

1 Estimating the COVID-19 epidemic trajectory and 2 hospital capacity requirements in South West 3 England: a mathematical modelling framework

4 Ross D. Booton¹, Louis MacGregor^{2,3}, Lucy Vass^{1,2}, Katharine J. Looker^{2,3},
5 Catherine Hyams⁴, Philip D. Bright⁵, Irasha Harding⁶, Rajeka Lazarus⁷, Fergus
6 Hamilton⁸, Daniel Lawson⁹, Leon Danon¹⁰, Adrian Pratt¹¹, Richard Wood^{12,13}, Ellen
7 Brooks-Pollock^{1,2,3,†}, Katherine M.E. Turner^{1,2,3,13,†,*}

8
9 ¹*Bristol Veterinary School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK*

10 ²*Population Health Science Institute, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK*

11 ³*NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Behavioural Science and Evaluation*

12 ⁴*Academic Respiratory Unit, Southmead Hospital, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK*

13 ⁵*Immunology, Pathology Sciences, North Bristol NHS Trust, Bristol, UK*

14 ⁶*Consultant in Microbiology, University Hospitals Bristol, Bristol, UK*

15 ⁷*Consultant in Microbiology and Infectious Diseases, University Hospitals Bristol, Bristol, UK*

16 ⁸*Infection Science, Southmead Hospital, North Bristol NHS Trust, Bristol, UK*

17 ⁹*School of Mathematics, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK*

18 ¹⁰*College of Engineering, Mathematics and Physical Sciences, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK*

19 ¹¹*Principal BI Analyst Modelling and Analytics, NHS Bristol, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire CCG*

20 ¹²*Head of Modelling and Analytics, NHS Bristol, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire CCG*

21 ¹³*Health Data Research UK South-West of England Partnership*

22 [†]*should be considered joint senior author*

23 ^{*}*Correspondence: katy.turner@bristol.ac.uk*

24
25 **Word count:** 4014 (not including references, figures or tables)

26 **Keywords:** *Mathematical model, COVID-19, hospital capacity, R value, epidemic*

27 **NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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

28 **Abstract**

29 **Objectives:** To develop a regional model of COVID-19 dynamics, for use in estimating
30 the number of infections, deaths and required acute and intensive care (IC) beds using
31 the South West of England (SW) as an example case.

32 **Design:** Open-source age-structured variant of a susceptible-exposed-infectious-
33 recovered (SEIR) deterministic compartmental mathematical model. Latin hypercube
34 sampling and maximum likelihood estimation were used to calibrate to cumulative
35 cases and cumulative deaths.

36 **Setting:** SW at a time considered early in the pandemic, where National Health
37 Service (NHS) authorities required evidence to guide localised planning and support
38 decision-making.

39 **Participants:** Publicly-available data on COVID-19 patients.

40 **Primary and secondary outcome measures:** The expected numbers of infected
41 cases, deaths due to COVID-19 infection, patient occupancy of acute and IC beds and
42 the reproduction (“R”) number over time.

43 **Results:** SW model projections indicate that, as of the 11th May 2020 (when
44 ‘lockdown’ measures were eased), 5,793 (95% credible interval, CrI, 2,003 – 12,051)
45 individuals were still infectious (0.10% of the total SW England population, 95%CrI
46 0.04 – 0.22%), and a total of 189,048 (95%CrI 141,580 – 277,955) had been infected
47 with the virus (either asymptotically or symptomatically), but recovered, which is
48 3.4% (95%CrI 2.5 – 5.0%) of the SW population. The total number of patients in acute
49 and IC beds in the SW on the 11th May 2020 was predicted to be 701 (95%CrI 169 –
50 1,543) and 110 (95%CrI 8 – 464) respectively. The R value in SW England was
51 predicted to be 2.6 (95%CrI 2.0 – 3.2) prior to any interventions, with social distancing

52 reducing this to 2.3 (95%CrI 1.8 – 2.9) and lockdown/ school closures further reducing
53 the R value to 0.6 (95CrI% 0.5 – 0.7).

54 **Conclusions:** The developed model has proved a valuable asset for local and
55 regional healthcare services. The model will be used further in the SW as the
56 pandemic evolves, and – as open source software – is portable to healthcare systems
57 in other geographies.

58

59 **Future work/ applications:**

- 60 i. Open-source modelling tool available for wider use and re-use.
- 61 ii. Customisable to a number of granularities such as at the local, regional and
62 national level.
- 63 iii. Supports a more holistic understanding of intervention efficacy through
64 estimating unobservable quantities, e.g. asymptomatic population.
- 65 iv. While not presented here, future use of the model could evaluate the effect of
66 various interventions on transmission of COVID-19.
- 67 v. Further developments could consider the impact of bedded capacity in terms
68 of resulting excess deaths.

69

70

71 Introduction

72 Since the initial outbreak in 2019 in Hubei Province, China, COVID-19, the
73 disease caused by Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-
74 2), has gone on to cause a pandemic [1]. As of 11th May 2020, the Centre for Systems
75 Science and Engineering at Johns Hopkins University reports over 4,000,000
76 confirmed cases and 250,000 deaths globally [2]. National responses to the outbreak
77 have varied; from severe restrictions on human mobility alongside widespread testing
78 and contact tracing in China [3] to the comparatively relaxed response in Sweden,
79 where lockdown measures have not been enacted [4]. In the UK, advice to socially
80 distance if displaying symptoms was given on the 15th March, while school closures
81 and ‘lockdown’ measures were implemented from 23rd March onwards [5].

82 Mathematical modelling has been used to predict the course of the COVID-19
83 pandemic and to evaluate the effectiveness of proposed and enacted interventions [6–
84 11]. These models have been predominantly aimed at the national level and have
85 largely been based on epidemiological and biological data sourced from the initial
86 epidemic in Wuhan, China [12] and the first large outbreak in Lombardy, Italy [13].

87 In the UK, the epidemic escalated most rapidly in London [14] and the majority
88 of national modelling is seemingly driven by the trends in London, due to its large case
89 numbers and large population. One of the key issues facing NHS authorities is
90 planning for more localised capacity needs and estimating the timings of surges in
91 demand at a regional or healthcare system level. This is especially challenging given
92 the rapidly evolving epidemiological and biological data; the changes in COVID-19
93 testing availability (e.g. previously limited and changing eligibility requirements); the
94 uncertainty in the effectiveness of interventions in different contexts; significant and

95 uncertain time-lags between initial infection and hospitalisation or death; and different
96 regions being at different points in the epidemic curve [9]. South West England (SW)
97 is the region with the lowest number of total cases in England (as of 11th May 2020),
98 lagging behind the national data driven by the earlier epidemic in London [9,14].

