

1 **Fast initial Covid-19 response means greater caution may be needed later**

2 Joël J.-M. Hirschi*

3 **Corresponding author address:* National Oceanography Centre, Southampton, SO14 3ZH, United

4 Kingdom

5 E-mail: joel.hirschi@noc.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

6 **Background:** As the Covid-19 pandemic unfolds it is becoming increas-
7 ingly clear that the strength of the first wave of the epidemic varies signifi-
8 cantly between countries. In this study a simple numerical model is used to
9 illustrate the impact the timing of initial measures against Covid-19 has on
10 the first wave of infection and possible implications this may have for the
11 measures taken as the first wave is ebbing. The results highlight that delay-
12 ing measures by 10 days is sufficient to largely account for the differences
13 seen between countries such as the UK and Germany for the first wave of
14 infections. A pronounced first wave means that a larger fraction of the total
15 population will have been infected and is therefore likely to display immunity.
16 Even if this fraction is far below the level needed for "herd immunity" the ef-
17 fective reproduction factor R_e is decreased compared to a population that had
18 no prior exposure to the virus. Even a small reduction in R_e can have major
19 influence on the evolution of the epidemic after the first wave of infections.
20 A large first wave means the resulting value for R_e will be lower than if the
21 first wave was mild. Without either vaccine or effective treatment countries
22 that experienced a small first wave should therefore relax measures at a slower
23 pace than countries where the first wave was strong.

24 **1. introduction**

25 Around the Globe the Covid-19 (SARS-CoV2) pandemic is currently impacting the daily lives
26 of billions of people. After being first reported in late 2019 in the Chinese Province of Hubei,
27 the Covid-19 virus has spread to all continents and led to - at the time of writing - about 1/3 of
28 the world population being subject to some form of "lockdown" rules. The paths chosen range
29 from strict lockdowns with most people confined to their homes until the peak of the epidemic
30 has been clearly passed (e.g. Hubei Province in China, South Korea, Italy, Spain) to more relaxed
31 approaches where the emphasis is on minimising the impact on daily life (e.g. Sweden). Many
32 nations are somewhere in the middle ground and have opted for various forms of "soft lockdown"
33 where people - whilst strongly encouraged to stay at home - can leave their homes to buy groceries,
34 to attend medical appointments or to exercise. In their approaches countries are weighing human
35 cost and in particular the capacity of the health system to cope with a surge in the number of cases,
36 against the cost of shutting or ramping down many sectors of the economy. Regardless of which
37 aspect weighs more heavily on the decision-making, the adopted approaches all have in common
38 that they want to prevent an uncontrolled, exponential increase in the number of people infected by
39 the virus. Despite debates and in some instances tensions between scientific advice, government
40 action and public perception there is consensus that an uncontrolled spread of the virus would
41 come at an unacceptable human cost which would overwhelm even the best prepared and efficient
42 health system.

43 All approaches that have been adopted include various forms of "social distancing" with the aim
44 to reduce the number of direct contacts between people in order to lower the effective reproduction
45 factor R_e (i.e. the number of people an infected person will infect on average) below a value of
46 1. Current estimates for the reproduction factor R_0 in a population that had no prior exposure to

47 Covid-19 are between 2 and 3 (e.g. Liu et al. 2020). This makes Covid-19 more contagious than
48 for example flu viruses with $R_0 \approx 1.3$ but less contagious than measles with $R_0 \approx 15$ in previously
49 unexposed populations. In addition to social distancing some countries also prescribe the use of
50 face masks when people leave their home - an approach most widely seen in Asia (e.g. China,
51 South Korea or Singapore) whereas in most western nations the choice of mask-wearing is left to
52 the individual. Social distancing and/or wearing face masks is not a new approach but was widely
53 used in earlier pandemics such as the Spanish flu in 1918/1919 (e.g. Martini et al. 2019; Reid et al.
54 2001). Such measures are simple and have been shown to be effective in slowing the spread of
55 viruses. These low-tech measures are still the backbone of our approach to slow down pandemics.
56 However, new technologies like contact tracing using mobile phones are increasingly being tested
57 to localise infection hotspots and inform targeted applications of measures.

