

1 The COVID-19 herd immunity threshold is not low: A re-analysis of 2 European data from spring of 2020

3 Spencer J. Fox¹, Pratyush Potu², Michael Lachmann³, Ravi Srinivasan⁴, Lauren Ancel Meyers^{1,3}

4

5 1 - Department of Integrative Biology, The University of Texas at Austin

6 2 - Department of Mathematics, The University of Texas at Austin

7 3 - The Santa Fe Institute

8 4 - Applied Research Laboratories, The University of Texas at Austin

9 Commentary

10 The time course and burden of the COVID-19 pandemic will depend on the herd
11 immunity threshold (HIT) of the virus, which is the fraction of the population that needs to be
12 immunized for an epidemic to slow in the absence of mitigation efforts. Estimates for the
13 COVID-19 HIT range from 6% to over 60%^{1,2}. Given that roughly 10% of the global population
14 has been infected³, the low end of this range implies that the pandemic should soon burn out on
15 its own, while the high end paints a grim picture of future morbidity and mortality, in the absence
16 of pervasive non-pharmacological interventions, efficacious vaccines, or life-saving drugs.

17 The recent publication of the Great Barrington Declaration (GBD), which calls for
18 relaxing all public health interventions on young, healthy individuals, has brought the question of
19 herd immunity to the forefront of COVID-19 policy discussions^{4,5}. The authors state that
20 “immunity in the population is playing a substantial role in controlling the spread,” tacitly
21 referencing preprints by multiple GBD authors that posit HITs of 10-20%^{2,6}. Evidence against
22 this claim is mounting, including pandemic resurgences throughout Europe and the US and
23 attack rates exceeding 50% in the hardest hit regions and congregate living settings⁷⁻⁹.


24 Given that this unpublished work is fundamentally shaping public discourse and global
25 policy, reconciling its claims with the rapidly evolving state of the pandemic is paramount. To
26 this end, we reevaluated the core model from the study and have identified a fundamental flaw
27 that leads to underestimation of the COVID-19 HIT. The authors sought to identify the *cause* of
28 the summer slowdown in four European countries by *fitting* an SEIR-like model of COVID-19
29 transmission to case count data up to July of 2020. The analysis is structured so that one of two
30 explanations are possible. Either the pandemic is self-limiting (i.e., the HIT is low) or social
31 distancing and other community mitigation efforts slowed transmission. However, teasing apart
32 the contributions of these factors from the case data alone is statistically impossible. In other
33 words, one cannot estimate the HIT without making assumptions about the efficacy of
34 community mitigation, and vice versa (See supplement).

35 So the researchers made a strong assumption about community mitigation efforts in
36 Europe in the spring and summer of 2020. Roughly, they assume that Europe locked down
37 throughout April and then returned to *normal* (linearly) by the end of August (Figure 1A - Blue).
38 By assuming that interventions disappear steeply, the model concludes that the pandemic must
39 be fading due to immunity buildup, and thus estimates low HITs. As it turns out, the derived HIT
40 is highly sensitive to the assumed timeline of mitigation (Figure S2-S3) and we have good
41 reason to believe their assumption is flawed. The authors use mobility traces to justify their
42 pattern², but other precautionary policies like school closures, wearing of face coverings, and
43 social distancing have likely kept transmission repressed far below the pre-April baseline
44 (Figure 1A - Black). When we plug this *plausible* scenario into the Aguas et al. model² (Figure
45 1A - Green), the COVID-19 HIT estimate increases six-fold for Belgium, three-fold for England,
46 ten-fold for Portugal, and six-fold for Spain (Figure 1B). A range of alternative scenarios produce
47 similar estimates (Figure S2-S3). If policymakers were to adopt a *herd immunity strategy*, in
48 which the virus is allowed to spread relatively unimpeded, we project that cumulative COVID-19
49 deaths would total almost 650,000 (95% CI: 500,000 - 780,000) across all four countries

50 through the end of the pandemic under the revised HIT estimates, roughly five-fold higher that
51 projected under the original low HIT estimates (Figure S4).

