

1 The basic reproduction number can be
2 accurately estimated within 14 days
3 after societal lockdown: The early stage
4 of the COVID-19 epidemic in Denmark

5
6 Jan Brink Valentin¹, Henrik Møller^{1,2} and Søren Paaske Johnsen¹

7
8 ¹Danish Center for Clinical Health Services Research (DACs), Department of Clinical Medicine, Aalborg
9 University and Aalborg University Hospital, Aalborg, Denmark

10 ²The Danish Clinical Registries (RKKP), Aarhus, Denmark

11

12 Corresponding author:

13 E-mail: jvalentin@dcm.aau.dk (JBV)

14

15

16

17 Abstract

18 **Objective:** Early identification of the basic reproduction number (BRN) is imperative to political decision
19 making during an epidemic. In this study, we estimated the BRN 7, 14, 21 and 28 days after societal
20 lockdown of Denmark during the early stage of the COVID-19 epidemic.

21 **Method:** We implemented the SEIR dynamical system for disease spread without vital dynamics. The BRN
22 was modulated using a sigmoid function. Model parameters were estimated on number of admitted
23 patients, number of patients in intensive care and cumulative number of deaths using the simulated
24 annealing Monte Carlo algorithm. Results are presented with 95% prediction intervals (PI).

25 **Results:** We were unable to determine any reliable estimate of the BRN at 7 days following lockdown. The
26 BRN had stabilised at day 14 throughout day 28, with the estimate ranging from 0.95 (95% PI: 0.92-0.98) at
27 day 7 to 0.92 (95% PI: 0.92-0.93) at day 28. We estimated the BRN prior to lockdown to be 3.32 (95% PI:
28 3.31-3.33). The effect of the lockdown was occurring over a period of a few days centred at March 18th
29 (95% PI: 17th-18th) 2020.

30 **Conclusion:** We believe our model provides a valuable tool for decision makers to reliably estimate the
31 effect of a politically determined lockdown during an epidemic.

32

33 **Short title:** The basic reproduction number can be accurately estimated within 14 days after societal
34 lockdown.

35 **Keywords:** COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, basic reproduction number, Danish population, SEIR, epidemic,
36 pandemic

37

38 Introduction

39 The SARS-CoV-2 virus has spread rapidly and have already had a dramatic impact on health care systems
40 and societies globally[1,2]. Moreover, the disease, which is often referred to as the corona virus disease
41 2019 (COVID-19), has so far caused more than 250.000 deaths worldwide and has had major socio-
42 economic implications in the affected countries[3]. In Denmark the disease has caused more than 500
43 deaths at the time of drafting, with the first case confirmed on February 27th 2020[4].

44 Efforts to reduce or avoid strain on the health care system seen in other countries have been imposed by
45 the Danish government[5]. These efforts have included: home isolation of confirmed cases, closing of
46 schools, non-essential businesses and public workplaces, closing of country borders and restriction of
47 gatherings to no more than 10 individuals. Although case isolation was imposed initially, most of these
48 actions were not presented to the Danish population before March 12th 2020 and invoked in the
49 subsequent days, with the final regulations taking effect on March 18th.

50 So far not much is known about the disease and many of the reported characteristics are based on
51 simplified models[1,6–10], while other studies focuses mainly on viral load[11] and cell biology including
52 pathogenesis[12,13]. The amount of disease spread during an epidemic is measured by the basic
53 reproduction number (BRN), however, this number depends on human behaviour and may therefore be
54 different in various cultures and it may change as policy makers impose restrictions on social
55 gatherings[14]. The BRN have previously been estimated in studies on a Chinese population[7,15],
56 nevertheless, only one study appears to have investigated the dynamics of the BRN[15]. To our knowledge,
57 no one has yet investigated how early an effect of a political intervention on the BRN can be detected.
58 Hence, the aim of the current study was to determine the time from a political strategy have been enforced
59 until the effect can be accurately estimated. In addition, we aimed to estimate characteristics of the COVID-
60 19 epidemic, such as fraction of infected individuals that are symptomatic and the average infection period.