58 As the Covid-19 pandemic unfolds with many countries having passed or are approaching the
59 peak of the first wave we can observe marked differences in the number of cases and deaths in
60 countries that are broadly comparable in terms of population size, health care systems and overall
61 living standards. For example Germany had fewer deaths in the first wave than the UK despite
62 having a larger population 83 vs 66 millions. Whilst it will be years until the full extent of the
63 human and economic cost of the Covid-19 pandemic is known there are already lessons that can
64 be learned - about the initial reactions and measures in future pandemics but also what to look
65 out for as nations gradually emerge from the first wave of a pandemic. Analytical and numerical
66 models can be powerful tools to understand the evolution of the pandemic so far and to test possible
67 scenarios for the evolution of the pandemic in the coming months and years (e.g. Prem et al. 2020;
68 Kucharski et al. 2020; Tsang et al. 2020). In this article a very simple model is used to illustrate
69 the impact the timing of measures can have on the severity of the first wave of the pandemic and
70 the consequences of a weak or a strong first wave once the lockdown rules are gradually relaxed.

71 The model is introduced in section 2, the results presented and discussed in sections 3 and 4 and
72 conclusions are given in section 5.

73 2. Method

74 The following introduces the model that will be used to test scenarios in which the timing for
75 the imposition and relaxation of measures during an epidemic is varied. The basic assumptions
76 for the model are that without imposition of any measures (i.e. daily human contacts as usual) and
77 in a population with no prior exposure to the virus the reproduction rate R_0 is assumed to be 2.5.
78 $R_0 = 2.5$ is at the lower end of the range of estimates for R_0 for Covid-19 (e.g. Liu et al. 2020; Wu
79 et al. 2020). An incubation time of 5 days is assumed i.e. within 5 days an infected person will on
80 average infect 2.5 people.

81 The cumulative number of cases C is calculated according to

$$C(t_0) = 1, \tag{1}$$

$$C(t_1) = C(t_0)(1 + R_0), \tag{2}$$

...

$$C(t_n) = C(t_{n-1}) + (C(t_{n-1}) - C(t_{n-2})) \frac{R_0(t_n)(sP - C(t_{n-1}))}{sP}, \tag{3}$$

$$R_e(t_n) = \frac{R_0(t_n)(sP - C(t_{n-1}))}{sP}, \tag{4}$$

82 where $P = 6.6 \times 10^7$ is the total population (similar to the UK), $s = 0.6$ the fraction of the
83 population that needs to have been infected for "herd immunity" to be reached. Since the average
84 time between infection and first symptoms to show is about 5 days the assumption is made that
85 $\Delta t = t_n - t_{n-1} = 5$ days. R_0 is the reproduction rate in a population that had no prior exposure to
86 the virus. R_e is the effective reproduction rate which accounts for the fact that, as the number of

87 infections in the population rise, the ability of the virus to infect people gradually decreases. This
88 assumes that people who had the virus will be immune to re-infection and that "herd immunity"
89 can be achieved. A linear relationship is assumed between $C(t_n)$ and R_e . More elaborate functions
90 could be used, but for to illustrate possible types of epidemic evolutions a linear relationship is
91 sufficient.

92 The reproduction rate $R_0(t_n)$ as used in equation 4 can be considered as indicative of the strin-
93 gency of the measures taken to slow the spread of the virus. No measures means $R_0(t_n) = 2.5$ and
94 $R_0(t_n) = 0$ would refer to a situation where every infected person can be isolated before passing
95 on the virus to anyone.

96 From $C(t_n)$ the number of new cases per day is calculated according to:

$$\Delta C(t_n) = \frac{C(t_n) - C(t_{n-1})}{\Delta t} \quad (5)$$

97 The total number of fatalities F at time t_n is calculated according to:

$$F(t_n) = \frac{m}{4} \sum_{i=n-3}^n C(t_i), \quad n \geq 4, \quad (6)$$

98 It is not yet clear what the mortality rate m for Covid-19 is. Based on the number of cases reported
99 by the World Health Organisation fatalities make about 6.5% of the total number of cases (WHO
100 2020). It is estimated that the actual number of people who have been infected is at least one
101 order of magnitude higher than the recorded number (e.g. Bendavid et al. 2020; Vardar 2020).
102 Therefore, a mortality rate of $m = 0.65\%$ is assumed here. The number of fatalities per day is:

$$\Delta F(t_n) = \frac{F(t_n) - F(t_{n-1})}{\Delta t} \quad (7)$$

103 *a. Experiments*

104 The goal of measures such as social distancing and lockdowns is to reduce R_0 in order to get R_e
105 below a value of 1 before the number of infected people requiring treatment becomes too large.
106 Figure 1 illustrates the evolution of $C(t_n)$ if no measures are taken. In this case R_e solely reduces
107 because the fraction of the population that has been infected increases. In this simple model it takes
108 about 120 days for 60% of the population to have been infected, which here will be used as the
109 threshold needed to reach herd immunity. From about day 80 onwards the effective reproduction
110 rate R_e starts to decrease, reaching values close to zero after about 120 days. After that time 60%
111 of the population (about 40 Mio people) would have been infected. With the assumed mortality
112 rate of 0.65% this would result in 250000 fatalities in a population of 66 million.

