

# 1 The UK Covid-19 lockdown weakened in April and 2 May 2020: implications for the size of the epidemic and 3 for outcomes had lockdown been earlier

4 Anthony Lander

5 Birmingham Women's and Children's Hospital NHS Trust, Birmingham UK  
6 Correspondence: [t.lander@nhs.net](mailto:t.lander@nhs.net); Tel.: (+44-121-333-9999)

7 **Abstract:** The number of active cases in the UK Covid-19 epidemic, the case fatality rate, the  
8 susceptible proportion of the population, and how well the lockdown was maintained during  
9 April–May 2020 are unknown. These four have a relationship with the shape of the daily mortality  
10 curve once one considers the intervals from infection to death or recovery. Without an understanding  
11 of this relationship we cannot say that an earlier lockdown would have saved lives. Using a small  
12 stochastic model, the lockdown had to be weakened, in April and May, for simulated deaths to match  
13 ongoing actual daily deaths. Google mobility data was found to be consistent with the weakening  
14 required in the model with similar changes from baseline in time and magnitude. If in an earlier  
15 lockdown, mobility and interactions would have followed a similar course, then with a large  
16 epidemic curve an earlier lockdown might be associated with many more deaths than some currently  
17 believe. This was confirmed in the stochastic model and in two modified SIR models of epidemics of  
18 various sizes. The first SIR model had a fixed period to recovery and the second used random  
19 periods, both models had random periods to death. Weakening of the mitigations was required to  
20 tune the output in large but not in small epidemics. This gives weight to the epidemic having affected  
21 many more individuals than some reports currently suggest. In both one and two-week earlier  
22 lockdowns, total deaths were found to depend on the size of the epidemic and to vary from  
23 2,000–49,000 deaths. There was a linear relationship between the peak proportion of the population  
24 infected and the reciprocal of the case fatality rate. This work questions the low prevalence of <0.1%,  
25 reported by the Office for National Statistics in May and June 2020, since to accommodate a  
26 weakening lockdown, the shape of the daily mortality curve, and an acceptable case fatality rate a  
27 much larger epidemic curve is required.

28 **Keywords:** Covid-19; mortality statistics; stochastic models, SIR-model, lockdown, social distancing  
29

---

## 30 1. Introduction

31 A plot of the time course of the proportion of the population who are currently infected—active  
32 cases—is known as the epidemic curve. During mitigated Covid-19 epidemics nations have counted  
33 deaths in different ways and the UK have altered its reporting. However, if a mortality data set has  
34 been consistently ascertained then the shape of that data maintains some fidelity with its antecedents  
35 and inferences may be generalisable. The principal antecedents are those elements that underly the  
36 mechanics generating the epidemic curve and the timing and effectiveness of the mitigations and  
37 importantly any unintended weakening of the mitigations. In the absence of a tight confidence interval  
38 on the case fatality rate the shape, but not the size, of the epidemic curve can be estimated from the  
39 mortality data. The size of the infected population may not be required to answer some questions.  
40 However, it is required if one asks 'What might have happened if the mitigations had been introduced  
41 earlier?' This requires an understanding of the size of the epidemic curve since the efficacy of any  
42 weakening in the mitigations will be sensitive to the susceptible proportion of the population.  
43 Importantly, the size of the epidemic curve and knowing the residual susceptible population are  
44 central to understanding the risks of a second-wave and planning relaxation of lockdown rules.

45 This author previously reported a stochastic model which simulated mainly UK in-hospital  
46 deaths [1]. That model was revised to include out-of-hospital deaths after Public Health England  
47 (PHE) changed its reporting system in late April 2020 [2]. Subsequent but modest revisions were  
48 issued [3]. In this work a first SIR model [A] used a fixed period to recovery of 12.8 days and PHE data  
49 up to a revision in late June whilst the second SIR model [B] which used a random period to recovery  
50 was tuned following a PHE revision accessed on 26 June [4].

51 A UK national newspaper, reported that 75% of UK Covid-19 deaths might have been avoided if  
52 the lockdown had begun one week earlier [5]. Dagpunar, using a case fatality rate of 1%, describes a  
53 SEIR (Susceptible, Exposed, Infected, Removed) model which generated 39,000 deaths for a mitigated  
54 epidemic, reducing to around 11,000 if mitigated one week earlier, see Table 1 [6].

