

# SUPPLEMENTARY APPENDIX

## Transmission dynamics of the COVID-19 epidemic in India and modelling optimal lockdown exit strategies

Mohak Gupta<sup>1#</sup> (MBBS), Saptarshi Soham Mohanta<sup>2#</sup>, Aditi Rao<sup>1\*</sup>, Giridara Gopal Parameswaran<sup>1\*</sup> (MD), Mudit Agarwal<sup>1</sup> (MBBS), Mehak Arora<sup>1</sup>, Archisman Mazumder<sup>1</sup>, Ayush Lohiya<sup>3</sup> (MD), Priyamadhava Behera<sup>4</sup> (MD), Agam Bansal<sup>5</sup> (MBBS), Rohit Kumar<sup>1</sup> (MD), Ved Prakash Meena<sup>1</sup> (MD), Pawan Tiwari<sup>1</sup> (MD), Anant Mohan<sup>1</sup> (MD), Sushma Bhatnagar<sup>1</sup> (MD)

# Joint first authors

\* Joint second authors

1 All India Institute of Medical Sciences (AIIMS), New Delhi, India

2 Indian Institute of Science Education and Research (IISER), Pune, India

3 Super Specialty Cancer Institute & Hospital, Lucknow, India

4 All India Institute of Medical Sciences (AIIMS), Bhubaneswar, India

5 Cleveland Clinic, OH USA

## CONTENTS

### 1. *Model Description*

1.1. From SEIR to SEIR-QDPA Model

1.2. An alternate interpretation of testing

### 2. *Reporting Lag and Incidence by Onset*

2.1. Table S1. Reporting Lag Raw Data (n=53)

2.2. Methodology for choosing the best fit distribution

2.3. Table S2. Reporting Lag Distribution Fit Parameters

2.4. Table S3. Reporting Lag Distribution Goodness-of-Fit Analysis

2.5. Sampling of Lag-adjusted Onset Dates

### 3. *R0 Estimates with EG and ML methods and R0 for states of India*

3.1. Methodology for Estimating R0

3.2. Table S4. Fit Parameters for R0 estimation

3.3. R0 Estimation for States with more than 50 cases on 20/04/20

3.4. Table S5. R0 estimates for 12 Indian States

3.5. Figure S1. Sensitivity of India R0 estimates to Serial Interval and Time Period.

### 4. *Testing criteria for COVID-19 in India*

4.1. Table S6. Federal testing recommendations provided by the Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR)

### 5. *Estimation of Effective Reproduction Number (Rt)*

5.1. Additional Information about estimation of Rt

5.2. Table S7. Raw Data for Imported Cases

5.3. Rt estimates for States

5.4. Table S8. Rt point estimates for national COVID-19 incidence data (without import adjustment)

5.5. Table S9. Rt point estimates for national COVID-19 incidence data (import adjusted)

5.6. Figure S2: Incidence by onset and effective reproduction rates (Rt) up to 11 April 2020 for Indian states of Maharashtra, Gujarat, Kerala, Delhi, Rajasthan, and Madhya Pradesh.

- 5.7. Figure S3.  $R_t$  for other Indian States up to 11 April 2020.
- 6. *Model fitting and Fit Sensitivity Analysis***
- 6.1. Fitting Methods, Initial Conditions and Uncertainty estimation
- 6.2. Figure S4. Best Fit to Data for Base Assumptions ( $a_i = 0.5$ ,  $p_a = 0.6$ ,  $f_a = 0.1$ ).
- 6.3. Assumption of constant Recovery Rate and Mortality Rate
- 6.4. Estimated model parameters for all assumed values of  $a_i$ ,  $p_a$ , and  $f_a$
- 6.5. Figure S5. Sensitivity of fit parameters  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\delta_s$  to assumptions of  $a_i$ ,  $p_a$ , and  $f_a$ .
- 6.6. Figure S6. Sensitivity of fit parameters  $\lambda$  and  $\kappa$  to assumptions of  $a_i$ ,  $p_a$ , and  $f_a$ .
- 6.7. Figure S7. Sensitivity of fit parameters  $\delta_s$  to assumptions of  $a_i$ ,  $p_a$ , and  $f_a$
- 7. *Prediction Sensitivity***
- 7.1. Figure S8. Sensitivity of predictions to assumptions of  $a_i$ ,  $p_a$ , and  $f_a$ .
- 8. *Calculation of R0 from the Model Parameters***
- 8.1. Calculating R0 from SEIR-QDPA Model
- 8.2. Figure S9. Estimation and Sensitivity of Model R0 to assumptions.
- 9. *Sensitivity Analysis of the effect of testing rate and social distancing policies***
- 9.1. Figure S10. Sensitivity of effect of testing rate and social distancing policies on total symptomatic cases to probability of asymptomaticity at 15 days after lockdown relaxation.
- 9.2. Figure S11. Sensitivity of effect of testing rate and social distancing policies on total symptomatic cases to probability of asymptomaticity at 45 days after lockdown relaxation.
- 9.3. Figure S12. Sensitivity of the number of symptomatic cases to probability of asymptomaticity over a 75-day period after lockdown relaxation if the testing rate and social distancing policies are not changed after relaxation.
- 9.4. Figure S13. Sensitivity of effect of testing rate and social distancing policies on total infections to probability of asymptomaticity at 15 days after lockdown relaxation.
- 9.5. Figure S14. Sensitivity of effect of testing rate and social distancing policies on total infections to probability of asymptomaticity at 45 days after lockdown relaxation.
- 10. *Effect of Gradual Lockdown Relaxation***
- 10.1. Simulating gradual lockdown relaxation
- 10.2. Figure S15. Gradual complete lockdown relaxation at three different points of time.
- 10.3. Figure S16. Lag before new rise in active case after Slow Lockdown Relaxation.
- 10.4. Figure S17. Gradual lockdown relaxation for 14 days at two different points of time.
- 11. *Lockdown Relaxation and the Healthcare System Capacity***
- 11.1. Estimating the Indian Healthcare System Capacity
- 11.2. Estimating the time taken to reach the Healthcare system capacity under lockdown relaxation scenarios.
- 11.3. Figure S18. Time taken to reach the healthcare system capacity under lockdown relaxation scenarios.
- 12. *Google COVID-19 Mobility Reports***
- 12.1. Background Information on how Google's mobility reports are generated

## 1. Model Description

### 1.1 From SEIR to SEIR-QDPA Model

In order to accurately describe the progression of the epidemic in the population, we generalize and redefine the 4 compartments of a SEIR model i.e.  $[S(t), E(t), I(t), R(t)]$ . We redefine the  $I(t)$  compartment as the number of undetected infective people and split it into two compartments signifying the undetected symptomatic infectives  $I_s(t)$  and undetected asymptomatic infectives  $I_a(t)$ . Exposed patients go to either of the compartments at a fixed ratio of asymptomatics to symptomatics given by  $r = p_a/(1-p_a)$  where  $p_a$  is the probability of being asymptomatic. We set the rates of transition from  $E(t)$  to  $I_a(t)$  and  $I_s(t)$  as  $r\gamma$  and  $\gamma$  respectively. This results in the distribution of exposed cases into the two infective compartments such that for each symptomatic case, there are  $r$  asymptomatic cases, causing a fixed fraction ( $p_a$ ) of the cases being asymptomatic.