113 In a set of experiments the model is used to illustrate the sensitivity of the long and short-term
114 development of an epidemic to the timing of the initial measures (e.g. social distancing). Focus is
115 on the first and potential second wave of infections (experiments A1, A2, B1, B2) and on possible
116 long-term evolutions of the epidemic during the years following the first infection (C1, C2, D1,
117 D2). The details for the experiments are listed in table 1. All experiments have in common that
118 the first measures (reducing R_0 from 2.5 to 1.1) start either on day 75 (A1, B1, C1, D1) or 65
119 (A2, B2, C2, D2). "Lockdown" measures which reduce R_0 from 1.1 to 0.85 start on day 80 for
120 all experiments. The experiments (A, B, C, D) then differ on the timing and type of measures
121 following the lockdown on day 80. All experiments are summarised in table 1.

122 To illustrate that the model can simulate realistic evolutions of the first wave of the Covid-
123 19 epidemic the simulated number of fatalities is aligned with the numbers recorded in the UK
124 and Germany. Model and observations are temporally aligned from the time onward when UK,
125 German, and simulated total numbers of fatalities first reach or exceed 10. In the model this

126 threshold is reached after 60 days. Data for the UK and Germany are available from Worldometers
127 (2020).

128 **3. Results**

129 The results shown in Figures 2 and 3 highlight the influence of timing of the first measures on
130 the severity of the first wave of an epidemic. A difference of 10 days in the starting time of initial
131 measures which reduce R_0 from 2.5 to 1.1 (soft lockdown) is sufficient for the model to simulate
132 evolutions of the number of deaths and death rate during the first wave which are comparable to the
133 numbers recorded in the UK and Germany. If first measures are introduced on day 75 (experiments
134 A1, B1, C1, D1) the maximum daily fatalities reach a maximum of just over 1000 deaths a day
135 and by day 115 the cumulative fatalities exceed 30000. In contrast if first measures start on day 65
136 (experiments A2, B2, C2, D2) the model simulates a peak in daily fatalities of just under 250 and
137 a total number of fatalities of under 8000 - even though the lockdown starts on day 80 ($R_0 = 0.85$)
138 in all experiments.

139 Except for experiments B1 and B2 where a long lockdown allows the number of cases to fall to
140 zero, the lockdown measures are relaxed on day 115. In experiments A1 and A2 there is a further
141 relaxing of measures on day 165 which allows a second wave to develop. This second wave is
142 much more pronounced for experiment A2 ("German" case) than for experiment A1 ("UK" case).
143 The respective peaks for daily fatalities are about 750 and 300. By day 280 a similar number
144 of cumulative fatalities (≈ 60000) is reached in both cases. The reason for the difference in the
145 amplitude of the second wave is the effective transmission rate R_e . In A1 the simulated total
146 number of cases C is just under 6 million people by the end of the lockdown (i.e. just under 10%
147 of the total population). However, less than two million people (around 3% of the total population)
148 would have been infected by the end of the lockdown in A2. These numbers are in the same order

149 as studies suggest for St Clara County in California (Bendavid et al. 2020) or Spain (Vardar 2020).
150 This difference is significant when it comes to the effective transmission rate R_e : In neither of the
151 two cases do we get close to the 60% level needed for herd immunity, however, the partial herd
152 immunity is more pronounced in A1 than A2. When considering measures that aim at getting R_e
153 close to or ideally below a value of 1 having 3% or 9% of the population who went through the
154 infection can be enough to get an effective reproduction rate which is just over or just under the
155 critical threshold of 1. This can be clearly seen for experiments A1 and A2 (Figure 2): After the
156 lockdown ends on day 115, R_e is below 1 for experiment A1 until a further relaxation allows R_0
157 and R_e to increase to 1.7 and about 1.4 in A1 whereas R_e increases to about 1.6 in A2 leading
158 to a markedly stronger second wave. As mentioned in section 2 R_0 does change according to the
159 assumed stringency of measures.

