

Modeling non-pharmaceutical interventions in the COVID-19 pandemic with survey-based simulations

Marius Kaffai¹ Raphael H. Heiberger¹

¹Institute for Social Sciences, University of Stuttgart, Germany

`marius.kaffai@sowi.uni-stuttgart.de`,

`raphael.heiberger@sowi.uni-stuttgart.de`

Abstract

Governments around the globe use non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to curb the spread of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases. Making decisions under uncertainty, they all face the same temporal paradox: estimating the impact of NPIs before they have been implemented. Due to the limited variance of empirical cases, researcher could so far not disentangle effects of individual NPIs or their impact on different demographic groups. In this paper, we utilize large-scale agent-based simulations in combination with Susceptible-Exposed-Infectious-Recovered (SEIR) models to investigate the spread of COVID-19 for some of the most affected federal states in Germany. In contrast to other studies, we sample agents from a representative survey. Including more realistic demographic attributes that influence agents' behavior yields accurate predictions of COVID-19 transmissions and allows us to investigate counterfactual "what-if" scenarios. Results show that quarantining infected people and exploiting industry-specific home office capacities are the most effective NPIs. Disentangling education-related NPIs reveals that each considered institution (kindergarten, school, university) has rather small effects on its own, yet, that combined openings would result in large increases in COVID-19 cases. Representative survey-characteristics of agents also allow us to estimate NPIs' effects on different age groups. For instance, re-opening schools would cause comparatively few infections among the risk-group of people older than 60 years.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Results	4
3	Discussion	6
4	Methods	8
A	Supplementary information	17

1 Introduction

In 2020, governments tried to curb the spread of COVID-19 without having an appropriate medical response available. Most governments implemented non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) which affect societal life in an unseen manner. Although there is initial evidence that NPIs, such as the closure of educational facilities [7, 26, 27], workplaces [27, 38] and certain businesses [7, 26], the cancellation of mass gatherings [7, 26, 27], case detection and contact tracing [23, 38], shielding of vulnerable people [24], wearing masks [36] or specific network intervention strategies [39] are effective in reducing the amount of new cases, it is also clear that NPIs come with severe side effects, e.g., on the economy [39, 41], labour markets [11], people’s physical [34] and mental health [8], or concerns on increasing domestic violence [6]. Thus, decision-maker act under immense pressure to balance public health risks while sustaining economic activities. In so doing, policy-makers are facing a temporal paradox when it comes to the implementation of NPIs: they have to decide whether a particular NPI (or a set thereof) is curbing the spread of COVID-19 without having reliable knowledge about the NPIs’ actual effectiveness. The best way to evaluate the effectiveness of NPIs would be to measure the empirical correlation between the implementation of a NPI and the change of the infection rate. However, an empirical estimation is difficult in many areas due to the unavailability of data. Only few studies exist with a rather narrow set of scenarios [7, 26, 27] or coarse resolutions [14]. Empirical studies on the effect of NPIs are by-design limited in scope because they can only measure the impact of what governments implement, i.e., estimations rest on scenarios which have actually happened. Based on inter-temporal cross-country data, Brauner et al. [7], for instance, cannot disentangle the effect of school closure and the effect of university closure, because in most countries these two institutions were closed almost at the same time. To circumvent one’s reliance on detailed empirical data in order to evaluate a larger variety of scenarios, simulation methods can be used to create and investigate the effect of NPIs which did not occur in reality [22, 44].

In addition, there is great need for more detailed knowledge of how NPIs work in the specific context of a country’s or region’s social structure [12, 44]. Preliminary evidence exists that the spread of COVID-19 cases is starkly influenced by structural circumstances, such as age distributions [13, 17] or network densities of geographic areas [31]. To reflect social structures and relevant characteristics of people’s behavior in simulations, agent-based modeling (ABM) have proven to be good complements to epidemiological differential equation models [18, 19, 39, 44]. Once a model with ‘predictive capability’ is established [40], it is possible to create scenarios that differ from empirical scenarios but to apply the simulation results to reality [22, 44].

Many researcher already exploit the benefits of data-driven agent-based models to investigate NPIs in the context of a countries’ specific circumstances [9, 10, 20, 24, 30, 35, 38]). ABM exist for the U.S. [10, 20], Canada [38], Australia [9], France [24], Singapore [30], Iran [35] and the UK [20]. Our model not only adds (parts of) Germany to this list but uses a innovative method to generate an artificial population of agents which resembles the real population of a federal state and, hence, important parts of its social structure. Thus instead of corresponding to a few, rather coarse macro-characteristics of the target population, our study represents households of survey participants. The micro-level of the simulation – agents with specific attributes living together with other agents with specific attributes – therefore reflects important properties of the social structure of a society; much more than synthesizing the artificial population based on aggregated macro-data on the target populations’s household structure.

Utilizing large-scale agent-based simulations with representative survey data in combination with SEIR models provides the frame for testing counterfactual “what-if” scenarios in a quasi-experimental setup. This allows us to assess the effectiveness of NPIs for a variety of otherwise unobservable scenarios and deduce the effect of each NPI on its own (cf. “Methods”4 for details). In addition, the micro-




Figure 1: Model fit by state. The solid lines depict the number of reported COVID-19 cases and the average of infections across simulation runs. Shaded areas represent the 95% confidence intervals of the averages. The root mean squared error of the model’s predictions ranges between 10.17 for Bavaria and 17.68 for Hamburg.

foundation of ABMs paves the way to differentiate NPIs’ impact on demographic sub-groups, of which age is the most important in regard to COVID-19 [17, 37].