99 COVID-19 results in a significant requirement for hospitalisation, and high
100 mortality amongst patients requiring admission to critical care (particularly amongst
101 those requiring ventilation) [15,16]. In the SW, the population is on average older than
102 in London [17] and is older than the UK as a whole (Table S1). Older age puts
103 individuals at elevated risk of requiring hospital care [18–20]. Consequently, we might
104 expect higher mortality and greater demand for beds in the SW than estimations output
105 from national models that may lack such granularity or risk sensitivity.

106 However, the SW's first case occurred around 2 weeks later than the first UK
107 case [14]; perhaps implying that the local SW epidemic may be more effectively
108 controlled due to a lower number of baseline cases (than the national average) at the
109 time national interventions were implemented, as well as reduced transmission due to
110 rurality. This sub-national analysis can support in mapping the local epidemic, planning
111 local hospital capacity outside of the main urban centres, and ensuring effective
112 mobilisation of additional support and resources if required. Should demand be lower
113 than expected, reliable forecasts could facilitate more effective use of available
114 resources through re-introducing elective treatments (that had initially been
115 postponed) and responding to other, non-COVID-19 sources of emergency demand.

116 In this study, taking into account the timeline of UK-wide non-pharmaceutical
117 interventions (social distancing, school closures/lockdown) we illustrate use of our
118 model in projecting estimates for the expected distributions of cases, deaths,

119 asymptomatic and symptomatic infections, and demand for acute and intensive care
120 (IC) beds. We present the model trajectories for SW England using publicly-available
121 data.

122

123 **Methods**

124 We developed a deterministic, ordinary differential equation model of the
125 transmission dynamics of COVID-19, including age-structured contact patterns, age
126 specific disease progression and demand for hospitalisation, both to acute and IC. We
127 then parameterised the model using available literature and calibrated the model to
128 data from the SW. The model is readily adapted to fit data at sub-regional (e.g. Clinical
129 Commissioning Group), regional or national level. Key assumptions of the model are
130 summarised in the supplementary information.

131 The model was developed in R and all code and links to source data are freely
132 available (github.com/rdbooton/bricovmod). The model is coded using package
133 *deSolve*, with contact matrices from package *socialmixr*, and sampling from package
134 *lhs*.

135 **Model structure**

136 The stages of COVID-19 included within this model are *S*-susceptible, *E*-exposed (not
137 currently infectious, but have been exposed to the virus), *A*- asymptomatic infection
138 (will never develop symptoms), *I*-symptomatic infection (consisting of pre-
139 symptomatic or mild to moderate symptoms), *H*-severe symptoms requiring
140 hospitalisation but not IC, *C*-very severe symptoms requiring IC, *R*-recovered and *D*-
141 death. The total population is $N = S + E + A + I + H + C + R + D$ (Figure 1).

142 Each compartment X_g is stratified by age-group (0-4, 5-17, 18-29, 30-39, 40-
143 49, 50-59, 60-69, ≥ 70) where X denotes the stage of COVID-19 (S,E,I,A,H,C,R,D) and
144 g denotes the age group class of individuals. Age groups were chosen to capture key
145 social contact patterns (primary, secondary and tertiary education and employment)
146 and variability in hospitalisation rates and outcomes from COVID-19 especially in older
147 age groups. The total in each age group is informed by recent Office for National
148 Statistics (ONS) estimates [21].

149 Susceptible individuals become exposed to the virus at a rate governed by the
150 force of infection λ_g , and individuals are non-infectious in the exposed category. A
151 proportion δ move from exposed to symptomatic infection and the remaining to
152 asymptomatic infection, both at the latent rate η . Individuals leave both the
153 asymptomatic and symptomatic compartments at rate μ . All asymptomatic individuals
154 eventually recover and there are no further stages of disease: the rate of leaving the
155 asymptomatic compartment is therefore equivalent to the infectious period, μ . A
156 proportion of symptomatic individuals γ_g go on to develop severe symptoms which
157 require hospitalisation, but not intensive care. Once requiring hospitalisation, we
158 assume individuals are no longer infectious to the general population due to self-
159 isolation guidelines restricting further mixing with anyone aside from household
160 members (if unable to be admitted to hospital) or frontline NHS staff (if admitted to
161 hospital). Individuals move out of the acute hospitalised compartment at rate ρ , either
162 through death, being moved to intensive care at rate ϵ , or through recovery (all
163 remaining individuals). A proportion ω_g of patients requiring IC will die at rate ψ , while
164 the rest will recover.

165 The model (schematic in Figure 1) is therefore described by the following differential
166 equations:

$$\text{Susceptible } S_g \quad \frac{dS_g}{dt} = -\lambda_g S_g \quad (1a)$$

$$\text{Exposed } E_g \quad \frac{dE_g}{dt} = \lambda_g S_g - \eta E_g \quad (1b)$$

$$\text{Asymptomatic } A_g \quad \frac{dA_g}{dt} = \eta(1 - \delta)E_g - \mu A_g \quad (1c)$$


$$\text{Infectious } I_g \quad \frac{dI_g}{dt} = \eta\delta E_g - \mu I_g \quad (1d)$$

$$\text{Hospitalised in acute} \\ \text{bed } H_g \quad \frac{dH_g}{dt} = \mu\gamma_g I_g - \rho H_g \quad (1e)$$

$$\text{Hospitalised in IC } C_g \quad \frac{dC_g}{dt} = \rho\epsilon H_g - \psi C_g \quad (1f)$$

$$\text{Recovered } R_g \quad \frac{dR_g}{dt} = \mu A_g + \mu(1 - \gamma_g)I_g + \\ (1 - \epsilon)(1 - \kappa)\rho H_g + (1 - \omega_g)\psi C_g \quad (1g)$$

$$\text{Death } D_g \quad \frac{dD_g}{dt} = (1 - \epsilon)\kappa\rho H_g + \omega_g\psi C_g \quad (1h)$$



167

168 **Figure 1:** Compartmental flow model diagram depicting stages of disease and transitions between
 169 states. Asymptomatic infection represents the number of people never showing symptoms, while
 170 symptomatic infection includes all those who show pre-symptomatic / mild symptoms to those who show
 171 more severe symptoms (pre-hospitalisation). Those who are hospitalised first occupy a non-IC bed
 172 (acute bed) after which they can either move into IC, recover or die. Those in IC can either recover or
 173 die at an increased rate compared to those in acute beds. This model does not capture those deaths
 174 which occur outside of hospital as a result of COVID-19.