160 Experiments B1 and B2 (Figure 2) illustrate the evolution for a prolonged lockdown where
161 $R_0 = 0.85$ until the number of daily cases ΔC decreases to zero. This point is reached after about
162 280 days in B1 and 340 days in B2. The numbers of fatalities plateau at about 37000 and 10000
163 cases for B1 and B2, respectively.

164 Experiments C1 and C2 show the possible evolution for repeated loosening and tightening of
165 the measures if daily fatalities $\Delta F < 50$ and $\Delta F > 75$. Rather than a second wave the evolution
166 is characterised by a number of "ripples" as measures are loosed or tightened. The number of
167 fatalities gradually increases in both C1 and C2 but the slope flattens as the value of R_e decreases.
168 This is more pronounced in C1: the stronger first wave leads to a larger difference between R_0 and
169 R_e . As mentioned earlier the reproduction rate R_0 can be regarded as a measure for how stringent
170 measures are: $R_0 = 2.5$ means that daily life is not restricted in any way (as shown in Figure 1
171 this comes at a high human cost) and $R_0 = 0$ means that there are no new infections. This is
172 only possible if every infected person is completely isolated and is unrealistic once the epidemic is

173 spreading through the population. Experiments D1 and D2 illustrate the case where R_0 is gradually
174 allowed to increase starting from $R_0 = 0.85$ during the lockdown to $R_0 = 2.5$. The rate of increase
175 in R_0 is determined by how large the tendency of R_e to fall is. The large first wave in D1 means R_0
176 can increase more quickly than in D2. In D1 $R_0 = 2.5$ after about 5 years whereas it takes about
177 13 years in D2. For both D1 and D2 the number of fatalities is about 160000.

178 **4. Discussion**

179 The cases shown in Figures 2 and 3 are very idealised. There is little doubt that if A2 ("German"
180 case - Figure 2) were to start developing in the real world, measures would be tightened again
181 before day 185 therefore avoiding the pronounced second wave. Given that F and ΔF are recorded,
182 authorities would be aware of this development and could act accordingly. Experiments B1 and
183 B2 have the lowest number of fatalities but they would require a long lockdown. With lockdowns
184 now being gradually eased this is not the path that most countries have chosen.

185 The scenarios C1 and C2 Figure 3 are more realistic as the extent of measures can adjust to
186 changes in the number of recorded infections and deaths. Here we can see that after the first
187 lockdown there are several phases where measures are tightened or loosened for short periods
188 resulting in "ripples" in the number of infections and fatalities but avoiding a strong second wave.
189 The thresholds of daily fatalities used to tighten or loosen measures are identical in C1 and C2.
190 However, the effective reproduction factor R_e is consistently lower in C1 than in C2. In order to
191 maintain the advantage of a clearly lower number of fatalities during the first wave the measures
192 in C2 would need to be slightly more stringent than in C1 i.e. R_0 would need to be consistently
193 lower. However, if one assumes that a vaccine (or an effective treatment) becomes available within
194 1 to 1.5 years C2 leads to a better outcome than C1. However, C1 would allow a daily life that is
195 closer to "normal" than C2. By specifically targeting "hotspots" where infections flare up again

196 it may be possible to consistently maintain an overall value of $R_e < 1$ without the need to tighten
197 measures everywhere (the latter is the underlying assumption in all experiments). This may lead
198 to evolutions of cases and fatalities which fall somewhere between experiments B1/2 and C1/2.

199 The scenarios illustrated in Figures 2 and 3 show that both the timing of the first measures as
200 well as the choices made once the first wave is ebbing are crucial. Early action is the most effective
201 way to reduce the amplitude of a first wave. Even delaying measures by a few days can result in
202 many more lives being lost in that first wave. During the Covid-19 pandemic some governments
203 chose not to act on initial warnings but only once it became obvious that the pandemic had taken
204 a firm foothold. Here, it is also important to acknowledge the difficulty in knowing how far into
205 a wave of infection a country actually is. Even in neighbouring countries the wave may be at an
206 earlier or later stage and taking identical measures at the same time may lead to very different
207 outcomes. If by the time the warnings come in the epidemic is more advanced than expected even
208 swift action will not be sufficient to avoid a major first wave. On the other hand if the development
209 of the wave lags expectations late action may still be sufficient to largely suppress the first wave.
210 The large uncertainty regarding the stage of an epidemic means that a good (or bad) outcome can
211 also be down to luck.