2 Results

To derive the efficacy of NPIs in counterfactual scenarios, the first step is to ensure the predictive capability of the model by assessing its fit to the actual spread of COVID-19. The proposed model matches the empirical data of the daily number of cumulative cases for each of the four most affected federal states in Germany (Figure 1). Our model predicts the rapid rise of COVID-19 cases in the early stages of the pandemic as well as its subsequent decelerated growth in which the infection numbers stabilize. The model also simulates accurately the different levels of disease spread in the four states, which vary considerable by structure (cf. SI Table 3).

After establishing that the model actually predicts the empirical spread of the Corona virus, we can turn to implementing counterfactual scenarios. We do that by removing each NPI that was at work in reality (the "Baseline"-scenario) and measure the effect of its omission in the simulation. Figure 2 reveals that decreasing the urge to quarantine infectious cases and reducing home office hours to regular percentages would cause the starkest increase across all implemented NPIs. While quarantine is, by a margin, the most important NPI in the two large territorial states (Baden-Wuerttemberg and Bavaria), it is a bit less important than increased home-office in the two smaller states. At the other end of the efficacy spectrum is the scenario in which there was no reduction of work hours in certain economic sectors due to economic downturns and the partial shutdown of their business. Across all states, it has almost no effect in our simulation if people would have worked normal hours.




Figure 2: Effect of counterfactual non-implementation of NPIs, by state. Each line represents the effect that the removal of one specific NPI has on the spread of COVID-19 in our simulation. For instance, "Normal.Homeoffice" means that the percentage of people working at home is set to the statistical average, i.e., the value in non-pandemic times.

Which education facilities may be kept running is one of the most controversial topics in Germany, since it affects the lives of millions of pupils and parents. Turning to education-related NPIs, our model predicts a large increase of COVID-19 cases if all three types of institutions (kindergartens, schools, and universities) would re-open. In contrast to previous studies [7], our model also allows us to inspect the effect of each education facility separately. In the counterfactual scenarios presented in Figure 2, opening schools would have increased COVID-19 cases by several hundred (per day). Figure 3 disentangles the numbers further. It shows that opening all education-related institutions at the same time has a considerable effect (third largest overall, 2), however, each institution alone causes much less infections. Therefore, contagious effects seem at work which can be mostly attributed to the interplay of kindergarten kids and pupils ("Open.Schools.Kinder" in Figure 3). If comparing education-related NPI individually, we see that the effects of all three types are rather similar. Yet, opening universities has slightly lower effects than the other two, and opening schools causes the highest average effect in all four states.

Besides considering NPIs separately, using an ABM with representative survey respondents as agents allows us to trace infections by age group. Age constitutes one of the main factors to identify risk groups [17]. In general and for each NPI, the mean age of infected agents decreases over time (Figure 4). This reflects recent findings using rare empirical data on the age of infected [37]. Furthermore, Figure 4 details how each NPI affects different age groups. It reveals that the counterfactual removal of NPIs drive COVID-19 numbers through the infection of agents younger than 60. Across all states, the scenarios in which schools re-open and pre-pandemic home office rates are attained lead to the lowest proportion among the elderly risk-group. In contrast, re-opening the universities yields a higher proportion of infections among people older than 60, although the vast majority of infections pertains younger people




Figure 3: Cumulative infection numbers for each counterfactual non-implementation of education-related NPIs, by state. Boxplots depict the distribution of all runs.

and the absolute numbers of COVID-19 caused by re-opening universities are rather low (Figure 2).

3 Discussion

Overcoming the temporal paradox of deciding whether the implementation of a particular NPI is decreasing the spread of COVID-19 before knowing its actual effect is crucial for policy-makers and researchers alike. Testing such counterfactual "what-if" scenarios could improve the basis for decision-making considerably and help to decide which NPIs to implement. Our approach illustrates a way to estimate the effectiveness of otherwise unobservable scenarios by simulating agents with attributes taken from a large survey representing about 27 million people. In so doing, our study generates insights on the effectiveness of several widespread NPIs (quarantine, home-office, closing universities, schools, and kindergartens, reduced work hours) in four federal states in Germany. Going beyond previous studies, our approach enables us to disentangle the effect of individual NPIs and, hence, provides information for policy makers who need to balance the trade-off underlining each NPI between individual and economic freedom on the one side, and prevention of disease spread on the other.

It can be shown that focused quarantining of infected agents and their household members (i.e., close contacts) is the most effective NPI. Governments should therefore make every effort to increase their ability of case detection and contact tracing [23, 38]. The second largest effect is the home office scenario. It can be shown that an increased usage of home office capacities is a very effective measure to reduce the number of new infections, which is in line with observational studies [3]. This result is particularly important, because although there was a considerable increase of home office usage in the beginning of the pandemic [32], both employers and employees still refuse to comprehensively rely on home office in the long term [29].

The most controversial NPI is the closure of educational facilities. In contrast to many observa-




Figure 4: Number of infected agents belonging to the risk-group (age ≥ 60), by state. Lines represent the share of cases in the risk group for each NPI over all simulation runs. To facilitate readability, a ribbon of confidence intervals is omitted. Figures including the CIs are available upon request.

tional studies [7, 14, 21], we are able to estimate a separate effect for each education-related NPI. Our simulations suggest that the separate re-opening of each institution yields rather low infection numbers. However, combined openings lead to multiple infections, in particular, re-opening kindergartens and schools at the same time increase COVID-19 cases considerably. Therefore, alternating periods of open educational institutions could represent a promising way to maintain low infection numbers while sustaining institutional functions.