175 **Contact patterns under national interventions**

176 We assume the population is stratified into pre-defined age groups with age-
177 specific mixing pattern represented by a contact matrix M with an element of m_{ij}
178 representing the contacts between someone of age group $i \in G$ with someone in age
179 group $j \in G$. The baseline contact matrix (with no interventions in place) is taken from
180 the POLYMOD survey conducted in the United Kingdom [22]. The contact pattern may
181 also be influenced by a range of interventions (social distancing was encouraged on
182 15th March 2020, schools were closed and lockdown occurred on 23rd March 2020).
183 We implement these interventions by assuming that the percentage of 0-18-year olds
184 attending school after the 23rd March 2020 was 5% (reducing all contacts between
185 school age individuals by 95%) and that social distancing reduced all contacts by 0-
186 50%. We take the element-wise minimum for each age group's contact with another
187 age group from all active interventions (distancing, schools/lockdown). A study on
188 post-lockdown contact patterns (CoMix [11]) is used to inform contacts after lockdown
189 (first survey 24th March 2020, with an average of 73% reduction in daily contacts
190 observed per person compared to POLYMOD).

191 Moving between contact matrices of multiple interventions was implemented by
192 assuming a phased, linear decrease. After lockdown we vary a parameter (*endphase*)
193 to capture the time taken to fully adjust (across the population, on average) to the new
194 measures (allowed to vary from 1 to 31 days). This assumption represents the time
195 taken for individuals to fully adapt to new measures (and household transmission),
196 and is in line with data on the delay in the control of COVID-19 (reductions in hospital
197 admissions and deaths after lockdown) [23]. The parameter *endphase* can be

198 interpreted as accounting for the time taken to adjust to all interventions (and not just
199 lockdown).

200

201 **The force of infection**

202 The age-specific force of infection λ_g , depends on the proportion of the population who
203 are infectious (asymptomatic A_g and symptomatic I_g only) and probability of
204 transmission β :

$$205 \quad \lambda_g = \beta \sum_{i \in G} m_{ig} \left(\frac{A_i}{N_g} + \frac{I_i}{N_g} \right) \quad (2)$$

206 **The basic reproduction number R_0**

207 The basic reproduction number R_0 of COVID-19 is estimated to be 2.79 ± 1.16 [24].
208 We include this estimate within our model by calculating the maximum eigenvalue of
209 the contact matrix \mathbf{M} , and allowing the transmission parameter to vary such that R_0 is
210 equal to the maximum eigenvalue of \mathbf{M} multiplied by the infectious period μ and the
211 transmission parameter β . This gives the value for the initial basic reproduction
212 number R_0 , which changes as the contact patterns change as lockdown and other
213 interventions are implemented.

214

215 **Parameter estimates and data sources**

216 Model parameters are detailed in Table 1. We used available published literature to
217 inform parameter estimates. We used the following publicly-available metrics for
218 model fitting: regional cumulative cases in SW England (tested and confirmed case in
219 hospital), and deaths (daily/cumulative counts) from the Public Health England
220 COVID-19 dashboard [14], and ONS weekly provisional data on COVID-19 related

221 deaths [25]. The case data is finalised prior to the previous five days, so we include all
222 data until 14th May 2020, based on data reported until 18th May 2020. The mortality
223 data from ONS does not explicitly state the number of COVID-19 related deaths
224 occurring in hospital, but they do report this value nationally (83.9% of COVID-19
225 deaths in hospital, as of 17th April 2020). We assume that this percentage applies to
226 the SW data and re-scale the mortality to 83.9% to represent an estimate of total
227 deaths in hospital.

228

229 **Model calibration**

230 Using the available data (Table 1), we define ranges for all parameters in our model
231 and sample all parameters simultaneously between these minimum and maximum
232 values assuming uniform distributions using Latin Hypercube Sampling (statistical
233 method for generating random parameters from multidimensional distribution), for a
234 total of 100,000 simulations. We used maximum likelihood estimation on total
235 cumulative cases and cumulative deaths with a Poisson negative log likelihood
236 calculated and summed over all observed and predicted points. For i observed cases
237 X_i (from data), and i predicted cases Y_i (from simulations of the model), we select the
238 best 100 parameter sets which maximise the log-likelihood $\sum X_i \log(Y_i) - Y_i$ from the
239 total sample of 100,000 simulations. The best 100 samples were taken as part of a
240 bias-variance trade-off (Supplementary Information, Sensitivity analysis), and the
241 qualitative inferences would not change with other choices of sample size. For each
242 data point (taken from cases and deaths) we calculate this log-likelihood, and weight
243 each according to the square-root of the mean of the respective case or death data.

244 This ensures that we are considering case and death data equally within our likelihood
 245 calculations.

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Uniform prior (min and max) or point estimate</i>
$1/\eta$	Duration of the non-infectious exposure period	5.1 days [26]
δ	Percentage of infections which become symptomatic	82.1% [27]; Vary between 73.15 – 91.05%
$1/\mu$	Duration of symptoms whilst not hospitalised (independent of outcome)	Vary between 2 – 14 days
$1/\rho$	Duration of stay in acute bed (independent of outcome)	Vary between 2 – 14 days
γ_g	Percentage of symptomatic cases which will require hospitalisation	0-4 = 0.00%, 5-17 = 0.0408%, 18-29 = 1.04%, 30-39 = 2.04-7.00%, 40-49 = 2.53-8.68%, 50-59 = 4.86-16.7%, 60-69 = 7.01-24.0%, 70+ = 9.87-37.6% [16]
$1/\psi$	Duration of stay in IC bed (independent of outcome)	3 – 11 days [28]
ϵ	Percentage of those requiring hospitalisation who will require IC	Vary between 0 – 30%
ω_g	Percentage of those requiring IC who will die	0-4 = 0.00%, 5-17 = 0.00%, 18-29 = 18.1%, 30-39 = 18.1%, 40-49 = 24.7%, 50-59 = 39.3%, 60-69 = 53.9%, 70+ = 65.3% [28]
κ	Percentage of those requiring acute beds (but not IC) who will die	Vary between 5 – 35%
<i>school</i>	Percentage of 0-18-year olds attending school after 23/03/2020	Assume 5%
<i>distancing</i>	Percentage reduction in contact rates due to social distancing after 15/03/2020	Vary between 0 – 50%
<i>lockdown</i>	Percentage reduction in contact rates due to lockdown after 23/03/2020	Retail/recreation: Bristol 86% Bath 90% Plymouth 85% Gloucs 84%, Somerset 82%, Devon 85%, Dorset 84% [29] Transit stations: Bristol 78% Bath 71% Plymouth 65% Gloucs 69%, Somerset 67%, Devon 66%, Dorset 63% [29] Vary between 63 - 90%
R_0	Initial reproductive number of COVID-19	1.63 – 3.95 [24]

246 **Table 1:** Parameter estimates used in the model and their sources. The distributions of unknown
 247 parameters are shown in Figure S1 for the best 100 fits.