212 However, luck can no longer be a factor after the first wave. Assuming that the mortality rate
213 and level of health care are broadly similar in different countries a large number of deaths in
214 proportion to the total population is a strong indicator that a higher percentage of the population
215 has been infected than if the number of deaths is low. The results shown in Figures 2 and 3 suggest
216 that when gradually easing the lockdown, countries which had a mild first wave (e.g. Germany,
217 Austria, Norway, South Korea) may opt for a slightly slower unwinding of measures than countries
218 that experienced a major first wave. Experiencing a major first wave means that there is likely to
219 be a higher "partial herd immunity" and that an effective reproduction rate $R_e < 1$ can be achieved

220 with more relaxed measures than in countries where the partial herd immunity is lower. This effect
221 can already be significant even if less than 10% of the total population have been infected (e.g.
222 Figure 2). Current studies suggest that only 10% or less of the total number of infections have
223 been detected and that less than 10% of the population has been infected (Bendavid et al. 2020;
224 Vardar 2020).

225 At this point it is worth remembering that if one assumes a virus against which a vaccine is years
226 away it is likely that the majority of the population will eventually be infected. Furthermore, "herd
227 immunity" can only be achieved if people who had the infection develop long-term immunity.
228 Whether this is the case is still subject of ongoing research (e.g. Prompetchara et al. 2020; Shi
229 et al. 2020; Grifoni et al. 2020; Braun et al. 2020). The only time when eradication of a virus is
230 possible without a vaccine is at the very onset of the outbreak provided the outbreak is localised
231 and that infected people can be isolated until they are no longer infectious. However, the window
232 of opportunity for this is short and by the time health services and authorities become aware of
233 (or acknowledge) the situation it may already be too late. Since people with Covid-19 can be
234 infectious before showing any symptoms (or indeed without developing systems) (e.g. Cascella
235 et al. 2020; Tindale et al. 2020) and that much international travel carried on as normal in the early
236 stages of the pandemic, containment was always going to be difficult.

237 **5. Conclusions**

238 A simple model has been used to simulate different scenarios for the Covid-19 epidemic in a
239 population of the size of the UK. The findings suggest that:

- 240 • Timing of initial measures is key not just for the first wave of an epidemic but - in the ab-
241 sence of either a vaccine or effective treatment - also for the longer term evolutions for years
242 following the initial outbreak.

- 243 ● Shifting the implementation time of first measures by 10 days could explain differences in
244 the number of recorded fatalities during the Covid-19 pandemic in countries such as the UK
245 or Germany.
- 246 ● A large first wave means that easing of lockdown measures can occur faster than if the first
247 wave was small. The reason for this is a lower effective reproduction factor after a strong first
248 wave due to partial "herd immunity".
- 249 ● Relaxing measures too much after a small first wave risks cancelling out the advantage gained
250 by the timely initial response to the pandemic.
- 251 ● Whether initial measures can largely suppress a the first wave of an epidemic is a combination
252 of timely action and heeding advice as well as luck as at the time when first measures are
253 taken it is difficult to know how far into the epidemic a country/region/town has progressed.

254 *Acknowledgments.* Comments by Bablu Sinha are gratefully acknowledged. This research re-
255 ceived no specific grant from any funding agency, commercial or not-for-profit sectors. .

256 **References**

- 257 Bendavid, E., and Coauthors, 2020: COVID-19 Antibody Seroprevalence in Santa Clara County,
258 California. *MedRxiv*.
- 259 Braun, J., and Coauthors, 2020: Presence of sars-cov-2 reactive t cells in covid-19 patients and
260 healthy donors. *medRxiv*, doi:10.1101/2020.04.17.20061440, URL [https://www.medrxiv.org/](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/04/22/2020.04.17.20061440)
261 [https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/04/22/2020.04.17.20061440)
262 [04/22/2020.04.17.20061440.full.pdf](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/04/22/2020.04.17.20061440.full.pdf).
- 263 Cascella, M., M. Rajnik, A. Cuomo, S. C. Dulebohn, and R. Di Napoli, 2020: Features, evaluation
264 and treatment coronavirus (COVID-19). *Statpearls [internet]*, StatPearls Publishing.