55

	Deaths	Peak deaths	Final Susceptible population
Unmitigated	634,000	18,000	4.8%
UK-like lockdown	39,000	930	94%
One-week earlier lockdown	11,200	260	98%

56

**Table 1.** Results from modeling by Dagpunar [6].

57 The UK introduced its lockdown when a total of 359 deaths had been reported, whilst Germany  
58 locked down after reporting a total of 86 deaths. On 17 March there had been a total of 81 deaths in the  
59 UK. It is an important question to ask; ‘What might have happened—if all else remained the  
60 same—but the lockdown was announced at a different time?’ This work simulated earlier and later  
61 lockdowns starting from 3–20 March 2020 using the previously described stochastic model.

62 In this stochastic model, just as in a SIR model, the size of the susceptible proportion of the  
63 population at any one time influences the efficacy of an intervention, be it a mitigation or a weakening  
64 of a lockdown. For this reason, if a set of parameters influencing a model’s behaviour are allowed to  
65 act on a population with a substantially different susceptible proportion then their influence will also  
66 be quite different. Caution is therefore needed in moving parametric changes earlier or later in an  
67 epidemic if the true magnitude of the epidemic curve is not known. Early in an epidemic when  
68 exponential growth is seen then the size of the susceptible population may be ignored but this does not  
69 apply later on.

70 Though we know something of the shape of the mortality data, and from this we can infer  
71 something of the shape of the epidemic curve, we cannot determine the magnitude of the epidemic  
72 curve without other information. The areas under the epidemic curve and the mortality curve give us  
73 the case fatality rate.


74 In this author’s previous simulations around 20% of the population were infected at the peak, but  
75 this is higher than the consensus of current opinion. According to the Office for National Statistics  
76 (ONS) between 17–30 May 2020, an average of 0.10% of the population in households had Covid-19  
77 (95% CI: 0.05% to 0.18%) [9]. A second estimate between 25 May to 7 June found 0.06% (95% CI : 0.02%  
78 to 0.12%) of the population in England had Covid-19 [7]. This second estimate was based on 11  
79 individuals in 8 households from a total of 19,933 participants.

80 In this work modelling is presented for different sized epidemics. The early parameters are the  
81 same, as the susceptible populations have not fallen sufficiently, but later parameters necessarily  
82 differ.

### 83 A thought experiment

84 Though it is unlikely that the UK epidemic was initiated with a single index case we will consider  
85 this in a simple thought experiment. If the rising phase is neither mitigated nor yet influenced by the  
86 falling susceptible population then it is exponential, and if the doubling was every 3 days then there  
87 would have been 25.5 days to get to 360 deaths at lockdown on 23 March placing the first death on 27  
88 February. PHE record the first UK death on 5 March. The antecedent infections (perhaps 20 days

89 before the 23 March) would, at 3 March, have been a magnitude larger related to the case fatality rate  
 90 (CFR). If we imagine CFR's of 1:1000 and 1:100 these place the hypothetical first cases on the 7 and 18  
 91 January respectively, see Figure 1.



92

93 **Figure 1.** A thought experiment is illustrated. Assuming a 3-day doubling in deaths (green) arising  
 94 from antecedent infections 20 days previously (dashed green line) producing a total of 359 deaths on 23  
 95 March the parent populations can be imagined for different case fatality rates. This crude  
 96 approximation places the start of the epidemic curves in early January.

## 97 2. Materials and Methods

98 Two modified SIR epidemics [A] and [B] were given start dates from 2–23 January. In [A] there  
 99 was a fixed period of 12.8 days to recovery for those becoming immune and in [B] a randomly chosen  
 100 period from two lognormal distributions. In both [A] and [B] the period to mortality was randomly  
 101 chosen. Each epidemic had its weakening tuned such that the daily mortality represented actual daily  
 102 mortality with social distancing and lockdown taking place on 17 and 24 March. Tuning was a visual  
 103 fit with one run of the model. Once tuned, each epidemic was re-run with social distancing taking  
 104 place either one or two-weeks week earlier (10 or 3 March). Lockdown likewise was earlier on the 17 or  
 105 10 March.