52 The fragility of the Aguas et al. study² undermines a key premise of GBD and other
53 recent calls for “herd immunity” strategies. To their credit, the authors clearly demonstrate that
54 population heterogeneity in susceptibility to infection can dramatically lower the herd immunity
55 threshold¹⁰. However, their model can only disentangle the impacts of heterogeneity versus
56 interventions on COVID-19 transmission when approached with sufficient data and validated
57 assumptions. Our rough, but arguably more plausible, re-estimates of the COVID-19 HIT
58 corroborate strong signals in the data and compelling arguments that most of the globe remains
59 far from herd immunity. Moreover, abandoning community mitigation efforts would jeopardize
60 the welfare of communities and integrity of healthcare systems.

61



62
63 **Figure 1: Re-estimation of the COVID-19 herd immunity thresholds (HIT) in four European**

64 **countries, using the model of Aguas et al.². (A) Strength of non-pharmacological**
65 **interventions indicated by a government response index¹¹ (black) compared to the trends**
66 **assumed by Aguas et al.² (blue) and plausible alternatives (green) derived to match the**
67 **observed indices. The time-series are scaled for comparison, where values of zero and one**

68 correspond to lack of mitigation efforts and the average level of community mitigation in April,
69 respectively. (B) Estimated HIT using the Aguas et al.² approach, under the original assumption
70 that non-pharmacological efforts rapidly decrease to baseline (blue) and alternative assumption
71 that measures mirror the government response index (green).

72 Acknowledgements

73 The authors thank the authors of Aguas et al.², for sharing their research code and data, which
74 allowed us to replicate and extend their analyses. We acknowledge the UT COVID-19 Modeling
75 Consortium for helpful discussion and comments, and the Texas Advanced Computing Center
76 (TACC) at The University of Texas at Austin for providing HPC resources that have contributed
77 to the research results reported within this paper. URL: <http://www.tacc.utexas.edu>. We also
78 acknowledge support from a CDC COVID-19 supplementary grant (U01IP001136-01-01).

79 Author Contributions

80 SJF, ML, and LAM conceived of the initial idea. PP carried out all analyses. RS and ML
81 developed the analytical framework for statistical identifiability. SJF and LAM supervised the
82 research. SJF and LAM wrote the initial draft. All authors significantly contributed to the
83 manuscript and approved the final draft. PP, SJF, and RS verified the underlying data.

84 Declaration of interests

85 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.
86

87 References

88 1 Fontanet A, Cauchemez S. COVID-19 herd immunity: where are we? *Nat Rev Immunol*
89 2020; **20**: 583–4.

- 90 2 Aguas R, Corder RM, King JG, Goncalves G, Ferreira MU, M. Gomes MG. Herd immunity
91 thresholds for SARS-CoV-2 estimated from unfolding epidemics. *Epidemiology*. 2020;
92 published online July 24. DOI:10.1101/2020.07.23.20160762.
- 93 3 Keaten J. WHO: 10% of world's people may have been infected with virus. Associated
94 Press. 2020; published online Oct 5. [https://apnews.com/article/virus-outbreak-archive-](https://apnews.com/article/virus-outbreak-archive-united-nations-54a3a5869c9ae4ee623497691e796083)
95 [united-nations-54a3a5869c9ae4ee623497691e796083](https://apnews.com/article/virus-outbreak-archive-united-nations-54a3a5869c9ae4ee623497691e796083) (accessed Nov 10, 2020).
- 96 4 Great Barrington Declaration. <https://gbdeclaration.org/> (accessed Nov 3, 2020).
- 97 5 Alwan NA, Burgess RA, Ashworth S, *et al*. Scientific consensus on the COVID-19
98 pandemic: we need to act now. *Lancet* 2020; **396**: e71–2.
- 99 6 Colombo M, Mellor J, Colhoun HM, M. Gomes MG, McKeigue PM. Trajectory of COVID-19
100 epidemic in Europe. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*. 2020; published online Sept
101 28. DOI:10.1101/2020.09.26.20202267.
- 102 7 Buss LF, Prete CA Jr, Abraham CMM, *et al*. COVID-19 herd immunity in the Brazilian
103 Amazon. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*. 2020; published online Sept 21.
104 DOI:10.1101/2020.09.16.20194787.
- 105 8 Hagan LM. Mass Testing for SARS-CoV-2 in 16 Prisons and Jails — Six Jurisdictions,
106 United States, April–May 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020; **69**.
107 DOI:10.15585/mmwr.mm6933a3.
- 108 9 McMichael TM, Currie DW, Clark S, *et al*. Epidemiology of Covid-19 in a Long-Term Care
109 Facility in King County, Washington. *N Engl J Med* 2020; **382**: 2005–11.
- 110 10 Gomes MGM, Corder RM, King JG, *et al*. Individual variation in susceptibility or exposure to
111 SARS-CoV-2 lowers the herd immunity threshold. *medRxiv* 2020; published online May 2.
112 DOI:10.1101/2020.04.27.20081893.
- 113 11 Hale T, Webster S, Petherick A, Phillips T, Kira B. Oxford covid-19 government response
114 tracker. *Blavatnik School of Government* 2020; **25**.

