Covid-19 health care demand and mortality in Sweden in response to non-pharmaceutical (NPIs) mitigation and suppression scenarios

Henrik Sjödin[1], Anders F. Johansson[2] , Zia Farooq[1], Åke Brännström[3], Hedi Katre Kriit[1], Annelies Wilder-Smith[4-6], Christofer Åström[1], Johan Thunberg[2], Joacim Rocklöv[1]

1. Department of Public Health and Clinical Medicine, Section of Sustainable Health, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden
2. Department of Clinical Microbiology, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden
3. Department of Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden
4. Department of Epidemiology and Global Health, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden
5. Department of Disease Control, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK
6. Heidelberg Institute of Global Health, University of Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany

Corresponding author: Joacim Rocklöv, Department of Public Health and Clinical Medicine, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden. Email: joacim.rocklov@umu.se

Introduction

In response to the COVID-19 outbreak, China implemented extraordinary public health measures at great socio-economic cost, moving swiftly and decisively to ensure early identification of cases, prompt laboratory testing, facility-based isolation of all cases, contact tracing and quarantine.[1] In the community, social distancing was implemented at a grand scale, all mobility put to an halt, and the city of Wuhan was in lock-down for about 4 weeks. China's tremendous efforts showed success. Other Asian countries facing a major explosion such as South Korea also managed to curb the epidemic. South Korea employed very liberal testing, hospital-based isolation of all cases (even mild ones), combined with extensive contact tracing enhanced by mobile phone and digital technologies, but did not use a lock-down.[2, 3] Despite many importations early on in the outbreak, Singapore has seen a flat rate of daily new cases, by focusing on prompt and aggressive pro-active case detection and attempting to interrupt every chain of transmission and keeping clusters at bay.[4]

While the outbreak in China is now contained, since mid March 2020, the epicentre of the COVID-19 pandemic is in Europe[5], with Italy reporting more deaths than China. Various European countries have seen an exponential growth in daily new cases, and unless strong

reductions in transmission, the wave is expected to hit all of Europe by the end of March 2020. There is an urgent need to reduce transmission and thus reduce the growth rate of this epidemic, reduce the height of the epidemic peak and the peak demand on healthcare services, as well as reduce the total number of infected persons.

In the absence of vaccines, a wide range of control measures can be considered to contain or mitigate COVID-19. These include active case finding with prompt isolation of cases, contact tracing with quarantine of contacts, school closures and closures of public places, mobility restrictions, social distancing in the community, social distancing only of the elderly, and a lock-down (also known as cordonaire sanitaire).[1] There is currently no consensus about which measures should be considered, in which combination, and at which epidemiological threshold such measures should be implemented for maximum public health impact.[6]

European policy-makers are currently debating two strategies: (a) containment or suppression, which aims to reverse epidemic growth, thereby reducing case numbers to low levels. And (b) mitigation, which focuses on slowing but not necessarily stopping epidemic spread –reducing peak healthcare demand while protecting those most at risk of severe disease from infection. Each policy has major challenges. Containment aims to reduce the reproduction number, R, to below 1, thus causing case numbers to decline. Mitigation aims to merely slow spread by reducing R, but not to below 1.

It should now be an urgent priority to quantify the effects of these measures and specifically whether they can reduce the effective reproductive number below 1, because this will guide the response strategies.

Here we estimate the impact of COVID-19 on the Swedish population at the municipality level, considering demography and human mobility under scenarios of mitigation and suppression. We estimate the timelines of incidence, hospitalization rates, the intensive care (ICU) need, and the mortality in relation to the current Swedish ICU capacity, and costs of care. We further investigate the sensitivity to various degrees of potential underreporting on the estimates.

Methods

We fitted a compartmental SEIR alike model including compartment for hospitalization and ICU care with age groups of 0-59, 60-79, and 80+ years at the level of municipality in Sweden. We further linked the municipalities to each other using a radiation model with was calibrated using a N1H1 Influenza A model to the influenza incidence in Sweden from 2015-2018. Demographic data was taken at the municipality level of Sweden for year 2018 from Statistics Sweden and all estimates was derived by municipality weighted proportion of populations by age groups of 10 years.

The case fatality ratio (CFR) varies across regions, partly depending on age structure of population, but also potential underreporting. Hospitalization and ICU needs per apparent infections was taken from Ferguson et al.[7] We alike Ferguson et al. assumed the infection fatality ratio (IFR) was lower than the CFR adjusting for underreporting, depending on the municipality age structure. We run the base scenario models on the assumption of 50% underreporting, approximately similar to Ferguson et al.[7] Under this assumption the IFR was estimated to around 1.0% (high) depending on the exact age structure. We further investigated the sensitivity to these results by allowing the proportion of underreporting due to mild disease to vary up to 80% and 90%, and thus the IFR to fall to around 0.5% (medium) and 0.2% (low) depending on age structure. The lower IFR of 0.2% still is double the IFR associated with influenza A.