### 106 The stochastic model

107 The stochastic model has been previously described [1,2]. The model is written in Microsoft Excel  
 108 VBA v7.1 operating in Windows 10. Individuals were assigned an age, sex, risk of mortality if infected,  
 109 a measure of daily viral exposure, a susceptibility factor, an incubation period, and two contagious  
 110 periods. One contagious period was for mild illness and the other for serious, critical or fatal illness.  
 111 Each individual had a 2-dimensional location, a status for symptoms, immunity and a flag for  
 112 alive/dead. Individuals had two clocks; one for an assigned contagious period and one for a virtual  
 113 twin, 80% of whom were assigned a lognormal fatal illness contagious period to represent in-hospital  
 114 deaths (meanlog 2.99, sdlog 0.223), and 20% a shorter, lognormally distributed period to represent  
 115 out-of-hospital deaths (meanlog 2.639, sdlog 0.2). The 80:20 ratio matches the PHE ascertainment of  
 116 deaths [2]. Incubation periods were based on Covid-19 data (meanlog 1.621, sdlog 0.418) [8]. Age and  
 117 sex followed the 2011 UK census. Knowing the age and sex, an individual was designated to die, if  
 118 infected, based on a probability taken from the Chinese Centre for Disease Control and Prevention [9].  
 119 The demographic details do not influence the outputs reported in this paper but were maintained in  
 120 case they prove useful in later developments.

121 A random 5% were assigned to be critically ill, and together with the dying individuals, this  
 122 group had the longer contagious period (meanlog of 2.99, sdlog of 0.223). A random, normally

123 distributed (mean 1, sd 0.2) susceptibility factor  $s$  was chosen. Randomly located and randomly  
124 moving individuals become infected if they exceed a daily infectious dose based on their cumulative  
125 proximity to contagious near neighbours and their susceptibility factor. The exposure, consequent  
126 upon an interaction between a susceptible individual  $i$  and a contagious individual  $j$ , had a  
127 relationship with the inverse square distance separating the individuals  $d_{i,j}$ . All separations  $d_{i,j}$  less than  
128 0.2 metres were assumed to be at 0.2 metres. Separations exceeding 5 m were ignored. When social  
129 distancing was applied, separations less than 2 m were treated as if at 2 m, this rule was applied for a  
130 percentage  $x$  of interactions designated  $SD_x$ . If for any susceptible  $i$ , on any day,  $s \sum d_{i,j}^{-2} > 1$  then the  
131 individual acquired an infection. One day elapsed between infection and symptoms. A percentage  $x$ ,  
132 of symptomatic individuals were confined, making no movements, and designated  $C_x$ , representing  
133 isolation. Mobile individuals could still come close to the confined. Individuals moved  $n$  times a day  
134 designated  $M_n$ , in a random walk (step-size 10 times the output of an inverse cumulative normal  
135 distribution with mean 0 m, sd 5 m). Individuals returned to their origins at the end of each day.  
136 Mobile individuals meeting boundaries were reflected to stay within the boundaries. In these  
137 simulations 2000 individuals were placed randomly in a 490 x 490 m square. Only small populations  
138 were needed since virtual twins were followed to death.

139 The model was parameterised as follows;  $M_n$  with  $n$  a surrogate for movements, a larger  $n$  simply  
140 representing more movements,  $SD_x$  with  $x$  being the percentage of interactions achieving social  
141 distancing, and  $C_x$  with  $x$  being the percentage of symptomatic individuals being confined. Before  
142 mitigation, the parameters were  $\{M_{18}, SD_{10}, C_{90}\}$ , on 17 March these changed to  $\{M_{14}, SD_{50}, C_{90}\}$  and on  
143 23-24 March they changed again to  $\{M_7, SD_{60}, C_{100}\}$ . The term 'tuning the model' means adjusting one or  
144 more parameters on one or more days after the lockdown to bring the simulated daily deaths closer to  
145 the actual daily deaths. Five contagious individuals were introduced to start an epidemic on day 1. The  
146 first mitigation of 17 March was placed when the susceptible population fell to 91%.

## 147 Two modified SIR models

148 UK Covid-19 mortality data was simulated using a modified classical *SIR* model [10]. For  
149 historical interest it is noted that Kermack and McKendrick used  $x, y, z$  with  $\kappa$  and  $l$  where  $S, I, R$   
150 with  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  are now more widely used. The rate of change in the susceptible proportion of the  
151 population  $S$ , was  $\frac{\partial S}{\partial t} = -\beta SI$  and  $\beta$  was modified to represent the mitigations and any weakening,  
152 whilst  $I$  represented the proportion of the population currently infected. Classically  $\frac{\partial I}{\partial t} = \beta SI - \gamma I$   
153 but in this model  $I$  fell following removal after individuals completed illness periods either after 12.8  
154 days [A] or following two randomly assigned probability distributions [B]. The two distributions were  
155 those used in the stochastic model above. Each individual was followed twice, once with a mixture of  
156 periods with a random 5% having a longer contagious period to build the epidemic curve, and the  
157 other with a random 80% having the longer period to build the mortality curve.