A key characteristic of COVID-19 is its elevated mortality for older people and the subsequent importance of demographics [17]. Taking into account social structures by using agents with survey-characteristics and in accordance with a very recent study for the USA [37], our findings reveal that younger age (less risk-prone) groups sustain the spread of COVID-19 when the fore-mentioned NPIs are omitted. Furthermore, simulations suggest that the removal of NPIs affect age groups differently. Considering age adds an important puzzle piece how to select NPIs, i.e., it allows to distinguish the impact of NPIs in regard to its overall effects *and* group-specific effects for the people who are most vulnerable to COVID-19.

Like other simulation studies, our analysis has several limitations. First, our model does not contain a representation of contacts between households or agents that do not take place in one of the implemented locations, e.g., contacts with relatives or friends. Second, our model does not contain locations where people meet during spare time. However, the influence of both points is mitigated because private contacts and leisure activities were reduced to a minimum in the observed period.

A further limitation is that we do not model changes of people's behavior. For example, we do not take into account the change in caution about infection risks in daily life or the obligation to keep distance and wear masks inside buildings. Also beyond the scope of this paper is the inclusion of external influences. Instead, we simulate a closed system. After the initial infections at the beginning of a run no

infections occur due to agents coming home from "outside", e.g., commuters or tourists.

As many other simulation studies, we had to estimate some parameters due to a lack of empirical data. However, we conducted a series of robustness checks for the most important of those parameters (cf. Figures 5-9 in SI). Sensitivity analyses suggest that the results are robust to changes in the parameters and, hence, to potential errors in assumed values.

Despite those limitations, we provide a reproducible model based on empirical agents which can be adopted and/or extended (Python code freely available). For instance, the current model including above NPIs could be readily applied on any states or regions. Researchers would only need to calibrate the model with subsequent empirical data on COVID-19 cases and survey data. In addition, researcher could extend the existing model with alternative NPIs which may be relevant for a specific region. The simulated world can be amplified by many other "meeting places" in which certain persons come into contact.

Despite all efforts and (slowly) increasing availability of vaccinations, it appears that COVID-19 will accompany our societies for some time to come [33]. Thus, the demand for data-driven epidemiological models including realistic social structures and demography will stay high. Our model is an instance how to incorporate survey-based populations and test counterfactual scenarios. The development and improvement of such models and the timely availability of more accurate data was maybe never more important than in the current global pandemic.

4 Methods

Creating the population of agents

Each agent-based model consists of 100000 agents living their live during the pandemic.¹ They are spending their time either at home, at an occupation specific work place, at kindergarten, at school, at university or at a supermarket. Each action depends on the day of week, the time of day and individual characteristics of each agent. The values of the agents' characteristics, such as age, gender, occupation, daily working hours or the time usually spent in the supermarket, are taken from survey data, i.e., each agent represents a survey respondent in regard to his or her attributes. For that purpose, we use the 2017 German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP) [43]. The SOEP is a representative panel survey that includes entire households of respondents. Table 1 (cf. supplementary information SI) lists all variables used to set agents' attributes.

We model the infection on the level of federal states with differing social structures. We chose the four states in Germany (Baden-Wuerttemberg, Bavaria, Hamburg, Saarland) with the highest infection rate relative to its population size during the first wave of Covid-19 in Germany (March 2020). While including other states/regions with lower infection numbers is possible, in principle, it is difficult to apply on our closed system because the disease spread dies most often in early stages without the influx from outside.

To create a population of agents that represents a given federal state, we first create a subset of SOEP-respondents who reside in the given state. In a second step, we take a random sample (with replacement) from the subset until a population size of at least 100000 is reached. The households' selection probabilities are not equal, but are weighted by the corresponding cross-sectional representativity weight provided by the SOEP for each household.

Like every survey, SOEP has to deal with missing values. For 3.53% of the sample we replace missing data on working hours by age- and gender-specific group means. For 3.46% of the sample we replace missing data on the occupation by a random occupation code in each simulation run. For cases with

¹All code is made available to reproduce results or to add further scenarios and, respectively, NPIs.

missing information about the time spent daily in supermarkets (26,92%) we impute the overall mean (approximately 1h). Finally, 1.62% of the households are excluded, because the case itself or a member of the corresponding household has missing data.

To set the agents' daily routines in the simulation, we classify each agent either as kindergartner, school student, working, university student, working university student or non-working agent. Therefore, we use "empirical agents" to trace the spread of COVID-19.

Building the simulated world

The simulated world consists of different types of locations where agents can stay and between which agents move. The types of locations implemented in the model are agents' homes, workplaces, school classes, kindergartens, universities and supermarkets, in order to simulate the most important NPIs that had come into effect in each federal state in Germany in Spring 2020. The subsequent NPIs have been closed schools, kindergartens and universities, increased usage of working from home (yet not at full scale), quarantine of the household of infected people and reduced working hours due to the economic shutdown.

For each household of the population a home is created in which all members of the household (taken from the SOEP) reside. The number of additional location types is adjusted to the characteristics of the agent population and the respective federal state. Table 1 (cf. SI) shows the parameters we use to calculate the corresponding number of locations in the simulation model.