We modelled the impact of the SARS-COV-2 virus on the Swedish population using the various counter measures associated with the mitigation versus the suppression strategies. The baseline scenarios include isolation of hospitalized patients and self-quarantine, which is restricting the infectious period of the average population. The infectious period in severely ill hospitalized patients is likely to vary by individual and range from days to weeks. In most cases, viral shedding in respiratory secretion for about seven days is likely a major driver of disease transmission. Due to the self-quarantine advice if symptoms (cough, fever), the actual infectious period can be assumed much shorter for many people, but household member are often still at risk. There are also clear indications for asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic transmission. We thus assumed the average effective infectious period was centered around 5 days, with a β of 0.5, this associates to an R_0 of 2.5, which is in the middle

of the range of reported basic reproduction rates for COVID-19. In the mitigation versus suppression scenarios we assumed the quarantine and isolation based on symptoms was present from the first day of reported COVID-19 cases in Sweden, February 24, 2020, while the mitigation and suppression strategies was activated first the 20th of March, 2020. The model and parameters are described in the supplement.

The model was initiated to simulate the municipality transmission dynamics and inter-municipality spread across Sweden starting from the 24th of February and ending 6 months later, August 23, 2020. Due to the many arriving travelers carrying SARS-COV-2 arriving from Italy the week of the 24th of February, the model was seeded with 1 case per 50,000 population. Municipalities smaller than 50,000 did not have any index cases. These index cases can either be seen as asymptomatic cases, cases with symptoms but lack of compliance to home quarantine, or cases with late symptom onset not identified early enough.

Table 1. Scenarios of different countermeasures to COVID-19. Isolation and self-quarantine onset were 24th of February; onset of the social isolation of elderly 13th of March; onset of between municipality mobility 13th of March; onset of all other interventions 20th of March.

Scenario	Description	Mobility between municipalities	Contact rates/social distancing
1	Isolation of hospitalized cases and self-quarantine of apparent symptomatic infections	Normal 100%	Normal 100%
2	Isolation of hospitalized cases and self-quarantine of apparent symptomatic infections and reduction; medium social distancing	Normal 100%	Medium 75%

3	Isolation of hospitalized cases and self-quarantine of apparent symptomatic infections; strong social distancing	Normal 100%	Strong 50%
4	Isolation of hospitalized cases and self-quarantine of apparent symptomatic infections; very strong social distancing (starting 20th March)	Normal 100%	Very strong 25%
5	Isolation of hospitalized cases and self-quarantine of apparent symptomatic infections; low mobility between municipalities (starting 20th of March)	Low 50%	Normal 100%
6	Isolation of hospitalized cases and self-quarantine of apparent symptomatic infections and reduction; medium social distancing; low mobility between municipalities (starting 20th of March)	Low 50%	Medium 75%
7	Isolation of hospitalized cases and self-quarantine of apparent symptomatic infections; strong social distancing; low mobility between municipalities (starting 20th of March)	Low 50%	Strong 50%
8	Isolation of hospitalized cases and self-quarantine of apparent symptomatic infections; very strong social distancing; low mobility between municipalities (starting 20th of March)	Low 50%	Very strong 25%
9	Isolation of hospitalized cases and self-quarantine of apparent symptomatic infections; social distancing of elderly	Low 50%	Very strong 50% among ages 60 years

Results

The epidemic in Sweden as a whole show to be sensitive to some of the NPI´s. Overall, the peak months varies by location, where overall the smaller rural municipalities are predicted to experience a later peak, and the urban municipalities are predicted to peak earlier. Reduced mobility between municipalities (scenario 1 vs 2) do change the timing of the peak, and further delays the outbreak onset in smaller rural municipalities. Municipalities with the oldest population overall experience higher ICU needs and largest health impacts.

Considering the ICU needs in the age groups studied, the scenarios 1-3 and 5-7 and 9 where contact rates and social distancing are reduced to by 50% independent of between municipality mobility, are resulting in mitigation scenarios. Some of them are flattening the outbreak curve and the ICU need substantially, especially at the 50% reduction of contacts and social distancing. The role of between municipality is still important, but not significantly for the rates demand in the whole of Sweden. For suppression, the contact rates and social distancing need to be reduced by 75%, also here the between municipality mobility is not a key factor when looking at the demand for the whole of Sweden overall. Scenario 9 corresponding to the mitigation scenario by only protecting the ages 60+ by reducing their contact by 50% by increasing social distancing isn't very sensitive to the between municipality mobility when looking at the ICU demand. The results of these predictions aggregated for all the municipalities in Sweden is presented in Figure 1.