248 **Model outputs**

249 For each of the 100 best parameter sets we run the model until 11th May 2020 and
250 output the cumulative cases and deaths in the SW. We output the predicted proportion
251 of the population who are infectious and who have ever been infected over time.
252 Finally, we estimate the daily and cumulative patterns of admission to and discharge
253 from hospital (intensive care and acute) and cumulative mortality from COVID-19.

254

255 **Results and outputs**

256 From 100,000 simulated parameter sets, we selected the best 100 baseline model fits
257 on the basis of agreement to the calibration data on daily confirmed COVID-19 cases
258 and weekly mortality due to COVID-19 in SW England. The distribution of the best
259 fitting values are shown in Figure S1a (and the priors in Figure S1b). All results are
260 shown with median and 95% credible intervals (95%CrI).

261


262 On 11th May 2020, the reported cumulative number of individuals with (lab confirmed)
263 COVID-19 was 7,116 in SW England [14], and the most recent report on total
264 cumulative deaths showed that 2,306 had died from COVID-19 (as of 8th May 2020)
265 [25].

266

267 **Estimating the total proportion of individuals in South West England** 268 **with COVID-19**

269 Figure 2 shows the projected numbers of exposed, recovered and infectious
270 (asymptomatic and symptomatic infections) until lockdown measures were lessened
271 on the 11th May 2020. On this date, the model predicts that a total of 5,793 (95%CrI


272 2,003 – 12,051) were infectious (0.10% of the total SW England population, 95%CrI
273 0.04 – 0.22%). The model also predicts that a total of 189,048 (95%CrI 141,580 –
274 277,955) have had the virus but recovered (either asymptotically or
275 symptomatically), which is 3.4% (95%CrI 2.5 – 5.0%) of the SW population (not
276 infectious and not susceptible to reinfection).



277
278 **Figure 2:** The predicted median size of the exposed (E), infectious (I) and recovered classes (R), along
279 with the size of asymptomatic and symptomatic individuals on each day in SW England until 11th May
280 2020. Blue and red vertical lines represent the date the government introduced social distancing and
281 school closures/lockdown, respectively.

282 Estimating the total COVID-19 hospitalised patients in acute and 283 intensive care beds

284 The total number of patients in acute (non-intensive care) hospital beds across SW
285 England was projected to be 701 (95%CrI 169 – 1,543) and the total number of
286 patients in intensive care hospital beds was projected to be 110 (95%CrI 8 – 464) on
287 the 11th May 2020 (Figure 3). Note that these ranges are quite large due to the
288 uncertainty in the data and as more data becomes available these predictions will
289 change.




290
291 **Figure 3:** The predicted number of hospitalised patients in acute and intensive care beds in the SW
292 until 11th May 2020. The number of daily incoming patients diagnosed with COVID-19 are shown in
293 orange (from SW daily case data [14]), 95% credible intervals are shown in light grey, 50% in dark grey
294 and the median value of the fits is highlighted in black. The shaded region indicates the prediction of
295 the model from the data. Blue and red vertical lines represent the date the government introduced social
296 distancing, and school closures/lockdown, respectively.

297

298 Estimating the reproduction number under interventions

299 Figure 4 shows the model prediction for the reproduction (“R”) number over time until
300 11th May 2020, when lockdown measures were relaxed. All interventions (social
301 distancing, school closures/lockdown) had a significant impact on the reproductive
302 number for COVID-19 in the South West of England. We predict that prior to any
303 interventions R was 2.6 (95%CrI 2.0 – 3.2), and the introduction of social distancing
304 reduced this number to 2.3 (95%CrI 1.8 – 2.9). At the minimum, R was 0.6 (95%CrI
305 0.5 – 0.7) after all prior interventions were enacted and adhered to (social distancing,
306 school closures and lockdown).



307

308 **Figure 4:** The effect of interventions on estimates of R (y-axis) over time until the 11th May 2020.

309

310 **Discussion**

311 We have developed a deterministic ordinary differential equation model of the
312 epidemic trajectory of COVID-19 focussing on acute and IC hospital bed capacity
313 planning to support local NHS authorities, calibrating to SW-specific data. The model
314 is age-structured and includes time-specific implementation of current interventions
315 (following advice and enforcement of social distancing, school closures and lockdown)
316 to predict the potential range of COVID-19 epidemic trajectories.

317 Using the publicly-available data on cases and deaths, combined with the early
318 estimates of parameters from early epidemics in other settings, we predict that on the
319 11th May 2020 a total of 5,793 (95%CrI 2,003 – 12,051) were infectious, which equates
320 to 0.10% (95%CrI 0.04 – 0.22%) of the total SW population. In addition, we find that
321 the model predicts a total of 189,048 (95%CrI 141,580 – 277,955) have had the virus
322 but recovered, which is 3.4% (95%CrI 2.5 – 5.0%) of the SW population.

323 We also estimate that the total number of patients in acute hospital beds in SW
324 England on 11th May 2020 was 701 (95%CrI 169 – 1,543) and in IC were 110 (95%CrI
325 8 – 464), while the R number has decreased from 2.6 (95%CrI 2.0 – 3.2) to 0.6
326 (95%CrI 0.5 – 0.7) after all interventions were enacted and fully adhered to.

327 The fits generally agree well with both the daily case data, and the cumulative
328 count of deaths in the SW, although the model overestimates the case data at early
329 stages, and underestimates later on (which can see seen in Figure S2a, and a scatter
330 plot of expected versus observed outputs in Figure S2b). This could be because we
331 are using formal fitting methods, or from the under-reporting of cases in the early
332 epidemic.

333 The primary strength of this study is that we have developed generalisable and
334 efficient modelling code incorporating disease transmission, interventions and hospital
335 bed demand which can be adapted for use in other regional or national scenarios, with
336 the model available on GitHub for open review and use
337 (github.com/rdbooton/bricovmod). We have worked closely with the NHS and at
338 Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) level to ensure the model captures key clinical
339 features of disease management in SW hospitals and provides output data in a format
340 relevant to support local planning. We combined local clinical expertise with detailed
341 literature searches, to ensure reasonable parameter ranges and assumptions in the
342 presence of high levels of parameter uncertainty.

343 The main challenge of this work is in balancing the urgent need locally for
344 prediction tools which are up to date (i.e. not relying on the national trends to inform
345 capacity planning), versus more exhaustive and robust methods for model
346 comparison. The latter of which uses existing models and more time-consuming (but
347 more robust) data fitting methods [30,31]. However, we believe that release of this
348 paper and sharing of model code will facilitate multidisciplinary collaboration, rapid
349 review and support future model comparison and uncertainty analyses [31].