Daily routines

During the day, agents engage in various activities. An activity is implemented in the simulation as staying at a certain place for a certain period of time. The type of activity an agent engages in, when and for how long, depends on the clock time, the weekday, the agent's attributes and the NPIs that are currently in effect. The default activity that every agent exhibits when there is no other activity on its schedule is being at home. The simulation starts with every agent being at home. Each time step represents an hour. Every morning at 8 o'clock each agent first decides whether it should stay at home due to symptoms of an infection or household quarantine. If neither is the case, if the agent's daily schedule is not affected by an NPI and if it is a weekday from Monday to Friday, kindergarden kids go to kindergarden, school kids go to school, university students attend university, and workers go to work. To account for the possibility of home office in the simulation, working agents change their location to their workplace only with a certain probability and otherwise start working from home. The probabilities to work from home are derived from data on the frequency of home office use per NACE-category in Germany in 2018 [4]. The respective NPI on increased home office usage sets numbers as if the home office capacity would have been exploited in each NACE-industry [4]. Therefore, the scenario in which home office is reduced to pre-pandemic times must be interpreted accordingly.

School kids and kindergarden kids return to their homes after 5 hours, university students after 4. If university students have jobs, they first go to work and after work they go to university. While the dwell time at kindergarden, school and university are based on assumptions, the daily working hours represent those of the modeled survey respondents. When agents are at home and do no other activity, there is a certain probability to go to the supermarket. Every night at 1 a.m. the clock is set forward to 7 a.m. so that most of the night time is skipped.

Modeling the infection

The biological aspect of the infection, i.e. what happens to an agent after the virus was successfully transmitted, was implemented in strong orientation to the way the process of infection is implemented in "Covasim" [28]. It can be considered as an extended S-E-I-R (susceptible, exposed, infectious, recovered) infection model [2]. If an infectious agent and a susceptible agent are at the same time in the same place, there is certain probability of infecting the susceptible agent. At each time step, each infectious agent randomly selects one agent that is currently in the same location if the infectious agent is currently not alone in its location. If the agent randomly selected by the infectious agent is susceptible to infection, its infection status is set to 'exposed' by a certain probability of infection. This hourly probability of infection is a very important, but unknown parameter and is therefore determined by model calibration to empirical infection data of a given state (cf. section "Scaling and calibration"). How long each stage lasts and if the agent develops symptoms or not, is determined individually for each agent based on its empirical characteristics. For each agent and each stage of infection we draw individual time spans from a log-normal-distribution following Covasim [28]. In addition, the decision whether an agent develops symptoms or not is determined by an age-dependent probability, which also resembles Covasim [28].

NPIs and scenarios

The initial goal of the model is to capture the course of the pandemic during its first wave in Germany. For each state, we simulate 100 days, starting with the day when a state had approximately 50 cases per 100,000 inhabitants. While this defines the scope of the paper's results, in future research the model could also be extended to further waves to come. The main aim is to estimate effects of multiple NPIs implemented during the first wave in Germany. These effects must be considered in the model in order to capture the mechanisms of virus spread as close to reality as possible. The changes on the agents' daily lives due to NPIs considered in the model are the following: less to no time at school, kindergarten or university, an increased amount of time working from home, quarantining households of infected agents and reduced or no work hours due a (partial) shutdown of certain branches of industry.

Most effects of NPIs are implemented as a change in probability of actually leaving the home and exercising a certain activity. In response to active NPIs, the specific probability reflects whether a certain location is closed (or to what degree), or that work hours are reduced for a given NACE-category. For example, a (partially) closed school is implemented as a daily probability that determines for each school kid separately whether he or she goes to school that day. If schools are completely open, the probability for school attendance is 1. Complete closure of schools are reflected in a daily probability of school attendance equal to 0. If an agent shows symptoms of an infection over a certain period of time, the agent and all household members are quarantined at home for 14 days.

In the baseline model we mimic the course of the lockdown in Germany with its onset at around march 15 and the following 3 months of disease spread. It is important to note that each effect is the change in the number of cases if a given NPI had not been implemented while all other NPIs remain active (if not reported differently, e.g., the combined effects of education-related NPIs in the "School_Kinder"-scenario).

Scaling and calibration

In each run of the simulation we collect the new infections per day, the cumulative cases on a day and the age of the infected agents. If the size of the agent population is exactly equal to 100000 cases, frequencies can be directly interpreted as cases per 100000 inhabitants. Otherwise, the infection frequencies are calculated by $I * 100000/P$, where I is the number of infections and P is the actual population size in

the simulation. Therefore, all results can be interpreted as cases per 100000.

Due to the many stochastic elements used in the simulation, each single run of the model returns different results, even when the same set of parameters is used. Thus, to obtain reliable results for a given set of parameters we run 60 repetitions of model runs and average the results.

Although the model includes relevant micro-level mechanisms of a pandemic and a representative agent population, we must perform some iterative fine-tuning as is often done in ABMs, i.e., calibrating the model to reproduce empirical data [45]. To calibrate the ABMs on infection frequencies in a given federal state, we determine the values of two parameters: the hourly probability an infected agent will infect another agent, and the time needed to quarantine a household after the first symptoms of a household member appear. We performed the calibration using the "Latin Hypercube Sampling" algorithm [45], which is implemented in the python package "Spotpy" [25]. For each model to be calibrated, we searched for the set of model parameters that generate simulated data with the smallest deviation to the corresponding daily empirical data on cumulative number of infections (data source: [42]). We stopped the calibration process when at least one set of parameters was found to generate simulated data with a fit of a root mean squared error less than 20. Because the calibration of the model for a single federal state requires at least 180 simulation runs (each consisting itself of 60 internal runs and one run takes approx. 20 minutes) due to varying parameter sets, each process of calibration was serialized on 192 cores provided by BW-HPC, a statewide computing and data infrastructure.