In our model, we further assume that a fixed fraction of asymptomatic infectious cases gets detected ( $f_a$ ) and go to the asymptomatic quarantine compartment  $Q_a(t)$  with detection rate  $a_t\delta_a$  where  $a_t = f_a/(1-f_a)$ , and the rest go into an undetected recovery compartment  $R_u(t)$  with recovery rate for asymptomatics  $\delta_a$ . The choice of rates leads to the distribution of asymptomatics into detected quarantined and undetected recovered in the ratio of  $a_t$ , i.e. a fixed fraction ( $f_a$ ) of asymptomatics are detected.

He et. al. determined that infectiousness declines significantly after a period of 7 days by studying the distributions of incubation period and serial interval.<sup>1</sup> Wölfel et al found that live virus could not be isolated after day 8 in spite of continuing high viral loads in young cases with mild symptoms.<sup>2</sup> Backed by both epidemiological and biological evidence, we set the time spent by an asymptomatic being infectious as 8 days. The  $\delta_a$  then becomes  $1/8$  days<sup>-1</sup>.

We assume that all symptomatic cases get detected with an average reporting lag  $\delta_s^{-1}$  after which they go to the symptomatic quarantine compartment  $Q_s(t)$ . We refer to the symptomatic and asymptomatic quarantine compartment together as the quarantine compartment  $Q(t)$ . We assume that transition of a case from  $I_a(t)$  and  $I_s(t)$  to  $Q(t)$  entails isolating, testing and reporting the case and that this isolation is 100% effective. From the symptomatic quarantine compartment, cases go to either the  $R_s(t)$  or  $D(t)$  denoting symptomatic recovered cases and fatal cases with recovery rate  $\lambda$  and mortality rate  $\kappa$  respectively. We assume that the recovery of asymptomatic cases in quarantine occurs at the same rate as symptomatics. Thus, from the asymptomatic quarantine compartment, cases go to  $R_a(t)$  denoting detected asymptomatic recovered cases with the recovery rate  $\lambda$ . We assume here that no asymptomatic case dies due to the infection. We refer to the symptomatic and detected asymptomatic recovered compartment together as the recovered compartment  $R(t)$ .

$$Q(t) = Q_a(t) + Q_s(t)$$

$$R(t) = R_a(t) + R_s(t)$$

Finally, we introduce an extension previously described by Peng et al where a new compartment  $P(t)$  is added to account for the combined effect of social-distancing by individuals and lockdown of infected regions within the country thus reducing the pool of susceptible individuals in the population at a protection rate  $\alpha$ .<sup>3</sup> Further, to model the effect of the relaxation of such measures, we introduce a deprotection rate  $\sigma$  with which individuals can leave the  $P(t)$  compartment thus increasing the susceptible population  $S(t)$ . The value of  $\sigma$  is set to zero till any preventive policies are withdrawn.

The dynamics of the model are described by the following ordinary differential equations (ODEs):

$$dS(t)/dt = -\beta S(t)I_s(t)/N - a_i\beta S(t)I_a(t)/N - \alpha S(t) + \sigma P(t)$$

$$dE(t)/dt = \beta S(t)I_s(t)/N + a_i\beta S(t)I_a(t)/N - \gamma(1+r)E(t)$$

$$dI_s(t)/dt = \gamma E(t) - \delta_s I_s(t)$$

$$dI_a(t)/dt = r\gamma E(t) - \delta_a I_a(t) - a_t\delta_a I_a(t)$$

$$dQ_s(t)/dt = \delta_s I_s(t) - \lambda Q_s(t) - \kappa Q_s(t)$$

$$dQ_a(t)/dt = a_t\delta_a I_a(t) - \lambda Q_a(t)$$

$$dR_s(t)/dt = \lambda Q_s(t)$$

$$dR_a(t)/dt = \lambda Q_a(t)$$

$$dD(t)/dt = \kappa Q_s(t)$$

$$dR_u(t)/dt = \delta_a I_a(t)$$

$$dP(t)/dt = \alpha S(t) - \sigma P(t)$$

where  $N$  is the total population of the country and is assumed to be constant. The compartments  $[S(t), E(t), I_s(t), I_a(t), Q_s(t), Q_a(t), R_s(t), R_a(t), D(t), R_u(t), P(t)]$  denote the susceptible, exposed, undetected symptomatic, undetected asymptomatic, quarantined symptomatic, quarantined asymptomatic, recovered symptomatic, recovered asymptomatic, fatalities, undetected recovered, and protected individuals respectively at time  $t$ .

## 1.2. An alternate interpretation of testing in our model

An increase in testing criteria and capacity would naturally have the largest impact on increasing the detection of infections with no or mild symptoms, considering that most infections with moderate-severe symptoms are more likely to be detected even at baseline testing. Since our primary goal in this study was to evaluate the effect of detecting more asymptomatics, we assumed that increased testing increases the detection of asymptomatics only, while in reality it would detect more cases across the clinical spectrum. However, the interpretations regarding impact of increased testing are not sensitive to this assumption, which has been discussed here through an alternate interpretation of the model.

Our 11-compartment model allows some flexibility in terms of interpretation. If instead of interpreting the  $I_s$  and  $I_a$  compartment as the Symptomatic and Asymptomatic infected individuals, we consider them as the Detectable and Undetectable infections (irrespective of symptoms), our model parameter  $p_a$  now represents 1-ascertainment proportion (ascertainment proportion is the proportion of total infections that are considered detectable at baseline) and increasing the  $f_a$  now becomes equivalent to improving the testing by reducing the bias towards detectable cases and improves detection of all cases irrespective of symptoms. Our model takes into account that undetected infected spend more time in an infective state in the population ( $\delta_a^{-1}$ ) compared to the detected cases ( $\delta_s^{-1}$ ), which reflects reality.