158 To achieve this, each day had ten equal intervals,  $\Delta t = 0.1 \text{ days}$ . With  $n, R(t) \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  
159  $S(t), I(t), \beta, t \in \mathbb{R}$  we start with  $S(0) = 1, I(0) = 1/n$  at  $t = 0$ . The algorithm proceeds as  $t \rightarrow t + \Delta t$ :  
160  $S(t + \Delta t) = S(t) - \beta SI$  and  $I(t + \Delta t) = I(t) + \beta SI - R(t)/n$ . For Model [A]  $\frac{R(t)}{n} = I(t - 12.8)$ . For  
161 model [B], two random numbers  $\mu$  and  $\nu$ , each with uniform distribution over the interval 0 to 1 were  
162 used to look up a time to recovery  $\Phi(\mu)$  from a cumulative probability density function (CDF) for a  
163 lognormal distribution. If  $\nu \geq 0.05$  the CDF had meanlog 2.639 and sdlog 0.2, and if  $\nu < 0.05$   
164 the CDF had meanlog 2.99 and sdlog 0.223. In like fashion for both [A] and [B], two random numbers  $\mu$   
165 and  $\nu$ , were used to look up a time to death  $\Psi(\mu)$  from a CDF for a lognormal distribution. If  $\nu \geq 0.8$   
166 the CDF had a meanlog 2.639 and sdlog 0.2, and if  $\nu < 0.8$  the CDF had meanlog 2.99 and sdlog 0.223.


167 For model [B] we let  $k(t)$  represent the number of new infections, and  $R(t)$  the number of  
168 individuals being removed at time  $t$ . We let  $d(t)$  be the number of people dying at time  $t$  if everyone  
169 infected dies. Using  $[x]$  to mean the nearest integer less than  $x$  we have  $k(t + \Delta t) = [nI(t + \Delta t)] -$   
170  $[nI(t)]$ , then we increment  $R(t + \Delta t + \Phi)$  by 1  $k$  times with the times,  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$ , being assessed for  
171 each  $k$  as described. In like fashion we increment  $d(t + \Delta t + \Psi)$  by 1  $k$  times which is the mortality

172 curve. The shape, but not the magnitude, of this mortality curve was then compared with the shape of  
173 the actual daily deaths. In this way a population of twins was followed in which one twin becomes  
174 immune and the other dies.

### 175 3. Results

#### 176 The weakening of the lockdown

177 From around 20 April 2020, actual UK daily deaths gradually rose above the range for simulated  
178 daily deaths in the stochastic model [2], (Figure 2, upper panel with arrow). To account for this, it was  
179 hypothesised that the lockdown had not been maintained as well as it was when it was first introduced  
180 with weakening starting around 7 April, (Figure 2, lower panel with arrow).




181

182 **Figure 2.** Ten simulations are shown. Actual daily mortality (red, mean blue) and simulated daily  
183 deaths (grey, mean black) and percentage of population currently infected (green, with mean black)  
184 against time. After 20 April (arrow), mean actual deaths start to exceed mean simulated deaths  
185 suggesting a breach of the lockdown, starting perhaps on 7 April (arrow), 13 days previously.

186 An alternative explanation is that the modelled epidemic curve was too large. This work aimed to  
187 (1) tune the stochastic model by making small changes to the parameters defining the lockdown at one  
188 or more intervals after 7 April, and (2) model smaller epidemics.

#### 189 Tuning the stochastic model

190 No single change of any one parameter, on a single date following the lockdown was sufficient to  
191 tune the stochastic model. With two changes in the same direction on two separate days tuning was  
192 improved. A small number of sets of parameters were then tested on three days. When applied  
193 following the lockdown (24 March) on days 16, 23, and 33 respectively, the sets  $A=\{M_8, SD_{60}, C_{90}\}$ ,  
194  $B=\{M_9, SD_{60}, C_{90}\}$  and  $C=\{M_{10}, SD_{60}, C_{90}\}$  produced a promising realignment of simulated and actual  
195 daily mortality which was then followed to 27 May, see Figure 3. Only the number of movements per  
196 day were increased 7→8→9→10, with all other parameters maintained.