350 As with all models of new infections there are significant parameter
351 uncertainties. Rapidly emerging literature is exploring a wide range of biological and
352 epidemiological factors concerning COVID-19, but due to the worldwide nature of
353 these studies, often parameter bands are wide and may be context specific. For
354 example, early estimates of the basic reproduction number ranged from 1.6 to 3.8 in
355 different locations [32,33], with an early estimate of 2.4 used in UK model projections
356 [8]. In addition, the information which informs our parameter selection is rapidly

357 evolving as new data is made available, sometimes on a daily basis. From our initial
358 analysis, we identified the following parameters as critical in determining the epidemic
359 trajectory within our model – the percentage of infections which become symptomatic,
360 the recovery time for cases which do not require hospital, the period between acute
361 and IC occupancy, the length of stay in IC, the probability of transmission per contact
362 and the gradual implementation of lockdown rather than immediate effect. Other
363 parameters (such as the percentage reduction in school-age contacts from school
364 closures) did not seem to influence the dynamic trajectory as strongly – and thus we
365 assume point estimates for these parameters. However, for example assuming that
366 95% of school-age contacts are reduced as a direct result of school closures is
367 perhaps an overestimate, and future modelling work should address these
368 uncertainties and their impacts on the epidemic trajectory of COVID-19 (but in this
369 case, this value was somewhat arbitrary, and the assumption was used in the absence
370 of school-age contact survey data). More research is urgently needed to refine these
371 parameter ranges and to validate these biological parameters experimentally.

372 We have also assumed that there is no nosocomial transmission of infection
373 between hospitalised cases and healthcare workers, as we do not have good data for
374 within-hospital transmission. However frontline healthcare staff were likely to have
375 been infected early on in the epidemic [34], which could have implications for our
376 predicted epidemic trajectory. Our model also assumes a closed system, which may
377 not strictly be true due to continuing essential travel. But given that up until 11th May,
378 travel restrictions are very severe due to lockdown measures [5], any remaining inter-
379 regional travel is likely to have minimal effects on our model outputs.

380 Similar to most other COVID-19 models, we use a variant on a susceptible-
381 exposed-infectious-recovered (SEIR) structure [8–10,16,30,35,36]. We do not
382 spatially structure the population as in other UK modelling [9,10], but we do include
383 age-specific mixing based on POLYMOD data [22], and the post-lockdown CoMix
384 study [11]. We also explicitly measure the total asymptomatic infection, and the total
385 in each of the clinically relevant hospital classes (acute or IC), which is a strength of
386 our approach. Future models could also take into account local bed capacity within
387 hospitals (including Nightingale centres) and accommodate the effect of demand
388 outstripping supply leading to excess deaths, inclusive of non-hospital-based death
389 such as is occurring within care homes. As with all modelling, we have not taken into
390 account all possible sources of modelling misspecification. Some of these
391 misspecifications will tend to increase the predicted epidemic period, and others will
392 decrease it. One factor that could significantly change our predicted epidemic period
393 is the underlying structure within the population leading to heterogeneity in the average
394 number of contacts under lockdown e.g. key workers have high levels of contact but
395 others are able to minimise contacts effectively, this might lead to an underestimate of
396 ongoing transmission, but potentially an overestimate of the effect of releasing
397 lockdown. We also know that there are important socio-economic considerations in
398 determining people’s ability to stay at home and particularly to work from home [37].

399 Early UK modelling predicted the infection peak to be reached roughly 3 weeks
400 from the initiation of severe lockdown measures, as taken by the UK government in
401 mid-March [8]. A more recent study factoring spatial distribution of the population
402 indicated the peak to follow in early April due to R_0 reducing to below 1 in many settings
403 in weeks following lockdown [9]. Other modelling indicated that deaths in the UK would

404 peak in mid-late April; furthermore, that the UK would not have enough acute and IC
405 beds to meet demand [38]. While modelling from the European Centre for Disease
406 Prevention and Control estimated peak cases to occur in most European countries in
407 mid-April [20], these estimations were largely at a national level. Due to the expected
408 lag of other regions behind London, these estimated peaks are likely to be shifted
409 further into the future for the separate regions of the UK, and as shown by our model
410 occurred in early- to mid-April. This is also likely to be true for future peaks which may
411 result from relaxing lockdown.

412 Outside of the UK, similar modelling from France [35] (which went into lockdown
413 at a similar time the UK on 17th March), predicted the peak in daily IC admissions at
414 the end of March. Interestingly however, when dissected by region, the peak in IC bed
415 demand varied by roughly 2 weeks. Swiss modelling similarly predicted a peak in
416 hospitalisation and numbers of patients needing IC beds in early April, after lockdown
417 implementation commenced on 17th March [36]. US modelling [39] disaggregated by
418 State, also highlights the peak of excess bed demand varies geographically, with this
419 peak ranging between the 2nd week of April, through to May dependent on the State
420 under consideration. The modelling based in France also cautioned that due to only
421 5.7% of the population having been infected by 11th May when the restrictions would
422 be eased, the population would be vulnerable to a second epidemic peak thereafter
423 [35].

424 The ONS in England estimated that an average of 0.25% of the population had
425 COVID-19 between the 4th and 17th May 2020 (95% confidence interval: 0.16 – 0.38%)
426 [40], which is greater than the 0.10% (95%CrI 0.04 – 0.22%) we found with our model
427 (on 11th May 2020), but with some overlap. In addition, the ONS estimated that 6.78%

428 (95%CrI 5.21 – 8.64%) tested positive for antibodies to COVID-19 up to 24th May 2020
429 in England [41], and Public Health England estimated that approximately 4% (2 – 6%)
430 tested positive for antibodies to COVID-19 between the 20th and 26th April 2020 in
431 the SW [42]. Comparing to our model, 3.4% (95%CrI 2.5 – 5.0%) had recovered on
432 the 11th May 2020 (2 weeks later), demonstrating that our model estimates may be
433 within sensible bounds, and further highlighting the need for more regional estimates
434 of crucial epidemiological parameters and seroprevalence. We have assumed that
435 individuals are not susceptible to reinfection within the model timeframe, however in
436 future work it will be important to explore this assumption. It is not known what the long
437 term pattern of immunity to COVID-19 will be [43], and this will be key to understanding
438 the future epidemiology in the absence of a vaccine or effective treatment options.

439 With this in mind, our findings demonstrate that there are still significant data
440 gaps – and in the absence of such data, mathematical models can provide a valuable
441 asset for local and regional healthcare services. This regional model will be used
442 further in the SW as the pandemic evolves and could be used within other healthcare
443 systems in other geographies to support localised predictions. Controlling intervention
444 measures at a more local level could be made possible through monitoring and
445 assessment at the regional level through a combination of clinical expertise and local
446 policy, guided by localised predictive forecasting as presented in this study.