- 265 Grifoni, A., and Coauthors, 2020: Targets of T cell responses to SARS-CoV-
266 2 coronavirus in humans with COVID-19 disease and unexposed individuals. *Cell*,
267 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2020.05.015>.
- 268 Kucharski, A. J., and Coauthors, 2020: Early dynamics of transmission and control of covid-19: a
269 mathematical modelling study. *The lancet infectious diseases*.
- 270 Liu, Y., A. A. Gayle, A. Wilder-Smith, and J. Rocklöv, 2020: The reproductive number of COVID-
271 19 is higher compared to SARS coronavirus. *Journal of travel medicine*.
- 272 Martini, M., V. Gazzaniga, N. L. Bragazzi, and I. Barberis, 2019: The Spanish Influenza Pandemic:
273 a lesson from history 100 years after 1918. *Journal of Preventive Medicine and Hygiene*, **60 (1)**,
274 E64.
- 275 Prem, K., and Coauthors, 2020: The effect of control strategies to reduce social mixing on out-
276 comes of the covid-19 epidemic in wuhan, china: a modelling study. *The Lancet Public Health*.
- 277 Prompetchara, E., C. Ketloy, and T. Palaga, 2020: Immune responses in COVID-19 and potential
278 vaccines: Lessons learned from SARS and MERS epidemic. *Asian Pac J Allergy Immunol*,
279 **38 (1)**, 1–9.
- 280 Reid, A. H., J. K. Taubenberger, and T. G. Fanning, 2001: The 1918 Spanish influenza: integrating
281 history and biology. *Microbes and infection*, **3 (1)**, 81–87.
- 282 Shi, Y., and Coauthors, 2020: Covid-19 infection: the perspectives on immune responses. Nature
283 Publishing Group.
- 284 Tindale, L., and Coauthors, 2020: Transmission interval estimates suggest pre-symptomatic spread
285 of COVID-19. *MedRxiv*.

- 286 Tsang, T. K., P. Wu, Y. Lin, E. H. Lau, G. M. Leung, and B. J. Cowling, 2020: Effect of changing
287 case definitions for covid-19 on the epidemic curve and transmission parameters in mainland
288 china: a modelling study. *The Lancet Public Health*.
- 289 Vardar, S., 2020: Estudio de seroprevalencia: sólo el 5% de los españoles tiene antic-
290 uerpos frente al coronavirus. URL [https://www.elmundo.es/ciencia-y-salud/salud/2020/05/13/](https://www.elmundo.es/ciencia-y-salud/salud/2020/05/13/5ebc25ae21efa09e608b45f5.html)
291 [5ebc25ae21efa09e608b45f5.html](https://www.elmundo.es/ciencia-y-salud/salud/2020/05/13/5ebc25ae21efa09e608b45f5.html), 13 May 2020, El Mundo.
- 292 WHO, 2020: WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard. URL <https://covid19.who.int>,
293 World Health Organisation.
- 294 Worldometers, 2020: Coronavirus. URL <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/country/>
295 [uk/https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/country/germany/](https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/country/germany/).
- 296 Wu, J. T., K. Leung, and G. M. Leung, 2020: Nowcasting and forecasting the potential domestic
297 and international spread of the 2019-ncov outbreak originating in wuhan, china: a modelling
298 study. *The Lancet*, **395 (10225)**, 689–697.

299 **LIST OF TABLES**

300 **Table 1.** Experiment overview. Measures start either on day 75 or 65 and lockdown
301 starts on day 80 in all cases. Lockdown is either relaxed on day 115 (A1, A2,
302 C1, C2, D1, D2 - $R_0 = 1.1$ or 1.05) or completely relaxed ($R_0 = 2.5$) if there
303 have been no new daily new cases for 50 days (B1, B2). Further relaxation
304 is either on day 165 (A1, A2); if daily fatalities $\Delta F < 50$ (C1, C2); or if the
305 effective reproduction rate $R_e < 1$ (D1, D2). Measures are tightened again
306 on day 185 (A1, A2 - $R_0 = 1.1$) or if the daily fatalities $\Delta F > 75$ (C1, C2 -
307 $R_0 = 1.05$). 17