References

- [1] Bruttoinlandsprodukt (VGR) | Statistikportal.de, 2020. URL <http://www.statistikportal.de/de/bruttoinlandsprodukt-vgr>.
- [2] Anas Abou-Ismael. Compartmental Models of the COVID-19 Pandemic for Physicians and Physician-Scientists. *Sn Comprehensive Clinical Medicine*, pages 1–7, June 2020. ISSN 2523-8973. doi:10.1007/s42399-020-00330-z. URL <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7270519/>.
- [3] Jean-Victor Alipour, Harald Fadinger, and Jan Schymik. My Home is My Castle - The Benefits of Working from Home During a Pandemic Crisis: Evidence from Germany. Technical Report crctr224_2020_178, University of Bonn and University of Mannheim, Germany, June 2020. URL https://ideas.repec.org/p/bon/boncrc/crctr224_2020_178.html.
- [4] Jean-Victor Alipour, Oliver Falck, and Simone Schüller. *Germany's Capacities to Work from Home*. April 2020.
- [5] Bertelsmann-Stiftung. Ländermonitor Frühkindliche Bildungssysteme. Gruppengröße 01.03.2019. Altersübergreifend Gruppen, ab 0 Jahren., 2020. URL https://www.laendermonitor.de/de/vergleich-bundeslaender-daten/personal-und-einrichtungen/kita-strukturen/gruppengroesse?tx_itahyperion_pluginview%5Baction%5D=chart&tx_itahyperion_pluginview%5Bcontroller%5D=PluginView&cHash=c6ebeec4ad1b9893fe5d1fb7119f0c8c.
- [6] Caroline Bradbury-Jones and Louise Isham. The pandemic paradox: The consequences of COVID-19 on domestic violence. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 29(13-14):2047–2049, 2020. ISSN 1365-2702. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.15296>. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/jocn.15296>.
- [7] Jan M. Brauner, Sören Mindermann, Mrinank Sharma, David Johnston, John Salvatier, Tomáš Gavenciak, Anna B. Stephenson, Gavin Leech, George Altman, Vladimir Mikulik, Alexander John Norman, Joshua Teperowski Monrad, Tamay Besiroglu, Hong Ge, Meghan A. Hartwick, Yee Whye Teh, Leonid Chindelevitch, Yarin Gal, and Jan Kulveit. Inferring the effectiveness of government interventions against COVID-19. *Science*, December 2020. ISSN 0036-8075, 1095-9203. doi:10.1126/science.abd9338. URL <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/early/2020/12/15/science.abd9338>.
- [8] Samantha K. Brooks, Rebecca K. Webster, Louise E. Smith, Lisa Woodland, Simon Wessely, Neil Greenberg, and Gideon James Rubin. The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. *The Lancet*, 395(10227):912–920, March 2020. ISSN 0140-6736, 1474-547X. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30460-8. URL [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(20\)30460-8/abstract](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(20)30460-8/abstract).
- [9] Sheryl L. Chang, Nathan Harding, Cameron Zachreson, Oliver M. Cliff, and Mikhail Prokopenko. Modelling transmission and control of the COVID-19 pandemic in Australia. *Nature Communications*, 11(1):5710, November 2020. ISSN 2041-1723. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-19393-6. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-020-19393-6>.
- [10] Dennis L. Chao, Assaf P. Oron, Devabhaktuni Srikrishna, and Michael Famulare. Modeling layered non-pharmaceutical interventions against SARS-CoV-2 in the United States with Corvid. *medRxiv*, page 2020.04.08.20058487, April 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.04.08.20058487. URL <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.08.20058487v1>.