115

116

117

118

119

1 Supplementary information for “The COVID-19
2 herd immunity threshold is not low: A re-analysis
3 of European data from spring of 2020”

4 Spencer J. Fox Pratyush Potu Michael Lachmann
5 Ravi Srinivasan Lauren Ancel Meyers

6 November 11, 2020

7 **1 Overview**

8 The low COVID-19 herd immunity thresholds (HITs) of 6-21% estimated in
9 Aguas et al. [1] are inconsistent with other model-derived estimates [5, 9, 2] and
10 seroprevalence-based estimates from some of the hardest hit regions around the
11 world [3]. To explain this apparent discrepancy, we conducted a thorough review
12 of their methods and code. We identified key assumptions about the timing and
13 extent of community mitigation efforts that shift the COVID-19 HIT estimates
14 downward. As their code was made openly available (<https://github.com/mmgomes1/covid>), we apply their exact model structure and fitting procedure
15 to evaluate the sensitivity of the HIT estimates to these assumptions.

16 Below, we detail our: (1) slight modification to their model fitting procedure,
17 (2) sensitivity analyses with respect to the assumed mitigation curves (i.e.,
18 timing and magnitude of transmission reduction via non-pharmacological inter-
19 ventions), (3) derivation of alternate *plausible* mitigation curves from the Oxford
20 COVID-19 Government Response Tracker response index data, (4) long-range
21 COVID-19 mortality projections depending on the estimate HIT, and, finally (5)
22 mathematical argument regarding the statistical non-identifiability the model
23 (i.e., inability to simultaneously estimate the impact of community mitiga-
24 tion and population heterogeneity). The code used for the primary analyses
25 along with the data can be accessed here: <https://github.com/pratyush16/VariationalSusceptibility>
26
27

28 **2 Modification to the Aguas et al. model**

29 We slightly modified the modeling framework of Aguas et al. [1] to include
30 an additional month of COVID-19 incidence data (through August 7th, 2020)
31 for Belgium (<https://epistat.wiv-isp.be/covid/>) and England (<https://coronavirus.data.gov.uk/details/about-data>). For Portugal and Spain we
32

33 analyzed data through July 10th, 2020 as in [1]. We made this adjustment to
34 address a strong tendency of the model to estimate a low HIT without evidence
35 of increased transmission following intense mitigation during the initial stay at
36 home orders.

37 **3 Sensitivity of COVID-19 HIT estimates to mit-** 38 **igation curves**

39 We analyzed the sensitivity of the HIT estimates from Aguas et al. to variations
40 in the assumed temporal progression of the mitigation curves within their mod-
41 eling framework. Specifically they assume a general shape of mitigation where
42 mitigation begins, increases until it reaches a maximum level, remains at the
43 maximum for some time, and then slowly returns to a baseline of no mitigation.
44 In this shape there are five key parameters governing the progression: (1) the
45 time that mitigation begins, (2) the time it takes for mitigation to take full
46 effect, (3) the maximum impact of mitigation, (4) the duration that mitigation
47 remains at maximum, and (5) the time for mitigation to be completely removed.

48 The modeling framework fits the timing that mitigation begins and the max-
49 imum impact it will have, but makes assumptions about the remaining param-
50 eters. Their framework assumes that once mitigation begins it will take 21 days
51 to reach a maximum level, will remain there for 30 days, and will subsequently
52 return to the original baseline level after 120 days. They test sensitivity to
53 slight deviations of the time to return to baseline and find minimal change in
54 HIT estimates looking at 150 or 180 days. As noted in the manuscript and
55 seen in Figure 1, we believed their assumptions about mitigation progression
56 were driving their low HIT estimates, so we tested the sensitivity of the low
57 HIT estimates to a wide-range of values for the maximum mitigation duration
58 (Figure S2) and times to return back to baseline (Figure S3). It's clear that
59 the model is sensitive to the assumed shape of mitigation, with HIT estimates
60 ranging from almost 5% to 85% depending on the country and assumed shape.