Experiment	Start measures [day]	Lockdown [day]	Relax measures [day, ΔC]	Relax further [day, ΔF , R_e]	Tighten again [day, ΔF]
A1	75 ($R_0 = 1.1$)	80 ($R_0 = 0.85$)	115 ($R_0 = 1.1$)	165 ($R_0 = 1.7$)	185 ($R_0 = 1.1$)
A2	65 ($R_0 = 1.1$)	”	”	”	”
B1	75 ($R_0 = 1.1$)	”	If $\sum_{i=n-10}^n \Delta C(t_i) = 0$: $R_0 = 2.5$	—	—
B2	65 ($R_0 = 1.1$)	”	”	—	—
C1	75 ($R_0 = 1.1$)	”	115 ($R_0 = 1.05$)	If $\Delta F < 50$: $R_0 = 1.4$	If $\Delta F > 75$: $R_0 = 1.05$
C2	65 ($R_0 = 1.1$)	”	”	”	”
D1	75 ($R_0 = 1.1$)	”	”	If $R_e(t_n) < 1$: $R_0(t_{n+1}) = R_0(t_n) + (1 - R_e(t_n))$	—
D2	65 ($R_0 = 1.1$)	”	”	”	—


308 TABLE 1. Experiment overview. Measures start either on day 75 or 65 and lockdown starts on day 80 in
309 all cases. Lockdown is either relaxed on day 115 (A1, A2, C1, C2, D1, D2 - $R_0 = 1.1$ or 1.05) or completely
310 relaxed ($R_0 = 2.5$) if there have been no new daily new cases for 50 days (B1, B2). Further relaxation is either
311 on day 165 (A1, A2); if daily fatalities $\Delta F < 50$ (C1, C2); or if the effective reproduction rate $R_e < 1$ (D1,
312 D2). Measures are tightened again on day 185 (A1, A2 - $R_0 = 1.1$) or if the daily fatalities $\Delta F > 75$ (C1, C2 -
313 $R_0 = 1.05$).

314 **LIST OF FIGURES**


315 **Fig. 1.** Scenario for the Covid-19 epidemic in a population of the size of the UK (66 million) as-
316 suming no measures to stop the spread of the virus are taken. Shown are: cumulative (blue)
317 and daily (red) cases (top row), cumulative and daily fatalities (2nd and 3rd row) and the
318 reproduction factor R_0 (magenta) and "effective reproduction factor" R_e (bottom). 19

319 **Fig. 2.** As Figure 1 for experiments A1, A2, B1, B2 (see Table 1 for details). Vertical lines show
320 the timing when different measures were taken: **black dashed** - begin of measures (steps
321 in the values of R_0 (magenta) and R_e (blue)), **solid black** - Lockdown, **green dashed** - first
322 and second easing of lockdown, **solid green** - 2nd lockdown. For the first wave the model is
323 compared to the fatalities reported in the UK (**orange line**) and Germany (**green line**). 20


324 **Fig. 3.** As Figure 2 for experiments C1, C2, D1, D2 (see Table 1 for details). Vertical lines show
325 the timing when different measures were taken: **black dashed** - begin of measures (steps
326 in the values of R_0 (magenta) and R_e (blue)), **solid black** - Lockdown, **green dashed**. For
327 the first wave the model is compared to the fatalities reported in the UK (**orange line**) and
328 Germany (**green line**). 21



329 FIG. 1. Scenario for the Covid-19 epidemic in a population of the size of the UK (66 million) assuming no
330 measures to stop the spread of the virus are taken. Shown are: cumulative (blue) and daily (red) cases (top
331 row), cumulative and daily fatalities (2nd and 3rd row) and the reproduction factor R_0 (magenta) and "effective
332 reproduction factor" R_e (bottom).



333 FIG. 2. As Figure 1 for experiments A1, A2, B1, B2 (see Table 1 for details). Vertical lines show the timing
 334 when different measures were taken: **black dashed** - begin of measures (steps in the values of R_0 (magenta)
 335 and R_e (blue)), **solid black** - Lockdown, **green dashed** - first and second easing of lockdown, **solid green** -
 336 2nd lockdown. For the first wave the model is compared to the fatalities reported in the UK (**orange line**) and
 337 Germany (**green line**).



338 FIG. 3. As Figure 2 for experiments C1, C2, D1, D2 (see Table 1 for details). Vertical lines show the timing
 339 when different measures were taken: **black dashed** - begin of measures (steps in the values of R_0 (magenta) and
 340 R_e (blue)), **solid black** - Lockdown, **green dashed**. For the first wave the model is compared to the fatalities
 341 reported in the UK (**orange line**) and Germany (**green line**).