- [11] Olivier Coibion, Yuriy Gorodnichenko, and Michael Weber. Labor Markets During the COVID-19 Crisis: A Preliminary View. Technical Report w27017, National Bureau of Economic Research, April 2020. URL <https://www.nber.org/papers/w27017>.
- [12] Tim Colbourn. COVID-19: extending or relaxing distancing control measures. *The Lancet Public Health*, 5(5):e236–e237, May 2020. ISSN 2468-2667. doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30072-4. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2468266720300724>.
- [13] Nicholas G. Davies, Petra Klepac, Yang Liu, Kiesha Prem, Mark Jit, CMMID COVID-19 working group, and Rosalind M. Eggo. Age-dependent effects in the transmission and control of COVID-19 epidemics. *Nature Medicine*, 26(8):1205–1211, August 2020. ISSN 1546-170X. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0962-9.
- [14] Jonas Dehning, Johannes Zierenberg, F. Paul Spitzner, Michael Wibral, Joao Pinheiro Neto, Michael Wilczek, and Viola Priesemann. Inferring change points in the spread of COVID-19 reveals the effectiveness of interventions. *Science*, 369(6500), July 2020. ISSN 0036-8075, 1095-9203. doi:10.1126/science.abb9789. URL <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/369/6500/eabb9789>.
- [15] Destatis. Bildung und Kultur. Allgemeinbildende Schulen. Schuljahr 2018/2019. Fachserie 11 Reihe 1., 2020. URL https://www.statistischebibliothek.de/mir/receive/DEHeft_mods_00112288.
- [16] Destatis. Verwaltungsgliederung am 31.03.2020 (1. Quartal), 2020. URL <https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Laender-Regionen/Regionales/Gemeindeverzeichnis/Administrativ/Archiv/Verwaltungsgliederung/Verwalt1QAktuell.html>.
- [17] Jennifer Beam Dowd, Liliana Andriano, David M. Brazel, Valentina Rotondi, Per Block, Xuejie Ding, Yan Liu, and Melinda C. Mills. Demographic science aids in understanding the spread and fatality rates of COVID-19. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(18):9696–9698, May 2020. ISSN 0027-8424, 1091-6490. doi:10.1073/pnas.2004911117. URL <https://www.pnas.org/content/117/18/9696>.
- [18] Joshua M. Epstein. Modelling to contain pandemics. *Nature*, 460(7256):687–687, August 2009. ISSN 1476-4687. doi:10.1038/460687a. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/460687a>.
- [19] Joshua M. Epstein and Robert Axtell. *Growing Artificial Societies: Social Science from the Bottom Up*. Brookings Institution Press, October 1996. isbn:978-0-262-05053-1.
- [20] N. Ferguson, D. Laydon, G. Nedjati Gilani, N. Imai, K. Ainslie, M. Baguelin, S. Bhatia, A. Boonyasiri, Z. Cucunuba Perez, G. Cuomo-Dannenburg, A. Dighe, I. Dorigatti, H. Fu, K. Gaythorpe, W. Green, A. Hamlet, W. Hinsley, L. Okell, S. Van Elsland, H. Thompson, R. Verity, E. Volz, H. Wang, Y. Wang, P. Walker, C. Walters, P. Winskill, C. Whittaker, C. Donnelly, S. Riley, and A. Ghani. Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID19 mortality and healthcare demand. Report, March 2020. URL <http://spiral.imperial.ac.uk/handle/10044/1/77482>.
- [21] Seth Flaxman, Swapnil Mishra, Axel Gandy, H. Juliette T. Unwin, Thomas A. Mellan, Helen Coupland, Charles Whittaker, Harrison Zhu, Tresnia Berah, Jeffrey W. Eaton, Mélodie Monod, Azra C. Ghani, Christl A. Donnelly, Steven Riley, Michaela A. C. Vollmer, Neil M. Ferguson, Lucy C. Okell, and Samir Bhatt. Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in Europe. *Nature*, 584(7820):257–261, August 2020. ISSN 1476-4687. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2405-7. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-020-2405-7>.

- [22] Nigel Gilbert, Petra Ahrweiler, Pete Barbrook-Johnson, Kavin Preethi Narasimhan, and Helen Wilkinson. Computational Modelling of Public Policy: Reflections on Practice. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*, 21(1):14, 2018. ISSN 1460-7425.
- [23] Giulia Giordano, Franco Blanchini, Raffaele Bruno, Patrizio Colaneri, Alessandro Di Filippo, Angela Di Matteo, and Marta Colaneri. Modelling the COVID-19 epidemic and implementation of population-wide interventions in Italy. *Nature Medicine*, 26(6):855–860, June 2020. ISSN 1546-170X. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0883-7. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41591-020-0883-7>.
- [24] Nicolas Hoertel, Martin Blachier, Carlos Blanco, Mark Olfson, Marc Massetti, Marina Sánchez Rico, Frédéric Limosin, and Henri Leleu. A stochastic agent-based model of the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic in France. *Nature Medicine*, 26(9):1417–1421, September 2020. ISSN 1546-170X. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-1001-6. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41591-020-1001-6>.
- [25] Tobias Houska, Philipp Kraft, Alejandro Chamorro-Chavez, and Lutz Breuer. SPOTting Model Parameters Using a Ready-Made Python Package. *PLOS ONE*, 10(12):e0145180, December 2015. ISSN 1932-6203. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0145180. URL <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0145180>.
- [26] Paul Raymond Hunter, Felipe Colon-Gonzalez, Julii Suzanne Brainard, and Steve Rushton. Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions against COVID-19 in Europe: a quasi-experimental study. *medRxiv*, page 2020.05.01.20088260, July 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.01.20088260. URL <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.01.20088260v2>.
- [27] Nazrul Islam, Stephen J. Sharp, Gerardo Chowell, Sharmin Shabnam, Ichiro Kawachi, Ben Lacey, Joseph M. Massaro, Ralph B. D’Agostino, and Martin White. Physical distancing interventions and incidence of coronavirus disease 2019: natural experiment in 149 countries. *BMJ*, 370, July 2020. ISSN 1756-1833. doi:10.1136/bmj.m2743. URL <https://www.bmj.com/content/370/bmj.m2743>.
- [28] Cliff C. Kerr, Robyn M. Stuart, Dina Mistry, Romesh G. Abeysuriya, Gregory Hart, Katherine Rosenfeld, Prashanth Selvaraj, Rafael C. Nunez, Brittany Hagedorn, Lauren George, Amanda Izzo, Anna Palmer, Dominic Delpont, Carrie Bennette, Bradley Wagner, Stewart Chang, Jamie A. Cohen, Jasmina Panovska-Griffiths, Michal Jastrzebski, Assaf P. Oron, Edward Wenger, Michael Famulare, and Daniel J. Klein. Covasim: an agent-based model of COVID-19 dynamics and interventions. *medRxiv*, page 2020.05.10.20097469, May 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.10.20097469. URL <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.10.20097469v1>.
- [29] KFrenken. Research on Home Office: A critical review, November 2020. URL <https://www.eipa.eu/research-on-home-office/>.
- [30] Joel R. Koo, Alex R. Cook, Minah Park, Yinxiaohe Sun, Haoyang Sun, Jue Tao Lim, Clarence Tam, and Borame L. Dickens. Interventions to mitigate early spread of SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore: a modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 20(6):678–688, June 2020. ISSN 1473-3099, 1474-4457. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30162-6. URL [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/laninf/article/PIIS1473-3099\(20\)30162-6/abstract](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/laninf/article/PIIS1473-3099(20)30162-6/abstract).
- [31] Theresa Kuchler, Dominic Russel, and Johannes Stroebel. The Geographic Spread of COVID-19 Correlates with the Structure of Social Networks as Measured by Facebook. Technical Report w26990, National Bureau of Economic Research, April 2020. URL <https://www.nber.org/papers/w26990>.