The ICU need for the total population of Sweden ranges from around 6 times to 30 times the ICU capacity of Sweden at the peak of the outbreak in the scenario 1 where only isolation and self-quarantine is practiced (Figure 1) depending on the IFR. In this scenario the age group below 60 year take up a substantial ICU need. In scenario 2 where contact rates are reduced moderately the whole population by social distancing, the demand at the peak of the outbreak is around 20 to 4 times higher than the ICU capacity, and the curve is slightly flattened. At the higher IFR the ages under 60 takes up a significant proportion of ICU capacity. Scenario 3 with strong reduction in contact rates and increases in social distancing the ICU demand curve is substantially flattened. At this level the ICU demand is lower than the capacity at the low IFR, just above at the medium IFR, and substantially above at the

high IFR. In scenario 4 where the contact rates and social distancing is very strong, the outbreak is suppressed, but risk to pick up again when the social distancing stops. Overall the scenarios 5-8 show similar patterns to 1-4 respectively but indicate the outbreaks and ICU demand is a bit larger for a longer period overall in Sweden when the between municipality mobility is higher compared to lower. In Figure 2 scenarios 9 is illustrated with 50% reduction in contacts and increased social distancing among ages 60+. In this scenario the under 60 years with take of a large bit of the ICU capacity independent of the IFR. At the peak the ICU demand will be around 30 times the capacity in Sweden at the higher IFR, while around 5 times the capacity at the lower IFR.

Table 2. Health care demand;

Scenario	IFR	Peak characteristics							
		Infections		In patient care		ICU demand		Deaths	
		Month	No.	Month	No.	Month	No.	No limits in ICU access	Excess due to limited ICU access*
1	High	17-maj-2020	819323	22-maj-2020	42752	28-maj-2020	14624	41930	41404
1	Medium	17-maj-2020	817490	22-maj-2020	17065	28-maj-2020	5837	16748	16222
1	Low	17-maj-2020	816938	22-maj-2020	8525	28-maj-2020	2916	8370	7844
2	High	4-juni-2020	432341	10-juni-2020	23555	15-juni-2020	8298	33380	32854
2	Medium	5-juni-2020	431035	9-juni-2020	9392	16-juni-2020	3309	13320	12794

2	Low	5-juni-2020	430576	9-juni-2020	4692	15-juni-2020	1653	6655	6129
3	High	20-juli-2020	81283	24-juli-2020	4719	31-juli-2020	1723	7988	7462
3	Medium	19-juli-2020	80966	24-juli-2020	1880	30-juli-2020	686	3186	2660
3	Low	20-juli-2020	80863	25-juli-2020	939	30-juli-2020	343	1592	1066
4	High	23-mars-2020	5318	30-mars-2020	256	8-apr-2020	85	211	0
4	Medium	23-mars-2020	5307	30-mars-2020	102	7-apr-2020	34	84	0
4	Low	23-mars-2020	5315	30-mars-2020	51	8-apr-2020	17	42	0
5	High	17-maj-2020	1079634	21-maj-2020	54144	27-maj-2020	18045	42960	42434
5	Medium	17-maj-2020	1076896	21-maj-2020	21610	27-maj-2020	7200	17161	16635
5	Low	17-maj-2020	1075473	21-maj-2020	10793	26-maj-2020	3596	8577	8051
6	High	7-juni-2020	605920	13-juni-2020	31683	18-juni-2020	10922	37215	36689
6	Medium	8-juni-2020	603866	12-juni-2020	12635	17-juni-2020	4355	14852	14326

6	Low	8-juni-2020	603293	13-juni-2020	6309	18-juni-2020	2175	7420	6894
7	High	11-aug-2020	115777	13-aug-2020	6463	16-aug-2020	2322	9688	9162
7	Medium	10-aug-2020	115362	12-aug-2020	2575	17-aug-2020	925	3866	3340
7	Low	10-aug-2020	115212	12-aug-2020	1286	17-aug-2020	462	1931	1405
8	High	23-mars-2020	5319	30-mars-2020	256	6-apr-2020	85	209	0
8	Medium	23-mars-2020	5310	31-mars-2020	102	8-apr-2020	34	84	0
9	High	26-maj-2020	862333	2-juni-2020	38576	9-juni-2020	11935	32820	32294
9	Medium	25-maj-2020	860146	1-juni-2020	15385	8-juni-2020	4759	13097	12571
9	Low	26-maj-2020	859607	2-juni-2020	7686	9-juni-2020	2377	6544	6018