197

198

199

200

**Figure 3.** Above: The mean of six simulations with weakening (black) with actual daily deaths (red, smoothed mean blue). Below: The mean mitigated epidemic curve with social distancing 17 March, lockdown 23 March and three step wise weakening changes A, B C.


201

202

203

204

The parametric changes used to tune the model represent a gradual but progressive weakening of the lockdown in real life. Google mobility data [11] was examined and changes in mobility at the time of the mitigations of 17 and 23–24 March were found. After the lockdown the percentage change from baseline of all relevant activities was similar to the changes required for tuning the model, see Figure 4.



205

206

207

208

**Figure 4.** Google mobility data plotted as % change from baseline (left axis) and the movement parameter  $\{M_n\}$  (blue with circles), which changed in a stepwise fashion (right axis  $n$ ).

209

210

211

212

213

214

215


216

In Figure 4, the percentage change from baseline for UK mobility activity, for 5 domains [11], is shown for the period of the mitigated epidemic, plotted against the left-hand axis as smoothed data. In the Google mobility data, there is evidence of activity gradually, and progressively rising through a few percentage points. On the right-hand axis, the parameter  $\{M_n\}$  is plotted such that a fall from 18 to 9 movements a day equates to a 50% fall in baseline activity on the left-hand axis.

Interestingly, the weakening of the lockdown which was modelled to tune the mortality output to fit the actual daily deaths, is similar to the weakening evident in the Google mobility data.

## 217 Locking down earlier or later

218 A series of epidemics were simulated in the stochastic model with lockdowns starting on different  
219 days between 10 March and 1 April. Social distancing was initiated 7 days before each lockdown and  
220 the lockdown was weakened in three steps as described above. The total mortality is plotted against  
221 the day of the lockdown (not the introduction of social distancing) and appears in Figure 5.



222


223 **Figure 5.** Simulated total deaths from 40 epidemics for lockdowns starting on different days, each with  
224 social distancing introduced 1 week earlier and weakening of the lockdown as described. This was  
225 output from the stochastic model with social distancing starting with  $S=91\%$ . The peak in infections  
226 was about 20%.

227 In Figure 5 the distribution of data points suggests that an earlier lockdown may not have been  
228 associated with fewer deaths, but this is in the context of a significant epidemic curve .

## 229 The two modified SIR models

230 *Model [A]*


231 In the modified SIR model [A], a population of 66 million was studied. The value of  $\beta$  for an  
232 unmitigated epidemic was 0.023 to give a doubling every 3 days, see **Error! Reference source not**  
233 **found..**



234


235 **Figure 6.** In this unmitigated epidemic 94% of the population became infected:  $S$  is the susceptible  
236 proportion (black),  $I$  the infected proportion (green) and in red the daily mortality. The area under the  
237 curve representing 62,000 deaths with a case fatality rate of 1:1000, and 620,000 with a case fatality rate  
238 of 1:100.

239 In Model [A], for the doubling to fall appropriately on the introduction of social distancing  
 240  $\beta = 0.01$ , falling further for the lockdown with  $\beta = 0.0064$ . The magnitude of the epidemic curve was  
 241 altered by changing the start date of the epidemic whilst keeping the two principal mitigations fixed in  
 242 time. The modelled daily deaths were compared with actual deaths and  $\beta$  was altered sequentially  
 243 with  $\beta_A$ ,  $\beta_B$  and  $\beta_C$  applied 14, 21 and 28 days after the lockdown to tune mortality.  
 244 With a late start and a small epidemic curve, the mortality was a good fit without any weakening  
 245 of the mitigations. As the epidemic start time was brought earlier and the magnitude of the epidemic  
 246 curve increased then weakening of the mitigations was required to tune the mortality data.



247  
 248 **Figure 7.** Six epidemic curves for Model [A] showing active cases as a percentage of the population  
 249 with social distancing 17 March and lockdown 24 March. The percentage infected between 17-30 May  
 250 appears in the right-hand panel. The ONS data would be consistent with the red epidemic.

251 The largest epidemic in Model [A], with a 19% peak in infections (which does not appear in  
 252 Figure 7) has its mortality output shown in Figure 8. Earlier lockdowns have significant numbers of  
 253 deaths.



254  
 255 **Figure 8.** An epidemic in Model [A] starting 2/1/20 with 19% at the peak of infections. Deaths with  
 256 mitigations starting 17 March (grey), 10 March (green), and 3 March (blue).