- [32] Florian Kunze, Kilian Hampel, and Sophia Zimmermann. Homeoffice in der Corona-Krise : eine nachhaltige Transformation der Arbeitswelt? WORKINGPAPER, 2020. URL <https://kops.uni-konstanz.de/handle/123456789/51524>.
- [33] Andrea M. Lerner, Gregory K. Folkers, and Anthony S. Fauci. Preventing the Spread of SARS-CoV-2 With Masks and Other “Low-tech” Interventions. *JAMA*, 324(19):1935, November 2020. ISSN 0098-7484. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.21946. URL <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2772459>.
- [34] Giuseppe Lippi, Brandon M. Henry, Chiara Bovo, and Fabian Sanchis-Gomar. Health risks and potential remedies during prolonged lockdowns for coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Diagnosis (Berlin, Germany)*, 7(2):85–90, 2020. ISSN 2194-802X. doi:10.1515/dx-2020-0041.
- [35] Navid Mahdizadeh Gharakhanlou and Navid Hooshangi. Spatio-temporal simulation of the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak using the agent-based modeling approach (case study: Urmia, Iran). *Informatics in Medicine Unlocked*, 20:100403, January 2020. ISSN 2352-9148. doi:10.1016/j.imu.2020.100403. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352914820305530>.
- [36] Timo Mitze, Reinhold Kosfeld, Johannes Rode, and Klaus Wälde. Face masks considerably reduce COVID-19 cases in Germany. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(51):32293–32301, December 2020.
- [37] Mélodie Monod, Alexandra Blenkinsop, Xiaoyue Xi, Daniel Hebert, Sivan Bershan, Simon Tietze, Marc Baguelin, Valerie C. Bradley, Yu Chen, Helen Coupland, Sarah Filippi, Jonathan Ish-Horowicz, Martin McManus, Thomas Mellan, Axel Gandy, Michael Hutchinson, H. Juliette T. Unwin, Sabine L. van Elsland, Michaela A. C. Vollmer, Sebastian Weber, Harrison Zhu, Anne Bezancon, Neil M. Ferguson, Swapnil Mishra, Seth Flaxman, Samir Bhatt, Oliver Ratmann, and on behalf of the Imperial College COVID-19 Response Team. Age groups that sustain resurging COVID-19 epidemics in the United States. *Science*, February 2021. ISSN 0036-8075, 1095-9203. doi:10.1126/science.abe8372. URL <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/early/2021/02/01/science.abe8372>.
- [38] Victoria Ng, Aamir Fazil, Lisa A. Waddell, Christina Bancej, Patricia Turgeon, Ainsley Otten, Nicole Atchessi, and Nicholas H. Ogden. Projected effects of nonpharmaceutical public health interventions to prevent resurgence of SARS-CoV-2 transmission in Canada. *CMAJ*, 192(37):E1053–E1064, September 2020. ISSN 0820-3946, 1488-2329. doi:10.1503/cmaj.200990. URL <https://www.cmaj.ca/content/192/37/E1053>.
- [39] Akihiro Nishi, George Dewey, Akira Endo, Sophia Neman, Sage K. Iwamoto, Michael Y. Ni, Yusuke Tsugawa, Georgios Iosifidis, Justin D. Smith, and Sean D. Young. Network interventions for managing the COVID-19 pandemic and sustaining economy. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, November 2020. ISSN 0027-8424, 1091-6490. doi:10.1073/pnas.2014297117. URL <https://www.pnas.org/content/early/2020/11/10/2014297117>.
- [40] William L. Oberkampf. Simulation Accuracy, Uncertainty, and Predictive Capability: A Physical Sciences Perspective. In Claus Beisbart and Nicole J. Saam, editors, *Computer Simulation Validation: Fundamental Concepts, Methodological Frameworks, and Philosophical Perspectives*, Simulation Foundations, Methods and Applications, pages 69–97. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2019. isbn:978-3-319-70766-2. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-70766-2_3.