61 Method

62 Model

63 We implemented the so-called SEIR[16,17] model without vital dynamics. This dynamical system simulates
64 number of susceptible S, exposed E, infectious I and recovered persons R, and is based on the SIR model by
65 Kermack and McKendrick[18,19], but with an additional equation for modelling the incubation period until
66 cases becomes infectious. In this time period, cases are referred to as exposed, hence, the additional E in
67 SEIR. From number of susceptible, infectious and recovered persons, we calculated daily numbers of
68 hospitalised patients, number of patients admitted to an intensive care unit (ICU) and cumulative number
69 of deaths following viral infection of SARS-CoV-2. These counts were calculated on national level using the
70 parameterisation described below. Model parameters were estimated from individual level patient data
71 when possible, while a few parameters, such as incubation time, were obtained from current literature. We
72 inferred the remaining parameters from number of hospitalised patients, number of patients admitted to
73 an ICU and cumulative number of deaths using a Monte Carlo algorithm.

74 Data sources

75 The Danish National Health Authority provided data on actual numbers of in-patients, ICU patients and
76 cumulative number of deaths in Denmark from March 16th 2020 to April 13th 2020, both dates included. In
77 Denmark, COVID-19 mortality is reported as infection fatality[4]. Information on age distribution of the
78 Danish population as of January 2020 was obtained from Statistics Denmark, while the North Denmark and
79 Central Denmark regions (1.92 million individuals corresponding to 32.9% of the total Danish population)
80 provided individual level data on their resident patients hospitalised and tested positive with COVID-19.

81 Basic Reproduction Number Function

82 The BRN was modelled over time t using a sigmoid function on the following form:

$$f(t) = a \cdot \text{sigm}(-b(t - k)) + c,$$

83 where $a + c$ is the BRN prior to intervention, c is the BRN after intervention, b is the transition rate and k is
84 the time of intervention. The model assumes that the BRN decreases over time, otherwise, c is the BRN
85 prior to intervention and $a + c$ is the BRN after intervention.

86 Parameters obtained from individual patient data

87 Individual level patient data contained information on time of hospital admission, ICU admission, hospital
88 discharge, ICU discharge and death. From these data, we estimated average length of hospital stay and ICU
89 care as well as average time from hospital admission to ICU admission and hospital admission to death.

90 Parameters obtained from current literature

91 We assumed the incubation time to be 5.2 days[20], however, the incubation time is usually defined as
92 time from exposure to symptom onset, while our model relies on the time from exposure to becoming
93 infectious, which is assumed to occur 12 hours prior to symptom onset[2]. Hence, we defined the exposure
94 timeframe to 4.7 days.

95 The age-stratified proportions of symptomatic cases in need of hospitalisation and intensive care, and age-
96 stratified infection fatality ratios were obtained from the report by Ferguson *et al*[2].

97 Parameters obtained by Monte Carlo sampling

98 We estimated the proportion of cases who are symptomatic, the average time from start of infectious
99 period to hospitalisation, the date of origin of the epidemic, the number of persons initially exposed and
100 the parameters of the BRN function describe above. The date of origin is defined as the date at which the
101 initial person or persons became exposed in Denmark.

102 The mean generation time, which by definition is equal to the mean infectious period[20], were likewise
103 inferred using the Monte Carlo approach. Finally, we added a parameter describing the ratio of
104 symptomatic cases in need of intensive care compared to those estimated on an external population[2].

105 Statistical analysis

106 Initially, we calculated parameters based on individual level patient data. We estimated average length of
107 hospital stay and ICU care as area under the curve using Kaplan-Meier survival analysis, while average time
108 from hospital admission to ICU admission and hospital admission to death was estimated, conditioned on
109 patients admitted to the ICU as well as patients who eventually died, respectively. All four parameters were
110 presented with 95% confidence intervals (CI).

111 Thereafter, we conducted four separate Monte Carlo searches using simulated annealing (SA) with the
112 initial 7, 14, 21 and 28 days of the available data. From here on we will refer to these searches as models 1
113 through 4, respectively. We assumed normally distributed number of in-patient beds, ICU beds and
114 cumulative number of death, with a standard deviation of one. The SA factor was varied from an initial
115 value of 200 to a final value of 40. The search was split on 32 threads using a 16-core Xeon(R) CPU E5-2630
116 v3 @ 2.40GHz hyperthreaded machine. The model parameters with the maximum log-likelihood were
117 chosen as the final model.