- Limited to the current ICU threshold of 526

Discussion

The results show a strong demand on health care and potential risks of fatalities in relation to sensitivity of the Swedish impacts from COVID-19. They describe uncertainty in the impacts from the responses in relation to mobility, connectivity, social distancing. The results strongly indicate risks with large demands of in-patient care and intensive care in relation to scenarios with less strong reductions in contact rates and with less social

distancing. Those impacts are reduced when we assume the underreporting is more substantial.

Overall, these analyses include uncertainties and with the development of more knowledge of the virus SARS-COV-2 and the disease risks with COVID-19, the implications of the results may need to be revisited.

Sweden is currently (20th of March, 2020) most likely following the scenario 2 and scenario 9 development, which suggest the health care demand and mortalities could be substantially from COVID-19. A change in strategy could reduce the impacts on the health care demand and the public health substantially, but would also need to consider impacts on other sectors in the society.

References

1 A Wilder-Smith, DO Freedman. Isolation, quarantine, social distancing and community containment: Pivotal role for old-style public health measures in the novel coronavirus (2019-ncov) outbreak. J Travel Med 2020.

2 D Korean Society of Infectious, D Korean Society of Pediatric Infectious, E Korean Society of, et al. Report on the epidemiological features of coronavirus disease 2019 (covid-19) outbreak in the republic of korea from january 19 to march 2, 2020. J Korean Med Sci 2020; 35(10):e112.

3 E Covid-19 National Emergency Response Center, KCfDC Case Management Team, Prevention. Contact transmission of covid-19 in south korea: Novel investigation techniques for tracing contacts. Osong Public Health Res Perspect 2020; 11(1):60-63.

4 VJ Lee, CJ Chiew, WX Khong. Interrupting transmission of covid-19: Lessons from containment efforts in singapore. J Travel Med 2020.

5 E Livingston, K Bucher. Coronavirus disease 2019 (covid-19) in italy. JAMA 2020.

6 A Flahault. Covid-19 cacophony: Is there any orchestra conductor? Lancet 2020; online(

7 N Ferguson, et al. Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (npis) to reduce covid-19 mortality and healthcare demand. DOI: https://doiorg/1025561/77482 2020.

Supplement

To account for time delays in the spatial spread of SARS-CoC-2 over large geographical ranges (i.e., Sweden) we set up a spatial compartmental model. We accordingly make a distinction between local (municipality) and global (Sweden) processes. The effects of local contact structures were assumed to be well described by the law of mass action; at local scales we can assume a well-mixed contact-structure due to the transmission efficiency at such spatial scales of SARS-CoV-2. The effects of global contact structures were assumed to

be well described by the Radiation model[1], which introduces time delays to the spatial progression of infections over Sweden.

We can therefore express a compartmental model generally for any municipality. We have developed an age-structured SEIR-based compartmental model extended to account for health-care demand arising from COVID-19 epidemic in Sweden. In any municipality i, we account for all individuals that are susceptible S_i; latent (exposed) E_i; infectious I_i; in health care H_i; in critical care C_i; recovering in health care after critical care $\widetilde{H}_i$; dead due to SARS-CoV-2 infection D_i; recovered R_i. Respective of these variables are age-structured (i.e., vectors with age-specific component values). We have accounted for three age-classes $a = (0-59, 60-79, 80+)$. The compartmental model can then be written

$$\dot{S}_i = -\frac{\beta S_i\left(\sum_a I_i + \sum_{i\neq j}\langle T_I\rangle_{ij} - \sum_{j\neq i}\langle T_I\rangle_{ji}\right)}{N_i} \qquad \text{S.1}$$

$$\dot{E}_i = \frac{\beta S_i\left(\sum_a I_i + \sum_{i\neq j}\langle T_I\rangle_{ij} - \sum_{j\neq i}\langle T_I\rangle_{ji}\right)}{N_i} - \frac{E}{l}$$

$$\dot{I}_i = \frac{E}{l} - (\epsilon\gamma_H + (1-\epsilon_i)\gamma)I_i$$

$$\dot{H}_i = \epsilon_i\gamma_H I_i - \left(\chi_i\gamma_C + \frac{(1-\chi_i)}{h}\right)H_i$$

$$\dot{C}_i = \chi_i\gamma_C H_i - \left(\frac{\mu}{p} + \frac{(1-\mu)}{p}\right)C_i$$