447

448 **Funding statement**

449 This work was funded with support from the Elizabeth Blackwell Institute, Bristol
450 UNCOVER (Bristol COVID Emergency Research) and Medical Research Council

451 UK. LM, KJL, EBP and KMET acknowledge support from the NIHR Health Protection
452 Research Unit in Behavioural Science and Evaluation at the University of Bristol.
453 This work was also supported by Health Data Research UK, which is funded by the
454 UK Medical Research Council, Engineering and Physical Sciences Research
455 Council, Economic and Social Research Council, National Institute for Health
456 Research, Chief Scientist Office of the Scottish Government Health and Social Care
457 Directorates, Health and Social Care Research and Development Division (Welsh
458 Government), Public Health Agency (South Western Ireland), British Heart
459 Foundation and Wellcome.

460

461 **Competing interests statement**

462 We declare no competing interests.

463

464 **Author contributions**

465 Conception and design of the study: LD, EBP. Acquisition of data: RDB, EBP, RW,
466 KMET. Mathematical modelling: RDB, LM, LD, EBP, RW, KMET. Coding and
467 simulations: RDB. Analysis and interpretation of results: RDB, LM, LV, KJL, CH, PB,
468 IH, RL, FH, DL, LD, AP, EBP, RW, KMET. Writing and drafting of the manuscript:
469 RDB, LM, LV, KJL, CH, PB, IH, RL, FH, DL, LD, AP, EBP, RW, KMET. Approval of
470 the submitted manuscript: RDB, LM, LV, KJL, CH, PB, IH, RL, FH, DL, LD, AP, EBP,
471 RW, KMET.

472

473 **Data sharing statement**

474 All model code is open source and available for download on GitHub
475 <https://github.com/rdbooton/bricovmod>. All data is freely available via the GOV.UK
476 COVID-19 dashboard [14] and ONS [21,25].

477

478

479

480

481 **References**

- 482 1. World Health Organization. WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the
483 mission briefing on COVID-19. 2020 [cited 27 Apr 2020]. Available:
484 <https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020>
485
- 486 2. Johns Hopkins University. COVID-19 Data Center. COVID-19 Case Tracker.
487 [cited 27 Apr 2020]. Available: <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/>
- 488 3. Payne C. State intervention in China. *Nat Hum Behav.* 2020;1.
- 489 4. Public Health Agency of Sweden. Public Health Authority regulations and
490 general advice on everyone's responsibility to prevent the infection of COVID-
491 19. 2020 [cited 7 Apr 2020]. Available:
492 <https://www.folkhalsomyndigheten.se/publicerat-material/publikationsarkiv/h/hslf-fs-202012/>
493
- 494 5. Public Health England. Guidance on social distancing for everyone in the UK.
495 In: *Guidance on social distancing for everyone in the UK* [Internet]. 2020 [cited
496 27 Apr 2020]. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-guidance-on-social-distancing-and-for-vulnerable-people/guidance-on-social->
497

498 distancing-for-everyone-in-the-uk-and-protecting-older-people-and-vulnerable-
499 adults

500 6. Prem K, Liu Y, Russell TW, Kucharski AJ, Eggo RM, Davies N, et al. The
501 effect of control strategies to reduce social mixing on outcomes of the COVID-
502 19 epidemic in Wuhan, China: a modelling study. *Lancet Public Heal.* 2020.

503 7. Flaxman S, Mishra S, Gandy A, Unwin JT, Coupland H, Mellan TA, et al.
504 Estimating the number of infections and the impact of non-pharmaceutical
505 interventions on COVID-19 in 11 European countries. *Imp Coll London*
506 *COVID-19 Report No 13.* 2020.

507 8. Ferguson NM, Laydon D, Gemma Nedjati-Gilani, Natsuko Imai, Kylie Ainslie
508 MB, Sangeeta Bhatia, Adhiratha Boonyasiri, Zulma Cucunubá, Gina Cuomo-
509 Dannenburg, Amy Dighe I, Dorigatti, Han Fu, Katy Gaythorpe, Will Green,
510 Arran Hamlet, Wes Hinsley, Lucy C Okell S van, Elstrand, Hayley Thompson,
511 Robert Verity, Erik Volz, Haowei Wang, Yuanrong Wang PGW, et al. Impact of
512 non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID19 mortality and
513 healthcare demand. *Imp Coll London COVID-19 Report No 9.* 2020.

514 9. Challen R, Tsaneva-Atanasova K, Pitt M. Estimates of regional infectivity of
515 COVID-19 in the United Kingdom following imposition of social distancing
516 measures. *medRxiv.* 2020.

517 10. Danon L, Brooks-Pollock E, Bailey M, Keeling MJ. A spatial model of CoVID-
518 19 transmission in England and Wales: early spread and peak timing.
519 *medRxiv.* 2020.

520 11. Jarvis CI, Zandvoort K Van, Gimma A, Prem K, Group CC-19 working, Klepac
521 P, et al. Quantifying the impact of physical distance measures on the

- 522 transmission of COVID-19 in the UK. medRxiv. 2020.
- 523 12. The Novel Coronavirus Pneumonia Emergency Response Epidemiology
524 Team. The epidemiological characteristics of an outbreak of 2019 novel
525 coronavirus diseases (COVID-19) — China, 2020. Chin J Epidemiol. 2020;41.
- 526 13. Onder G, Rezza G, Brusaferro S. Case-fatality rate and characteristics of
527 patients dying in relation to COVID-19 in Italy. JAMA - Journal of the American
528 Medical Association. 2020.
- 529 14. Public Health England. Coronavirus (COVID-19) in the UK: data dashboard.
530 2020 [cited 28 Apr 2020]. Available: <https://coronavirus.data.gov.uk/#>
- 531 15. Yang X, Yu Y, Xu J, Shu H, Xia J, Liu H, et al. Clinical course and outcomes of
532 critically ill patients with SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a single-
533 centered, retrospective, observational study. Lancet Respir Med. 2020.
- 534 16. Verity R, Okell LC, Dorigatti I, Winskill P, Whittaker C, Imai N, et al. Estimates
535 of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019 : a model-based analysis. Lancet
536 Infect Dis. 2020.
- 537 17. McCurdy C. Ageing, fast and slow: when place and demography collide.
538 Resolut Found. 2019. Available:
539 [https://www.resolutionfoundation.org/app/uploads/2019/10/Ageing-fast-and-](https://www.resolutionfoundation.org/app/uploads/2019/10/Ageing-fast-and-slowpdf)
540 [slowpdf](https://www.resolutionfoundation.org/app/uploads/2019/10/Ageing-fast-and-slowpdf)
- 541 18. Yang J, Zheng Y, Gou X, Pu K, Chen Z, Guo Q, et al. Prevalence of
542 comorbidities in the novel Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19) infection: a
543 systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J Infect Dis. 2020.
- 544 19. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, Fan G, Liu Y, Liu Z, et al. Clinical course and risk factors
545 for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a