Thus, this alternate view allows us to generalize our results with respect to how the testing policies affect the epidemic after lockdown relaxations. One limitation of this interpretation is that we assume asymptomatic cases (here, undetectable cases) have lower infectivity than symptomatics (here, detectable cases) in a homogenous social mixing environment. Although undetectable cases are more likely to be asymptomatic, this assumption does not necessarily hold true in this alternate interpretation. Still, this limitation would result in an underestimation of the impact of testing rather than an overestimation.

## 2. Reporting Lag and Incidence by Onset

2.1 Table S1. Reporting Lag Raw Data (n=53)

Sl. no.	Date of Admission	Days since onset of symptoms	Sl. no.	Date of Admission	Days since onset of symptoms	Sl. no.	Date of Admission	Days since onset of symptoms
1	27/3/20	2	19	31/3/20	7	37	2/4/20	2
2	30/3/20	3	20	31/3/20	8	38	5/4/20	3
3	31/3/20	2	21	31/3/20	9	39	7/4/20	5
4	31/3/20	2	22	31/3/20	10	40	7/4/20	7
5	31/3/20	2	23	1/4/20	1	41	8/4/20	1
6	31/3/20	2	24	1/4/20	1	42	8/4/20	7
7	31/3/20	2	25	1/4/20	2	43	10/4/20	2
8	31/3/20	2	26	1/4/20	2	44	10/4/20	2
9	31/3/20	3	27	1/4/20	2	45	10/4/20	3
10	31/3/20	3	28	1/4/20	2	46	11/4/20	3
11	31/3/20	3	29	1/4/20	2	47	12/4/20	5
12	31/3/20	3	30	1/4/20	2	48	16/4/20	7
13	31/3/20	3	31	1/4/20	2	49	16/4/20	5
14	31/3/20	3	32	1/4/20	2	50	17/4/20	2
15	31/3/20	4	33	1/4/20	2	51	17/4/20	2
16	31/3/20	4	34	1/4/20	3	52	17/4/20	2
17	31/3/20	5	35	1/4/20	3	53	17/4/20	3
18	31/3/20	7	36	1/4/20	4			

Delay from onset to admission was available for 53 out of 55 symptomatic patients.

### 2.2 Methodology for choosing the best fit distribution

Gamma and Exponential distributions were fit to the Reporting Lag data with Maximum Likelihood Estimation using the *fitdistrplus* package in R 3.6.3.<sup>4</sup> Due to the small sample size and lack of reliable prior information about the distribution of reporting lag, the maximum likelihood method was chosen. Since the data was found to have a heavy tail, we chose to fit gamma and exponential distributions. The goodness of fit was estimated using the *Akaike information criterion (AIC)* and *Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC)*. The distribution with a better BIC was selected as the appropriate descriptor of the Reporting Lag distribution.

### 2.3 Table S2. Reporting Lag Distribution Fit Parameters.

Fitting of the Exponential distribution by Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE)				
Parameter	Estimate	Std. Error (SE)	Median (Bootstrap)	95% CI (Bootstrap)
rate	0.294	0.040	0.296	0.229–0.389
Fitting of the Gamma distribution by Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE)				
Parameter	Estimate	Std. Error (SE)	Median (Bootstrap)	95% CI (Bootstrap)
shape	3.325	0.616	3.450	2.422–5.193
rate	0.979	0.196	1.017	0.702–1.607

The distribution was found to have a heavy tail and was fit on a very small number of samples likely leading to high uncertainty observed in the fits.

### 2.4 Table S3. Reporting Lag Distribution Goodness-of-Fit Analysis.

Goodness-of-fit statistics	Gamma Distribution	Exponential Distribution
Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic	0.2314472	0.3884527
Cramer-von Mises statistic	0.5809448	1.2872294
Anderson-Darling statistic	3.1523223	6.5702843
Goodness-of-fit criteria	Gamma Distribution	Exponential Distribution
Akaike's Information Criterion	208.8763	237.6025
Bayesian Information Criterion	212.8169	239.5728

$\delta \text{BIC} > 10$  and  $\delta \text{AIC} > 10$ . The difference in fit is very strong suggesting the gamma distribution is a much better fit.

### 2.5 Sampling of Lag-adjusted Onset Dates

From the estimated distribution of Reporting Lag, 1000 samples of the fitted distribution parameters ( $\varphi_i$ ) were drawn taking into account the uncertainty in the distribution parameters ie. shape and scale for the gamma distribution and rate for the exponential distribution to serve as the posterior distribution of reporting lag. For each of the 1000 samples of fitted parameters, the reporting dates ( $r_i$ ) were transformed to give the symptom onset date ( $o_i$ ) by the formula:

$$o_i = r_i - l_i$$

where  $l_i \sim \text{Gamma}(\varphi_i)$  or  $\text{Exp}(\varphi_i)$  resulting in 1000 lag adjusted datasets. This process was applied to the reporting incidence data for the nation and the different states.

### 3. R<sub>0</sub> Estimates with both EG and ML methods and R<sub>0</sub> for states of India

#### 3.1 Methodology for Estimating R<sub>0</sub>

For the estimation of R<sub>0</sub>, we use Maximum Likelihood (ML) method as described by White & Pagano and the Exponential Growth (EG) method as described by Wallinga & Lipsitch in R 3.6.3 using the R0 package.<sup>5,6</sup> The best fit time period was chosen for calculation of confidence intervals for R<sub>0</sub>. As we had adjusted for imported cases, we reported the results of the method which gave a more reliable fit with a better R<sup>2</sup> score as the R<sub>0</sub>. We also analysed the sensitivity of R<sub>0</sub> to the serial interval distribution chosen by keeping standard deviation fixed at 3 and varying the mean from 2 days to 7 days.