118 Finally, we implemented a second Monte Carlo search for each of the four models using the Metropolis
119 Hastings algorithm. The purpose of this search was to estimate prediction intervals (PI), thus, the algorithm
120 was initiated using the parameters of the best fit, of each of the four models from the prior search. Again,
121 we employed normally distributed number of in-patient beds, ICU beds and cumulative number of deaths,
122 but with a Poisson-like standard deviation. Relevant model parameters as well as projected number of in-
123 patient beds, ICU beds and cumulative number of deaths are presented with 95% PI.

124 Initial statistical analysis were conducted using Stata 14 (StataCorp. 2015. Stata Statistical Software: Release
125 14. College Station, TX: StataCorp LP), while we employed Python version 2.7 (Python Software Foundation.
126 Python Language Reference, version 2.7. Available at www.python.org) for the Monte Carlo searches and
127 subsequent analysis.

128 Funding

129 No funding was received.

130 Ethics

131 According to Danish legislation, register studies does not need approval by an ethics committee. Data usage
132 was approved by the local Danish Data Protection Agency.

133 Results

134 From the individual level patient data we identified 356 patients admitted and tested positive for COVID-19
135 in the Central Denmark and North Denmark Region with a mean admission time of 10.87 days (95% CI:
136 9.23-12.51). Of these patients, 80 subjects were admitted to an ICU with a mean length of hospital stay at
137 the ICU of 11.27 days (95% CI: 9.48-13.06), while the mean time from hospital admission to ICU admission
138 was 2.93 days (95% CI: 2.28-3.57). During the observation period, we observed 43 deaths in the Central
139 Denmark and North Denmark Regions, from which we estimated the mean time from hospital admission to
140 death to be 9.02 days (95% CI: 6.76-11.29).

141 Relevant model parameters are presented in Table 1. All four models found almost the same BRN prior to
142 intervention with the fourth model, which included 28days of observation, estimating the BRN at 3.32 (95%
143 PI: 3.31-3.33). Likewise, models 2 to 4 estimated almost the same BRN after intervention as well as time of
144 intervention, with the fourth model estimating these parameters as 0.92 (95% PI: 0.92-0.93) and March 18th
145 (95% PI: March 17th-March 18th), respectively. The first model did not converge and was unable to estimate
146 these two parameters, as the time of intervention could be any time after March 17th.

147

148 **Table 1. Parameters estimated using simulated annealing.**

	Model 1 (7 days)	Model 2 (14	Model 3 (21	Model 4 (28

		days)	days)	days)
BRN before intervention (95% PI)	3.37 (3.55-3.86)	3.35 (3.31-3.39)	3.45 (3.43-3.47)	3.32 (3.31-3.33)
BRN after intervention (95% PI)	NA	0.95 (0.92-0.98)	0.93 (0.91-0.95)	0.92 (0.92-0.93)
Time of intervention (95% PI)	NA	March 18th (17th-18th)	March 18th (17th-18th)	March 18th (17th-18th)
Proportion of symptomatic cases (95% PI)	0.60 (0.49-0.71)	0.55 (0.47-0.64)	0.49 (0.46-0.52)	0.47 (0.45-0.49)
Ratio of ICU cases compared to an external population (95% PI)*	0.95 (0.86-1.05)	1.02 (0.95-1.10)	0.91 (0.87-0.96)	0.85 (0.81-0.89)
Average number days from start of infectious period to hospitalisation (95% PI)**	4.64 (4.08-5.20)	4.67 (4.43-4.90)	5.09 (4.75-4.44)	4.87 (4.39-5.34)
Average infectious period (95% PI)	6.38 (6.22-6.55)	6.40 (6.33-6.47)	6.49 (6.47-6.51)	6.24 (6.15-6.33)

149 Columns names indicates data availability, thus, in Model 1 only the initial 7 days of data was used for
150 estimating the parameters, while the entire range of data was used for estimating the parameters in Model
151 4.