61 It is clear that the estimated HITs are extremely sensitive to these assump-
62 tions, and that there are many combinations of heterogeneity and mitigation
63 progression that can give similar fits (described in the next section), so it is
64 extremely important that the assumed mitigation curves match reality. While
65 Aguas et al. matched their mitigation shapes to mobility data, these data are not
66 an accurate picture for total transmission mitigation, as decoupling of mobility
67 and transmission has been previously noted as populations adopt precautionary
68 behavior like mask wearing and social distancing [12].

69 Instead, we focused on the government response index developed by re-
70 searchers at the University of Oxford [7]. This index captures 18 policy in-
71 dicators widely implemented around the world, and produces an overall value
72 that captures the strength of government responses through time as shown in
73 Figure 1A. We found that the Aguas et al baseline assumptions did not match
74 the actual progression of mitigation policies, and instead chose to fit the esti-




Figure S1: Country-specific case counts used for fitting alongside daily estimates of the effective reproduction number. Case counts in black indicate data used that are the same as Aguas et al, and light grey indicates the additional data we included in our fitting procedure as described in the modifications section of the supplement.

75 mated time to completely remove mitigation according to the government re-




Figure S2: Sensitivity of herd immunity threshold (HIT) estimates to assumptions about the duration at maximum mitigation. Vertical black dashed line indicates the assumed value in Aguas et al. All estimates are made assuming the baseline value of time for mitigation to be completely removed of 120 days.

76 sponse index. We assumed the baseline assumptions of 21 days to implement
77 mitigation and 30 days at maximum mitigation impact, and fit the timing to
78 completely remove mitigation based on the trends in the government response
79 index. Fitted estimates for the time to return to normal can be found in Figure
80 S3 for each country, and are almost an order of magnitude larger than assumed
81 in Aguas et al (120): Belgium (828 days), England (1,130 days), Portugal (981
82 days), and Spain (1,033 days). While the government response index also likely
83 doesn't capture the full progression of community mitigation, because it doesn't
84 capture adherence to policies, we feel that it likely captures general countrywide
85 trends better than mobility data alone.

86 4 Projecting mortality under a *herd immunity* 87 policy

88 We calculated the final epidemic size for an uncontrolled epidemic based on
89 the method described in [6] for each country. We carried out the same fitting




Figure S3: Sensitivity of herd immunity threshold (HIT) estimates to assumptions about the time for mitigation to be completely removed. Colored solid lines show sensitivity across all four European countries. Vertical black dashed line shows the assumed value in Aguas et al, and vertical colored lines show the fitted value from government response index used in our main analysis for each of the specific countries. All estimates are made assuming the baseline value of maximum mitigation duration of 30 days.

90 procedure as Aguas et al. using either their assumed mitigation curve or our
91 revised version, we then calculated the mortality cost of following a “herd im-
92 munity strategy” using the estimated parameters from each European country.
93 For each European country we used the estimated final epidemic size estimated
94 for that scenario as the total infection count and an infection fatality rate of
95 0.68% (95% CI: 0.53%-0.82%) [10]. For the US, we assumed average final epi-
96 demic sizes based on the average of the estimates for the four countries for each
97 assumed mitigation curve scenario, which suggests final epidemic sizes of 13.9%
98 and 79.2% for the Aguas et al. and alternative scenarios respectively. Estimates
99 for both scenarios can be seen in Figure S4. Country population sizes were as-
100 sumed to be 56,286,961 (England), 11,607,113 (Belgium), 10,186,314 (Portugal),
101 46,761,086 (Spain), and 331,674,530 (United States) as estimated from UN pop-
102 ulation statistics made available through <https://www.worldometers.info/>.