#### 3.2 Table S4. Fit Parameters for R<sub>0</sub> estimation


	Exponential Growth	Maximum Likelihood
R <sub>0</sub> Estimate	2.083	2.717
95% CI	2.044–2.122	2.496–2.950
Goodness of fit (R <sup>2</sup> )	0.972	0.914
Best Fit Time-period	32 days	5 days

#### 3.3 R<sub>0</sub> Estimation for States with more than 50 cases on 20/04/20

The R<sub>0</sub> could be estimated for the states of Kerala, Maharashtra, Delhi, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, Telangana, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Jammu & Kashmir, Haryana and Punjab. The ML algorithm failed to converge for the states of Gujarat, West Bengal, Madhya Pradesh and Bihar. The fits for the states had a very low R<sup>2</sup> due to multiple factors such as a major impact of import of new cases from other states (significant for some states due to import of cases from the Delhi cluster) in the estimation of R<sub>0</sub> and policies implemented by the government to curb the spread. When calculating the R<sub>0</sub>, we were unable to adjust for imported cases as state-wise imported case data was not available. Thus, we used Maximum Likelihood approach for estimating R<sub>0</sub> for the states as it is more robust for unaccounted import of cases.

#### 3.4 Table S5. R<sub>0</sub> estimates for 12 Indian States

State	R <sub>0</sub> Estimate	95% CI	Goodness of fit (R <sup>2</sup> )
Kerala	1.783	1.417–2.207	0.413
Maharashtra	1.533	1.467–1.599	0.708
Delhi	1.897	1.765–2.036	0.618
Rajasthan	1.954	1.756–2.166	0.784
Tamil Nadu	3.998	3.316–4.769	0.791
Uttar Pradesh	1.514	1.402–1.633	0.675
Telangana	2.413	1.997–2.884	0.813
Andhra Pradesh	1.374	1.237–1.521	0.432
Karnataka	1.436	1.235–1.659	0.622
Jammu & Kashmir	1.775	1.410–2.199	0.556
Haryana	1.814	1.407–2.294	0.503
Punjab	1.723	1.337–2.130	0.372



**3.5 Figure S1. Sensitivity of India  $R_0$  estimates to Serial Interval and Time Period.** (A,B) Sensitivity Analysis of  $R_0$  estimates with respect to the choice of the time period over which the  $R_0$  was calculated for EG and ML methods. (C,D) Goodness of Fit across a choice of time periods over which the  $R_0$  was calculated for EG and ML methods. Red represents the best fit. (E,F) Sensitivity Analysis of  $R_0$  estimates with respect to the distribution of Serial Intervals across which the  $R_0$  was calculated for EG and ML methods. All graphs were generated in  $R_0$  package with R 3.6.3.



#### 4. Testing criteria for COVID-19 in India<sup>7</sup>

4.1 Table S6. Federal testing recommendations provided by the Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR)

Date	ICMR testing criteria for COVID-19
9 March 2020	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>All contacts of laboratory confirmed positive cases IF they become symptomatic (fever, cough, difficulty in breathing etc.) within 14 days of home quarantine.</b></li> <li>2. <b>All people with history of international travel to COVID-19 affected countries within the last 14 days IF they become symptomatic (fever, cough, difficulty in breathing etc.) within 14 days of home quarantine.</b></li> </ol>
17 March 2020	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All contacts of laboratory confirmed positive cases IF they become symptomatic (fever, cough, difficulty in breathing etc.) within 14 days of home quarantine.</li> <li>2. All people with history of international travel IF they become symptomatic (fever, cough, difficulty in breathing etc.) within 14 days of home quarantine.</li> <li>3. <b>Health care workers managing respiratory distress / Severe Acute Respiratory Illness should be tested when they are symptomatic.</b></li> </ol>
20 March 2020	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All symptomatic* individuals who have undertaken international travel in the last 14 days.</li> <li>2. All symptomatic contacts of laboratory confirmed cases.</li> <li>3. All symptomatic health care workers.</li> <li>4. <b>All hospitalized patients with Severe Acute Respiratory Illness (SARI: fever AND cough and/or shortness of breath).</b></li> <li>5. <b>Asymptomatic direct and high-risk contacts** of a confirmed case should be tested once between day 5 and day 14 of coming in his/her contact.</b></li> </ol>
9 April 2020	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All symptomatic individuals who have undertaken international travel in the last 14 days</li> <li>2. All symptomatic contacts of laboratory confirmed cases</li> <li>3. All symptomatic health care workers</li> <li>4. All patients with Severe Acute Respiratory Illness (fever AND cough and/or shortness of breath)</li> <li>5. Asymptomatic direct and high-risk contacts<sup>#</sup> of a confirmed case should be tested once between day 5 and day 14 of coming in his/her contact</li> <li>6. <b>In hotspots/cluster (as per MoHFW) and in large migration gatherings/ evacuees centres: All symptomatic Influenza like illness (ILI: fever, cough, sore throat, runny nose)</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b>Within 7 days of illness – rRT-PCR</b></li> <li>b. <b>After 7 days of illness – Antibody test (If negative, confirmed by rRT-PCR)</b></li> </ol> </li> </ol>

Testing policies are updated with time to reflect the pandemic situation. Newly added criteria are written in bold.

MoHFW = Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India.

\*Symptomatic refers to fever/cough/shortness of breath.

<sup>#</sup> Direct and high-risk contacts include those who live in the same household with a confirmed case and HCP who examined a confirmed case.

## 5. Estimation of Effective Reproduction Number ( $R_t$ )

### 5.1 Additional Information about estimation of $R_t$

When evaluating the  $R_t$  in *EpiEstim* package in R 3.6.3 with the method described by Wallinga and Teunis, we consider a gamma prior with mean 2.6 and SD 2, and 5-day sliding windows.<sup>8</sup> The serial interval distribution was assumed to follow a gamma distribution with mean 3.96 days (95% CI 3.53–4.39, SD = 0.215) and a standard deviation of 4.75 (95% CI 4.46–5.07, SD = 0.145) days based on a study done in Wuhan on 468 infector-infectee pairs.<sup>9</sup> Correction for the imported cases was done for the national incidence data after adjusting for reporting lag. The estimates of the effective reproduction number for each day were combined for the 1000 lag adjusted datasets by calculating pooled mean and pooled standard deviation and a net estimate for 50% and 95% confidence intervals were calculated. All simulations were done in Python 3.6 and plots were made in matplotlib 2.2.2.