257 The salient features of 10 epidemics with  $\beta_0 = 0.023$ ,  $\beta_{SD} = 0.01$  on the 17 March and  $\beta_L =$   
 258  $0.0064$  for the 24 March (except for Epidemic A23 where  $\beta_L = 0.0063$ ) appear in **Table 2**. The  
 259 designation of an epidemic includes the date in January for the first case: **A6** had its first case on 6  
 260 January.  
 261



Epidemic [A]	A2	A5	A6	A7	A8	A11	A14	A17	A20	A23
$\beta_A$ 7 April	0.0113	0.008	0.0076	0.0071	0.007	0.0066	0.00645	0.0064	0.0064	0.00635
$\beta_B$ 14 April	0.0114	0.0087	0.00815	0.0076	0.0075	0.0068	0.00650	0.0064	0.0064	0.00635
$\beta_C$ 21 April	0.0115	0.0095	0.0085	0.0081	0.008	0.0071	0.00655	0.0064	0.0064	0.00635
Case Fatality Rate	1:762	1:505	1:423	1:361	1:309	1:177	1:97	1:48	1:26	1:14
Peak Infection	19%	12%	10.0%	8.4%	7.0%	3.9%	2.1%	1.1%	0.61%	0.32%
17–30 May	2.93	2.23	1.62	1.4	1.34	0.72	0.38	0.22	0.13	0.07
	1.78	1.58	1.06	0.98	0.93	0.48	0.24	0.14	0.09	0.04
25 May-7 June	2.17	1.81	1.25	1.1	1.07	0.56	0.29	0.16	0.10	0.05
	1.27	1.25	0.81	0.76	0.7	0.38	0.18	0.11	0.07	0.03
S on 1 July 2020	49%	65%	71%	75%	78%	88%	93%	96%	98%	98.9%
Lockdown 1 week earlier $\beta_{SD}$ 10 March	47,100 (106%)	43,900 (93%)	31,700 (70%)	28,400 (62%)	25,800 (54%)	15,000 (32%)	12,100 (26.3%)	11,300 (24.5%)	11,100 (23.6%)	10,800 (23.1%)
Lockdown 2 weeks earlier $\beta_{SD}$ 3 March	48,900 (110%)	44,500 (95%)	27,800 (61%)	21,700 (47%)	13,200 (28%)	3,900 (8.4%)	2,800 (6.2%)	2,600 (5.6%)	2,500 (5.4%)	2,200 (5.2%)

262 **Table 2.** Data from 10 epidemics in Model [A], each initiated with the same  $\beta$  changing at the  
 263 mitigations on 17 and 24 March in the same way. The highlighted cells have the % of active cases  
 264 found by the Office for National Statistics and Epidemic A14 has a CFR of about 1:100.

265 Epidemics starting earlier had more infections and a lower  $S$  when mitigations were introduced.  
 266 Epidemics starting earlier required greater weakening of the mitigations to tune their mortality curves.


267 *Model [B]*

268 The salient features for 6 epidemics from Model [B], appear in **Table 2**:  $\beta_0 = 0.023$ ,  $\beta_{sd} = 0.01$  on  
 269 the 17 March with the value for  $\beta_L$  for the 24 March varying.

Epidemic [B]	B2	B5	B7	B8	B11	B14
Lockdown $\beta_L$ from 24 March	0.0067	0.0064	0.0064	0.0064	0.0062	0.0058
Weakening $\beta_A$ 7 April	0.0098	0.007	0.0066	0.00645	0.0062	0.0058
$\beta_B$ 14 April	0.0105	0.0076	0.007	0.0066	0.0062	0.0058
$\beta_C$ 21 April	0.0115	0.0083	0.0075	0.007	0.0062	0.0058
Case Fatality Rate	1:888	1:569	1:437	1:357	1:208	1:97
Peak in infections	22.1%	13.5%	9.7%	7.7%	4.3%	2.1%
17–30 May	4.0–2.4	2.6–1.7	2.3–1.5	1.9–1.2	1.1–0.72	0.5–0.33
25 May-7 June	2.9–1.6	2.0–1.3	1.8–1.2	1.5–0.96	0.84–0.55	0.39–0.26
S on 1 July 2020	40%	65%	70%	78%	86%	93%
Lockdown 1 week earlier $\beta_{SD}$ 10 March	47,600 (106%)	37,000 (81%)	29,300 (63%)	25,800 (54%)	15,500 (33%)	17,000 (37%)
Lockdown 2 weeks earlier $\beta_{SD}$ 3 March	49,200 (110%)	35,000 (77%)	20,700 (44%)	13,200 (28%)	3,900 (8.4%)	2,850 (6.2%)

270 **Table 3.** Data from 5 Model [B] epidemics, each initiated with the same  $\beta$ , changing at the  
 271 mitigation on 17 March to 0.01 but requiring different strengths of lockdown.