Figure S4: Mortality estimate for a herd immunity strategy for each of the four European countries and the United States. Comparison between estimated mortality if herd immunity thresholds are as low as estimated in Aguas et al (Blue), versus those estimated using the policy-based, alternative mitigation curve (Green). Estimates assume an infection fatality rate of 0.68% (95% CI: 0.53%-0.82%) [10]

103 5 Non-identifiability of the model

104 The model fitting procedure from Aguas et al. explains transmission dynamics
105 between mitigation and population heterogeneity, which impacts herd immu-
106 nity thresholds. In Aguas et al., they begin with assumed mitigation curves and
107 estimate the herd immunity threshold. Here we describe mathematically why
108 their estimation procedure is only identifiable with strong assumptions about
109 the shape of the mitigation curves. We first break down the model structure
110 into component parts to make clear the tension between mitigation and herd
111 immunity. Then we use this analytical framework to flip their estimation proce-
112 dure around to show how one can estimate mitigation curves that fit epidemic
113 trajectories for any assumed herd immunity threshold.

114 To start, consider an SEIR model with variable susceptibility $S_t(x)$ and
115 time-dependent mitigation M_t due to non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs),
116 as given in Aguas et al.:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{S}(x) &= -x\lambda S(x)M \\ \dot{E}(x) &= x\lambda S(x)M - \delta E(x) \\ \dot{I}(x) &= \delta E(x) - \gamma I(x) \\ \dot{R}(x) &= \gamma I(x)\end{aligned}$$

117 Then,

$$R_0 = \frac{\beta}{\gamma}, \quad R_t = \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \bar{S}_t M_t = R_0 \bar{S}_t M_t,$$

118 where R_0 is the basic reproduction number, $R_t = R_{\text{eff}}(t)$ is the effective repro-
119 duction number at time t , and $\bar{S}_t = \int x' S_t(x') dx'$ is the mean susceptibility at
120 time t . More generally, we can consider time-dependent effective reproduction
121 numbers of the form

$$R_t = R_0 F_t(S) M_t, \quad (1)$$

122 where $F_t(S)$ is some functional of the variable susceptibility $S_t(x)$ as a function
123 of x (notice that the functional itself does not change over time, but that the
124 resulting function has a time dependence since $S_t(x)$ does). The model of Aguas
125 et al. corresponds to the case when $F_t(S) = \bar{S}_t$. From this equation it is already
126 clear that given a time series R_t , we can for every t only infer the combined
127 impact of heterogeneity and mitigation (the product $F_t(S)M_t$), but not each
128 separately.

129 Now consider $\tilde{R}_t = R_t/M_t = R_0 F_t(S)$, the effective reproduction number if
130 there was no intervention at all (i.e., if $M_t \equiv 1$). Herd immunity is reached at
131 $T = \min \{t' : \tilde{R}_t \leq 1 \text{ for all } t \geq t'\}$ (i.e., the first time after which \tilde{R}_t remains
132 at or below 1), and the corresponding herd immunity threshold is

$$\text{HIT} = 1 - S_T,$$

133 where $S_t = \int S_t(x') dx'$.

134 Epidemic dynamics with Gamma-distributed variable sus- 135 ceptibility

136 Following a similar derivation as that in Montalban et al. [11], it can be shown
137 that

$$S_t(x) = S_0(x) e^{-x \cdot k_t}$$

138 where $k_t = \int_0^t \lambda_s M_s ds$ and λ_t is the force of infection at time t . Assuming $S_0(x)$
139 is a Gamma(a, a) density (where a is related to the coefficient of variation by
140 $\text{CV} = 1/\sqrt{a}$), we have that

$$S_t(x) = \left(\frac{a}{a + k_t} \right)^a \text{Gamma}_{a, a+k_t}(x).$$

141 Taking integrals, it can be shown that

$$S_t = \left(\frac{a}{a + k_t} \right)^a$$

142 and

$$\bar{S}_t = \left(\frac{a}{a + k_t} \right)^{a+1} = (S_t)^{\frac{a+1}{a}}.$$

143 Using the previous formula, we have that $S_t = (\bar{S}_t)^{\frac{a}{a+1}}$. Since $\tilde{R}_T =$
 144 $R_T/M_T = 1$, we have that $R_0\bar{S}_T = 1$ and

$$\text{HIT} = 1 - (\bar{S}_T)^{\frac{a}{a+1}} = 1 - R_0^{-\frac{a}{a+1}}.$$

145 Deriving mitigation curves from herd immunity thresholds

146 We now show how it is possible to derive a mitigation curve M_t that is consistent
 147 with the dynamics under Gamma-distributed variable susceptibility for a given
 148 herd immunity threshold.