### 5.2 Table S7. Raw Data for Imported Cases. (Source- COVID19India<sup>10</sup>)

Date	Imported Cases	Date	Imported Cases	Date	Imported Cases
3/1/2020	0	3/14/2020	11	3/27/2020	40
3/2/2020	2	3/15/2020	5	3/28/2020	16
3/3/2020	1	3/16/2020	12	3/29/2020	20
3/4/2020	15	3/17/2020	14	3/30/2020	11
3/5/2020	2	3/18/2020	21	3/31/2020	20
3/6/2020	1	3/19/2020	27	4/1/2020	7
3/7/2020	2	3/20/2020	34	4/2/2020	8
3/8/2020	3	3/21/2020	35	4/3/2020	6
3/9/2020	6	3/22/2020	45	4/4/2020	3
3/10/2020	2	3/23/2020	55	4/5/2020	1
3/11/2020	7	3/24/2020	38	4/6/2020	0
3/12/2020	10	3/25/2020	34	4/7/2020	0
3/13/2020	5	3/26/2020	24	4/8/2020	0

**5.3 Table S8.  $R_t$  point estimates for national COVID-19 incidence data (without import adjustment).**

Date	$R_t$ Estimate (95% CI)	Date	$R_t$ Estimate (95% CI)
3/10/2020	1.814 (1.337,2.291)	4/1/2020	1.608 (1.497,1.72)
3/11/2020	1.647 (1.241,2.052)	4/2/2020	1.524 (1.426,1.623)
3/12/2020	1.573 (1.209,1.936)	4/3/2020	1.44 (1.355,1.526)
3/13/2020	1.577 (1.238,1.916)	4/4/2020	1.369 (1.295,1.443)
3/14/2020	1.639 (1.316,1.962)	4/5/2020	1.326 (1.261,1.390)
3/15/2020	1.737 (1.427,2.048)	4/6/2020	1.306 (1.248,1.365)
3/16/2020	1.808 (1.513,2.102)	4/7/2020	1.301 (1.246,1.356)
3/17/2020	1.862 (1.585,2.138)	4/8/2020	1.301 (1.248,1.354)
3/18/2020	1.861 (1.606,2.117)	4/9/2020	1.298 (1.247,1.349)
3/19/2020	1.8 (1.57,2.031)	4/10/2020	1.293 (1.243,1.342)
3/20/2020	1.715 (1.51,1.919)	4/11/2020	1.278 (1.23,1.326)
3/21/2020	1.630 (1.448,1.812)	4/12/2020	1.25 (1.205,1.295)
3/22/2020	1.565 (1.403,1.728)	4/13/2020	1.224 (1.182,1.266)
3/23/2020	1.524 (1.376,1.672)	4/14/2020	1.213 (1.173,1.252)
3/24/2020	1.516 (1.379,1.654)	4/15/2020	1.214 (1.176,1.252)
3/25/2020	1.541 (1.41,1.673)	4/16/2020	1.217 (1.18,1.254)
3/26/2020	1.584 (1.456,1.713)	4/17/2020	1.213 (1.176,1.249)
3/27/2020	1.642 (1.514,1.77)	4/18/2020	1.208 (1.172,1.244)
3/28/2020	1.709 (1.579,1.838)	4/19/2020	1.202 (1.167,1.236)
3/29/2020	1.746 (1.614,1.877)	4/20/2020	1.19 (1.156,1.223)
3/30/2020	1.733 (1.603,1.862)	4/21/2020	1.175 (1.143,1.207)
3/31/2020	1.681 (1.559,1.803)	4/22/2020	1.159 (1.129,1.19)


**5.4 Table S9.  $R_t$  point estimates for national COVID-19 incidence data (import adjusted).**

Date	$R_t$ Estimate (95% CI)	Date	$R_t$ Estimate (95% CI)
3/10/2020	0.716 (0.432,0.999)	4/1/2020	1.58 (1.471,1.69)
3/11/2020	0.605 (0.371,0.838)	4/2/2020	1.506 (1.409,1.604)
3/12/2020	0.537 (0.335,0.739)	4/3/2020	1.43 (1.345,1.515)
3/13/2020	0.507 (0.326,0.688)	4/4/2020	1.363 (1.29,1.437)
3/14/2020	0.512 (0.345,0.68)	4/5/2020	1.322 (1.258,1.387)
3/15/2020	0.549 (0.389,0.709)	4/6/2020	1.305 (1.247,1.364)
3/16/2020	0.592 (0.44,0.745)	4/7/2020	1.301 (1.246,1.356)
3/17/2020	0.653 (0.505,0.801)	4/8/2020	1.301 (1.248,1.354)
3/18/2020	0.713 (0.571,0.856)	4/9/2020	1.298 (1.247,1.349)
3/19/2020	0.753 (0.619,0.887)	4/10/2020	1.293 (1.243,1.343)
3/20/2020	0.772 (0.648,0.896)	4/11/2020	1.278 (1.23,1.326)
3/21/2020	0.807 (0.69,0.923)	4/12/2020	1.249 (1.204,1.295)
3/22/2020	0.863 (0.751,0.975)	4/13/2020	1.223 (1.181,1.265)
3/23/2020	0.937 (0.828,1.046)	4/14/2020	1.212 (1.173,1.252)
3/24/2020	1.037 (0.928,1.145)	4/15/2020	1.213 (1.175,1.251)
3/25/2020	1.161 (1.052,1.271)	4/16/2020	1.217 (1.18,1.254)
3/26/2020	1.299 (1.187,1.412)	4/17/2020	1.213 (1.177,1.25)
3/27/2020	1.435 (1.319,1.551)	4/18/2020	1.208 (1.173,1.244)
3/28/2020	1.56 (1.439,1.681)	4/19/2020	1.202 (1.168,1.237)
3/29/2020	1.642 (1.517,1.767)	4/20/2020	1.19 (1.157,1.224)
3/30/2020	1.665 (1.54,1.789)	4/21/2020	1.175 (1.143,1.208)
3/31/2020	1.637 (1.518,1.757)	4/22/2020	1.159 (1.129,1.19)


### 5.5 $R_t$ trends for States

The  $R_t$  was evaluated for states with more than 50 cases on 20th April 2020 other than Odisha due to a lack of active cases until very recently. The method to estimate was the same as the method used for the national data. Imported cases could not be adjusted due to lack of state-wise data of internationally imported cases and for interstate transport of COVID-19 cases. The estimates of the effective reproduction number for each day were combined for the 100 lag adjusted datasets by calculating pooled mean and pooled standard deviation and a net estimate for 50% and 95% confidence intervals were calculated. All bootstraps were done in Python 3.6 and plots were made in matplotlib 2.2.2.