- [41] Maria Polyakova, Geoffrey Kocks, Victoria Udalova, and Amy Finkelstein. Initial economic damage from the COVID-19 pandemic in the United States is more widespread across ages and geographies than initial mortality impacts. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(45):27934–27939, November 2020. ISSN 0027-8424, 1091-6490. doi:10.1073/pnas.2014279117. URL <https://www.pnas.org/content/117/45/27934>.
- [42] Robert-Koch-Institut. Data on covid19: https://npgeo-corona-npgeo-de.hub.arcgis.com/datasets/dd4580c810204019a7b8eb3e0b329dd6_0, 2021. URL https://npgeo-corona-npgeo-de.hub.arcgis.com/datasets/dd4580c810204019a7b8eb3e0b329dd6_0/data.
- [43] Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP). Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP), data for years 1984-2017, version 34, SOEP, 2017., 2019. URL <http://doi.org/10.5684/soep.v34>.
- [44] Flaminio Squazzoni, J. Gareth Polhill, Bruce Edmonds, Petra Ahrweiler, Patrycja Antosz, Geeske Scholz, Émile Chappin, Melania Borit, Harko Verhagen, Francesca Giardini, and Nigel Gilbert. Computational Models That Matter During a Global Pandemic Outbreak: A Call to Action. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*, 23(2):10, 2020. ISSN 1460-7425.
- [45] Jan C. Thiele, Winfried Kurth, and Volker Grimm. Facilitating Parameter Estimation and Sensitivity Analysis of Agent-Based Models: A Cookbook Using NetLogo and R. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*, 17(3):11, 2014. ISSN 1460-7425.

A Supplementary information

Table 1: Values and data sources of simulation parameters

Parameter	Value	Source
Hours worked on weekdays	agent-specific	[43]
Age	agent-specific	[43]
Gender	agent-specific	[43]
Federal state	agent-specific	[43]
Nace rev. 2 category	agent-specific	[43]
Household weight	household-specific	[43]
Enrollment at the university	agent-specific	[43]
Daily hours at stores	agent-specific	[43]
Daily hours at kindergarten	5	Assumption
Daily hours at school	5	Assumption
Daily hours at universities	4	Assumption
Kindergarten age	0 - 5	Assumption
School age	6 - 19	Assumption
Supermarkets per agents	1/1000	Assumption
Colleagues per work place	10	Assumption
Number of supermarkets an agent visits	2	Assumption
Number of Universities	1	Assumption
Days until an agent cures symptoms at home	1	Assumption
Duration of household quarantine in days	14	Assumption
Daytime	8 - 21	Assumption
Probability of developing symptoms at age 0-9	0.5	[28]
Probability of developing symptoms at age 10-19	0.55	[28]
Probability of developing symptoms at age 20-29	0.6	[28]
Probability of developing symptoms at age 30-39	0.65	[28]
Probability of developing symptoms at age 40-49	0.7	[28]
Probability of developing symptoms at age 50-59	0.75	[28]
Probability of developing symptoms at age 60-69	0.8	[28]
Probability of developing symptoms at age 70-79	0.85	[28]
Probability of developing symptoms at age > 80	0.9	[28]
Days from exposed to presymp. infectious	lognormal(4.6, 4.8)	[28]
Days from presymp. infectious to (a)symp. infectious	lognormal(1, 1)	[28]
Days from (a)symptomatic to recovered	lognormal(8, 2)	[28]
Average class size Baden-Wuerttemberg	22	[15]
Average class size Bavaria	23	[15]
Average class size Hamburg	25	[15]
Average class size Saarland	24	[15]
Average kindergarten group size in Baden-Wuerttemberg	15	[5]
Average kindergarten group size in Bavaria	18	[5]
Average kindergarten group size in Hamburg	18	[5]
Average kindergarten group size in Saarland	18	[5]

Table 2: Calibrated parameters

Parameter	Baden-Wuerttemberg	Bavaria	Hamburg	Saarland
Hourly infection probability	0.06213	0.0645	0.0502	0.04727
Days from symptoms to household quarantine	1.21	1.32	1.40	1.30

Table 3: Descriptive statistics on federal states

Variable	Baden-Wuertt.	Bavaria	Hamburg	Saarland	Source
GDP 2019 in billions €	524.33	632.90	123.27	36.25	[1]
Inhabitants per km ² 2018	310	185	2438	385	[16]
Average age in agent pop.	46.153958	45.791286	45.164004	44.727600	[43]
Average household size in agent pop.	2.791733	2.605203	2.735912	2.513871	[43]
Average work hours in agent pop.	3.091075	3.106836	2.696887	3.082421	[43]
Most frequent NACE Rev.2 in agent pop.	C (14.62%)	C (13.02%)	Q (7.94%)	Q (12.72%)	[43]
Men in agent pop.	48.33%	48.47%	44.86%	46.44%	[43]
Pupils in agent pop.	13.31%	12.53%	14.44%	12.65%	[43]
Kindergarten kids in agent pop.	5.01%	4.81%	5.08%	4.51%	[43]
University students in agent pop.	2.32%	2.12%	3.44%	1.45%	[43]




Figure 5: Robustness check: hours at kindergarten. Compares the number of COVID-19 infections in the baseline scenario across different values for the daily hours at kindergarten. The value in the center is the one used in the main analysis.




Figure 6: Robustness check: hours at school. Compares the number of COVID-19 infections in the baseline scenario across different values for hours at school. The value in the center is the one used in the main analysis.




Figure 7: Robustness check: hours at university. Compares the number of COVID-19 infections in the baseline scenario across different values for hours at university. The value in the center is the one used in the main analysis.




Figure 8: Robustness check: number of colleagues. Compares the number of COVID-19 infections in the baseline scenario across different values for number of colleagues. The value in the center is the one used in the main analysis.




Figure 9: Robustness check: maximum number of students per university. Compares the number of COVID-19 infections in the baseline scenario across different values for the maximum number of students per university. We used 100,000 in the main analysis, which means that there is only one university per simulated world.