272 Epidemics starting earlier had more infections and a lower  $S$  when mitigations were introduced.  
 273 The mortality curves for 4 Model [B] epidemics appear in Figure 9.




274

275

276 **Figure 9.** Actual daily UK mortality with smoothed average (black). Four Model [B] epidemics starting  
 277 on 2–11 January with ever smaller epidemic curves (not shown). Tuned simulated mortality with social  
 278 distancing 17 March and lockdown 24 March (grey), untuned mortality (red), earlier introduction of  
 279 social distancing 10 March and lockdown 17 March (green), social distancing 3 March and lockdown 10  
 280 March (blue).

281 There was a linear relationship between the peak % of the population infected and the reciprocal  
 282 of the case fatality rate; this is shown in two ways in Figure 10.




283

284 **Figure 10.** The peak % in  $I$  is proportional to the reciprocal of the Case Fatality Rate. Model [A] black,  
 285 Model [B] red.

286


287 **Weakening of the mitigations compared with Google mobility data**

288 The parameters required to weaken each of the epidemics were compared with Google mobility  
 289 data. The comparison is a challenge as we are comparing different phenomena. In Figure 11, Google  
 290 mobility data is shown with smoothed data as % change from baseline on the left-hand axis for a  
 291 number of domains. We cannot combine these curves, but together, they give an indication of the  
 292 depth and timing of changes in activity. On the right-hand axis, with  $\beta = 0.023$  being the base line and  
 293 the scale logarithmic, the values for weakening of the mitigations are plotted for epidemics A2–A11 in  
 294 Model [A].



295  
 296 **Figure 11.** Weakening of the mitigations shown as changes in  $\beta$  (left axis) for 4 Model [A] epidemics  
 297 shown with Google mobility data as % change from baseline (right axis).

298 In Figure 11 epidemics A5 and A8 are perhaps the most attractive suggesting a CFR between 500 and  
 299 300 and peak infections between 12% and 7%. For Model [B] a similar comparison appears in is made  
 300 in Figure 12.



301  
 302 **Figure 12.** Weakening of the mitigations shown as changes in  $\beta$  (left axis) for 5 Model [B] epidemics  
 303 shown with Google mobility data as % change from baseline (right axis).

304 In Figure 12, Epidemic B8 and B7 appear to have some consistency with the Google data.

#### 305 4. Discussion and conclusions

306 A simple stochastic model of the mitigated UK Covid-19 epidemic was developed to simulate  
307 daily mortality data and test assumptions about the mechanics of the epidemic and its mitigations.  
308 Actual daily deaths started to exceed the mean of simulations and a weakening of the lockdown was  
309 hypothesised. With modest but progressive changes in parameters, the model was successfully tuned.  
310 The timing and percentage change in the model's baseline movement parameter was similar to  
311 changes published by Google for UK mobility data over the same period.

312 The principal reason for modelling is to test one's assumptions about how the real-world works.  
313 One may learn more from a failing model than from a model that, by good fortune, produces output  
314 that happens to simulate the real world. Models can be criticised if they become over-elaborate or  
315 over-parametised or if they are tweaked, simply to produce a desired output. The stochastic model,  
316 with its large epidemic curve was tuned to bring its simulated deaths into line with actual deaths by  
317 weakening earlier mitigating parameters as the epidemic curve progressed. The impact of the  
318 parametric changes on the epidemic curve were necessarily sensitive to the proportion of the  
319 population who were susceptible at the time of the change and thereafter. For this reason, advancing  
320 or delaying parametric changes had a marked impact on the epidemic curves. Furthermore, it is clear  
321 that a small epidemic that is swiftly mitigated, and which barely reduces the susceptible proportion,  
322 will be less sensitive to later changes in those parameters compared to larger epidemics which  
323 dramatically reduce the susceptible population. If one is to ask about the impact of moving the  
324 lockdown on a mitigated epidemic that has weakened, it is crucial to understand the size of the  
325 epidemic curve and something about the weakening.