We examined the  $R_t$  curves of the states of Maharashtra, Gujarat, Delhi, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh which together accounted for 66% of total cases in India as on 28 April 2020. Delhi, Maharashtra, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh showed the Nizammudin cluster-related rise in  $R_t$  during late-March, with Delhi being the origin of the cluster showing the highest rise. Gujarat, in contrast, showed a rise later in early-April which was probably linked to increased local transmission in the state capital of Ahmedabad. We also included Kerala since it was the first state to reach  $R_t=1$  in early April and has sustained low transmission levels since then. All states except Madhya Pradesh showed a continuing downtrend on the last examined date. The composite of these trends roughly depicts the trend of  $R_t$  of India. Kerala's ability to maintain a low  $R_t$  may be attributed to its high literacy rate, active community participation and decentralisation of power- village councils taking the initiative to contain cases locally, use of drones for cluster containment, and social welfare initiatives which provided isolation rooms for people with cramped homes which didn't allow social distancing from family. Kerala's health-system response has been proven to be robust in earlier outbreaks like the Nipah virus outbreak in 2018.



**5.5 Figure S2: Incidence by onset and effective reproduction rates ( $R_t$ ) up to 11 April 2020 for Indian states of Maharashtra, Gujarat, Kerala, Delhi, Rajasthan, and Madhya Pradesh.** The state name is green if the most recent 50% CI of  $R_t$  is below 1 as on 11 April 2020, otherwise red. State-level Incidence by Onset and Effective Reproductive Number ( $R_t$ ) number calculated with time-dependent Maximum Likelihood Method with 5 day sliding windows and 100 lag adjusted datasets. All bootstraps were done in Python 3.6 and plots were made in matplotlib 2.2.2.




**5.6 Figure S3.  $R_t$  for other Indian States up to 11 April 2020.** The state name is green if the most recent 50% CI of  $R_t$  is below 1, otherwise red. State-level Incidence by Onset and Effective Reproductive Number ( $R_t$ ) number calculated with time-dependent Maximum Likelihood Method with 5 day sliding windows and 100 lag adjusted datasets. All bootstraps were done in Python 3·6 and plots were made in matplotlib 2·2·2.

## 6. Model fitting and Fit Sensitivity Analysis

### 6.1 Fitting Methods, Initial Conditions and Uncertainty estimation

Fitting was done using Least-Square Fitting with Trust Region Reflective algorithm in *Scipy* package (Python 3.7). This method was chosen as it allows for a bound on the fitted parameters and was found to converge reliably. The data was fit from the date the number of active cases crossed 100 individuals. Due to lack of data for  $E(t)$  and  $I_s(t)$  compartment, we also fit for the initial conditions for these compartments. Initial conditions for  $I_a(t)$  and  $R_u(t)$  were set in the ratio of asymptomatics to symptomatics with respect to the initial values of  $I_s(t)$  and  $R(t)$  compartments respectively. Since the number of detected recovered cases was very small we assume all of them were asymptomatic and thus  $R_a(t)$  was initially set to zero. All other compartments were set to zero with the exception of  $S(t)$  which was set to ensure the sum of all compartments was  $N$ . Newer values were given higher weightage for the fitting by supplying the fitting algorithm with errors given by  $e = w(1-w)^t$  where  $t$  is the index of the sample and  $w = 0.5$  is an arbitrary error weightage parameter as described by Chowell.<sup>11</sup> In order to estimate the uncertainty in the parameter fit we adapt the Bootstrap approach described by Chowell using a Poissonian error structure without overdispersion and determine the 95% confidence intervals of the parameters with 1000 bootstrap samples.<sup>11</sup> All simulations were done in Python 3.6 and plots were made in matplotlib 2.2.2.



**6.2 Figure S4. Best Fit to Data for Base Assumptions ( $a_i = 0.5$ ,  $p_a = 0.6$ ,  $f_a = 0.1$ ).** '+' represent data with which the model was trained, 'o' refers to data points for dates after the training limit. Bands represent 95% confidence intervals for the mean prediction. All simulations were done in Python 3.6 and plots were made in matplotlib 2.2.2.

### 6.3 Assumption of constant Recovery Rate ( $\lambda$ ) and Mortality Rate ( $\kappa$ )

Our model fails to predict the increased rise in recovery as it assumes a constant recovery rate ( $\lambda$ ) but in reality, the recovery rate ( $\lambda$ ) is often found to increase during the progress of an outbreak due to multiple factors. Similarly, mortality ( $\kappa$ ) is also found to reduce. Due to lack of sufficient data about the nature of the increase in these rates, the model was assumed to have a constant value that fits well to early dynamics of epidemics. In reality, a more flexible form such as a sigmoid may be a better assumption.


### 6.4 Estimated model parameters for all assumed values of $a_i$ , $p_a$ , and $f_a$

Table S10 shows the best-fit parameter estimates for the base assumptions of  $p_a=0.6$  (chosen based upon the asymptomatic proportion estimated from primary patient data),  $a_i=0.5$ , and  $f_a=0.1$ .

**Table S10: Estimated parameters for the model for base assumptions ( $a_i=0.5$ ,  $p_a=0.6$ ,  $f_a=0.1$ ).**


PARAMETER	BEST-FIT ESTIMATE (95% CI)
Transmission Rate ( $\beta$ )	1.421 (1.287–1.553)
Reporting Lag ( $\delta_s^{-1}$ )	2.118 (2.069–2.200)
Protection Rate ( $\alpha$ )	0.043 (0.038–0.048)
Recovery Rate ( $\lambda$ )	0.0191 (0.0184–0.0198)
Mortality Rate ( $\kappa$ )	0.0047 (0.0043–0.005)
Initial Exposed ( $E_0$ )	50 (24–74)
Initial Symptomatic Infected ( $I_0$ )	40 (29–54)

The sensitivity of the fit parameters to our assumptions were evaluated and it was found that recovery rate ( $\lambda$ ) and mortality rate ( $\kappa$ ) is independent of the assumptions, which is expected as these parameters are directly dependent on the relation between quarantine, recovery and fatality data. On the other hand, while there was some variability in the values of protection rate (between 0.032–0.048) and reporting rate (between 0.40–0.48) many of which were within the confidence interval, a large variability was observed in the value of transmission rate (0.8–2.0) with higher transmission rates favoured when the ratio of asymptomatic was low and their relative infectivity is also low.




**6.5 Figure S5. Sensitivity of fit parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  to assumptions of  $a_i$ ,  $p_a$ , and  $f_a$ .** All values are reported with 95% CI (empirical estimate) with 1000 bootstrapped fits to the dataset as described in Chowell (2012)<sup>11</sup>. All plots were made in matplotlib 2.2.2.