152 *External population based on the report by Ferguson *et al*[2]

153 **Hospitalised cases only

154

155

156 The proportion of symptomatic cases and ratio of ICU cases compared to an external population decreased
157 from model 1 to 4, while average number days from start of infectious period to hospitalisation and
158 average infectious period were stable throughout all four models.

159 Fig 1 shows the BRN over time estimated by model 4. Assumption of constant levels prior and after
160 intervention is implicit in the parametrisation of the BRN, thus, the PIs are constant at distant times.

161

162 **Fig 1. Estimated change of the BRN with 95% prediction intervals during the early stage of COVID-19**
163 **epidemic in Denmark.** BRN is parametrised using a single sigmoid function and prediction intervals are
164 sampled using the Metropolis Hastings algorithm.

165

166 Fig 2 shows projected and observed number of in-patient beds needed, ICU beds needed and cumulative
167 number of deaths in Denmark with 95% PIs. Fig 3 shows projected and observed number of deaths on a
168 daily basis in Denmark with 95% PIs.

169

170 **Fig 2. Observed and projected numbers of in-patient beds needed, ICU beds needed and cumulative**
171 **number of deaths in Denmark.** Projections follows the SEIR dynamical system with dynamical BRN.
172 Prediction intervals are sampled using the Metropolis Hastings algorithm.

173

174 **Fig 3. Observed and projected numbers of deaths in Denmark.** Se Fig 2 for further specification.

175

176 Discussion

177 To our knowledge this is the first study to infer characteristics of the COVID-19 epidemic based on number
178 of in-patient beds needed, ICU beds needed and cumulative number of deaths, rather than the number of
179 infected persons. In Denmark, health care service is free and available for all residents, and all hospitals are
180 committed to report these numbers to the national health authority. Hence, we consider our outcome
181 measures to be highly reliable, in contrast to number of infected, which is highly dependent on test
182 strategy and consequently also sensitive to changes in test strategy during the epidemic.

183 Visual inspection of Fig 2 and 3 shows a good fit of the data, though, the number of ICU beds needed seems
184 to be somewhat shifted in time. However, the model assumes that the average time from start of infectious
185 period to hospitalisation is independent of disease severity. An explanation of this bias may simply be that
186 subjects in need of intensive care are hospitalised earlier compared to hospitalised patients in general. This
187 discrepancy may also explain the decrease in proportion of symptomatic cases and ratio of ICU cases
188 compared to external population as more data becomes available.

189 Our findings suggest that the severity of the epidemic may be higher compared to other studies, as we
190 estimate the BRN to be above 3.3 even after inducing case isolation. A similar study by Kucharski *et al*[15]
191 estimated the dynamics of the BRN in Wuhan using sequential Monte Carlo simulation[21] and found a BRN
192 of 2.6 at its highest and just below 1.0 at its lowest. However, this model was fitted on number of
193 confirmed cases, which was reflected in the high inaccuracy of the model.

194 From the individual level patient data we were able to estimate clinical characteristics based on data from
195 two regions of Denmark. Together with the Monte Carlo estimated parameters we found that the mean
196 time from start of infectious period to hospitalisation was 4.9 days, and with a mean time from
197 hospitalisation to death of 9.0 days, we arrive at infectious onset to death of 13.9 days. Similar to our study,

198 a study by Verity *et al*[1] estimated the time to death conditioned on whether death occurred, but on a
199 population of Hubei, mainland China. They found the mean time from symptom onset to death to be 18.8
200 days. Although these figures are not fully comparable, the difference is important. The Verity study,
201 however, was based on only 24 deaths. Another study found that the mean time from illness onset to
202 death was 15.0 days and from hospital admission to death was 8.8 days[6].