- 546 retrospective cohort study. *Lancet*. 2020.
- 547 20. Stockholm: ECDC (European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control).
548 Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic: increased transmission in
549 the EU/EEA and the UK – seventh update, 25 March 2020. 2020. Available:
550 [https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/RRA-seventh-](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/RRA-seventh-update-Outbreak-of-coronavirus-disease-COVID-19.pdf)
551 [update-Outbreak-of-coronavirus-disease-COVID-19.pdf](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/RRA-seventh-update-Outbreak-of-coronavirus-disease-COVID-19.pdf)
- 552 21. Office for National Statistics. Estimates of the population for the UK, England
553 and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. 2020. Available:
554 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/populationestimatesforukenglandandwalesScotlandandNorthernIreland)
555 [/populationestimates/datasets/populationestimatesforukenglandandwalescot](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/populationestimatesforukenglandandwalesScotlandandNorthernIreland)
556 [landandNorthernIreland](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/populationestimatesforukenglandandwalesScotlandandNorthernIreland)
- 557 22. Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, Beutels P, Auranen K, Mikolajczyk R, et al. Social
558 contacts and mixing patterns relevant to the spread of infectious diseases.
559 *PLoS Med*. 2008. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0050074
- 560 23. Stedman M, Davies M, Anderson SG, Lunt M, Verma A, Heald A. A phased
561 approach to unlocking during the COVID-19 pandemic; Lessons from trend
562 analysis. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.04.20.20072264
- 563 24. Liu Y, Gayle AA, Wilder-Smith A, Rocklöv J. The reproductive number of
564 COVID-19 is higher compared to SARS coronavirus. *J Travel Med*. 2020;27.
565 doi:10.1093/jtm/taaa021
- 566 25. Office for National Statistics. Deaths registered in England and Wales,
567 provisional 2020: up to week ending 17 April 2020. 2020. Available:
568 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarria](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deaths/datasets/weeklyprovisionalfiguresondeathsregisteredinEnglandand)
569 [ges/deaths/datasets/weeklyprovisionalfiguresondeathsregisteredinEnglandand](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deaths/datasets/weeklyprovisionalfiguresondeathsregisteredinEnglandand)

- 570 wales
- 571 26. Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, Jones FK, Zheng Q, Meredith HR, et al. The
572 incubation period of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) from publicly
573 reported confirmed cases: estimation and application. *Ann Intern Med.* 2020.
- 574 27. Mizumoto K, Kagaya K, Zarebski A, Chowell G. Estimating the asymptomatic
575 proportion of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases on board the
576 Diamond Princess cruise ship, Yokohama, Japan, 2020. *Eurosurveillance.*
577 2020.
- 578 28. ICNARC COVID-19 study case mix programme database. ICNARC report on
579 COVID-19 in critical care 15 May 2020. 2020. Available:
580 <https://www.icnarc.org/Our-Audit/Audits/Cmp/Reports>
- 581 29. Google. United Kingdom COVID-19 Community Mobility Report: Mobility
582 changes April 5 2020. 2020. Available:
583 [https://www.gstatic.com/covid19/mobility/2020-04-](https://www.gstatic.com/covid19/mobility/2020-04-05_GB_Mobility_Report_en.pdf)
584 [05_GB_Mobility_Report_en.pdf](https://www.gstatic.com/covid19/mobility/2020-04-05_GB_Mobility_Report_en.pdf)
- 585 30. Wynants L, Van Calster B, Bonten MMJ, Collins GS, Debray TPA, De Vos M,
586 et al. Prediction models for diagnosis and prognosis of covid-19 infection:
587 systematic review and critical appraisal. *BMJ.* 2020.
- 588 31. Latif S, Usman M, Manzoor S, Iqbal W, Qadir J, Tyson G, Castro I, Razi A,
589 Boulos MN CJ. Leveraging Data Science To Combat COVID-19: A
590 Comprehensive Review. 2020.
- 591 32. Kucharski AJ, Russell TW, Diamond C, Liu Y, Edmunds J, Funk S, et al. Early
592 dynamics of transmission and control of COVID-19: a mathematical modelling
593 study. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2020.

- 594 33. Read JM, Bridgen JRRE, Cummings DATA, Ho A, Jewell CP. Novel
595 coronavirus 2019-nCoV: early estimation of epidemiological parameters and
596 epidemic predictions. medRxiv. 2020.
- 597 34. The Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine Website. How many healthcare
598 workers are infected? 2020 [cited 23 Apr 2020]. Available:
599 [https://www.cebm.net/covid-19/covid-19-how-many-healthcare-workers-are-](https://www.cebm.net/covid-19/covid-19-how-many-healthcare-workers-are-infected/)
600 [infected/](https://www.cebm.net/covid-19/covid-19-how-many-healthcare-workers-are-infected/)
- 601 35. Salje H, Kiem C, Lefrancq N, Courtejoie N, Bosetti P. Estimating the burden of
602 SARS-CoV-2 in France. HAL ID pasteur-02548181. 2020.
- 603 36. Althaus C. Real-time modeling and projections of the COVID-19 epidemic in
604 Switzerland. Inst Soc Prev Med Univ Bern, Switz. 2020. Available:
605 <https://ispmberngithubio/covid-19/swiss-epidemic-model/>
- 606 37. Dingel J, Neiman B. How Many Jobs Can be Done at Home? NBER Work
607 Pap. 2020.
- 608 38. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. New COVID-19 forecasts for
609 Europe: Italy & Spain have passed the peak of their epidemics; UK, early in its
610 epidemic, faces a fast-mounting death toll. 2020. Available:
611 [http://www.healthdata.org/news-release/new-covid-19-forecasts-europe-italy-](http://www.healthdata.org/news-release/new-covid-19-forecasts-europe-italy-spain-have-passed-peak-their-epidemics-uk-early-its)
612 [spain-have-passed-peak-their-epidemics-uk-early-its](http://www.healthdata.org/news-release/new-covid-19-forecasts-europe-italy-spain-have-passed-peak-their-epidemics-uk-early-its)
- 613 39. IHME COVID-19 health service utilization forecasting team. Forecasting
614 COVID-19 impact on hospital bed-days, ICU-days, ventilator-days and deaths
615 by US state in the next 4 months. medrxiv. 2020.
- 616 40. ONS. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Infection Survey pilot: England, 21 May 2020.
617 2020.