**6.6 Figure S6. Sensitivity of fit parameters  $\lambda$  and  $\kappa$  to assumptions of  $a_i$ ,  $p_a$ , and  $f_a$ .** All values are reported with 95% CI with 1000 bootstrapped fits to the dataset as described in Chowell (2012)<sup>11</sup>. All plots were made in matplotlib 2.2.2.



**6.7 Figure S7. Sensitivity of fit parameters  $\delta_s$  to assumptions of  $a_i$ ,  $p_a$ , and  $f_a$ .** All values are reported with 95% CI with 1000 bootstrapped fits to the dataset as described in Chowell (2012)<sup>11</sup>. All plots were made in matplotlib 2.2.2.

## 7. Prediction Sensitivity



**7.1 Figure S8. Sensitivity of predictions to assumptions of  $a_i$ ,  $p_a$ , and  $f_a$ .** All values are reported with 95% CI with 1000 bootstrapped fits to the dataset as described in Chowell (2012).<sup>11</sup> Cases counts are reported in thousands and dates are reported with respect to 18th April 2020. All plots were made in matplotlib 2.2.2.

## 8. Calculation of $R_0$ from the Model Parameters

### 8.1 Calculating $R_0$ from SEIR-QDPA Model

The Basic Reproduction number ( $R_0$ ) can be calculated for the model using the next-generation matrix method as described by van den Driessche (2017).<sup>12</sup> When there is a non-zero probability of asymptomaticity ( $p_a$ ), the  $R_0$  is given by:

$$R_0 = (\delta_a \beta (1+a_i) + \delta_s a_i \beta r) / (\delta_a \delta_s (1+r)(1+a_i))$$

When the probability of asymptomaticity is zero, the model reduces to an SEIR at the initial time point and the  $R_0$  is simply given by:

$$R_0 = \beta / \delta_s$$


A very important factor that should be taken into consideration when interpreting the value of  $R_0$  given by the model is that unlike other simpler models such as SIR or SEIR models,  $R_0$  is not a descriptor of the dynamics at all points of time of the epidemic. This is because of the introduction of the “Protected” compartment. The better descriptor of the dynamics is given by the effective  $R_0$  given by:

$$R_0(t) = R_0 \exp(-\alpha t)$$

which is a function of time that takes into account the reduction in the number of susceptibles in the population as they enter the “Protected” compartment. The true effective reproductive number  $R_t$  is given by:


$$R_t(t) = R_0 S(t) / N$$

Since our reduction in susceptible population necessarily decays exponentially from  $N$  and asymptotic to zero, our estimates of  $R_0$  from the model are artificially higher than  $R_0$  directly estimated from data in order to explain the dynamics of the epidemic where the spread is very fast in early stages but saturates before the spread to less than the growth limit of  $R_t = 1$ . While our assumption of the constant protection rate with no leakage, may stand true for small ideal communities, for a country with non-homogenous responses to the crisis this assumption may not stand true.




**8.2 Figure S9. Estimation and Sensitivity of Model  $R_0$  to assumptions.** All values are reported with 95% CI with 1000 bootstrapped fits to the dataset as described in Chowell (2012).<sup>11</sup> The  $R_0$  is found to be lowest in the scenarios of low asymptomatic infectivity, high probability of asymptomaticity and high detection rate and conversely the highest at high asymptomatic infectivity, low probability of asymptomaticity and low detection rate. All plots were made in matplotlib 2.2.2.


## 9. Sensitivity Analysis of effect of testing rate and social distancing policies



**9.1 Figure S10. Sensitivity of effect of testing rate and social distancing policies on total symptomatic cases to the probability of asymptomaticity at 15 days after lockdown relaxation.** All values are reported in thousands of cases. All simulations were done in Python 3.6 and plots were made in matplotlib 2.2.2. When the proportion of asymptomatics is 80%, and detection is increased from 10% to 20% for 15 days— for every extra asymptomatic detected by increased testing, the number of infections prevented is 7.2 at  $\beta$ , 5.5 at  $0.8\beta$  and 3.8 at  $0.5\beta$ . When the proportion of asymptomatics is 40%, and detection is increased from 10% to 20% for 15 days— for every extra asymptomatic detected by increased testing, the number of infections prevented is 9.2 at  $\beta$ , 7.1 at  $0.8\beta$  and 3.8 at  $0.5\beta$ .




**9.2 Figure S11. Sensitivity of effect of testing rate and social distancing policies on total symptomatic cases to probability of asymptomaticity at 45 days after lockdown relaxation.** All values are reported in thousands of cases. All simulations were done in Python 3.6 and plots were made in matplotlib 2.2.2.




**9.3 Figure S12. Sensitivity of the number of symptomatic cases to the probability of asymptomaticity over a 75-day period after lockdown relaxation if the testing rate and social distancing policies are not changed after relaxation.** It is observed that the order of the trends reverses over time. This can be explained by the fact that when the epidemic was under control due to a large fraction of the population being protected, lower values of  $p_a$  reduced the total number of infections due to decreased asymptomatic spread. But when the lockdown was relaxed, the incidence of symptomatic cases reflected the probability of being symptomatic which is higher when  $p_a$  is lower and vice versa. All simulations were done in Python 3.6 and plots were made in matplotlib 2.2.2.





9.4 Figure S13. Sensitivity of effect of testing rate and social distancing policies on total infections to the probability of asymptomaticity at 15 days after lockdown relaxation. All values are reported in thousands of cases. All simulations were done in Python 3.6 and plots were made in matplotlib 2.2.2.




9.5 Figure S14. Sensitivity of effect of testing rate and social distancing policies on total infections to probability of asymptomaticity at 45 days after lockdown relaxation. All values are reported in thousands of cases. All simulations were done in Python 3.6 and plots were made in matplotlib 2.2.2.


## 10. Effect of Slow Lockdown Relaxation

### 10.1 Simulating gradual lockdown relaxation


In order to simulate a slow lockdown release, instead of setting the value of deprotection rate ( $\sigma$ ) as a large value, we set it equal to the value of protection rate ( $\alpha$ ) such that the lockdown reverts itself at the same rate as it occurred. All simulations were done in Python 3·6 and plots were made in matplotlib 2·2·2.