203 A study by To *et al* found the infectious time to be 7.5 days (95% CI: 5.3 to 19)[7] with a CI well containing
204 the infectious time estimate of our study, which was 6.24 (95% PI: 6.15-6.33). The same study found the
205 mean duration of symptom onset to hospitalisation to be 9.1 and 12.5 days in two time stratified
206 populations. In contrast, our study suggest this number to be less than 4.87 days. The difference may be
207 explained by cultural differences between Denmark and China, however, another study in China estimated
208 the median time from symptom onset to hospitalization to be 1.2 days (range: 0.2 to 29.9 days)[9], while a
209 study from Singapore found this number to be 4 days[8]. Finally, Guan *et al* found the mean duration of
210 hospitalisation to be 12.8 days[10], which is similar to the 10.9 days in our study. There is still a high
211 disagreement between the clinical characteristics of COVID-19 in different studies. Nevertheless, we
212 believe our findings to be generalizable to external populations, because our study is conducted using
213 reliable data in a country where health care service is free and available for all residents.

214 The model suggest that the change from initial BRN to the reduced BRN is centred around March 18th 2020,
215 and from Fig 1 it seems the change occurred over a period of four days or less. The timing of the change
216 occurred as final government orders were at effect only six days after the societal lockdown strategy was
217 initially presented. Social distancing was encourage early on, however, fines were not imposed until March
218 18th. Nevertheless, from the current study is not possible to distinguish which of the political actions were
219 most effective, as all actions were implemented within a short time.

220 Model limitations

221 A few of the model parameters is obtained from the literature, which may have some impact on estimated
222 model parameters, considering these may not be fully generalizable to a Danish population. In addition, the
223 model assumes that the time from symptom onset to hospitalisation is the same for severe cases as for in-
224 patients in general. This lack of differential initial symptom load may explain the decreasing fraction of
225 symptomatic cases and ratio of ICU cases compared to the external population, as the model may be
226 unable to accurately predict the number of ICU beds needed. Nevertheless, the model also assumes
227 constant proportion of symptomatic cases over time, however, as the epidemic progresses, high risk
228 subjects may be more likely to be isolated by their own choice or as part of a political strategy. Therefore,
229 the proportion of symptomatic cases may be better fitted using the same dynamical model as for the BRN.
230 Moreover, our current model is subject to bias from changes in treatment availability, such as increased
231 use of remdesivir, though current treatment opportunities have limited effect[12,22].

232 Perspective

233 The current global challenge of reopening society with fewest fatal consequences and at the same time
234 reducing economical costs warrants valid and precise prediction models. We believe that the current study
235 provides a valuable tool for early measurement of the effect of a political intervention. As time progresses
236 and the political strategy is adjusted, one can simply add additional sigmoid function, without having to
237 refit the parameters of the prior BRN functions. However, the results of the current study suggests that
238 each adjustment of any political strategy aimed at constraining the COVID-19 epidemic should be invoked
239 with at least fourteen days intervals.

240 Conclusion

241 In this study we estimated characteristics of the COVID-19 epidemic in Denmark based on the number of in-
242 patient beds needed, the number of ICU beds needed and the cumulative number of deaths. We found the

243 model parameters to be stable as more data were accrued over time. Moreover, we found that the time of
244 change from initial BRN to the reduced BRN to be in good accordance with actual timing of the political
245 actions. We believe the model constitutes a useful tool for early assessment of the effect following political
246 interference. The model can easily be implemented in other settings.

247 References

- 248 1. Verity R, Okell LC, Dorigatti I, Winskill P, Whittaker C, Imai N, et al. Estimates of the severity of
249 coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based analysis. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2020. doi:10.1016/s1473-
250 3099(20)30243-7
- 251 2. Ferguson NM, Laydon D, Nedjati-Gilani G, Imai N, Ainslie K, Baguelin M, et al. Impact of non-
252 pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand. *Imp Coll*
253 *COVID-19 Response Team.* 2020.
- 254 3. Nicola M, Alsaifi Z, Sohrabi C, Kerwan A, Al-Jabir A, Iosifidis C, et al. The socio-economic implications
255 of the coronavirus pandemic (COVID-19): A review. *Int J Surg.* 2020;78: 185–193.
256 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsu.2020.04.018>
- 257 4. <https://www.sst.dk/da/corona/tal-og-overvaagning>. 2020.
- 258 5. <https://politi.dk/coronavirus-i-danmark/seneste-nyt-fra-myndighederne>. 2020.
- 259 6. Linton NM, Kobayashi T, Yang Y, Hayashi K, Akhmetzhanov AR, Jung S, et al. Incubation Period and
260 Other Epidemiological Characteristics of 2019 Novel Coronavirus Infections with Right Truncation: A
261 Statistical Analysis of Publicly Available Case Data. *J Clin Med.* 2020. doi:10.3390/jcm9020538
- 262 7. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, Wang X, Zhou L, Tong Y, et al. Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of
263 Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia. *N Engl J Med.* 2020. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2001316
- 264 8. Pung R, Chiew CJ, Young BE, Chin S, Chen MI-C, Clapham HE, et al. Investigation of three clusters of