149 To begin, let us reparameterize time in terms of the proportion of susceptibles
 150 S_t to make our calculations simpler. First, Note that S_t is strictly monotone
 151 decreasing so long as $\lambda_t M_t > 0$ for all t (i.e., both the force of infection and
 152 mitigation curve are strictly positive), and that $S_0 = 1$ and $S_t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.
 153 Let $\sigma_t = 1 - S_t$. Then, we can reparameterize time by $t \mapsto \sigma$ (i.e., $[0, \infty) \mapsto$
 154 $[0, 1]$). That is, Equation (1) becomes

$$R_\sigma = R_0 F_\sigma M_\sigma.$$

155 Assume that F_t and R_t are given. Then M_σ can be calculated as

$$M_\sigma = \frac{R_\sigma}{R_0 F_\sigma}.$$

156 Let us write script letters for log of the values:

$$\mathcal{M}_\sigma = \log(M_\sigma) = \log(R_\sigma) - \log(R_0) - \log(F_\sigma) = \mathcal{R}_\sigma - \mathcal{R}_0 - \mathcal{F}_\sigma.$$

157 Since $F_t(S) = (S_t)^{(a+1)/a}$, we have that $F_\sigma = (1 - \sigma)^{(a+1)/a}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{F}_\sigma =$
 158 $\frac{a+1}{a} \log(1 - \sigma)$ and

$$\mathcal{M}_\sigma = \mathcal{R}_\sigma - \mathcal{R}_0 - \frac{a+1}{a} \log(1 - \sigma).$$

159 As before, herd immunity is reached at the value S_* of S at which no growth
 160 occurs in the absence of intervention, i.e., $R_t/M_t \equiv R_*/M_* = 1$. That is,

$$1 = R_0 F_*(S_*),$$

161 and therefore $F_*(S_*) = R_0^{-1}$. Let $\sigma_* = 1 - S_* = \text{HIT}$. Since $F(S) = S^{(a+1)/a}$,
 162 this implies

$$(1 - \sigma_*)^{\frac{a+1}{a}} = \frac{1}{R_0}.$$

163 Taking logarithms, we find that

$$\frac{a+1}{a} = \frac{-\mathcal{R}_0}{\log(1-\sigma_*)}.$$

164 Finally, substituting this into the expression above we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_\sigma &= \mathcal{R}_\sigma - \mathcal{R}_0 + \frac{\mathcal{R}_0}{\log(1-\sigma_*)} \log(1-\sigma) \\ &= \mathcal{R}_0 \left(\frac{\log(1-\sigma)}{\log(1-\sigma_*)} - \left(1 - \frac{\mathcal{R}_\sigma}{\mathcal{R}_0}\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

165 Inverting the mapping $t \mapsto \sigma$, we can again write this as a function of time t :

$$\mathcal{M}_t = \mathcal{R}_0 \left(\frac{\log(S_t)}{\log(S_*)} - \left(1 - \frac{\mathcal{R}_t}{\mathcal{R}_0}\right) \right).$$

166 Exponentiating both sides, we finally arrive at the expression

$$\begin{aligned} M_t &= \exp \left[\log(\mathcal{R}_0) \left(\frac{\log(S_t)}{\log(S_*)} - \left(1 - \frac{\log(R_t)}{\log(\mathcal{R}_0)}\right) \right) \right] \\ &= R_t \cdot R_0^{\frac{\log(S_t)}{\log(1-\text{HIT})} - 1} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

167 This gives us a formula for calculating a mitigation curve M_t that is consistent
168 with the underlying variable susceptibility model of Aguas et al., for any chosen
169 value of a herd immunity threshold.

170 Computing mitigation curves as a function of herd immu- 171 nity threshold

172 We can see from the previous section that the model is attempting to match the
173 dynamics seen in the data through a combination of mitigation and herd immu-
174 nity as impacted through population heterogeneity. To further show why strong
175 mitigation assumptions are needed to estimate the herd immunity thresholds,
176 we show how one can craft mitigation curves to match dynamics for a wide
177 range of herd immunity thresholds for each of the four countries investigated
178 (Belgium, England, Portugal, and Spain).