$$\dot{\widetilde{H}}_i = \frac{(1-\mu)}{p}C_i - \tilde{\gamma}\widetilde{H}_i$$

$$\dot{D}_i = \frac{\mu}{p}C_i$$

$$\dot{R}_i = (1-\epsilon_i)\gamma I_i + \frac{(1-\chi_i)}{h}H_i + \tilde{\gamma}\widetilde{H}_i$$

where $N = S_i + E_i + I_i + R_i$, and where $\langle T_I\rangle_{ij}$ denotes the number of infected individuals from the jth municipality visiting the ith municipality, on average for a day, and $\langle T_I\rangle_{ji}$ denotes the number of infected individuals from the ith municipality going the ith municipality, on average for a day. These mobility rates are given by the Radiation model[1], where we used the time dependent rate scaling $\alpha(t)$, with 0.001 as the baseline, i.e., the counter-scenario of inter-municipality travel-reductions. Please see table S1 for model parameterization that was based to a large extent on Ferguson et al.[2]

Table 1. Parameters in equation system S.1 and their respective values.

Parameter	**Notation and value**	**Notes**
Age-classes	$a = (0-59, 60-79, 80+)$	
Time-dependent transmission rate	$\beta = 0.55c(t)$	
Latent period	$l = 4$	
Recovery rate or removal rate	γ =1/5	
The proportion of infected cases requiring hospitalization	ϵ_i	See table 2 for age structured values
Hospitalization rate of infected cases requiring hospitalization	$\gamma_H = 1/5$	
The proportion of hospitalized cases requiring critical care	χ_i	See table 2 for age structured values
Rate of going into critical care	$\gamma_C = 1/6$	
Critical-care period	$p = 7$	
The proportion in critical care that dies	$\mu = 0.49$	
Recovery rate from health care after critical care	$\tilde{\gamma} = 1/7$	
Time-dependent contact rate	$c(t) = \frac{1-\hat{c}}{1+\exp(5(t-\hat{t}))} + \hat{c}$	Contact rate reduced to $\hat{c}$ around $\hat{t}$ = March 20
Time-dependent inter-municipality travel-rate scaling	$\alpha(t) = \alpha_0\left(\frac{1-\hat{\alpha}}{1+\exp(5(t-\hat{t}))} + \hat{\alpha}\right)$	Travel rate reduced to $\alpha_0\hat{\alpha}$ around $\hat{t}$ = March 20; with $\alpha_0 = 0.001$
Contact rate scaling (reduction)	$\hat{c} = (1, 0.75, 0.5, 0.25)$	Four scenarios, where the first means no change to normal.
Travel rate scaling (reduction)	$\hat{\alpha} = (1, 0.5)$	Two scenarios, where the first means no change to normal.

Table 2 Severity of age-classes (from Ferguson et al. 2020). Drawing on these age-structured data, we derived the corresponding *proportion of infected cases requiring hospitalization* for age-classes $a = (0-59, 60-79, 80+)$ by first correcting for underreporting (50%, 80%, 80%), and by taking a weighted average for each age-class in a. We also derived the *proportion of hospitalized cases requiring critical care* by the weighted averaging, and not correcting for underreporting as there is naturally no underreporting of hospitalized cases.

Table 2.		
Age-class (years)	**Percent of reported cases requiring hospitalization**	**Percent of hospitalized cases requiring critical care**
0-9	0.1	5.0
10-19	0.3	5.0
20-29	1.2	5.0
30-39	3.2	5.0
40-49	4.9	6.3
50-59	10.2	12.2
60-69	16.6	27.4
70-79	24.3	43.2
80+	27.3	70.9

References

1. Simini, F., González, M.C., Maritan, A. & Barabási, A.-L. (2012). A universal model for mobility and migration patterns. *Nature*, 484, 96–100.
2. N Ferguson, et al. Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (npis) to reduce covid-19 mortality and healthcare demand. DOI: https://doiorg/1025561/77482 2020.




a
Scenario 9; IFR high
Number of people requiring intensive care
15000
10000
5000
0
All
0-59
60-79
80+
ICU
Feb
Mar
Apr
May
Jun
Jul
Aug
Sep
2020


b
Scenario 9; IFR medium
5000
4000
3000
2000
1000
0
ICU
Feb
Mar
Apr
May
Jun
Jul
Aug
Sep
2020


c
Scenario 9; IFR low
2500
2000
1500
1000
500
0
ICU
Feb
Mar
Apr
May
Jun
Jul
Aug
Sep
2020