- 618 41. ONS. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Infection Survey pilot: 28 May 2020. 2020.
- 619 42. Public Health England. Weekly Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)
- 620 Surveillance Report, Week 22. 2020. Available:
- 621 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/a](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/888254/COVID19_Epidemiological_Summary_w22_Final.pdf)
- 622 [ttachment_data/file/888254/COVID19_Epidemiological_Summary_w22_Final.](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/888254/COVID19_Epidemiological_Summary_w22_Final.pdf)
- 623 pdf
- 624 43. Altmann DM, Douek DC, Boyton RJ. What policy makers need to know about
- 625 COVID-19 protective immunity. The Lancet Comments. 2020.
- 626
- 627
- 628

629 Supplementary information

Age group	Population size SW	Percent population	Percent population
	England	size SW England	size UK
0-4	296,357	5.3%	6.0%
5-18	805,965	14.4%	15.4%
18-29	806,885	14.4%	15.4%
30-39	654,469	11.7%	13.4%
40-49	684,872	12.2%	12.8%
50-59	782,317	14.0%	13.4%
60-69	671,294	12.0%	10.5%
70+	897,576	16.0%	13.1%

630 **Table S1:** Demography of SW England compared to the UK.

631

632

633

634

635

636


637

638 **Key assumptions used in the model**

639

- 640 i. *Closed, static population size with no immigration or emigration due to*
641 *the model being run over a short period of time, and current travel restrictions which*
642 *should prevent significant movement of individuals in and out of the South West.*
- 643 ii. *No nosocomial transmission.*
- 644 iii. *Recovered individuals are not susceptible to reinfection within the timeframe of*
645 *the model horizon.*
- 646 iv. *Trajectory of model outputs is assuming that there is no easing of lockdown situation*
647 *over the timeframe of the model horizon.*
- 648 v. *There is no restriction on number of hospital (IC and acute) beds available.*
- 649 vi. *Asymptomatic and symptomatic are equally infectious and recover at the same rate.*
- 650 vii. *95% reduction in 0-18-year old contacts from school closures*
- 651 viii. *Range of 0 - 50% reduction in contacts from social distancing and range of 63 - 90%*
652 *reduction in contact rates due to lockdown*
- 653 ix. *The reduction of any given contact rate is taken to be the minimum from lockdown,*
654 *school closures and social distancing.*
- 655 x. *R_0 is sampled between 2.79 +/- 1.16 and the infectious period and transmission*
656 *probability are chosen to achieve this*
- 657 xi. *Proportion symptomatic which require hospitalisation depends on age, with increased*
658 *risk for older age groups*
- 659 xii. *Proportion in IC who will die depends on age, with increased risk for older age*
660 *groups*
- 661 xiii. *The percentage of infections which become symptomatic is 73.15 - 91.05%*
- 662 xiv. *The percentage of those requiring hospital who will require IC 0 - 30%*
- 663 xv. *The percentage of those requiring acute beds (but not IC) who will die 5 - 35%*

664




665

666 **Figure S1a:** The distribution of the best 100 parameters selected for in the Latin Hypercube Sampling

667 and likelihood fitting from 100,000 simulations.

668




669

670 **Figure S1b:** The distribution of the uniform priors in the Latin Hypercube Sampling from 100,000

671 samples.


672



673

674 **Figure S2a:** Fitting performance of the model. The cumulative case numbers and hospital deaths for
675 COVID-19 in SW England until lockdown measures were gradually lifted (11th May 2020), based on
676 case data and death data (orange). 95% credible intervals of our model projections are shown in light
677 grey, 50% in dark grey and the median value of the model is highlighted in black. The shaded region
678 indicates the prediction of the model from the data. We did not consider the effects of lockdown being
679 lifted, and our transmission rates are fitted to both before lockdown and after lockdown. Blue and red
680 vertical lines represent the dates when social distancing and school closures/lockdown were introduced
681 nationally, respectively.

682



683

684 **Figure S2b:** The expected (model) versus observed (data) for the median of 100 fits, and all 100 fits

685 for counts of daily case numbers. The model tends to overestimate the case data at earlier stages of

686 the epidemic and underestimate at later stages of the epidemic.

687

688

689

690

691 Sensitivity analysis

692 The choice of the final sample size $m=100$ taken from 100k samples is based on a
 693 bias-variance trade-off with lower m giving a better model fit but higher m allowing
 694 more predictions to be included. The choice of m is not of practical significance for the
 695 median and 95% credible intervals of the main outcome measures of the model – bed
 696 modelling - as shown in the below table.

Size of final sample size from 100k samples	Median (95% CrI) value on 11 th May 2020			
	Total recovered	Total infectious	Total in acute beds	Total in IC beds
50	191k (143k – 276k)	5k (2k – 10k)	579 (152 – 1424)	107 (14 – 497)
100	189k (142k – 278k)	6k (2k – 12k)	701 (169 – 1543)	110 (8 – 464)
200	189k (141k - 276k)	6k (2k – 16k)	709 (171 – 1564)	105 (5 – 454)
500	191k (132k – 289k)	7k (2k – 20k)	690 (171 – 1644)	109 (5 – 426)

697

698 Increasing m does slightly increase the estimate of the infectious population (*total*
 699 *infectious*). This is explained by including models with slightly higher R value, i.e. R is
 700 biased upwards as we move further away from the best answer. The bias is small
 701 compared to the modelling uncertainty.

Size of final sample size from 100k samples	Median (95% CrI) of parameter							
	R	δ	$1/\mu$	$1/\rho$	$1/\psi$	ϵ	κ	endphase
50	2.5 (2.1 - 3.1)	82 (74 – 90%)	3.9 (2.6 – 5.8)	6.3 (2.4 – 13.1)	6.5 (2.6 – 13.8)	19 (4 – 28%)	29 (19 – 34%)	21.3 (11.1 – 30.0)
100	2.6 (2.1 - 3.2)	82 (74 – 90%)	4.3 (2.5 – 6.0)	7.7 (2.3 – 13.3)	6.7 (2.5 – 13.8)	16 (2 – 30%)	28 (19 – 34%)	19.7 (10.8 – 30.0)
200	2.6 (2.1 - 3.3)	82 (74 – 91%)	4.5 (2.4 – 6.7)	7.8 (2.3 – 13.6)	6.7 (2.4 – 13.8)	16 (1 – 30%)	28 (17 – 34%)	18.5 (8.6 – 30.3)
500	2.7 (2.1 - 3.5)	82 (74 – 90%)	5.0 (2.5 – 8.3)	7.3 (2.4 – 13.6)	7.2 (2.5 – 13.8)	17 (1 – 29%)	28 (15 – 35%)	18.3 (6.4 – 30.3)

702

703 The inverse of μ and ψ becomes bigger (as it is related to the selection of R), as the
704 sample size becomes larger. This then reduces the parameters *endphase*,
705 κ , and ϵ in order to account for this bias in R.

706

707 We choose to report values for $m=100$ samples as part of the bias-variance trade-off.
708 The bias is small for this choice, with R close to unbiased and the confidence
709 intervals capture all of the significant variation components. The qualitative
710 inferences would not change with any of the above choices of m and uncertainty has
711 been well captured.