179 Using Equation (2), we can estimate daily mitigation impacts for a given herd
180 immunity threshold (HIT) given the necessary data. To do so, one only needs
181 estimates for the basic reproduction number (R_0), daily effective reproduction
182 number (R_t), and the proportion of the population still susceptible to the disease
183 (S_t). For each of the four countries we first estimated R_t using the available
184 case data and a common method for measuring the instantaneous reproduction
185 number assuming a mean serial interval of 5.8 days and standard deviation of
186 4.48 days [4, 8]. We took the largest value of R_t as our rough estimate for the
187 R_0 . Finally, we used the case data and the estimated country-specific reporting

188 rates estimated in Aguas et al. to estimate the true incidence of disease each
189 day, which we converted to S_t using $S_t = S_{t-1} - C_t/\rho$. Here, C_t is the number
190 of the reported cases in that country at time t , and ρ is the country-specific
191 reporting rate from Aguas et al: Belgium (0.06), Portugal (0.09), Spain (0.059),
192 England (0.024).

193 In Figure S5 we show the calculated mitigation curves for each country across
194 a range of potential HITs from 20% to 70%.

195 References

- 196 [1] Ricardo Aguas et al. “Herd immunity thresholds for SARS-CoV-2 esti-
197 mated from unfolding epidemics”. In: *medRxiv* (2020). DOI: 10.1101/
198 2020.07.23.20160762. URL: [https://www.medrxiv.org/content/
199 early/2020/08/31/2020.07.23.20160762](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/08/31/2020.07.23.20160762).
- 200 [2] Tom Britton, Frank Ball, and Pieter Trapman. “A mathematical model
201 reveals the influence of population heterogeneity on herd immunity to
202 SARS-CoV-2”. en. In: *Science* 369.6505 (Aug. 2020), pp. 846–849.
- 203 [3] Lewis F Buss et al. “COVID-19 herd immunity in the Brazilian Amazon”.
204 Sept. 2020.
- 205 [4] Anne Cori et al. “A New Framework and Software to Estimate Time-
206 Varying Reproduction Numbers During Epidemics”. In: *American Jour-
207 nal of Epidemiology* 178.9 (Sept. 2013), pp. 1505–1512. ISSN: 0002-9262.
208 DOI: 10.1093/aje/kwt133. eprint: [https://academic.oup.com/aje/
209 article-pdf/178/9/1505/17341195/kwt133.pdf](https://academic.oup.com/aje/article-pdf/178/9/1505/17341195/kwt133.pdf). URL: [https://doi.
210 org/10.1093/aje/kwt133](https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwt133).
- 211 [5] Arnaud Fontanet and Simon Cauchemez. “COVID-19 herd immunity:
212 where are we?” en. In: *Nat. Rev. Immunol.* 20.10 (Oct. 2020), pp. 583–584.
- 213 [6] M Gabriela M Gomes et al. “Individual variation in susceptibility or ex-
214 posure to SARS-CoV-2 lowers the herd immunity threshold”. In: *medRxiv*
215 (2020). DOI: 10.1101/2020.04.27.20081893. URL: [https://www.
216 medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/05/21/2020.04.27.20081893](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/05/21/2020.04.27.20081893).
- 217 [7] Thomas Hale et al. “Oxford covid-19 government response tracker”. In:
218 *Blavatnik School of Government* 25 (2020).
- 219 [8] Xi He et al. “Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of
220 COVID-19”. en. In: *Nat. Med.* (Apr. 2020).
- 221 [9] Kin On Kwok et al. *Herd immunity – estimating the level required to halt
222 the COVID-19 epidemics in affected countries*. 2020.
- 223 [10] Gideon Meyerowitz-Katz and Lea Merone. “A systematic review and meta-
224 analysis of published research data on COVID-19 infection-fatality rates”.
225 en. In: *Int. J. Infect. Dis.* (Sept. 2020).




Figure S5: Using cases data and R_t estimation we calculate M_t , the NPI transmission multiplier timelines that would be inferred to have a predetermined HIT.

- 226 [11] Antonio Montalbán, Rodrigo M. Corder, and M. Gabriela M. Gomes. *Herd*
227 *immunity under individual variation and reinfection*. 2020. arXiv: 2008.
228 00098 [q-bio.PE].
- 229 [12] P Nouvellet et al. “Report 26: Reduction in mobility and COVID-19 trans-
230 mission”. In: (). URL: [https://spiral.imperial.ac.uk/handle/10044/](https://spiral.imperial.ac.uk/handle/10044/1/79643)
231 [1/79643](https://spiral.imperial.ac.uk/handle/10044/1/79643).