326 The stochastic model might be considered to have naive parameters making it a poor  
327 approximation for human behaviour but the step-wise changes that were introduced to reshape the  
328 mortality data have some similarity to real-world changes seen in Google mobility data. If the  
329 stochastic model's parameters are considered naïve then modelling with  $\beta$  and particularly  $\gamma$  are  
330 clearly far more abstract. In the SIR model  $\beta$ , has some statistical mechanical elegance in that it relates  
331 to a reasonable real-world understanding of the probability of spread of a contagious disease but  $\gamma$  is  
332 for the same reasons far less attractive. It is for this reason that the fall in  $I$ , in Model [B], was modelled  
333 by  $\Psi(\mu)$ .

334 The modified SIR model that generated an epidemic curve with an average of 0.1% of the  
335 population infected between 17-30 May, in line with the ONS figures, was so small that the CFR was  
336 1:26 which seems far too low a figure. The largest modified SIR epidemics had peaks around 20%,  
337 close to the stochastic model, and required a significant weakening of the mitigation. For the SIR  
338 models this weakening was considered to be more marked than that found in the Google mobility  
339 data. Though there is no simple way of determining a relationship between  $\beta$  and mobility, except in  
340 direction and time, it was felt that epidemics with peak infections between 8–14% and CFR's 1:300–500  
341 were most likely to share the weakening found in Google's data.

342 If the susceptible proportion of the population in early July is as high as this work requires for  
343 consistency with the ONS data, or for consistency with a CFR of around 100, then the risks of a  
344 second-wave are very high. If the susceptible proportion of the population in early July is lower and  
345 consistent with a larger epidemic curve and a lower CFR then the risks of a second-wave are lower.  
346

347 **Acknowledgments:** Thejasvi Subramanian and Louise Lander for contributions to the development of this  
348 project.

349 **Funding:** This research received no external funding.

350 **Conflicts of Interest:** The author declares no conflict of interest.

351

352 **References**

- 353 1. Lander, A.D. Releasing the lockdown in the UK Covid-19 epidemic: a stochastic model. *medRxiv* **2020**,  
354 2020.04.28.20083329, doi:10.1101/2020.04.28.20083329.
- 355 2. Lander, A.D.; Subramanian, T. Modelling exit strategies for the UK Covid-19 lockdown with revised  
356 mortality data. *medRxiv* **2020**, 2020.05.05.20091579, doi:10.1101/2020.05.05.20091579.
- 357 3. United Kingdom Coronavirus: 250,908 Cases and 36,042 Deaths - Worldometer Available online:  
358 <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/country/uk/> (accessed on May 22, 2020).
- 359 4. Number of coronavirus (COVID-19) cases in the UK - GOV.UK Available online:  
360 <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/coronavirus-covid-19-information-for-the-public> (accessed on Jun 26, 2020).
- 361 5. Donnelly, L. Earlier lockdown could have prevented three-quarters of UK coronavirus deaths, modelling  
362 suggests. *The Telegraph* 2020.
- 363 6. Dagpunar, J.S. *Sensitivity of UK Covid-19 deaths to the timing of suppression measures and their relaxation*;  
364 Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS), 2020;
- 365 7. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Infection Survey pilot - Office for National Statistics Available online:  
366 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulleti  
367 ns/coronaviruscovid19infectionsurveysurvey/12june2020/previous/v1](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/coronaviruscovid19infectionsurveysurvey/12june2020/previous/v1) (accessed on Jun 15, 2020).
- 368 8. Lauer, S.A.; Grantz, K.H.; Bi, Q.; Jones, F.K.; Zheng, Q.; Meredith, H.; Azman, A.S.; Reich, N.G.; Lessler, J.  
369 The incubation period of 2019-nCoV from publicly reported confirmed cases: estimation and application.  
370 *medRxiv* **2020**, 2020.02.02.20020016, doi:10.1101/2020.02.02.20020016.
- 371 9. Deng, G.; Yin, M.; Chen, X.; Zeng, F. Clinical determinants for fatality of 44,672 patients with COVID-19.  
372 *Critical Care* **2020**, *24*, 179, doi:10.1186/s13054-020-02902-w.
- 373 10. A contribution to the mathematical theory of epidemics. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series*  
374 *A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical and Physical Character* **1927**, *115*, 700–721,  
375 doi:10.1098/rspa.1927.0118.
- 376 11. COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports Available online: <https://www.google.com/covid19/mobility/>  
377 (accessed on May 25, 2020).
- 378



© 2020 by the author. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).