**10.2 Figure S15. Gradual complete lockdown relaxation at three different points of time.** The delayed gradual relaxation of the lockdown buys more time before the number of active cases starts rising again as observed in the fast lockdown relaxation. Bands represent 95% confidence intervals for the mean prediction. All simulations were done in Python 3·6 and plots were made in matplotlib 2·2·2.



**10.3 Figure S16. Lag before new rise in active case after Slow Lockdown Relaxation.** The time gained by delaying the relaxation is found to be linearly increasing (Pearson's R: 0·987; 95% CI 0·949–0·997;  $p < 0·0001$ ). The gain in time in the case of a slow lockdown relaxation is found to be more than the case of a fast lockdown relaxation. All simulations were done in Python 3·6 and plots were made in matplotlib 2·2·2.



**10.4 Figure S17. Gradual lockdown relaxation for 14 days at two different points of time.** The delayed gradual relaxation of the lockdown reduced the number of active cases in the second as observed in the fast lockdown relaxation. A slow relaxation reduced the effect of relaxation on the growth of the second peak compared to the fast lockdown relaxation. Bands represent 95% confidence intervals for the mean prediction. All simulations were done in Python 3.6 and plots were made in matplotlib 2.2.2.


## 11. Lockdown Relaxation and the Healthcare System Capacity

### 11.1 Estimating the Indian Healthcare System Capacity

Previous studies have estimated the number of ICU beds in India to be around 35,699 to 57,119 ICU beds.<sup>13</sup> We assume the number of ICU beds in India to be around 70,000 to account for growth in the healthcare system. If we assume that 50% of these beds are equipped with ventilators and are allocated exclusively to COVID-19 patients, that gives us 35,000 COVID-19 ready ICU beds. Previous studies suggest that approximately 5% of symptomatic patients need ICU support,<sup>14</sup> that gives us an upper bound for the healthcare system capacity of 7,00,00 active symptomatic cases.

### 11.2 Estimating the time taken to reach the Healthcare system capacity under lockdown relaxation scenarios.

We simulate the model under the different (fast) lockdown relaxation scenarios we described earlier and determined the time taken to reach the healthcare system capacity of 7,00,000 active symptomatic cases from the date of relaxation. We find that for all finite relaxation durations, there exists a delay in lockdown relaxation that prevents the scenario of the health capacity being overloaded. For smaller relaxation periods, this delay is found to be smaller. It should be noted that these assumptions assume fast and complete lockdown relaxations periods for the entire country at once. In reality, the lockdown relaxations will likely be introduced on a state-by-state basis and may be more of a slow staggered response.



**11.3 Figure S18. Time taken to reach the healthcare system capacity under lockdown relaxation scenarios.** Blank blocks represent the scenario where the healthcare system capacity is never reached and the epidemic is under control. Figure shows the heatmap for the mean time taken to hit the healthcare capacity under different lockdown durations and dates of start of lockdown relaxations.

## ***12. Google COVID-19 Mobility Reports***

### **12.1 Background Information on how Google's mobility reports are generated<sup>15</sup>**

The mobility scores are calculated by comparing visits and length of stay at different places change compared to a baseline value for the day of the week. The baseline values were calculated from the median values during the 5-week period Jan 3–Feb 6, 2020. These values were calculated on the basis of anonymized data from users who have opted-in to Location History for their Google Account. We acknowledge that this mobility data may be biased towards users of this service, and may or may not represent the exact behavior of a wider population.

For the analysis of mobility, Google has divided the mobility into 6 categories relevant to social distancing policies and practices. They are: Grocery & Pharmacy (places like grocery markets, food warehouses, farmers markets, speciality food shops, drug stores, and pharmacies), Parks (places like local parks, national parks, public beaches, marinas, dog parks, plazas, and public gardens), Transit stations (places like public transport hubs such as subway, bus, and train stations), Retail & Recreation (places like restaurants, cafes, shopping centres, theme parks, museums, libraries, and movie theatres), Residential (places of residence), Workplaces (places of work such as offices).

## **References for supplementary appendix**

- 1 He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, *et al.* Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat Med* 2020; : 1–4.
- 2 Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, *et al.* Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature* 2020; published online April 1. DOI:10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x.
- 3 Peng L, Yang W, Zhang D, Zhuge C, Hong L. Epidemic analysis of COVID-19 in China by dynamical modeling. *medRxiv* 2020; : 2020.02.16.20023465.
- 4 Delignette-Muller ML, Dutang C. fitdistrplus: An R Package for Fitting Distributions. *J Stat Softw* 2015; **064**. <https://ideas.repec.org/a/jss/jstsof/v064i04.html> (accessed May 2, 2020).
- 5 White LF, Pagano M. A likelihood-based method for real-time estimation of the serial interval and reproductive number of an epidemic. *Stat Med* 2008; **27**: 2999–3016.
- 6 Wallinga J, Lipsitch M. How generation intervals shape the relationship between growth rates and reproductive numbers. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 2007; **274**: 599–604.
- 7 ICMR. Testing Strategy Updates for COVID-19 in India. Indian Counc. Med. Res. <https://www.icmr.gov.in/cteststrat.html> (accessed April 30, 2020).
- 8 Wu JT, Leung K, Leung GM. Nowcasting and forecasting the potential domestic and international spread of the 2019-nCoV outbreak originating in Wuhan, China: a modelling study. *The Lancet* 2020; **395**: 689–97.
- 9 Du Z, Xu X, Wu Y, Wang L, Cowling BJ, Meyers LA. Early Release - Serial Interval of COVID-19 among Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases - Volume 26, Number 6—June 2020 - Emerging Infectious Diseases journal - CDC. DOI:10.3201/eid2606.200357.
- 10 COVID19India Database API. <https://api.covid19india.org/>.
- 11 Chowell G. Fitting dynamic models to epidemic outbreaks with quantified uncertainty: A primer for parameter uncertainty, identifiability, and forecasts. *Infect Dis Model* 2017; **2**: 379–98.
- 12 van den Driessche P. Reproduction numbers of infectious disease models. *Infect Dis Model* 2017; **2**: 288–303.
- 13 Jayaram R, Ramakrishnan N. Cost of intensive care in India. *Indian J Crit Care Med Peer-Rev Off Publ Indian Soc Crit Care Med* 2008; **12**: 55–61.
- 14 Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72 314 Cases From the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *JAMA* 2020; **323**: 1239–42.
- 15 Google LLC. Google COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports. <https://www.google.com/covid19/mobility/> (accessed April 24, 2020).