `mc2d1` and `nloptr1` R packages. The PERT distribution was used because it is able to capture skewed bell-shaped distributions. As most studies reported the 95% confidence interval and some studies did not report the interval type, all uncertainty intervals were assumed to represent the 95% confidence interval. Each parameterized distribution was then sampled 10,000 times to produce the final consensus distribution. As all of the included studies had been assigned a score of two or three, weighting the estimates made no difference, so no weighting was applied to the final distribution.

## Value of the distribution

The weibull, gamma, and normal distributions fit to the combined data. See Table 2 for the fitted parameters, and Figure S1 for the density plots. We used the normal distribution with a mean of 2.6 and a standard deviation of 0.54.

## Included Studies

Table S1. Table of included studies

First Author [number]	Location	Central Estimate	Uncertainty Interval - Low	Uncertainty Interval - High	Central Estimate Type	Quality Score
Riou, J <sub>2</sub>	China	2.2	1.4	3.8	NA	3
Imai, N <sub>3</sub>	China	2.6	1.5	3.5	mean	2
Read, J <sub>4</sub>	NA	3.11	2.39	4.13	mean	2
Zhao, S <sub>5</sub>	China	2.24	1.96	2.55	mean	2
Liu, T <sub>6</sub>	NA	2.9	2.32	3.63	NA	2
Chinazzi, M <sub>7</sub>	NA	2.4	2.2	2.6	mean	2
Wu, T <sub>8</sub>	NA	2.68	2.47	2.86	NA	2
Jung, S <sub>9</sub>	China	2.1	2	2.2	NA	2
Jung, S [2]	China	3.2	2.7	3.7	NA	3
Zhuang, Z <sub>10</sub>	Italy	2.6	2.3	2.9	mean	3
Zhuang, Z [2] <sub>10</sub>	Italy	3.3	3	3.6	mean	3
Zhuang, Z [3] <sub>10</sub>	South Korea	2.6	2.3	2.9	mean	3
Zhuang, Z [4] <sub>10</sub>	South Korea	3.2	2.9	3.5	mean	3
Chong, K <sub>11</sub>	Zhejiang, China	2.08	1.49	2.72	mean	2
Chong, K [2] <sub>11</sub>	Zhejiang, China	1.88	1.38	2.41	mean	2
Li, Qun <sub>12</sub>	Wuhan, China	2.2	1.4	3.9	unspecified	2
Abbott, S <sub>13</sub>	NA	2.5	2	3	NA	2

Figure S1. Density plots for the combined reproduction number (R0) and fitted distributions




Table S2. Parameters of the fitted distributions

Distribution	Parameter 1 Type	Parameter 1	Parameter 2 Type	Parameter 2
Weibull	shape	5.39	scale	2.85
Gamma	shape	22.44	rate	8.52
Normal	mean	2.63	sd	0.54

## References

1. Pouillot R, Delignette-Muller ML. Evaluating variability and uncertainty separately in microbial quantitative risk assessment using two R packages. *Int J Food Microbiol*. 2010 Sep 1;142(3):330–40.
2. Riou J, Althaus CL. Pattern of early human-to-human transmission of Wuhan 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV), December 2019 to January 2020. *Eurosurveillance*. 2020 Jan 30;25(4):2000058.
3. Imai N, Cori A, Dorigatti I, Baguelin M, Donnelly C, Riley S, et al. Report 3: Transmissibility of 2019-nCoV. 2020 Jan 25;
4. Read JM, Bridgen JR, Cummings DA, Ho A, Jewell CP. Novel coronavirus 2019-nCoV: early estimation of epidemiological parameters and epidemic predictions. *medRxiv*. 2020 Jan 28;2020.01.23.20018549.
5. Zhao S, Ran J, Musa SS, Yang G, Lou Y, Gao D, et al. Preliminary estimation of the basic reproduction number of novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in China, from 2019 to 2020: A data-driven analysis in the early phase of the outbreak. *bioRxiv*. 2020 Jan 24;2020.01.23.916395.
6. Liu T, Hu J, Kang M, Lin L, Zhong H, Xiao J, et al. Transmission dynamics of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV). *bioRxiv*. 2020 Jan 26;2020.01.25.919787.
7. Chinazzi M, Davis JT, Ajelli M, Gioannini C, Litvinova M, Merler S, et al. The effect of travel restrictions on the spread of the 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) outbreak [Internet]. *Epidemiology*; 2020 Feb [cited 2020 Mar 31]. Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.02.09.20021261>
8. Wu P, Hao X, Lau EHY, Wong JY, Leung KSM, Wu JT, et al. Real-time tentative assessment of the epidemiological characteristics of novel coronavirus infections in Wuhan, China, as at 22 January 2020. *Eurosurveillance* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 23 [cited 2020 Mar 31];25(3). Available from: <https://www.eurosurveillance.org/content/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.3.2000044>
9. Jung S, Akhmetzhanov AR, Hayashi K, Linton NM, Yang Y, Yuan B, et al. Real time estimation of the risk of death from novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) infection: Inference using exported cases [Internet]. *Epidemiology*; 2020 Feb [cited 2020 Mar 31]. Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.01.29.20019547>
10. Zhuang Z, Zhao S, Lin Q, Cao P, Lou Y, Yang L, et al. Preliminary estimating the reproduction number of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak in Republic of Korea and Italy by 5 March 2020 [Internet]. *Epidemiology*; 2020 Mar [cited 2020 Mar 31]. Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.03.02.20030312>
11. Chong KC, Cheng W, Zhao S, Ling F, Mohammad KN, Wang MH, et al. Monitoring Disease Transmissibility of 2019 Novel Coronavirus Disease in Zhejiang, China [Internet]. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*; 2020 Mar [cited 2020 Mar 31]. Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.03.02.20028704>
12. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, Wang X, Zhou L, Tong Y, et al. Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel Coronavirus–Infected Pneumonia. *N Engl J Med*. 2020 Jan 29;NEJMoa2001316.
13. Abbott S, Hellewell J, Munday J, CMMID nCoV working group, Funk S. The transmissibility of novel Coronavirus in the early stages of the 2019-20 outbreak in Wuhan: Exploring initial point-source exposure sizes and durations using scenario analysis. *Wellcome Open Res*. 2020 Feb 3;5:17.