- 265 COVID-19 in Singapore: implications for surveillance and response measures. *Lancet* (London,
266 England). 2020.
- 267 9. Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, Jones FK, Zheng Q, Meredith HR, et al. The Incubation Period of
268 Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and
269 Application. *Ann Intern Med*. 2020. Available: <https://doi.org/10.7326/M20-0504>
- 270 10. Guan W, Ni Z, Hu Y, Liang W, Ou C, He J, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in
271 China. *N Engl J Med*. 2020. doi:10.1056/nejmoa2002032
- 272 11. To KK-W, Tsang OT-Y, Leung W-S, Tam AR, Wu T-C, Lung DC, et al. Temporal profiles of viral load in
273 posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-
274 CoV-2: an observational cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020. doi:10.1016/s1473-3099(20)30196-1
- 275 12. Cao Y chen, Deng Q xin, Dai S xue. Remdesivir for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2
276 causing COVID-19: An evaluation of the evidence. *Travel Medicine and Infectious Disease*. 2020.
277 doi:10.1016/j.tmaid.2020.101647
- 278 13. Mason RJ. Pathogenesis of COVID-19 from a cell biology perspective. *European Respiratory Journal*.
279 2020. doi:10.1183/13993003.00607-2020
- 280 14. Liu Y, Eggo RM, Kucharski AJ. Secondary attack rate and superspreading events for SARS-CoV-2. *The*
281 *Lancet*. 2020. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30462-1
- 282 15. Kucharski AJ, Russell TW, Diamond C, Liu Y, Edmunds J, Funk S, et al. Early dynamics of transmission
283 and control of COVID-19: a mathematical modelling study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020.
284 doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30144-4
- 285 16. Aron JL, Schwartz IB. Seasonality and period-doubling bifurcations in an epidemic model. *J Theor*
286 *Biol*. 1984;110: 665–679. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5193\(84\)80150-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5193(84)80150-2)

- 287 17. Stehlé J, Voirin N, Barrat A, Cattuto C, Colizza V, Isella L, et al. Simulation of an SEIR infectious
288 disease model on the dynamic contact network of conference attendees. *BMC Med.* 2011;9: 87.
289 Available: <https://doi.org/10.1186/1741-7015-9-87>
- 290 18. Kermack WO, McKendrick AG. A Contribution to the Mathematical Theory of Epidemics. *Proc R Soc*
291 *Lond.* 1927;A115: 700–721.
- 292 19. Allen LJS. Some discrete-time SI, SIR, and SIS epidemic models. *Math Biosci.* 1994;124: 83–105.
293 doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/0025-5564\(94\)90025-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0025-5564(94)90025-6)
- 294 20. Ma J. Estimating epidemic exponential growth rate and basic reproduction number. *Infectious*
295 *Disease Modelling.* 2020. doi:10.1016/j.idm.2019.12.009
- 296 21. Dureau J, Kalogeropoulos K, Baguelin M. Capturing the time-varying drivers of an epidemic using
297 stochastic dynamical systems. *Biostatistics.* 2013. doi:10.1093/biostatistics/kxs052
- 298 22. Beigel JH, Tomashek KM, Dodd LE, Mehta AK, Zingman BS, Kalil AC, et al. Remdesivir for the
299 Treatment of Covid-19 — Preliminary Report. *N Engl J Med.* 2020. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2007764

300

301





